

# Promoting Ethics and Integrity in Indonesia: Justifications and Reasonings of The Mepi's Project for Indonesian Higher Education Institutions

Agus Wahyudi

Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

## ABSTRACT

The Management of Ethics and Strengthening Integrity (MEPI, *Manajemen Etika dan Penguatan Integritas*)'s program has been developed at and by Gadjah Mada University (UGM), Indonesia, since mid-2018. This paper overviews the project and discusses its justifications and reasonings. One of the driving forces in the emergence of the MEPI has been addressing "ethical neediness" as a common phenomenon in Indonesia. In addition, there is a need to promote a confident expectation of conduct among campus residents in research, education, and community services. To address this challenge of "ethical neediness," a conventional approach emphasizing ethical management on a narrow rules-based focus is often utilized. This article contends that to have effective ethics management, such a conventional approach is insufficient. This presentation will discuss why the MEPI adopts a strategy of the non-conventional approach based on a combination of external and internal controls. As a project specifically designed to improve standards of ethical behaviors and expectations of conduct, the MEPI applies to the campus environment and various governmental and civil society organizations. This article contributes to our knowledge about making ethical priorities and ethical management measures underlying the MEPI's project that utilizes a non-conventional strategy of aggressively promoting ethics and integrity, emphasizing aspects of a rules-based (or compliance) and values-based approach combined.

**Keywords:** Ethical Neediness, MEPI UGM, Ethics, Integrity, Academic Misconduct

## INTRODUCTION

Ethical neediness involves life choices and social policies involving ethical considerations: it relates to the individual and collective knowledge about good and bad. It is specifically not separable from the problem of mistaken moral choices or the use of low (untested) ethical standards in human society. Particularly in higher education institutions, how people determine the choice of actions and policies that indicate their collective performance is an essential root of ethical questions. It is in higher education institutions that one can also find ethical neediness. In *New Research in Academic Misconduct Interventions*, reported by "the International Center for Academic Integrity" (ICAI),<sup>[1]</sup> it is noted that 50-80% of students in countries around the world acknowledge engaging in academic misconduct, typically plagiarism and cheating. ICAI also mentioned *Who's Who* findings that showed that among high school children in America, 80% of them were accepted to the best campuses, committed fraud, and considered cheating an everyday thing. More than half of them do not consider cheating a serious violation. Many universities report increases, sometimes dramatic ones, in academic misconduct, especially as colleges moved online during the COVID-19 crisis.<sup>[2]</sup> In China, there have been similarly expressed concerns among scientists and the media about the integrity of Chinese science.<sup>[3]</sup> As noted by Zeng and Resnik (2010: 166), an investigation conducted by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) from 1998-2005 found evidence of 60 government-funded scientists' misconduct, while data falsification (40%) was the most common findings, followed by plagiarism (34%) and data fabrication or theft (7%), in addition of other types misconduct that amounted to 19% of the total. Various cases of violations of academic ethics,

such as plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, and so on, continue occurring in many parts of the world.

The challenge of ethical neediness and academic misconduct on campuses in Indonesia is arguably no different. The problem of ethical neediness remains, if not even more extensive, unseen under the surface and never disappeared, and thus it cannot be underestimated. The impacts of the past authoritarian government policies on moral education in Indonesia persisted at various levels, including its public officials and school curricula, despite the seeming transformation toward democracy[4]. The “Ethics Management and Strengthening Integrity” (MEPI)’s program was introduced at and by Gadjah Mada University (UGM), Indonesia started, in 2018. The initiative occurred amid the Indonesian political elites and public officers’ rampant corruption and the alleged low quality of its education, which are assumed to have been closely connected with ethical neediness. Moreover, various cases that are highly problematic from the moral standards point of view and appear as significant integrity problems for the lives of the universities (which are also deeply related to the ethical culture in many private companies and government offices) always occur. They are evidence with varying seriousness that never seems to be appropriately managed due to the unavailability of adequate instruments, if not a lack of urgency among the leaders and decision-makers.

To further illustrate an approach to overcoming ethical neediness, this article discusses the MEPI and why and how the UGM started the project. The discussion will focus on its justification and analysis of its reasonings. It will explain that the MEPI is a model to promote ethics and integrity, firstly implemented at the UGM campus environment aggressively and coordinatedly. This article will discuss this last notion: what is meant by promoting ethics and integrity? It has been a cliché, yet it is always challenging that before one can improve ethical life in the world, one must first improve it in a small scope. Improving ethics and integrity starts from ethically significant circumstances, such as campus life. However, the MEPI may also apply to similar “ethically significant circumstances” of scopes and contexts outside campuses, including government offices or private companies.

This presentation will be divided into two parts. The first section will discuss the concepts of ethics and integrity and how the two concepts relate to one another before outlining the justification and analysis of the implications of the MEPI program. Misconceptions regarding ethical and moral education policies, including laws, will be discussed in this section to show how the MEPI’s strategy differs from conventional ethical and legal management. The MEPI adopts non-conventional strategies of combining external controls or rules-based (or compliance) and internal controls or values-based approaches, as outlined by Staffan Andersson and Helena Ekelund (2022). The second part will discuss the meaning of “promoting ethics and integrity” in depth. It will explain why promoting ethics and integrity differs from mere policing and prevention and why MEPI is a program designed to avoid two extreme temptations; blind submission and narrow fanaticism. The non-conventional approach in this line of thinking suggests that the MEPI utilizes strategies that combine measures to ensure compliance with existing rules and encourage the development of appropriate ethical values among the UGM’s civitas academica. A conclusion and evaluations will be provided at the end of this presentation.

## JUSTIFICATIONS AND REASONINGS

Historically, the MEPI proposal[5] was initiated at and by the Gadjah Mada University (UGM) Rector’s office under the coordination of the Deputy Chancellor for Research and Community Service (WRPPM, Wakil Rektor Bidang Pendidikan dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat) for “maintaining and increasing public trust as part of UGM’s duties in carrying out education, research, and community service.[6]”

The MEPI’s program takes as its starting point the notion that academic integrity is essential for the success of educational goals and objectives and the success of each lecturer’s mission. The MEPI also provides a

basis for responsible behavior for all campus residents, especially students, after completing their education at UGM[7]. Accordingly, the target of the MEPI program is the entire “academic community,” and it is not only focused on students. The MEPI is intended to promote ethics and integrity in UGM campus life aggressively. In the early stages of its development, it prioritizes the development of learning modules and instruments attached to a specific platform or web media containing ethical tools of norms and ethical standards covering various topics or themes[8] deemed relevant for the *civitas academica* at UGM and other higher education institutions. All modules assign to a particular society of practice, an ethically significant circumstance as needed. The MEPI’s roadmap indicates that these standards of modules will be improvable, and all modules are always subject to evaluation to ensure continuous “improvement” through periodic assessments. There is always a possibility to add learning topics as necessary through institutionalizing content quality control of a peer review.

Although ethics is often associated with personal or individual morality judgments, the meaning of ethics in the context of MEPI refers not primarily to “personal morality.” Still, it is “a set of normative constraints that arise from one’s being, by one’s choice, part of something larger than oneself, an enterprise, undertaking, or organization.[9]” Following Wueste (2014: 23), such collectivities must have or “should have its own integrity...should be understood in the same way as individual integrity should be, as an achievement without closure, as an ongoing project, a task that entails sustained effort, if what has been achieved is to be maintained.” In short, while the MEPI operates at the individual level, its yardstick is for improving the performance of groups and collectivities.[10]

It is necessary to clarify the terms of ethical, moral, and integrity. These terms concern “right and wrong” or “good and evil,” yet many interpretations exist. In the MEPI, ethical and moral are synonyms, denoting the principle of right and wrong in conduct (Thompson, 1985). But they also appeal to the general consent, are not a matter of individual taste, apply to everyone in similar circumstances and involve the interests of others (interpersonal). The interests at stake are “fundamental” (Huberts 2018). The term “ethics also means the study of such principles (Huberts, 2014: 49–50).

Integrity is often obscure and confusing[11] yet significantly linked to ethics and moral action. Both ethics (morality) and integrity have to do with ethical norms and values and refer to a general consent relevant to everyone in the same circumstances. While ethics and integrity involve values and norms as the basis for judgment and decision-making, there are differences in the roles played by the two terms. As Huberts (2018) suggests, a “value” is a belief or quality that contributes to judgments about what is good; right; beautiful; or admirable by any individual or institution. Accordingly, values have weight in the choice of action by individuals and collectives. A norm is more specific as they tell us whether something is good or bad, right or wrong, beautiful or ugly, and thus for types of behavior, they answer the question “what is the correct thing to do?.” Therefore, integrity encompasses ethical principles such as autonomy, fidelity, privacy, and personal beliefs and values (Milton, 2014). Acting in accordance with one’s general ethical principles is keeping with so-called moral integrity. Moral integrity links with actions such as distinguishing right from wrong and being prepared to speak up and act for right and wrong, even under non-conducive circumstances. (Milton 2014)

Integrity and ethics are dynamically interconnected; one can strengthen and reinforces the other.[12] However, ethics and integrity are distinguishable analytically. Ethics is an external system of rules and laws, and the narrative of legal or regulatory texts in society often determines the ‘boundary lines’ of the behaviors or attitudes of its citizens. To behave ethically is that obeys or comply with rules or laws. In contrast, integrity is an internal system of principles that guides our behavior. While there are usually rewards when we follow the rules and punishments when we break them, the rewards of integrity are intrinsic. Integrity is a choice rather than an obligation and cannot be forced by outside sources, despite being influenced by upbringing and exposure. Integrity conveys a sense of wholeness and strength; if one

acts with integrity, she/he is doing what is right—even when no one is watching.

So, to behave integritively or with integrity is doing whatever is considered right, no matter what the law or rules say. Ethics is complying with rules, laws, or regulations, whereas integrity is a matter of doing the right thing, no matter what the rules or laws are. The main incentive for one’s integrity is the satisfaction gained from the judgment made of courageous acts when one’s integrity is tested. In ethics, if a person does not cross the line and is within the boundaries ethical line, then that person is considered to be behaving ethically or being an ethical person.

Therefore, ethical behavior is passive as it remains within the lines of rules or laws. The primary impulse to act ethically is to avoid getting into trouble. However, it may be that a person is within the lines of a code or ethical requirement but lacks integrity. It is possible that a person, organization, country, or government is said to be ethical or to behave ethically but lacks integrity. Why is that so? Some people just try to stay out of trouble because rules or laws have been set for them. It doesn’t mean that they wouldn’t be required to behave the same way later if they weren’t banned. Integrity involves personality traits or individual characters with greater depth. A person’s integrity represents his/her more complete self—involving values, morality, performance, success, belief and selflessness, and so on.

In contrast to ethics, integrity is not passive but active. Integrity reaches beyond or overcomes passivity (passivity). Integrity is the effort to “be” without complaint or self-repentance. The determinants of integrity are other people and not written provisions or laws, or regulations. Michael R. Weber draws the difference between morality and ethics in the following way (see Fig. 1 dan Fig. 2)[\[13\]](#):



**Fig. 1: Morality and Ethics Relations**

**Morality:** Introduced by Cicero in the Roman Era, *mos mores* (custom, etiquette, good practices); morality develops narrower than ethics. Morality is more temporal and depends on the place/time. Moralists: only talk about orders and prohibitions: “don’t get naked, don’t watch that tv show!” A moralist says I don’t like that; therefore, you shouldn’t see it or do it. Morality becomes oppressive at certain moments. Principle of moralism, and moralists believe that “it is legitimate to limit people’s liberty in order to prevent them from doing things that are morally wrong, even when their actions are harmless.” (Tuckness and Wolf 2017: 48).

**Ethics:** Ethics is not oppressive. It answers the question: how should life be lived? What kind of human being should I be?



**Fig. 2: Ethics and Integrity Relations**

In a nutshell, ethics is passive behavior –the important thing is to be within the ‘boundary lines.’ While integrity requires action—rising beyond the ‘boundary lines.’

For that reason, the MEPI departs from the assumption that a work environment, a small unit such as a university, can become a crucially important and decisive collective foundation for developing the integrity of the individuals within it. The MEPI, therefore, is targeting what we have called “an ethically significant circumstance” or a particular “society of practices” as its operating location. Nonetheless, the MEPI recognizes the possibility that the opposite assumption may be valid, that the existence of individuals who are well aware and have worked hard to develop ethical standards may transmit the principles of personal integrity into their professional and institutional environment.

Another issue regarding the ethics and integrity management strategy has occurred in Indonesia and perhaps other countries. One is the misconception that integrity and ethics can only be inculcated by formulating a “code of ethics” or “code of honor.” For example, institutions, professions, or particular social organizations generally have explicitly written or formulated a code of honor or code of ethics that regulates or guides the ethical behavior of its citizens.[\[14\]](#) This code serves as guiding principles or standard practices of conduct deemed necessary in improving a person’s integrity. In this sense, ethics is often understood in the same way or with a similar meaning to legal principles or the rule of law.[\[15\]](#) If the ethical practice is narrated in warning sentences such as “just do the right thing” in legal practice, especially concerning the judicial process, then “activist judges” have included or involved their ideology, political views, or personal morality in the legal decisions they make.

In contrast, other judges work solely on deciding cases as they are (mechanical jurist’s conception of adjudication), following the written laws, or obeying or implementing the written law. For the latter judge, in other words, making legal decisions is similar to the case of working based on the principle of a syllogism whose central premise comes from legal books or the written rules/regulations. The implementation of ethics seems to run according to this legal tradition.

One of the concerns that prompted the emergence of the MEPI is the misunderstanding occurring in moral, ethical, and legal management strategies and why the MEPI needs to be created as an alternative program intended to promote ethical and integrity standards of behaviors among the UGM’s campus members and as an institution. One of the misconceptions in moral or legal management is the assumption that law and ethics work solely with the principle of syllogism or “geo-syllogistic” ethical principles. Unfortunately, it also develops in many higher education institutions, influencing broader environmental practices, including state institutions. This misconception is known in legal principles as “mechanical jurisprudence.”[\[16\]](#) A code of honor or code of conduct, including written legal rules or customs, remains important. However, the MEPI assumes that it is necessary to ensure that individuals on campus are aware of and willing to address deeper questions about “why” certain ethical principles are accepted and others are considered wrong.

Such lack of awareness and an apparent inability to question more profound moral dilemmas is the challenge to be overcome through the MEPI program, often referred to in ethics or legal management as a problem of “lack of normativity.” It is the lack of adequate understanding among those affected by or related to laws, ethical rules, or norms for the importance of the “knowledge of why” something is wrong or right. People in the right position to make ethically or morally reflective and responsible judgments need to have the capacity to deal with this normative ethical question. The MEPI aims to fill this void, at least at the UGM campus and presumably beyond.

The lack of normativity may be evident in an example that all students, lecturers, and researchers at a University campus must avoid a norm stipulating that plagiarism is wrong. But what if the case is that a student only witnesses or sees his friend or colleague doing or has committed plagiarism, and he doesn't do it? Should the student report to the authorities? Can it be highly valued if there is a person or group of people (or if there is a regulation that requires them) who "sees" or "witnesses" other people committing violations (such as plagiarism and cheating) and must report it to those people of authority? What if the code of ethics regarding the obligation to "report" or to monitor the violations committed by students conflicts with other virtues that are considered equally important, if not less necessary, in the social life on campus, such as loyalty and social solidarity? What is problematic in this case example of a moral problem? One disturbing thing is that rules (prohibitions/orders), codes of ethics, or codes of honor are only a thing of orders that must be carried out or obeyed.

The MEPI program, therefore, is designed based on the consideration that compliance with "obligations" should not arise solely because of "orders" that require it. There is a difference between two situations when a teenager carries out an obligation because a parent says, "you have to do what I say," from a teenager who takes particular actions because he understands why he is carrying out that obligation. So, in the MEPI, students will have to avoid plagiarism not because of or primarily to comply with orders (University rules or prohibitions), which have indeed prohibited plagiarism, but because they know why plagiarism is not good for them to do so. Students must obtain sufficient knowledge and skills on how to avoid it. For example, they must be given adequate training in writing skills and quotation techniques, paraphrasing, and so on to eschew plagiarism.

The MEPI's approach is different from conventional ethics and integrity management measures, one of which is because this approach takes the notion that integrity is not only formed from the calculation of rewards and punishments but also normative awareness of internalized responsibility.<sup>[17]</sup> In other words, the MEPI is a program deliberately designed to ensure that the willingness to be responsible emerges from the awareness within every community member while also recognizing the need for ethical legislation and codes of conduct as instruments of external controls and rules-based compliance.

In the next section, we will discuss why the best response to the problem of "ethical neediness," as mentioned above, cannot be relied upon or relied solely on increasingly stringent rules and punishments or an increasing number of them. In other words, it is necessary to take another alternative path, namely by aggressively promoting ethics and integrity and with integrity (integritively). In this sense, efforts to promote a culture of integrity and ethical commitment carry out through the MEPI program.

## PROMOTING ETHICS AND INTEGRITY

Acting with integrity and the efforts to strengthen integrity in a community or organization start from recognizing that integrity cannot be promoted only by the parameters of laws or rules that contain prohibitions or orders. One way of assessing whether an act has been performed with integrity is whether or not it falls within the parameters of a set law or regulation. The key to promoting integrity and the performance of a person living with integrity depends on fulfilling the requirements of "normativity." Any efforts to promote integrity cannot be successful if a person or group's actions are only the product of "fear" of sanctions or punishment for rule violations. Nor is it simply because the moral agent has been successfully programmed mechanically or through a process of repetition as robots that follow laws or rules mechanically according to the demands of the situation. The following two points are relevant to understand how the MEPI program will work and why the MEPI's program promotes integrity aggressively and with integrity.

First, promoting integrity is different from simply teaching integrity. The MEPI aims to help all academics (lecturers, students, and employees) acquire the skills and knowledge needed to identify ethical issues in their respective fields of assignment or work. The hope is that they ultimately are able to deal with the ethical problems they face effectively, reflectively, and responsibly. These skills and knowledge can be taught. Therefore teaching is an essential aspect of the MEPI project as a way of transmitting ethical knowledge. This knowledge transmission is conducted by preparing and regularly evaluating various website-based learning syllabuses and modules that contain topics related to ethical problems for the target users (society of practices) within the campus environment. However, while the MEPI program has and should focus, at an early stage and throughout its process, on the goal of teaching ethical issues and how to deal with them, it is also and primarily directed at encouraging and strengthening “awareness” and “ethical commitment.” These three things (skills, awareness, and commitment) are three interrelated triads, required not coincidentally in any moral formation. Skills, awareness, and commitment will always go hand in hand in efforts to promote and strengthen ethics and integrity. All three are packages that cannot be separated from one another, as Wueste (2014: 29) explains:

Skill, awareness, and commitment go together; it’s a package deal. In ethics, skill without awareness or commitment is like a tool in a drawer. The value of a screwdriver in a drawer depends on knowing when to bring it out and being motivated to fix or build something. We can do quite a lot in equipping our students to be women and men of integrity, but, and this is very important, although what we’re in a position to provide is necessary, it is not sufficient. Skills can be taught and honed; awareness and commitment can be nurtured, but actual awareness and commitment, and good faith application of skill, are things only students themselves can provide.

Ethical behavior and integrity cannot be promoted or strengthened only through coercion of applicable laws or regulations to achieve compliance. It is thus necessary to equip ethics and moral education with requirements of normative perspectives. As some scholars have discussed (see Wueste 2014: Cole and Kiss 2000; Lancaster 2005), academic integrity is generally managed and developed through the “three Ps,” namely, policing, prevention, and promotion. The first two, *policing and prevention*, are instrumental approaches, emphasizing increasingly stringent sanctions and stronger coercion against all forms of rule and ethical violations. In cases where an ethics violation or integrity violation has occurred, especially when the case has attracted public attention or has turned into a widely known scandalous issue, this instrumental approach is generally applicable in many Universities. Usually, the honor code or code of ethics is the standard of judgment in these cases of violating ethics or integrity. The formulation of the honor code and code of ethics, which professional organizations generally recognize, contains virtues and vices.

Unlike these conventional steps, the MEPI is paying special attention to forming and monitoring the formulation of a code of ethics in the campus environment. The MEPI accepts the premise or axiom that a code of ethics has both good and bad sides. While the bad side of the code of ethics is often related to the formulation of sanctions that may or often be coupled with the implications of punishment for failure to report a case of ethical violation, the good side of the ethics code is inviting us to pay attention to something that can strengthen the sense of ownership of internalized responsibility and the notions of personal responsibility. The vitality of the virtues of an ethics code depends on its ability not to block or cloud one’s view of values. In other words, the value commitments that should be protected with an ethics code are the “source of strength” of the code, despite it is the administration and interpretation of legalism that often become a barrier to its efficacy. It can be said that the virtues attached to the ethics code imply a more normative meaning of P (Promotion) rather than an instrumentalist meaning and is richer than just the notions of “policing” and “prevention” (Wueste 2014: 58).

Second, the MEPI, which among other things, maintains the institutionalization of a code of ethics or honor code, needs to be ensured that it is not trapped in two dangerous extremes, between Scylla and Charybdis, blind submission (abdication) and narrow fanaticism (zealotry). These two extremes will only jeopardize ethical and legal awareness and threaten the success of moral development. The MEPI is designed to go beyond and overcome the temptations of these two dangerous monsters that threaten the development of morality and integrity. The two extremes in question are often described as a tug-of-war, the two monsters from Ancient Greek legend, which in Wueste's discussion (2014: 37) are described as follows:

“The Scylla and Charybdis we need to steer between, abdication and zealotry, are extremes that jeopardize good faith efforts to promote integrity; either pretty much guarantees that we will not reach our destination/achieve our purpose. The former rears its ugly head when, for one reason or another, we fail to see to it that serious ethical violations are met with serious consequences, which itself has serious consequences (e.g., a growing sense that ‘ethics-talk’ is empty, i.e., mere prattle). The latter also has serious consequences, as when overly zealous enforcement of rules entails results that are widely regarded as simply absurd, which encourages the thought that what we’re about is silly rather than serious. In either case, then, ethics and integrity come to be seen as a trifle, a fool’s game, frivolous, and a waste of time. Put another way, whether we run up on the rocks or are sucked into the whirlpool, the upshot is severe injury or worse to the project, as if only a fool could believe that a man could indeed be a knave.”

At the UGM campus and in many other Indonesian Universities, various policies have emerged to tackle ethical and behavioral issues of the campus's *civitas academica*. At least after the reform era in Indonesia, which began in 1998, several policies concerning moral and ethical regulations have been issued [18]. The quality of its ethical standards and the level of success of these ethical policies requires a separate study. However, several points may be worth noting regarding the ethics regulations or policies on the UGM campus. First, the intention to use legal language or rules as a basis for upholding ethical behavior indicates that commitment and ethical awareness are only built through “policing” and “prevention” approaches and not through the “promotion” approach of ethical values. Second, the concept of morals often overlaps and does not distinguish its meaning from etiquette, manners, or even fashion (aesthetics). [19] Third, and most importantly, almost all approaches to moral and ethical policy at UGM have developed from the tradition of ethics based on the principle of “geometric” reasoning. Thus it is an understanding of ethics as a “geosyllogistic” concept based on the belief that moral principles can be upheld by the “mechanical jurist conception of adjudication” approach. This approach could be risky to fall into the trap of two extremes between blind submission (abdication) and narrow fanaticism (zealotry), which arguably have failed, or even it distanced themselves from the initial purpose of building a more ethical and integrity attitude. The MEPI has been crafted and is, until now, being developed at UGM. Still, it is also dedicated to serving Indonesia to address such issues and as an alternative design to promote ethics and integrity, with the new approach shifting from the conventional strategy of moral development and promoting moral progress [20].

## CONCLUSION

Solving moral problems requires moral judgments, evaluating proposed courses of action or decisions, and designing policies in morals, ethics, and integrity. It has been discussed that solving ethical problems requires the ability to make moral evaluations, that is, the ability to judge right or wrong and skills and knowledge of “why” something is right or wrong. Another aspect often neglected by the ethical management measures in Indonesia generally but has become the underlying premise of the MEPI's project is the “imperative to think about what to do” (Whitbeck 1996). Moral agents of individuals, institutions, or organizations' leaders should demonstrate this critical thinking in ethical choice.



The MEPI's project of UGM aims to carry out the latter objective, but by considering the reality of ethical problems and the readiness to accept the notion that the complexities that have become challenges to living ethically and with integrity must be managed with integrity as well. The MEPI's project follows a non-conventional strategy emphasizing aspects of external controls (rules-based or compliance) approach and internal controls (values-based) strategy of ethical management measures combined. This strategy will require a commitment to serious, honest, and non-instrumentalist academic integrity, that is, a willingness to question its ethical foundations. The real test of whether the MEPI will be able to promote ethics and integrity aggressively successfully and with integrity according to its stated vision and goals remains to depend partly on the ability of academic actors and leaders in Indonesia generally and at UGM particularly to manage ethical issues to avoid the temptations and threats of the two dangerous monsters that have been described: between Scylla and Charybdis, between blind submission (abdication), and narrow fanaticism (zealotry) pertinent to all moral issues in the academic world, and beyond. With this, the problem of "ethical neediness" could be better handled, and the pursuit of ethical excellence at the level of academic institutions will be more feasible.

\*\*\*

**Acknowledgment:** This paper was indebted to the UGM MEPI TEAM 2018-2020, especially Dr. Ika Dewi Ana (Deputy Chancellor for Research and Community Service), Prof. Mustafa (Head of UGM Research Directorate), and Dr. Mirwan Husada (Secretary of the Research Directorate UGM and Secretary of MEPI UGM).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Andersson, S. and Ekelund, H., (2022). Promoting Ethics Management Strategies in the Public Sector: Rules, Values, and Inclusion in Sweden, *Administration & Society*, Vol. 54(6): 1089 –1116
2. Cole, S., & Kiss, E., (2000). What Can we do about Student Cheating? *About Campus*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/108648220000500203>
3. Bourchier, D., (2015). *Illiberal Democracy in Indonesia: The Ideology of the Family State*. London and New York: Routledge
4. Dey, S. Reports Of Cheating At Colleges Soar During The Pandemic. <https://www.npr.org/2021/08/27/1031255390/reports-of-cheating-at-colleges-soar-during-the-pandemic/> Accessed 25 June 2023
5. Huberts, L. W. J. C., (2014). *The integrity of governance. What it is, what we know, what is done, and where to go*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan
6. Huberts, L. W. J. C., (2018). Integrity: What it is and Why it is Important. *Public Integrity*. 20:sup1, S18-S32. DOI: 10.1080/10999922.2018.1477404
7. Ives, R. New Research in Academic Misconduct Interventions. <https://academicintegrity.org/resources/blog/237-new-research-in-academic-misconduct-interventions?/> Accessed 24 June 2023
8. Kirby, N., (2022). Institutional integrity: Its meaning and value. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practices*, 25: 809-834
9. Lancaster, J. (2005). The challenges of our current practice. In J.M. Lancaster & Associates (Eds.), *Exercising power with wisdom: Bridging legal and ethical practice with intention*. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications
10. Milton, C.L., (2015). Ethics and academic integrity. *Ethical Issues. Nursing Science Quarterly* Vol. 28 (1): 18-20

11. Polowczyk, P. ?, (2017). Organizational ethical integrity: good and bad illusions. *Palgrave Communications*: 3:46 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-017-0044-x>
12. Pope, K. S., (2015). Steps to Strengthen Ethics in Organizations: Research Findings, Ethics Placebos, and What Works. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 16:139–152
13. Regulation of Gadjah Mada University's Rector No. 246/P/SK/HT/2004 about "Ethics Code of Docent at UGM." <https://psti.ft.ugm.ac.id/file/sk-rektor-kode-etik-dosen-ugm/> Accessed 25 June 2023
14. Regulation of Gadjah Mada University's Rector No. 711/P/SK/HT/2013 about "Gadjah Mada University's Student Attitudes." <https://ugm.ac.id/downloads/kode%20etik%20mahasiswa%20final%20ugm.pdf> / Accessed 25 June 2023
15. Regulation of Gadjah Mada University's Rector No. 6/P/SK/HT/2015 about "ethics of academic writing (*authorship*) of Publication Works." <https://research.fk.ugm.ac.id/peraturan-rektor-ugm-tentang-authorship/> Accessed 25 June 2023
16. Regulation of Gadjah Mada University's Rector No. 8, 2017, about the "Honor Code of Administrative Staff of UGM." <http://sdm.ugm.ac.id/web/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/kode-etik-tendik.pdf> Accessed 25 June 2023
17. Schwartz, M., (2014). *Achieving Ethical Excellence*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
18. Thompson, D. F., (1985). The Possibility of Administrative Ethics. *Public Administration Review*, 45(5): 555–561
19. Weber, M. R. "The difference between being ethical and possessing integrity is minute, but the impact on others and on yourself is dramatic" in [FRI\\_DifferenceBetweenEthics\\_and\\_Integrity\\_9\\_15\\_TO\\_10\\_15\\_AM.pdf](#)
20. Whitbeck, C., (1996) *Ethics as design: Doing Justice to Moral Problems*. The Hastings Center Report 26, no. 3
21. Wueste, D. W., (2014). *Promoting Integrity Integritively: Avoiding the Scylla and Charybdis of Abdication and Zealotry*. In Micheal Schwartz. *Achieving Ethical Excellence*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited
22. Zeng, W. and Resnik, D. (2010). *Research Integrity in China: Problems and Prospects*. *Developing World Bioethics*. Vol. 10 No. 3

## FOOT NOTES

[1] Robert Ives, *New Research in Academic Misconduct Interventions*. <https://academicintegrity.org/resources/blog/237-new-research-in-academic-misconduct-interventions/> Accessed 24 June 2023

[2] Shena Dey, *Reports Of Cheating At Colleges Soar During The Pandemic*. <https://www.npr.org/2021/08/27/1031255390/reports-of-cheating-at-colleges-soar-during-the-pandemic/> Accessed 25 June 2023

[3] Weiqin Zeng and David Resnik, *Research Integrity in China: Problems and Prospects*. *Developing World Bioethics*. Vol. 10 No. 3, 2010: 164-171

[4] An excellent account of the working and the impacts of the Indonesian authoritarian government policies on moral education, one especially known as "P4" (standing for Guide to the Realisation and Implementation of Pancasila) under Suharto presidential rule, can be seen in the work of David Bouchier, *Illiberal Democracy in Indonesia: The Ideology of the Family State*. London and New York: Routledge, 2015:187-201

[5] For a complete view of the MEPI see <https://mepi.ugm.ac.id>

[6] This can be seen in “Hibah Modul MEPI UGM” (Grant of the UGM MEPI’s modules). <https://penelitian.ugm.ac.id/2018/05/08/hibah-modul-manajemen-etik-dan-penguatan-integritas-mepi-2/>; see also Surat Keputusan (SK) Rektor UGM (Rector of UGM’s decision) No. 809/UN1.P.III/SK/HUKOR/2018 about “TIM Inisiasi dan Persiapan MEPI UGM” (The Initial Team of UGM MEPI’s Preparation).

[7] Cf. The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity. <https://academicintegrity.org/fundamental-values/> accessed 25 June 2023.

[8] Some of the topics developed at the early stages of the MEPI included titles, and its authors are as follows: a). Animal as Research Subjects (Dr. drh. Doddi Yudhabuntara); b). Plagiarism (Prof. Dr. Soenarto Sastrowijoto, Sp.THT(K)); 3). Doing “Social Services” Responsibly (Dr. Rizal Mustansyir, M.Hum); 4). Conflict of Commitment and Conscience (Drs. Agus Wahyudi, M.Si., M.A); 5). Conflict of Interest (I Made Krisnajaya, SIP, M.Pol.Admin); 6). C clinical ethics and laboratory (Prof. dr. Suparjati Sunarto, Sp.A(K)., Ph.D.); 7). Research Ethics with Human Subject for the Natural Sciences (Prof. dr. Madarina Julia, MPH, Ph.D., SpAK); 8). Research Ethics with Human Subjects for the Social Sciences and Humanities (Prof. Dra. RA Yayi Suryo Prabandari, M.Si., Ph.D.); 9). Managing Radicalism in Campus (Prof. M. Mukhtasar Syamsudin, M.Hum., Ph.D. of Arts); 10). Sexual Harrasment (Prof. dr. Mohamad Hakimi, SpOG(K), PhD); 11). Drug Abuses (Prof. Dr. Sri Suryawati, Apt.); 12). Alcohol (Dr. Dra. Suhartini, Apt., SU(P)).

[9] Daniel W. Wueste, “Promoting Integrity Integritively: Avoiding the Scylla and Charybdis of Abdication and Zealotry.” In Micheal Schwartz. *Achieving Ethical Excellence*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. iBooks. 2014.

[10] A recent work that discusses the difference of and the relationship between the institutional morality and the individual morality and how the two are interconnected is Nokolas Kirby, Institutional Integrity: Its Meaning and Value. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practices* (2022) 25: 809-834. Kirby underscores a notion that integrity at individual level operates differently from the group or organizational level. While, in some sense, moral integrity is an ideal for individual human agent, the case is different from the institution or organization, and it is not even an ideal for individual human agents as rulers.

[11] Pawe? ?ukasz Polowczyk, Organizational ethical integrity: good and bad illusions. Palgrave Communications: 3:46, 2017. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-017-0044-x>. Huberts (2018) also shows that literature reviews on the term of integrity led to at least eight different views.

[12] Integrity and ethics. [http://www.abundancecompany.com/ethics\\_integrity.htm](http://www.abundancecompany.com/ethics_integrity.htm) accessed desember 2018/Accessed 6 February 2023

[13] Michael R. Weber, “The difference between being ethical and possessing integrity is minute, but the impact on others and yourself is dramatic” in FRI\_DifferenceBetweenEthics\_and\_Integrity\_9\_15\_TO\_10\_15\_AM.pdf/accessed Desember 2018

[14] An example is the Honor Code of the United States Military Academy which states: ‘A Cadet will not lie, cheat, steal, nor tolerate those who do’ (quoted from Wueste, 2014: 40). This is an example of a code of ethics in the form of a “no” injunction (for example, prohibiting lying, stealing or cheating), while there are codes of ethics in the form of a “required” directive (for example, the International Center for Academic Integrity-ICAI, sets standards of “honesty, can trustworthy, fair, respectful, responsible, and courageous, as fundamental academic values). In addition, certain professions such as Medicine, Journalism, Police, Army,

and so on in many countries generally also have this honor code or code of ethics. The critic mentions the essence of this code of ethics:

Organizations often point with pride to their ethics codes, highlighting high ideals and clear prohibitions of questionable conduct. Codes can communicate basic standards and admirable aspirations. But ethics codes—including those backed by good-faith enforcement—often fall short of fostering an ethically strong organization. Unethical acts may go unnoticed, noticed acts may go unreported, reported acts may not be fully and fairly investigated, and investigation findings may not be adequately acted on (Kenneth S. Pope, Steps to Strengthen Ethics in Organizations: Research Findings, Ethics Placebos, and What Works. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 16:139–152, 2015: 141)

[15] The illustration in this part follows the lines set by Wueste, op cit.

[16] According to this approach, to find out how something should be done is through a mechanical way, namely by deriving an answer from an ethical question by applying a number of basic principles (axioms) and simple rules of deduction techniques. As with the work of geometry,...the answers derived are certain and can always be guaranteed to be correct. If there is an error, the reason must be due to a logical error, not because of the axioms themselves. But critics state the following counterattack to this approach: “The problems in the mechanical jurist’s conception of adjudication are similar to the problems associated with what might be called a ‘geo-syllogistic’ (mis)conception of ethics. Both are to stick with similes from Greek myth, like the siren’s song, in being difficult to resist and dangerous. The best evidence that these misconceptions are difficult to resist is how widespread they are. And the sense in which they are dangerous, or at least deeply problematic, emerges when, for example, we try to teach ethics across the curriculum or reveal the ethical dimensions of an institution’s concern with academic integrity.” (See: Wueste, op cit, in Michael Schwartz. “Achieving Ethical Excellence.” 2014: 26)

[17] This strategy is similar to the “values-based” strategy, in contrast to the “rules-based” (or compliance) approach. Values-based strategy or internal controls approach emphasizes instruments to encourage self-regulation, moral judgment, and each person striving to tune his or her ethical compass. It centers on the agents’ internalizing professional values and standards through personal and professional socialization processes. This strategy is also sometimes referred to as the “high-road” to ethics. In contrast, the rules-based (or compliance) strategy or external controls approach emphasizes rule compliance, avoidance of illegal behavior, and a belief in the extrinsic motivation of employees and that relying on self-regulation and professional standards to uphold ethical behavior is insufficient. It refers to the necessity of putting instruments on individual public servants from “outside themselves,” such as ethics legislation and codes of conduct, and thus provides clear guidelines and may be straightforward and quick to implement and monitor. This approach is sometimes referred to as the “low road” to ethics (Staffan Andersson and Helena Ekelund, Promoting Ethics Management Strategies in the Public Sector: Rules, Values, and Inclusion in Sweden, *Administration & Society*, Vol. 54(6), 2022:1092-1093).

[18] Regulation of Gadjah Mada University Rector No. 246/P/SK/HT/2004 about “Ethics Code of Docent at UGM.” <https://psti.ft.ugm.ac.id/file/sk-rektor-kode-etik-dosen-ugm>; Regulation of Gadjah Mada University’s Rector No. 711/P/SK/HT/2013 pertaining to “Gadjah Mada University’s Student Attitudes.” <https://ugm.ac.id/downloads/kode%20etik%20mahasiswa%20final%20ugm.pdf>; Regulation of Gadjah Mada University’s Rector No. 6/P/SK/HT/2015 about “ethics of academic writing (*authorship*) of Publication Works.” <https://research.fk.ugm.ac.id/peraturan-rektor-ugm-tentang-authorship>; Regulation of Gadjah Mada University’s Rector No. 8/2017 pertaining to “Honor Code of Administrative Staff of UGM”; and other regulations pertaining to the issues of the campus ethics and norms can be seen at: <https://magister.psikologi.ugm.ac.id/evaluasi-dan-monitoring-program-pendidikan/>; [http://psikologi.ugm.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/tata\\_perilaku\\_mahasiswa.pdf](http://psikologi.ugm.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/tata_perilaku_mahasiswa.pdf); <http://maksifeb.ugm.ac.id/academic/ethics/>; <http://fk.ugm.ac>

etik/;

[19] One of the Faculties at UGM had attracted wide public attention after issuing a regulation mandating the students to pay attention to a rule of how the “student contacting lecturers,” stipulating, for example, that students must pay attention to the language use, the time of when they can or can not call the docent, how to introduce themselves to the lecturer, and how to ask or request assistance from the professor. In other faculties within the UGM campus, ethics is also confounded by how they dress. For example, the rule prohibits students from wearing jeans, t-shirts, or sandals when they need services on campus. See media reports about this: <https://news.detik.com/berita-jawa-tengah/d-3913967/penjelasan-rektor-ugm-soal-banner-etika-menghubungi-dosen-di-kampusnya>; <http://kpj.geo.ugm.ac.id/kode-etik-mahasiswa-fakultas-geografi/>;

[20] For example, the MEPI’s Roadmap outlined stages and processes that required some assessments: 1). preparation and initiation in 2018, which included the creation of modules, learning websites, and content quality assurance through “focus group discussions”; 2). The first (I) Semester was the Implementation Trial, 2019, which included sampling, user acceptance testing, and formulation of implementation SOPs; 3). Regulation and implementation were conducted in the second (II) Semester of 2019, covering implementation, regulation, and monitoring and evaluation; 4). National advocacy activities were done during the Semester I of 2020, consisting of marketing and standard supervision, and 5). Ethics culture and integrity evaluation were conducted in Semester II of 2020, which includes an evaluation of the entire MEPI program with MEPI month activities and a culture of ethics and integrity (Quoted from the Terms of Reference/KAK MEPI Module Grants, UGM Research Directorate in 2018).