



## HOW TO IMPROVE THE HONESTY OF STUDENTS IN INDONESIA? SUFISM-BASED ISLAMIC EDUCATION MODEL AS AN ALTERNATIVE

 **Munawar Rahmat<sup>1+</sup>**  
**M. Wildan Yahya<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Study Program of Science of Islamic Religious Education, Indonesia  
University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia.

Email: [munawarrahmat.pai@upi.edu](mailto:munawarrahmat.pai@upi.edu) Tel: +6287884941758

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Dakwah, Bandung Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia.



(+ Corresponding author)

### ABSTRACT

#### Article History

Received: 5 November 2020

Revised: 27 November 2020

Accepted: 16 December 2020

Published: 7 January 2021

#### Keywords

Education based sufism

honesty

Indonesia

Islamic education

Model of teaching.

The phenomenon of dishonesty among Indonesian students is severe and frequent. The conventional lecture model to teach principles of ethics, morality and honesty is less reliable. A new and more effective model is needed. Sufism is a discipline of Islamic science that studies the inner dimension of man as an effort to approach God as closely as possible. In Sufism there are several core characteristics such as God is always felt to be present, *zuhud*, *uzlah*, and *qana'ah*. The research aims to produce a model of Islamic education based on Sufism to increase students' honesty. The research took place in two universities in the city of Bandung, Indonesia. In each university, three experimental classes (200 students) used the Sufism-based education model, while the other three classes (control class) used the conventional model (200 students). The study material as well as number of sessions (six times face to face) on honesty for the two classes was the same. The difference was that the experimental class was taught honesty through Sufism based principles, while the control class studied through the conventional method different from Sufism. The research method was quasi-experimental as before and after six lectures, we tested both classes with a pre-test and a post-test. The result was an increase in scores in both groups but the experimental group scored much higher than the control one. The implication is that the Islamic education model based on Sufism is proven to be more effective than the conventional education model in increasing students' honesty.

**Contribution/Originality:** This study is one of the pioneering studies to show that the principles of Sufism can be used to teach honesty to Indonesian students. The main principles of Sufism are dhikr (feeling God's presence and remembering Him), *zuhûd* (oriented to the afterlife), ' *uzlah* (ready to do right/honestly even though alone), and *qana' ah* (feeling satisfied with the sustenance that God has given, much or little).

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of dishonesty appears to be a moral problem in Indonesia as well as in many other countries. In Indonesia, the problem of dishonesty is however very severe. Corruption with a higher quantity and quality has affected almost all levels of the Indonesian society. There have been dozens of ministers and regional heads as well as hundreds of legislators who have been tripped in corruption cases. In 2018 alone, 29 governors, regents, and mayors were founded indulged in corruption (Tribunjogja, 2018). Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) reported that during the last four years there were 181 corruption cases of the village funds (Tribunkaltim, 2018). In the world of education, the ICW noted at least 12 patterns of corruption mostly occurring on campus. These cases relate include the practice of electing a rector, procurement of goods and services, asset sales, and illegal fees. ICW

found at least 37 cases of alleged corruption in tertiary institutions from 2006 to August 2016. Likewise, from 2005 to 2016 there were around 425 cases of corruption, out of which 214 cases of corruption occurred in the education office (Darmawan, 2018). It seems that corruption and dishonesty are global phenomena. Transparency International releases the Global Corruption Barometer which reports public opinion on corruption and bribery. Surprisingly, educational institutions are prone to this immoral activity (Barometer, 2009).

Is religion or religious life not a barrier for someone to commit corruption? How is it possible for corruptors to carry out their dishonest actions in budget posts that are directly related to the afterlife? How can a candidate for a regional head who is corrupt and arrested by the KPK, be elected by a community in an area known for being religious and win the regional head elections? Such questions have engrossed the Indonesian society known for its religious fervor. The Indonesian Survey Institute (LSI) in the last two years has surveyed trends in public perceptions of corruption, affiliations of religious organizations, and democracy. There are many things revealed in the survey results. The Executive Director of LSI said that respondents have different attitudes and actions towards corrupt practices. The public tends to admit that they cannot accept corruption, but on the other hand, they can tolerate the practice. Even more surprising, respondents who are members of religious organizations in Indonesia, tend to be more pro-corruption. This fact can be proven by the fact that in the political system in Indonesia, religious organizations sometimes act as channels for organizing the vote-buying and selling processes (Kuskrihdho, 2018). This means that corruption in Indonesia is evenly distributed among all levels of society who have access to state and government finances. It turns out that corruption also occurs in social and religious funds; no matter what the corrupted funds are for, whether for infrastructure, education, social, or religious development. Another phenomenon of dishonesty is the rise of mistresses, adultery, and infidelity between husbands and wives, which are also examples of dishonesty towards socio-religious principles.

There are instances of dishonesty even in an environment outside the university. In northern Europe, for instance, project reporting suffers from dishonest practices. Normally, a report's cover is printed in three colors: blue (if the project report is prepared as planned, without any notes), yellow (if the project report is prepared according to the plan with some notes), and red (the project report deviates from the plan). The report makers who are supposed to give a red cover to a report often replace it with yellow. If the dishonesty was discovered, the reporter would argue and claim that he had prepared as per plan. Thus he would try to immune himself from accusations of poor project workmanship (Kvalnes, 2014). Misreporting of a project is distorted in two ways: Either the reporter accidentally assumes the wrong status, or the reporter deliberately misreport the perceived status (Smith, 1995). Project managers and other decision-makers in projects all rely on accurate information about relevant aspects of the project. Problems arise when there is a reluctance to report negative project news. This can lead to poor project performance, both concerning the process or the result. If decision-makers are misinformed, projects are likely to languish and possibly collapse in costly and potentially embarrassing ways (Smith, Keil, & Depledge, 2001).

In the world of education, there is a technical process to prepare the results of the National Examination and to determine the number of students who pass and who get high scores. State higher education entrance exams are almost always enlivened by the jockey phenomenon. Small private universities distribute their diplomas in unusual ways. Only with 1-2 years of study, students get a bachelor's degree. There are even those who get their diplomas without going to college at all. Among students of undergraduate, master, and doctoral programs, even among lecturers and professors, there is a phenomenon of plagiarism. A study of student respondents from the University of Mindanao (Davao City, Philippines) showed that students were more honest at home than on campus. But they see honesty as an investment for a future career. Then first and second-year students view professors as honest people while final year students view professors as less honest (Tamayo, 2014). Other research results show that even students who are known to be honest commit dishonesty because first, dishonesty brings benefits to them without reducing their self-concept; and second, those close to them do not try to correct their mistakes (Nazar,

Ariely, & Amir, 2008). Dishonesty of students in the form of cheating as a habit of students is being reported for decades. (Parr, 1936), even among those students who excel and are bright students (Taradi, Taradi, & Dogas, 2012). If not controlled, this fraudulent behavior may continue until they work as professionals. Therefore, student dishonesty needs to be prevented and minimized. Among the efforts to improve students' honesty in exams is the quality of exam questions that are trusted by them as an instrument to measure the quality of their learning outcomes (McClain, Gulbis, & Hays, 2017).

So far, corruption prevention has only been resolved with a criminal law approach. Corruptors who are caught are tried in the KPK court and imprisoned. The question is whether educational institutions can prevent corrupt behavior from an early age. Eradicating corruption is a long process which undergoes not only legal mechanisms but also in the form of sowing logical reasoning and new values free of corruption through formal education. The results of qualitative research in SMP and SMA Kota Bandung (Indonesia) show that anti-corruption learning in citizenship subjects is carried out through contextual learning and value learning approaches. This learning includes an anti-corruption education module, adjustment of anti-corruption values through honest canteen practices, and creating an anti-corruption climate in schools (Komalasari & Saripudin, 2015). Dishonesty can also be minimized through the enforcement of a code of ethics (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2002); the influence of lecturers and fellow students (Teodorescu & Andrei, 2009); and a positive environment (Bernardi et al., 2004).

Honesty education in higher education is teachers' responsibility especially those who teach religious and moral courses. However, there is a dearth of studies on making honesty education model in religious education more effective for students. In 2012, a study was conducted on the effectiveness of the *targhib-tarhib* (divine punishment-reward) learning model to increase the honesty of students at the Indonesian Education University. The result included first, the level of student honesty was still low; and second, that learning model could only slightly increase student honesty scores (Rahmat & Fahrudin, 2012). It was not known whether the improvement in honesty with this model would last long or how long it would take for the level of honesty of students to return to normal.

In Islam, there are teachings of *sharia* (more outward in nature) and *haqiqa* (more inwardly). Honesty learning can be approached with *sharia* (knowledge of morals) and nature (the science of sufism). The *sharia* approach emphasizes the halal-haram aspect while the intrinsic approach emphasizes the issue of human closeness to God. Sufism is not a characteristic of Islam but it is a feature of world's major religions, including the result of a meeting of Sufis with the Christians (Smith, 1995). Among the main teachings of Sufism are *maqamat* (the stages in which humans approach God), especially repentance (asking for God's forgiveness), *wara'* (keeping the soul pure), *zuhud* (more oriented towards the afterlife without forgetting the world), *uzlah* (being able to carry out noble teachings even if alone), *qana'ah* (satisfied with God's gift, whether much or little), *patience*, *tawakkal* (submit/represent matters to God), and *dhikr* (feeling the presence of God and remembering Him) (Rahmat, Supriadi, & Fahrudin, 2016). The teachings of Sufism are very difficult to comprehend so university teachers tend to only use the *sharia* approach, besides there are also lecturers who reject Sufism on the accusation of being influencing the religion outside of Islam (Wijaya & Rudi, 2020). The teachings of Sufism that are thought to be related to honesty are *dhikr*, *zuhud*, *uzlah*, and *qana'ah*. These four *maqamat* of *tasawuf* are accepted by all Muslims so that they will not cause problems when implemented in educational practice.

The main question of this research, hence, was framed as: What is the model of honesty education based on Sufism in Islamic education in the two universities (UPI and UNISBA) in Indonesia?

## 2. METHODS

The study used a quasi-experimental design. The research was conducted at two universities, Indonesia University of Education (UPI) and Bandung Islamic University (UNISBA). In each university, for this study, three classes of 100 students each (experimental group) were taught adopting the Islamic education model based on

Sufism, and the other three classes (control group, 100 students each) used the conventional learning model (Islamic education model without Sufism). The lecture material for both groups was the same, namely texts about honesty. The duration of a class was also same for each lecture in each group equal to 6x100 minutes. The only difference was that the experimental class was taught with Sufism highlighting its principles such as importance of repentance, *zuhud*, and avoiding arrogance and *ujub*, *riya*, *sum`ah*. Before the start of the experimentation, both classes were tested (pretest), and after eight lectures they were tested again with the same test (post-test). The two tests (pre and post) used topics such as Religiosity, religious tolerance, and character of Sufism. The research was conducted in the even semester of 2019 and the odd semester of 2020.

The questionnaire contained mainly Yes - No statements. A few examples include: "Under no circumstances should I tell the truth, I won't lie; I will be a true witness even if I harm my immediate family; It is only natural for people to do petty corruption just to make ends meet." The validity and reliability were tested with a sample of 400 students using IBM SPSS Statistics version 24. A total of 20 items were found valid (16 items significant at alpha 0.01 and four items significant at alpha 0.05).  $r = 0.86$  significant at alpha 0.01.

The Analyze Paired Samples Statistics Paradigms were used to conduct comparative tests between the experimental group and the control group, as well as to examine the post-test and pre-test results of both the experimental and control groups. This model adopted Bruce Joyce & Marsha Weil's *Models of Teaching* (Joyce & Weil, 2009). The model steps included: first, model design (consisting of model scenarios, model orientation, and analysis of the model), and second, model implementation.

### 3. FINDINGS

#### 3.1. Learning Model Design

A model of Islamic education learning based on Sufism was designed with the following three stages:

##### i. Scenario of honesty learning Model

The scenario of the Sufism-based honesty learning model face-to-face with each student was carried out in three stages: First, opening the lecture. At this stage the lecturer explained the theme of the lecture (namely "honesty") and the learning objectives (so that students understand, uphold, and are expected to behave "honestly"); second, convey the main message of the lecture (studying "honesty" with the Sufism approach). At this stage the lecturer explained the meaning of "honesty" and the importance of upholding "honesty" as an effort to approach God as closely as possible, discussing it through moral dilemmas and Sufistic solutions, and trying to personify the values of "honesty" based on mysticism to students; and third, closing the lecture. At this stage, the lecturer closed the lecture by awakening students to uphold "honesty", as an effort to approach Allah as closely as possible.

##### ii. Model Orientation

###### • The Meaning of Honest Sufism Perspective.

Honest is a character for people who tell the truth and act in righteous manner. Included in the category of saying and acting truthfully are being true in witnesses (not hiding the truth), keeping promises (when promised), and being trustworthy (when given trust). The opposite of being honest is lying, whether in speech or deed. Falsehood includes perjury, breaking promises, and treason. Honesty is the character of the believer, while lying is the character of the hypocrite. The Prophet Muhammad SAW said, there are three characteristics of a hypocrite: If you lie, if you promise to break your promise, and if you are believe in treason (Bukhari, 2013; Muslim, 2013). The Q 4/al-Nisa verse 145 states that the hypocrites are put to the deepest hell.

Honest action is very hard because it involves a very broad field of life. Honest or dishonest betting is religion, whether to choose Allah and His Messenger (to be honest) or choose the world (tell lies, break promises, and betray) with the risk of facing the punishment of Allah. In Q 4/al-Nisa verse 135 Allah SWT says: "O you who believe, be

you a true enforcer of justice, a witness for Allah, even if it is against yourself or your parents and relatives. If he is rich or poor, then Allah knows more about his benefits; so do not follow lust because you want to deviate from the truth. And if you twist (words) or are reluctant to be a witness, then verily Allah is All-knowing all that you do (Qur`ān, 2013). Then in a hadith, Rasulullah SAW said: Always do you honestly, because being honest leads to goodness, while virtue brings him to heaven. It is not someone honest and he always tries to be honest, until he is written with Allah as an honest person. And stay away from lying because it leads to disobedience, while disobedience leads to hell. It is not someone who lies and always tries to lie until he is written with Allah as a liar (Bukhari, 2013; Muslim, 2013).

Sufistic perspective does not mean honesty in words and deeds; but it must be based on inner honesty. The basis for honest deeds is to obey Allah and His Messenger, as a form of worship to Allah until the God who is worshiped is felt to be present while indulged in dishonest acts by remembering Him so that God is felt to be always watching (Q 15/al-Hijr: 99 other verses) (Qur`ān, 2013).

- *Psychological and Pedagogical Principles of Sufism Approach.*

Humans are created in physical and mental dimensions [body, heart, spirit, and taste] (Rahmat, 2010b). Sufism is an attempt to conquer the physical dimension of man to submit to the spiritual dimension (Hilal, 2002). The essence of Sufism is an awareness of the existence of communication and dialogue between the human spirit by isolating oneself and contemplating (Nasution, 1973). As Afandi emphasizes, the essence of Sufism is to study how the human essence meets the essence of God through a recitation expert in the science of essence (Afandi, 2009). Even though they are interpreted differently, the three experts on Sufism both emphasize that the study of Sufism is more about natural science, emphasizes *riyadhah* (spiritual practice) more to the inner dimension, and emphasizes my awareness of God's presence and the sharpening of feelings always with God. The Sufistic education model is very much following Islamic philosophy-anthropology and psychology.

- *Features of the Sufism Approach.*

The Sufism approach emphasizes the integration of *share`at* and essence development. In the guidance of prayers, for example, it is not just that students perform the five prayers as a practice laid down in Islamic conditions. However, most important is the inner dimension or to be able to do *dhikr*, to remember Allah, according to Allah's command: *wa aqimi al-shalâta li al-dzikrî* = and establish prayers to remember me (Q 20/Thaha: 14) (Qur`ān, 2013) and (Q 2/al-Baqarah: 45) (Qur`ān, 2013). The Sufism approach is under *fithrah* or the origin of human events (human nature) created by Allah from His Self (Q 30/al-Rum: 30) (Qur`ān, 2013) which according to KH Muhammad Munawwar Affandi is the human identity or the element of taste (*sirr*), which is the deepest, innermost, human dimension (Affandi, 2002).

### iii. Model Analysis

- Stages of the Model.

The stage of the Sufistic model of education begins by describing the Islamic view (with direct reference to the Qur'an, with an explanation of Sufism). It is about human character and the way back to God; it describes the main Sufi values (which was the theme of the lecture); followed by reviewing the characters to be implanted; then examines the characters that are implanted based on Sufi values; and finally contemplation. The complete description is explained as follows:

(a) The *first* stage, describes the human character of the Islamic perspective (Qur`ān, 2013). The word which means *human* in the Qur'an is *basyar*, *al-insan*, and *al-nâs*. Almost all the verses of the Qur'an relating to these three terms of humans have been condemned by Allah as *zhalûman jahûlâ* (unjust and ignorant), *kafir*, polytheists, and not knowing the true religion. The only safe way to return to God is to kill lust (*jihad akbar*) by obeying Allah and His Messenger or *Ulil Amri* among you (Rahmat, 2010a).

(b) The *second* stage reveals the Islamic perspective (al-Qur'an and Sufism) on the ways to return to God, to

reach God which begins with a safe death (*khusn al-khatimah*). *Jihad akbar* (*jihad* to subdue lust and lust) is the main path used by Sufis (Rahmat, 2010a). Imam Ghazali describes the seven ladders of lust, namely: anger, *lawwâmah*, *mulhimah*, *muthmainnah*, *radhiyah*, *mardhiyah*, and *kâmilah* (Ghazali, 1989). It seems that the effort to subdue that lust is to climb (the *taraqi* process) the seven ladders of lust to *kâmilah* lust. The need to subdue the 7 passions is expressed by scholars like Murshid Tariqat, KH Muhammad Munawwar Affandi, Murshid (Teacher of the Shattariyah), who emphasized the necessity of subduing the 7 ladders of lust by relying on the Recitation Expert in the *ummah* (Affandi, 2002). "The initial start is very heavy, you have to start from the 4th ladder of lust, *muthmainnah* lust," according to Q 89/Al-Fajr verses 27-30 (Qur`ân, 2013).

(c) The *third* stage, examines the characters to be developed. In this research, for example, the character developed is "honesty".

(d) The *fourth* stage, combining the discussion of the characters inculcated with Sufistic values (*dzikir*, *zuhûd*, *qana'ah*, and *'uzlah*; other Sufistic values can also be added such as repentance, *tawakkal*, and *shabr*).

(e) The *fifth* stage, contemplation. At this stage, students are asked to ponder by expressing messages and impressions received after the lecture process with this Sufism approach.

- Social System.

The teacher would invite students to reflect on the origin of human events (nature, or human identity) which God created from His Nature, and from His Self to bring humans to life in the world, Allah's intention was only to test the humans [with a test in the form of 'hard' and 'happy'] (Q 21/al-Anbiya: 35) (Qur`ân, 2013) and most humans cannot pass this worldly test (Q 2/Al-Baqarah verses 87-88) (Qur`ân, 2013). The students were subsequently invited to also reflect on the path that must be taken to return to Allah until they arrive safely, which turned out to be very difficult. But as hard as possible to carry out the commands of Allah and His Messenger is much harder to break them (because Allah has *'azab*/torture).

During the lecture, the teacher also provided the widest possible opportunity for students to ask questions, dialogue, discuss, and try to internalize and personalize the Sufi values and characters that are implanted. It was mandated that the Digital Qur'an must always be a part of the lecture process with students and teachers always carrying a copy of the Digital Qur'an.

- Principles of Student and Lecturer Reaction.

The principles of reactions are based on students' and teachers' actions and reactions. Whatever students said about the impact of obedience or disobedience to Allah, the truth must be tested together (by both teachers and students) by opening the Digital Qur'an. The study was completed according to the themes. For example, when describing the human character, all human terms in the Qur'an (*basyar*, *al-insan*, *al-nas*) must be discussed thoroughly. The result expected was that all students would accept as much as Allah's orders as a good thing for themselves; and would also accept that every violation of Allah is evil that must be avoided because it has fatal consequences.

- Support System.

A support system was built up in this study with the help of thematic and content analysis using the hermeneutic method of deriving meaning of the terms of the Qur'an (especially to study the Sufistic verses on honesty: *dzikir*, *zuhûd*, *qana'ah*, and *'uzlah*). The results of this historical and psychological research may also be ascribed to the behavior of religious and honest pious people.

### 3.2. Model Implementation

The implementation of the model was carried out through a quasi-experimental design for each of the three experimental and three control classes at the Indonesia University of Education (UPI) and Bandung Islamic University (UNISBA). The stages of learning in both the groups, the experimental and control were as follows.

*First, Planning Stage*

At this stage, the objectives and the learning approaches were revealed to the teachers and students. The major learning objective was that students should understand the meaning of honesty and consequences of telling lies, and what it means to get high scores of honesty and low scores for lying, and a determination to be honest and avoid lying. The learning model was based on Sufism in the experimental class which emphasized the inner dimension of honesty as an effort to approach Allah as closely as possible. Such Sufism values were identified that were thought to have a strong influence on honesty principles such as *dzikr* (remembering God), *zuhûd* (oriented to the afterlife), *'uzlah* (ready to do right/honestly even though alone), and *qana'ah* (feeling satisfied with the *rizki* (sustenance) that God has given, much or little). However, the learning model in the control class was only to directly examine honesty without using the Sufism principles.

The teaching material for honesty in both experimental and control classes was the same. The breadth of the material and the level of depth that was attempted was also the same. Likewise, the number of meetings was also same, namely six meetings (6 x 100 minutes). The manner of presentation and the order of the material were left to each teacher. The only difference was that the experimental class used the Sufism-based learning model while the control class did not.

**Table-1. Sufism-Based Honesty Teaching Materials.**

Lecture No	Material Substance	Description of Material Substance
1	Feel the presence of God	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. God is always with His servants anywhere and in any activity.</li> <li>b. God always watches over His servants. Because the servants of God must always do good and right.</li> <li>c. Humans must always remember God. By remembering God the heart is at ease.</li> </ul>
2	The meaning and importance of <i>zuhûd</i> , <i>'uzlah</i> , and <i>qana'ah</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Zuhûd</i> is afterlife oriented. With <i>zuhud</i>, the world's happiness will be achieved.</li> <li>b. <i>'Uzlah</i>, it means being able to be honest even though alone, because most humans are not honest.</li> <li>c. <i>Qana'ah</i> is feeling satisfied with the <i>rizki</i> God gives, even if it's a little. With <i>qana'ah</i>, even the slightest <i>rizki</i> will be felt a lot.</li> </ul>
3	Meaning and high value of honesty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The meaning of being honest is telling the truth, keeping promises; and trust.</li> <li>b. Prophets are examples of honesty.</li> <li>c. The high value of honesty is the happiness of the world and the hereafter. God promises heaven for the honest.</li> </ul>
4	Meaning and high value of speaking truth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. God loves those who speak the truth and hates those who tell lies.</li> <li>b. Humans love those who speak the truth and hate those who tell lies.</li> <li>c. Liars are characteristics of hypocrites.</li> <li>d. Sooner or later, lies will be discovered</li> </ul>
5	Meaning and high value of keeping promises.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. God loves those who keep promises and hates those who break promises.</li> <li>b. Humans love those who keep their promises and hate those who break their promises.</li> <li>c. Breaking promises is a hallmark of a hypocrite.</li> <li>d. Sooner or later, people who break their promises are bound to get bad replies.</li> </ul>
6	Meaning and high value of carrying out a mandate, not treason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. God loves those who are trustworthy and hates those who are treasonous.</li> <li>b. Humans love people who are trustworthy and hate those who are treasonous.</li> <li>c. Treason is a characteristic of a hypocrite.</li> <li>d. Sooner or later the traitor is bound to get bad repayment.</li> </ul>

The text related to honesty discussed following aspects:

- Meaning and high scores are for speaking the truth and low scores are for telling lies.
- Meaning and high value are for keeping promises if a promise made; while low value will result for breaking promises.
- The meaning and high value will result for doing a mandate if the mandate was given; however, low value committed treason.
- Meaning and high scores would result for being fair while low scores would result from cheating practices.

### Second, Implementation Stage

The implementation of honesty learning in the control class was entirely left to each lecturer. They taught the material with their respective skills, without using the principles of Sufism. As for the experimental class, the order of the teaching material was as presented in Table 1.

### 3.3. Model Evaluation

#### 3.3.1. Student Honesty Level

The level of student honesty was measured before and after the experimental learning as shown in Tables 2-5.

**Table-2.** Description of the level of honesty of UPI students (Experiment Class).

Level of Honesty	Pre-test results (%)	Post-test results (%)
1. High (17-20)	5	29
2. Moderate (14-16)	34	30
3. Low (10-13)	44	35
4. Dishonest (0-9)	17	6
Total	100	100

Note: n = 100 students.

Before studying Sufism based lectures, most of the UPI respondents in the experimental class had a low level of honesty and were largely dishonest (44% and 17%) (Table 2). A small proportion was at the medium level (34%) and very few were at high level of honesty (5%). Meanwhile, after studying, there was an increase in these levels. More than half of the respondents were reached the medium and high levels taken together (30% and 29%), while less than half remained at the low level and found not honest (35% and 6%). (Table 2)

**Table-3.** Description of the level of honesty of UPI students (Control Class).

Level of Honesty	Pre-test results (%)	Post-test results (%)
1. High (17-20)	5	17
2. Moderate (14-16)	30	33
3. Low (10-13)	48	40
4. Dishonest (0-9)	17	10
Total	100	100

Note: n = 100 students.

Before studying, most of the UPI respondents in the control class had a low level of honesty and dishonesty (Table 3) (48% and 17%). A small proportion is at the medium level (30%) and very few at the high level (5%). Meanwhile, after studying, there was an increase even though it did not change qualitatively. More than half of the respondents were at a low level and dishonest (40% and 10%), while almost half were at the medium and high levels (33% and 17%).



**Table-4.** Description of the level of honesty of UNISBA students (Experiment Class).

Level of Honesty	Pre-test results (%)	Post-test results (%)
1. High (17-20)	4	26
2. Moderate (14-16)	31	35
3. Low (10-13)	49	35
4. Dishonest (0-9)	16	4
Total	100	100

Note: n = 100 students.

Before studying, most of the UNISBA respondents in the experimental class showed a low level of honesty and were dishonest (49% and 16%) (Table 4). A small proportion showed medium and high levels (31% and 4%). Meanwhile, after studying, there was an increase. Most of the respondents were at medium and high levels (35% and 26%), while a small proportion was at the low level (35%) and very few were at the dishonest level (4%).

**Table-5.** Description of the level of honesty of UNISBA students (Control Class).

Level of Honesty	Pre-test results (%)	Post-test results (%)
1. High (17-20)	5	17
2. Moderate (14-16)	30	33
3. Low (10-13)	48	40
4. Dishonest (0-9)	17	10
Total	100	100

Note: n = 100 students.

Before studying, most of the control class UNISBA respondents had a low level of honesty and dishonesty (48% and 17%) (Table 5). A small proportion is at the medium level (30%) and very few at the high level (5%). Meanwhile, after studying, there was an increase. Half of the respondents are at the medium and high levels (33% and 17%), half are at a low level, and are not honest (40% and 10%).

### 3.3.2. Model Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the model can be seen from the mean and t-test results of pre and post-test results of honesty in the experimental class and control class as in the following table.

**Table-6.** Mean of experiment group, mean of control group, and t-test of honesty scores in UPI students.

Group	Mean 1	Mean 2	t-test	Remark
1. Post-Pre Experiment	14.15	12.43	16.159	Significant at alpha 0.01
2. Post-Pre Control	13.13	12.39	7.045	Significant at alpha 0.01
3. Pre-Experiment-Control	12.43	12.39	.099	Not significant
4. Post-Experiment-Control	14.15	13.13	2.273	Significant at alpha 0.05
5. Experiment-Control Gain	1.72	.74	6.575	Significant at alpha 0.01

Note: n Experiment = 100 students, n Control = 100 students.

The table above shows that the new and conventional Islamic education models both contribute to increasing the honesty of UPI students ( $t = 16,159$  and  $7,045$  are significant at alpha  $.01$  and  $df 99$ ). Before the experiment, both groups had relatively the same mean honesty scores, namely  $12.43$  and  $12.39$  ( $t = .199$  not significant at alpha  $0.05$  and  $df 99$ ). But after the experiment (six face-to-face sessions of 100 minutes each) the experimental class score increased higher (i.e.  $14.15$ ) than the control class (only  $13.13$ ),  $t = 2.273$  (significant at alpha  $0.05$   $df 99$ ). This difference was confirmed by the gain test of the two groups,  $t = 6.145$  (significant at alpha  $0.01$   $df 99$ ). Thus, the Islamic education model based on Sufism proved more effective than conventional education models in increasing the honesty of UPI students.

**Table-7.** Mean of experiment group, mean of control group, and t-test of honesty scores in UNISBA students.

Group	Mean 1	Mean 2	t-test	Remark
1. Post-Pre Experiment	14.12	12.39	15.839	Significant at alpha 0.01
2. Post-Pre Control	13.41	12.45	10.690	Significant at alpha 0.01
3. Pre-Experiment-Control	12.39	12.45	.194	Not significant
4. Post-Experiment-Control	14.12	13.41	1.993	Significant at alpha 0.05
5. Experiment-Control Gain	1.62	.96	4.685	Significant at alpha 0.01

Note: n Experiment = 100 students, n Control = 100 students.

Similarly, Table 7 shows new and conventional Islamic education models contribute to increasing the honesty of UNISBA students ( $t = 15,839$  and  $10,690$  are significant at alpha  $.01$  and  $df 99$ ). Before the experiment, the two groups had relatively similar mean honesty scores, namely  $12.39$  and  $12.45$  ( $t = .194$  not significant at alpha  $0.05$  and  $df 99$ ). But after the experiment (six face-to-face sessions of 100 minutes each) the experimental class score increased higher (ie  $14.12$ ) than the control class (only  $13.41$ ),  $t = 1.993$  (significant at alpha  $0.05$   $df 99$ ). This difference was confirmed by the gain test of the two groups,  $t = 4.689$  (significant at alpha  $0.01$   $df 99$ ). Thus, the Islamic education model based on Sufism proved more effective than conventional education models in increasing the honesty of UNISBA students.

The next question that was tested was whether the influence of the Sufism-based education model and the conventional education model both last long in increasing the student honesty. To find the answer, three months after the first post-test, another post-test was carried out. The results are presented in the following table (Table 8).

**Table-8.** Mean of experiment group, mean of control group, and t-test of honesty scores in UPI students after three months.

Group	Mean 1	Mean 2	t-test	Remark
1. Post-Pre Experiment	13.58	12.43	11.755	Significant at alpha 0.01
2. Post-Pre Control	12.54	12.39	1.774	Significant at alpha 0.01
3. Pre-Experiment-Control	12.43	12.39	.099	Not significant
4. Post-Experiment-Control	13.58	12.54	2.377	Significant at alpha 0.05
5. Experiment-Control Gain	1.15	.15	7.181	Significant at alpha 0.01

Note: n Experiment = 100 students, n Control = 100 students.

Table 8 shows that only the new education model contributed to increasing the honesty of UPI students. Three months after the first post-test, the score of honesty in the experimental class had further increased from  $12.43$  to  $13.58$  and  $t = 11,755$  (significant at alpha  $.01$  and  $df 99$ ), whereas in the control class there was only a small increase in scores from  $12.39$  to  $12.54$  and  $t = 1,774$  (not significant at  $.05$  alpha and  $99$   $df$ ). The effectiveness of this new Islamic education model was thus strengthened by the results of the comparative test results of the difference in post-test scores in the two classes where  $t = 2,377$  (significant at alpha  $0.05$  and  $df 99$ ). Strengthened again by the gain test of the two groups where  $t = 7.181$  (significant at alpha  $0.01$  and  $df 99$ ). Thus, only the Islamic education model based on Sufism can be said to be truly effective, while the conventional Islamic education model is completely ineffective in increasing the honesty of UPI student.

**Table-9.** Mean of experiment group, mean of control group, and t-test of honesty scores in UNISBA students after three months later.

Group	Mean 1	Mean 2	t-test	Remark
1. Post-Pre Experiment	14.12	12.39	15.839	Significant at alpha 0.01
2. Post-Pre Control	13.41	12.45	10.690	Significant at alpha 0.01
3. Pre-Experiment-Control	12.39	12.45	.194	Not significant
4. Post-Experiment-Control	14.12	13.41	1.993	Significant at alpha 0.05
5. Experiment-Control Gain	1.62	.96	4.685	Significant at alpha 0.01

Note: n Experiment = 100 students, n Control = 100 students.

The table above shows that only the new education model contributes to increasing the honesty of UNISBA students. Three months later after the first post-test, the honesty score in the experimental class increased from  $12.39$  to  $13.39$  and  $t = 9,574$  (significant at alpha  $.01$  and  $df 99$ ), while in the control class there was only a small

increase in scores from 12.45 to 12.58 and  $t = 1806$  (not significant at .05 alpha and 99 df). The effectiveness of this new Islamic education model was strengthened by the results of the comparison of the differences in post-test scores in the two classes where  $t = 2,375$  (significant at alpha 0.05 and df 99) It was seen strengthened again by the gain test of the two groups where  $t = 6,692$  (significant at alpha 0.01 and df 99). Thus, only the Islamic education model based on Sufism can be truly effective, while the conventional Islamic education model proves completely ineffective in increasing the honesty of UNISBA students.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study are twofold: first, the level of student honesty at two universities in Bandung, Indonesia tends to be low; and second, in Islamic religious learning only a model of Sufism-based education can truly increase student honesty. The conventional education model only increases honesty temporarily, because only three months later the level of honesty of students in the conventional mode returns to its original state as before the experiment.

The first finding that the level of student honesty tends to be low is in line with the results of previous studies. Dishonesty and cheating among students has been reported for decades. For example, cheating is shown as a student habit (Parr, 1936), including among high-achieving students and medical students (Taradi et al., 2012). The findings of this study indicate that dishonesty occurs among both students and professors. A study at the University of Mindanao - Davao City, Philippines recorded the views of students about the honesty of professors. The first and second-year students viewed professors as honest people but final year students found dishonesty in their professors (Smith. et al., 2001). Why do they have different views? Maybe the students in early years did not know the professors very well while in the later years students become more familiar with them.

Likewise there is dishonesty even in an environment outside the university. Studies in northern Europe found dishonesty in project reporting (Kuskrihdho, 2018). Project reporters tend to distort reports (Smith, 1995) and also are reluctant to accept negative project reports as theirs (Smith. et al., 2001). In another study, people who are known to be honest show dishonesty. The reasons are: first, dishonesty brings benefits to those people without hurting their self-concept; second, people who are close to them do not try to correct their mistakes (Nazar et al., 2008). When does dishonesty occur?, Did it happen when students set foot in the university, or has it been there since they were still studying in high school? The results of research studies conducted in Kuningan Regency and high school students in Bandung, West Java show that the level of honesty of high school and vocational school students tends to be low (Lesmaya, 2019; Rahman, 2015).

The second finding is that only the Islamic education model based on Sufism can increase student honesty. This educational model does not appear to have been studied in previous literature. However, educational models to increase honesty are quite a lot. Among other findings, it was found that students cheat because they do not believe in the quality of the exam questions. Therefore, the prevention effort is to make an examination instrument that is trusted by students as an instrument for measuring the quality of their learning outcomes (McClain et al., 2017). Students' honesty can be minimized through the enforcement of ethical codes (McCabe et al., 2002) as well as through the influence of lecturers and student friends (Teodorescu & Andrei, 2009) and a positive environment (Bernardi et al., 2004). A qualitative study was carried out at the secondary school level in Bandung, Indonesia on anti-corruption learning in citizenship subjects. The study emphasized on contextual learning and value learning approaches as well as the anti-corruption education module, adjustment of anti-corruption values through honest canteen practices, and the creation of an anti-corruption climate in schools (Komalasari & Saripudin, 2015).

#### 5. CONCLUSION

Indonesian society needs a religious model that combines *sharia* (more outward in nature) and *haqiqa* (more inwardly). *Dhikr* (feeling God's presence and remembering Him), *zuhûd* (oriented to the afterlife), *'uzlah* (ready to

do right/honestly even though alone), and *qana'ah* (feeling satisfied with the sustenance that God has given, much or little) are the four principles of Sufism which agreed upon by both Sufi and non-Sufi scholars. We recommend Islamic Education lecturers to implement honesty education based on Sufism.

**Funding:** This study received financial support from Indonesia University of Education) and the Deputy for Strengthening Research and Development, Ministry of Research and Technology/National Research and Innovation Agency).

**Competing Interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**Acknowledgement:** Both authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

## REFERENCES

- Afandi, A. K. (2009). *Sufism: Turning the heart to shine*. Surabaya, Indonesia: Visi Humanika.
- Affandi, K. M. M. (2002). *Risalah Ilmu Syaththariah: The path to God*. Bandung, Indonesia: Pustaka Pondok Sufi.
- Barometer, G. C. (2009). Global corruption barometer. Beyond GDP. 243.
- Bernardi, R. A., Metzger, R. L., Bruno, R. G. S., Hoogkamp, M. A. W., Reyes, L. E., & Barnaby, G. H. (2004). Examining the decision process of students' cheating behavior: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50(4), 397-414. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:busi.0000025039.47788.c2>.
- Bukhari, I. (2013). *Şahîh al-Bukhari*. Retrieved from [www.lidwapusaka.com](http://www.lidwapusaka.com).
- Darmawan, C. (2018). Education fund corruption. Retrieved from: <https://berita.upi.edu/korupsi-dana-pendidikan>. [Accessed December 22, 2018].
- Ghazali, I. (1989). *Ihya` Al-Ghazali*. Semarang, Indonesia: CV Fauzan.
- Hilal, I. (2002). *Sufism between religion and philosophy: A methodological criticism*. Jakarta: Publisher Pustaka Hidayah.
- Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (2009). *Models of teaching*. New Jersey, USA: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Komalasari, K., & Saripudin, D. (2015). Integration of anti-corruption education in school's activities. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 12(6), 445.4-51. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajassp.2015.445.451>.
- Kuskrihdho, A. (2018). Strange, religious society but high corruption. Retrieved from <https://www.voaindonesia.com>. [Accessed 26 September 2018].
- Kvalnes, Ø. (2014). Honesty in projects. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 7(4), 590-600. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijmpb-07-2013-0027>.
- Lesmaya, N. D. (2019). *Study of honesty, arguments of honesty, and learning achievement of high school students in Bandung*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Indonesia University of Education. Bandung, Indonesia.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 357-378.
- McClain, L., Gulbis, A., & Hays, D. (2017). Honesty on student evaluations of teaching: Effectiveness, purpose, and timing matter. *Journal Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(3), 369-385. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1350828>.
- Muslim, I. (2013). *Şahîh Muslim*. Retrieved from [www.lidwapusaka.com](http://www.lidwapusaka.com).
- Nasution, H. (1973). *Philosophy and mysticism in Islam*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Bulan-Bintang.
- Nazar, N., Ariely, D., & Amir, O. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(6), 633-644. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.45.6.633>.
- Parr, F. W. (1936). The problem of student honesty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 7(6), 318-326. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1936.11772825>.
- Qur`ān (2013). *Tafsir Al-Quran*. Retrieved from <https://quran.kemenag.go.id/index.php>.
- Rahman, A. (2015). *The effect of honesty development in the family and school environment on the honesty level of high school students in Kuningan Regency*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Indonesia University of Education. Bandung, Indonesia.

- Rahmat, M., & Fahrudin. (2012). *Tarhib-tarhib learning model based on 'core' characters in MKDU lectures for fostering honest and anti-cheating character in UPI students*. Research Report. Institute for Research and Community Service, Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia.
- Rahmat, M., Supriadi, U., & Fahrudin. (2016). The development of sufistic “core” character-based quranic stories learning model in islamic education for the improvement of the students’ behavior. *Man in India*, 96(12), 5099–5111.
- Rahmat, M. (2010b). Insan Kamil education process at Pondok Sufi Ilmu Syaththariah Pondok Pesantren Sumber Daya At-Taqwa Tanjunganom Nganjuk East Java. *Alqalam: Journal of Islamic Studies*, 27(1), 1–40. Available at: <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.32678/alqalam.v27i1.578>.
- Rahmat, M. (2010a). *Implications of the concept of Insan Kamil in general education at Pondok Sufi Pomosda*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Indonesia University of Education. Bandung, Indonesia.
- Smith, M. (1995). Studies in early mysticism in the near and Middle East. In *Index Theologicus: International Bibliography of Theology and Religious Studies*. Retrieved from: <https://ixtheo.de/Record/1645381781>.
- Smith, J. H., Keil, M., & Depledge, G. (2001). Keeping mum as the project goes under: Towards an explanatory model. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(2), 189–227.
- Tamayo, A. M. (2014). Virtues of honesty in a higher education institution. *American Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 1–6.
- Taradi, S. K., Taradi, M., & Dogas, Z. (2012). Croatian medical students see academic dishonesty as an acceptable behaviour: a cross-sectional multicampus study. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 38, 376–379. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2011-100015>.
- Teodorescu, D., & Andrei, T. (2009). Faculty and peer influences on academic integrity: College cheating in Romania. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(3), 267–282.
- Tribunjogja. (2018). List of regional heads stumbling in corruption cses in 2018, there are 29 Governors. Retrieved from: <https://jogja.tribunnews.com/2018/12/27/daftar-kepala-daerah-yang-menjadi-tersangka-kasus-korupsi-sepanjang-2018>.
- Tribunkaltim. (2018). ICW: During 4 years there were 181 corruption cases in the Village Fund, the wife of the village head was also the suspect. Retrieved from: <https://kaltim.tribunnews.com/2018/11/21/icw-selama-4-tahun-ada-181-kasus-korupsi-dana-desa-istri-kepala-desa-juga-ikut-tersangka>.
- Wijaya, N. R. Y., & Rudi, A. (2020). The origin of sufism: A debate. *Career Journal*, 8(1), 105–124.

*Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), International Journal of Education and Practice shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.*