



IMPLEMENTATION OF CAMPUS POLICIES IN UPHOLDING STUDENT ACADEMIC ETHICS

¹Dinda Puspita Sari, ²Farhan Ali Ginting, ³Fasya Al Faiga, ⁴Febri Pasaribu

Faculty of Islamic Economics and Business, State Islamic University of North Sumatra

¹dyndasari01@gmail.com, ²farhanaliginting@gmail.com, ³febrifebri202011@gmail.com,
⁴fasyaalfaiga@gmail.com

ABSTRACT	ARTICLE INFO
This study examines the implementation of campus policies in upholding student academic ethics within Indonesian higher education institutions. Although formal policies such as academic codes of conduct and anti-plagiarism regulations have been widely adopted, significant challenges remain in deeply internalizing ethical values among students. Policy enforcement often focuses on administrative compliance rather than fostering genuine moral commitment. Using a qualitative approach supported by ethical theories and relevant literature, this research explores the effectiveness of educational strategies, the roles of faculty and leadership, and awareness of digital ethics. The findings indicate that integrative educational approaches, proactive leadership, and transparent reporting systems significantly contribute to building a strong culture of academic integrity. This study highlights the importance of holistic and continuous efforts involving all academic stakeholders to embed ethical principles.	Article History: <i>Received 1 Jan 2025</i> <i>Revised 2 Mart 2025</i> <i>Accepted 7 Apr 2025</i> <i>Available online 2 Jun 2025</i> Keywords: Academic Ethics, Campus Policy, Academic Integrity, Value Internalization, Moral Education, Academic Misconduct, Campus culture
	To cite this paper (in APA style): 1Dinda Puspita Sari.

INTRODUCTION

Academic ethics represent a fundamental pillar in higher education, serving as a moral compass that guides both students and educators in the pursuit of knowledge (Oktasari & Muallifin, 2024). These ethics are rooted in principles such as honesty, fairness, responsibility, and respect for intellectual property (Hafizha, 2021). As higher education institutions increasingly emphasize the production of high-quality research and academic output, the need to uphold ethical conduct becomes even more pressing. Unfortunately, the rapid growth of digital technologies and easy access to information have made violations of academic ethics such as plagiarism, cheating, and data falsification more prevalent and, in some cases, more difficult to detect (Badri, 2024). These issues not only undermine the credibility of academic institutions but also erode the moral fabric of future professionals and leaders.

In response to these challenges, many universities and colleges around the world have introduced formal policies aimed at regulating and reinforcing ethical academic behavior among students (King, 2009). These policies may include academic codes of conduct, plagiarism prevention systems, procedures for reporting and addressing violations, and ethical training integrated into the curriculum. However, the mere existence of these policies does not guarantee their effectiveness. Implementation often varies across departments and faculties, and enforcement can be inconsistent due to a lack of awareness, resources, or institutional commitment (Tarigan, 2024). Therefore, understanding how these policies are translated into practice is essential for evaluating their impact.

The implementation of academic ethics policies must be more than a top-down approach. It requires a cultural shift within the academic community, where ethical behavior is not only expected but also modeled and reinforced by faculty, staff, and administrators (Austin, 1990). Students must internalize ethical values not out of fear of punishment but because they understand the intrinsic value of academic integrity. This internalization can be facilitated through educational interventions such as workshops, case studies, and mentorship programs that demonstrate the relevance of ethics to students' personal and professional lives.

One of the core issues in policy implementation is communication. Students often remain unaware of the details or importance of institutional policies regarding academic ethics (Loise et al., 2025). In many cases, these policies are embedded in lengthy student handbooks or academic regulations that are rarely read or discussed

in class. As a result, policies remain passive documents rather than active tools for guidance and decision-making. Effective communication strategies, such as orientation sessions, visual campaigns, and digital platforms, are necessary to bridge this gap between policy and practice (Okonkwo et al., 2023).

Another important consideration is the role of faculty members as role models and enforcers of academic ethics. Faculty are at the frontline of policy implementation, as they design assessments, supervise theses, and detect academic misconduct (Saniyah, 2023). Yet, without proper training or support, faculty may either overlook violations or struggle to apply sanctions fairly and consistently. Universities must therefore invest in the capacity-building of educators to ensure they are equipped to uphold institutional standards and respond to ethical dilemmas in teaching and research (Power, 2015).

Technological tools have become both a threat and an asset in the enforcement of academic ethics. On one hand, the internet, AI writing tools, and file-sharing platforms have enabled new forms of academic dishonesty (Fukuyama, 2021). On the other hand, detection technologies such as plagiarism checkers (e.g., Turnitin), proctoring software, and AI detectors have empowered institutions to monitor and verify student work more effectively. Nevertheless, the use of technology must be balanced with pedagogical strategies that emphasize learning, critical thinking, and ethical reasoning, rather than relying solely on surveillance and punishment (Nurhayati, & Sodik, 2024).

Institutional structure and governance also play a critical role in how effectively policies are implemented. Universities with clear reporting systems, designated ethics committees, and transparent sanctions are generally better positioned to respond to violations and uphold standards (Koebel, 2018). In contrast, vague procedures and the absence of accountability mechanisms can result in selective enforcement and loss of trust in the system. Institutional leadership must demonstrate a commitment to integrity through policies that are actionable, inclusive, and regularly reviewed for effectiveness (Abraham, 2023).

Cultural and contextual factors further influence how academic ethics are perceived and practiced. In some educational contexts, collectivist values or hierarchical relationships may discourage students from reporting misconduct or questioning authority (Syafii, 2024). Furthermore, students under academic pressure or facing language barriers may resort to unethical practices as coping mechanisms.

Therefore, policy implementation must be sensitive to the lived realities of students and offer supportive, rather than purely punitive, interventions.

Furthermore, the development of academic ethics cannot be separated from broader efforts in character education (Abdurahman et al., 2025). Institutions must approach ethics not only from a regulatory perspective but also as a component of holistic student development. This includes promoting empathy, responsibility, and social awareness through both curricular and co-curricular activities. Creating ethical learning environments requires collaboration between academic departments, student affairs, libraries, and IT services to create a cohesive support system (Frost et al., 2010).

In conclusion, the implementation of campus policies in upholding student academic ethics is a complex, multifaceted process that extends beyond the creation of rules. It requires commitment, collaboration, and creativity in engaging students and faculty alike in the pursuit of academic integrity. Through effective communication, faculty empowerment, technological support, and values-based education, universities can cultivate a culture of ethics that prepares students not only for academic success but also for responsible citizenship in an increasingly complex world.

METHOD

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach aimed at providing an in-depth understanding of the implementation of campus policies in upholding student academic ethics. This approach is selected because it allows the researcher to explore social phenomena in a holistic and contextual manner, especially concerning policies, values, and ethical practices within higher education institutions.

Data sources in this research are derived from a literature review of academic policy documents issued by various universities in Indonesia and internationally. These include codes of academic conduct, guidelines for scientific writing, procedures for academic misconduct, and ethics education modules. Additionally, the study refers to recent scholarly articles discussing the implementation of academic ethics, scientific integrity, and higher education governance.

The data collection technique relies on documentation and secondary source analysis from peer-reviewed journals, reference books, policy reports, and official publications of higher education institutions. A comparative approach is also used to analyze policy documents from selected universities recognized for their efforts in

strengthening academic integrity, to identify common patterns and institutional variations in policy implementation.

The collected data are analyzed qualitatively through content analysis, by identifying key themes related to the implementation of academic ethics policies. This includes interpreting the content of policy documents, implementation methods, challenges encountered, and strategies adopted by universities to internalize ethical values among students.

To ensure data validity, source triangulation is conducted by comparing findings from various literature and institutional documents. Validity is also reinforced by referring to established theories and concepts from experts in academic ethics, higher education management, and public policy. The results of the analysis are presented descriptively, with a focus on interpretation of meaning, context, and implications of each finding. This research does not aim to produce statistical generalizations but rather to offer conceptual and practical insights that can serve as a reference for developing or refining academic ethics policies within campus environments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that the majority of higher education institutions in Indonesia have adopted formalized campus policies related to academic ethics for students. These policies generally take the form of academic codes of conduct, anti-plagiarism rules, disciplinary procedures, and exam monitoring systems. Despite these efforts, the actual implementation of such policies reveals considerable variation in effectiveness. A key issue identified is that many students interpret these rules as mere administrative obligations rather than moral values that guide academic conduct. This observation is supported by Perkins, Gezgin & Roe (2020), who emphasize that written policies, while necessary, are not sufficient without a strong institutional culture of academic integrity.

The research further found that while students were often exposed to ethical regulations during orientation sessions or through student handbooks, their understanding of the purpose and substance of those policies remained superficial. This gap suggests that institutional efforts to socialize academic ethics have not yet succeeded in fostering deep comprehension or commitment. Hanisch & Eirdosh (2023) Social Learning Theory asserts that moral and ethical behaviors are not effectively learned through unidirectional communication but rather through modeling, reinforcement, and immersion in a values-oriented environment.

In institutions where ethics education is integrated into the academic experience, the internalization of ethical norms tends to be stronger. Some campuses employ strategies such as academic integrity workshops, anti-plagiarism seminars, and classroom discussions on ethical case studies. These efforts are aligned with Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development (1969), which posits that moral reasoning matures through exposure to ethical dilemmas and reflective dialogue. Students on these campuses not only exhibit a clearer understanding of the ethical expectations but also show greater intrinsic motivation to act ethically.

Conversely, universities that rely heavily on punitive enforcement strategies without educational support are often less successful in instilling long-term ethical behavior. Students in such environments tend to comply with rules out of fear rather than moral conviction. Research by Schrage et al (2023). highlights that overly legalistic approaches to academic misconduct may actually contribute to student disengagement and rationalization of unethical behavior. Therefore, it is essential for campuses to balance punitive measures with formative approaches that nurture moral awareness.

The role of faculty members in promoting academic ethics cannot be overstated. This study reveals that lecturers are often underutilized in ethical development programs. In many cases, instructors are not provided with training on how to address academic integrity in classroom settings, nor are they encouraged to incorporate ethics into course discussions. Yet, Nurpratiwi, (2021) argue that student-faculty interaction is a critical factor in the development of student character. Universities that empower faculty as ethical mentors create more opportunities for students to engage with ethical norms through relational learning.

Another issue identified is the absence of safe, transparent, and well-functioning reporting mechanisms. Both students and faculty are often reluctant to report academic misconduct due to fears of retaliation, lack of anonymity, or perceived ineffectiveness of the system. According Onyango (2021) institutions should implement confidential whistleblower systems that protect the identity of reporters and ensure that reported cases are handled fairly and consistently. Without such systems, a culture of silence can undermine policy implementation.

Digital technologies have also introduced new ethical challenges. The rise of AI tools, paraphrasing software, and contract cheating websites has made it easier for students to engage in academic dishonesty without detection. This study found that

many students use these technologies without understanding the ethical boundaries involved. Howard and Davies (2009) observed that digital plagiarism is often normalized among students, in part because of a lack of structured education on digital ethics. Institutions must now integrate digital literacy into their ethics education to address these emerging issues.

The study found that institutions with dedicated ethics curricula either through standalone courses or integration into existing syllabi demonstrated significantly better outcomes. For instance, students exposed to systematic instruction in academic integrity consistently reported higher levels of ethical awareness and less inclination to cheat. Boyce, (2008) supports this finding, arguing that ethics education should be an institutional priority, not an optional activity. Ethical values are most effectively internalized when reinforced through multiple, sustained exposures over time.

Campus culture plays a substantial role in reinforcing or undermining ethical norms. In some universities, unethical behaviors like group cheating or assignment plagiarism have become normalized. Students who choose to behave ethically often face peer pressure or even social isolation. According to Cialdini and Trost (1998), social norms strongly influence individual behavior, especially in group settings. Changing campus culture to reward ethical behavior and discourage academic misconduct is therefore an essential component of ethical policy implementation.

Leadership from senior university administrators is crucial in promoting ethical standards. This research found that institutions where rectors, deans, and department heads publicly champion academic integrity tend to exhibit lower rates of misconduct. Leadership commitment sends a powerful message to faculty and students alike. A 2020 study by the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) reported that institutions with proactive leadership in academic ethics experienced significantly better compliance with ethical standards.

This study also emphasizes the importance of taking a whole-institution approach to academic ethics. Effective policy implementation must integrate written regulations, cultural reinforcement, educational programs, and technological systems. Bretag et al. (2011) proposed a comprehensive model that incorporates all these dimensions, noting that integrity is a shared responsibility that cannot be delegated to a single office or department. Cross-functional collaboration is essential for success.

Student involvement in policy formulation and ethical dialogue is another best practice highlighted in this study. When students are engaged in drafting codes of

conduct or participating in ethics committees, they develop a stronger sense of ownership and responsibility. Constructivist educational theory supports this participatory approach, suggesting that knowledge and values are more deeply internalized when students actively co-construct them through experience.

Evaluation mechanisms remain underdeveloped in most universities. Very few institutions conduct regular assessments of their academic ethics programs. Routine surveys, audits, and focus groups could help identify policy gaps and areas for improvement. Devlin and Gray (2007) argue that without ongoing evaluation, institutions risk implementing ethics policies that are ineffective, outdated, or disconnected from current student realities.

As higher education becomes increasingly globalized, academic ethics is now considered a critical component of institutional reputation. International accreditors and exchange programs often require proof of ethical compliance. Indonesian universities must therefore ensure that their academic integrity frameworks not only meet local needs but also align with global standards. This includes adopting technologies such as plagiarism detection software and providing multilingual ethics education.

Ultimately, the findings of this research underscore that academic ethics is not merely a matter of disciplinary compliance but a vital aspect of personal and professional development. Universities must take moral as well as institutional responsibility for cultivating ethical scholars. Only through consistent, educational, and inclusive implementation of policies—supported by theory, evidence, and community engagement—can academic integrity be meaningfully upheld.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study highlight that although most higher education institutions in Indonesia have established formal policies regarding student academic ethics, significant challenges remain in effectively internalizing these ethical values among students. Policies that exist primarily as administrative rules, without a strong culture of integrity and deep moral understanding, tend to be insufficient in fostering honest and responsible academic behavior. Therefore, the enforcement of academic ethics must be based on a holistic approach that combines written regulations, moral education, and the cultivation of an academic culture that prioritizes integrity as a core value.

Furthermore, this research emphasizes the importance of an educational approach over a purely punitive one in enforcing academic ethics policies. Educational strategies such as training on plagiarism prevention, case-based ethical discussions, and integrating ethics into the curriculum have been shown to enhance students' understanding and intrinsic motivation to uphold academic integrity. Additionally, the role of faculty members and institutional leadership as key agents in instilling ethical values is critical. Direct interaction and proactive leadership help create a conducive academic environment for the sustained development of students' character. Transparent reporting systems and protection mechanisms for whistleblowers are also vital to ensure fair and effective enforcement of policies.

Finally, in light of emerging digital technologies that introduce new ethical challenges, universities must integrate digital literacy and ethics education into their academic programs promptly. Regular evaluation of academic ethics policies and active student involvement in policy development are essential steps to maintain the relevance and sustainability of ethical practices. Thus, the effective implementation of campus policies goes beyond regulating behavior; it builds a strong moral foundation to nurture academically excellent individuals who also demonstrate high integrity and social responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Abdurahman, A., Habibi, D. D., Muslim, B., Firdaus, P., & Rahmawati, D. (2025). *Pendidikan Karakter*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Abraham, N. M. (2023). Institutional Leadership, Governance and Economic recovery. *Journal of Institutional Leadership*, 5(2), 262-274.
- Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. *New directions for institutional research*, 1990(68), 61-74.
- Badri, S. (2024). Hak Cipta dan Plagiarisme dalam Karya Ilmiah: Analisis Hukum dan Implikasi untuk Pendidikan Tinggi. *Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum IBLAM*.
- Boyce, G. (2008). The social relevance of ethics education in a global (ising) era: From individual dilemmas to systemic crises. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 19(2), 255-290.
- Frost, R. A., Strom, S. L., Downey, J., Schultz, D. D., & Holland, T. A. (2010). Enhancing student learning with academic and student affairs collaboration. *The Community College Enterprise*, 16(1), 37.
- Fukuyama, F. (2021). G. Paradigma dan Pendekatan. *Antara Teknologi Dan Teologi-Rajawali Pers*, 29.
- Hafizha, R. (2021). Pentingnya integritas akademik. *Journal of Education and Counseling (JECO)*, 1(2), 115-124.

Hanisch, S., & Eirdosh, D. (2023). Behavioral science and education for sustainable development: towards metacognitive competency. *Sustainability*, 15(9), 7413.

- King, R. (2009). *Governing universities globally: Organizations, regulation and rankings*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Koebel, J. T. (2018). Facilitating university compliance using regulatory policy incentives. *JC & UL*, 44, 160.
- Loise, M., Arsyad, M., & Gani, M. (2025). *Dari Kebijakan Ke Aksi: Implementasi Layanan Akademik Di Perguruan Tinggi*. Deepublish.
- Nurhayati, E., & Sodik, S. (2024). Literasi Digital dalam Penulisan Karya Tulis Ilmiah Pada Mahasiswa: Digital literacy in scientific article writing. *BELAJAR BAHASA: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 9(2), 226-236.
- Nurpratiwi, H. (2021). Membangun karakter mahasiswa Indonesia melalui pendidikan moral. *JIPSINDO (Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial Indonesia)*, 8(1), 29-43.
- Okonkwo, I., Mujinga, J., Namkoisse, E., & Francisco, A. (2023). Localization and global marketing: Adapting digital strategies for diverse audiences. *Journal of Digital Marketing and Communication*, 3(2), 66-80.
- Oktasari, F., & Muallifin, M. D. A. (2024). Politik Hukum Larangan Joki Skripsi Sebagai Bentuk Pelanggaran Integritas Akademik Guna Mengatasi Maraknya Fenomena Tindakan Joki Skripsi. *Legacy: Jurnal Hukum dan Perundang-Undangan*, 4(2), 64-89.
- Onyango, G. (2021). Whistleblower protection in developing countries: a review of challenges and prospects. *SN Business & Economics*, 1(12), 169.
- Perkins, M., Gezgin, U. B., & Roe, J. (2020). Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16, 1-15.
- Power, L., Millington, K. A., & Bengtsson, S. (2015). Building capacity in higher education topic guide. *Health and Education Advice and Resources Team*. <http://www.heart-resources.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Capacity-Building-in-Higher-Education-Topic-Guide.pdf>.
- Putri, N. A., & Rohman, F. (2024). Evaluasi dampak program literasi al-qur'an terhadap penguatan karakter religius siswa sekolah menengah pertama. *Jurnal EDUCATIO: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 10(1), 766-778.
- Saniyah, M., Sarkowi, A., Azis, L., & Salman, S. (2023). KONSEP DASAR ETIKA KEGURUAN. *Jurnal Al-Karim: Jurnal Pendidikan, Psikologi dan Studi Islam*, 8(2), 92-107.
- Schrage, J. M., & Giacomini, N. G. (Eds.). (2023). *Reframing campus conflict: Student conduct practice through the lens of inclusive excellence*. Taylor & Francis.
- Syafii, H. (2024). *KAMMI: Reconstructing the Epicenter of Current Movement*. Gaza Library Publishing.
- Tarigan, R. S. (2024). *Menuju Negara Hukum Yang Berkeadilan*. Ruang Karya Bersama.