

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i8.3190>

## Research and the Role of the Research Ethics Commission

Alexander Seran<sup>1</sup>

### **Abstract**

*Plagiarism has become a recurring ethical violation in academic research, damaging the credibility of scientific endeavors and the integrity of intellectual property. The Research Ethics Commission, as an independent institution, is expected to mitigate such violations through ethical clearance and supervision. This study aims to examine the role and challenges of the Research Ethics Commission in preventing plagiarism and ensuring ethical research practices. Using a qualitative approach with a case study method, the research analyzes secondary data from documented plagiarism cases in Indonesia between 2000-2023. The findings reveal that weak enforcement of ethical standards, lack of understanding of research ethics among academics, and procedural gaps in ethical clearance contribute to the prevalence of plagiarism. Moreover, the study emphasizes that ethical norms, rooted in rationality, objectivity, and justice, must be upheld consistently by researchers and research institutions. The conclusion underscores the urgency of strengthening the function and authority of the Research Ethics Commission, ensuring transparency and fairness in ethical assessments to protect the dignity of research subjects and uphold scientific integrity.*

**Keywords:** Research Ethics, Violations, Plagiarism, Ethical Commission, Ethical Clearance.

### **Introduction**

The occurrence of research ethics violations and the weak role of the Research Ethics Commission in various research institutions and universities has become widely discussed recently (Bieliauskaite, 2019). Bieliauskaite says that there can be little doubt that ethical awareness can contribute to moral orientation in today's ambiguous situations that occur in the professional life of academicians. A course of professional ethics in academic curricula might face difficulties for members of academia to appreciate the culture of academic ethics and the fail to obey the Code of conducts. When it came to the surface, the problem of plagiarism was seen as the crime of taking someone else's work or ideas and claiming it as one's own. Shortcuts taken by researchers to submit their work often occur due to demands for promotions while the control that should be carried out by the Research Ethics Commission does not work properly for various reasons. For example, the scarcity of reviewers to provide ethical clearance for research proposals which pile up and vary from various backgrounds. As a result, after a scientific work is published, the reading public easily discovers ethical problems, namely plagiarism. Archer and Matheson (2019) outline cases of three intellectuals who have behaved immorally or faced accusations of immorality. They raise the question of whether it is appropriate to admire an immoral person for their intellectual contributions. The accusation against immoral intellectuals is not definitely proof against them because many people still see the other side of immoral intellectuals, perhaps because of their position in public office or their involvement in other social affairs. However, society needs to be critical because the object of

---

<sup>1</sup> School of Economics and Business, Department of Masteral Applied Economics, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, Email: [alex.seran@atmajaya.ac.id](mailto:alex.seran@atmajaya.ac.id)



intellectual admiration concerns all personalities. Ethics of admiration is not only admiration of an emotional nature but appreciation of intellectuals as moral exemplars in terms of truth, objectivity, and justice.

The problem raised in this article is intellectual crime committed intentionally to obtain a reputation and public appreciation through fraud or theft of the work of others published on behalf of the perpetrators.

Plagiarism is therefore the act of taking someone else's work or ideas and claiming it as one's own without giving proper credit or sources. Plagiarism is considered a violation of academic and professional ethics. Such violations have a negative impact on the reputation and career of the perpetrator and harm to the creator of the original work. Plagiarism often occurs among academics, officials, and public figures. The following are several examples of plagiarism cases that emerged in the media from 2000 to 2023.

The questions that must be answered by this article are as follows.

- a. How to prevent plagiarism as an intellectual crime that violates the rights of the real writer and claimed by the perpetrators as a result of his work?
- b. How to build competent institutions and have the authority to examine the research proposal, give ethics worthless permission to the proposed proposal, and/ or cancel the proposal indicated by plagiarism?
- c. How to create equality of rights and obligations in the educational process so that the relationship between lecturers and students does not apply as a relationship between superiors and subordinates in producing scientific work so that lecturers do not arbitrarily take the work of students they guided and published as their own works?
- d. How to socialize ethics as a principle of legitimacy so that people respect ethics as a source of legal norms that must be upheld in the settlement of plagiarism cases?

The purpose of this article is to lay the basis of ethical and legal relationships in the Praxis of the Ethics Commission. Weak Ethics in Research and the Lack of Power of the Ethics Commissions as an Independent Body in Reviewing the Ethical Aspects of Research are the objectives of this research, namely:

- a. To study ethics and regulate human actions regarding what they can and cannot do to protect humans from violations.
- b. To practice ethics in research as a guideline and way to protect human participants and animals involved in research.
- c. To ensure that research is conducted in a way that meets the interests of individuals, groups, and/or society.
- d. To comply with the role of the Research Ethics Commission as an independent body tasked with reviewing the ethical aspects of research to safeguard the dignity, rights, safety, and welfare of all research participants.

From the problems and research objectives described above, the benefits of this research can be formulated as follows.

- a. Improving personal quality and integrity through an adequate understanding of ethics

so that a person can act to avoid plagiarism, forgery, fabrication, or manipulation of data.

- b. Protecting the rights, welfare, and dignity of research subjects, by respecting their privacy, confidentiality, consent, and voluntary participation, and
- c. Preventing or reducing the risks and negative impacts of research, both for researchers, research subjects and the wider community.
- d. Understanding ethical issues in research and how to apply ethics in research referring to research ethics guidelines through rewards and sanctions for each researcher.

### **Ethical Theories**

Ethics is the science of what is good and bad, regarding moral rights and obligations, a collection of principles or values related to morals, and the values of right or wrong held in society. Ethics is a part of philosophy that studies morals and human social actions. Ethics also has several types, such as general ethics, special ethics, and meta ethics. Ethics has the function of assessing, determining and determining actions carried out by humans. Aristotle (Nicomachean Ethics, Book VI) explained that ethics is about what one ought to choose that which is intermediate, not the excess nor the defect, and that the intermediate is determined by the dictates of the right rule. The ethical theory is then referred to explain ethical problems in plagiarism is the theory of teleological ethics, deontology, and ethical theory of virtue.

Ethical theories are generally grouped into three. They provide an accessible overview of classical and modern moral theories (Beauchamp, 1982; Bertens, 1990). First, the ethical theory of teleology talks about the purpose of action. If what is done is appropriate and realizes the goals set, then the action is good. The ethical theories based on teleology are utilities, pragmatism, cost-and-benefit, and hedonism. They are normative ethical theories that evaluate actions based on their consequences for benefit, happiness, and pleasure. Utilitarianism originated from the late 18th- and 19th-century English philosophers and economists, Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. According to utilitarianism, an action (or type of action) is considered right if it tends to promote happiness or pleasure, and wrong if it tends to produce unhappiness or pain—not only for the performer of the action but also for everyone else affected by it.

Second, deontological ethics asserts that an action is considered morally good because of some characteristic of the action itself, not because of the outcome it produces. It emphasizes the relationship between duty and the morality of human actions. Deontological ethical theory speaks of free will as a command that obliges a person to act according to the will of the individual like a binding law. Ethical theories based on free will are theories about rights, justice, due care, etc. The pioneer of the ethical theory of deontology was Immanuel Kant (1964, 1981, and 1997)

Third, the ethical theory of virtue talks about the character that acts well according to habits inherited through education in the family, community, and society. Qualities of character are wisdom, courage, justice and self-control. Human excellence in acting ethically is based on the consideration of always being balanced to avoid partiality or partiality. The main figure of the ethical theory of virtue is Aristotle (2001).

Of all the three ethical theories proposed, there is no absolute ethical theory in its application. Ethical Clearance for a research proposal is decided using ethical arguments compiled from all ethical theories above and deciding that the research proposal is feasible because it is not

absolute about one ethical theory. Ethical judgment is mixed in the form of considerations that prioritize rationality, effectivity, and fairness. Therefore, research proposal assessors are required to have a comprehensive understanding of the ethics to influence the development of science and technology in the world of life.

### **Values and Norms**

Values and norms are two interrelated concepts in society. Values are principles or beliefs held by individuals or groups. Values reflect what is considered important, good and meaningful in life. Value is subjective, because each person can have a different view of what is valuable. Examples of values include honesty, justice, love, and loyalty. Norms are rules or standards of behavior that exist in society. Norms govern how we interact, communicate, and behave. Norms can be written (for example laws) or unwritten (customs). Norms help regulate individual behavior to comply with applicable rules. Examples of norms include manners, speech etiquette, and traffic norms.

Values and norms complement each other. Values reflect beliefs, while norms regulate behavior based on these values. Norms appear after the existence of values and function to bind the implementation of values. Values are implicit (disguised/implied), while norms are explicit (real, firm and clear). In other words, values provide the basis for norms, and norms implement these values in everyday life. So, values and norms play a mutual role in forming overall social harmony and agreement (Hadi, 2021).

The difference between polite norms (etiquette), religious norms, legal norms, and ethical norms are as follows.

First, norms of manners (etiquette) refer to manners that come from the habits and customs of society. This includes rules about how we speak, dress, and interact with others. The goal of polite norms is to maintain good manners and avoid social conflict. This helps in creating a harmonious environment. Sanctions or violations of polite norms usually do not have strict punitive sanctions, but can cause social discomfort or negative judgment from others. The scope of polite norms is applicable in everyday interactions and dependent on culture and environment. Second, religious norms come from religious teachings and holy books. Religious authorities supervised and established these norms. The purpose of religious norms is to guide individuals to live according to the teachings of their religion. It includes moral, ethical, and spiritual rules. Violations of religious norms can result in sin, curse, or punishment in the afterlife. Religious norms apply to adherents of certain religions. Third, legal norms are based on statutory regulations issued by the competent legislative body. The purpose of legal norms is to maintain order and justice in society, as well as protect individual rights and collective interests. Violations of legal norms can result in fines, imprisonment or other penalties and generally apply to all citizens and individuals in a country. Fourth, ethical norms relate to the moral values and principles that govern human actions and behavior. Ethical norms aim to guide individuals in making good and correct decisions. This includes considerations about goodness, justice, and responsibility. Violations of ethical norms may result in negative judgments from others or feelings of guilt. Ethical Norms can be applied in a variety of life situations, including at work, in personal relationships, and in moral decision making.

In short, polite norms (etiquette), religious norms, legal norms and ethical norms have differences in the source of authority, objectives, sanctions and scope. All of these norms play an important role in shaping human behavior and interactions in society (Hadi, A. 2021,

September 24). Ethical values and norms can be differentiated but cannot be separated. Ethical values are principles or beliefs that are considered important in human life, while ethical norms are rules or standards of behavior that are expected from someone in society. Ethical values and norms are interrelated and influence each other. Ethical values form the basis of ethical norms, and ethical norms implement ethical values in practice (Kompasiana, 2015, February 26). Ethical values and norms are an inseparable unity, because they both have a very important role in human life. Ethical values and norms can help humans make the right decisions, produce positive behavior, and maintain harmony in society. As a norm, ethics functions to determine appropriate behavior, namely what must be done. As norms, ethics are the same as religion, law, and etiquette because they all claim standards of behavior that humans are obliged to carry out. The difference between ethics and religion, law and etiquette as norms lies in the meaning of obligations and the implementation of sanctions for violations. The meaning of ethical norm obligations is based on universal rationality that what is mandatory is generally applicable and can be justified rationally, objectively, and fairly. On the other hand, the obligations of religious norms, law and etiquette are determined by each religious belief, law and etiquette which vary between religious adherents, legal jurisdictions, and each culture. So, in terms of universal applicability, ethical norms are generally accepted norms in accordance with universal standards of respect for human dignity as rational and free-willed creatures. Therefore, ethics displays ethical qualities as norms of good behavior that can and must be studied rationally and practiced honestly in the life of a pluralist society without discriminating it from religion, jurisdiction, and customs.

### **Research Ethics as Special Ethics (Applied Ethics)**

The branches of ethics that must be studied are general ethics, special ethics (applied Ethics), and meta ethics. The following is a brief explanation of the three. General ethics is ethics that discusses the basic conditions of how humans act ethically regardless of background, culture or religion (Rahmat, H (2020, April 27). Special ethics (Applied ethics) is the ethics that applies basic moral principles in special areas of life, such as sports, business or certain professions. Special ethics can be divided into two types, namely individual ethics and social ethics. Special ethics are specific and situational, according to the context and characteristics of the area of life concerned (Gonel, B (2023, May 10). Meta ethics is ethics that discusses the philosophical and methodological aspects of ethics, such as the source, meaning and justification of moral values. Meta ethics does not provide practical guidance on how to act ethically, but rather examines the logical, linguistic, and epistemological foundations of ethics (Jagad, ID (2024).

Research ethics are rules that must be obeyed during the process of implementing and reporting research. Research ethics is included in special ethics, namely ethics that apply in certain fields, such as science, technology, health, law, etc. Special ethics are different from general ethics, namely ethics that apply universally to all humans, such as the values of goodness, justice, honesty and humanity. Research ethics, as a special ethics, has the aim of protecting the rights of research participants, increasing the validity of research, and maintaining scientific or academic integrity.

The essence of research is the work of investigating certain aspects of reality. In other words, research does not aim to provide reading books or scientific literature but rather is a scientific activity to increase human knowledge about the thing being researched. Herein lies the reason why research requires ethics. The question is, what is ethics and how does it work to assess the appropriateness of research as a contribution to enriching the body of knowledge? The questions

above can be explained through understanding ethics as norms or standards of behavior. Ethics as norms or standards of behavior are the same as religion, law, and manners or etiquette, how to measure or determine the appropriateness of good behavior. As a norm or standard of good behavior, ethics is the same as religion, law and etiquette because each norm claims desired human behavior, namely, good behavior is rewarded, whereas bad behavior is sanctioned. The application of sanctions differentiates ethical norms from other norms. Sanctions for violating legal norms are the strongest because they are binding (ligat) and can be physically enforced through law enforcement or prison. Sanctions for violating religious norms are mental torment, feelings of guilt/sin or exclusion from the community. The sanction for violating polite norms is shame. The sanction for violating ethical norms is social guilt. Isolation and corporal punishment can be used as sanctions for ethical violations but they do not by themselves improve ethical behavior if the improvement in behavior does not come from awareness. The presence of a Research Ethics Commission is important here.

### **Research Ethics Commission**

The Research Ethics Commission is an institution consisting by government or community agreement of a group of people who are authorized to carry out the function or task of investigating research ethics issues (on scientific research proposals). The purpose of establishing the Research Ethics Commission is to create guidelines and consider the suitability of proposals for publication of scientific work from the perspective of ethics as values and norms. Ethical norms for scientific research are the fulfillment of ethical values as a condition for the feasibility of research or writing or creating scientific work.

The reality of science in the realm of modernism is diverse, so the membership of the Research Ethics Commission must be cross-disciplinary so that the Research Ethics Commission as an institution can investigate the validity of a claim in different worlds of science. Ethical assessment of research proposals submitted to the Research Ethics Commission to obtain an assessment of ethical feasibility (ethical clearance) or ethical clearance is not based on literal moral feelings, religious values and legal rules but rather on rational considerations that carefully take into account scientific, ethical and ethical aspects, and human freedom. The Research Ethics Commission's consideration of research proposals is discursive-multidisciplinary in nature.

The measure of the validity of claims in submitted research proposals is examined by the Research Ethics Commission by prioritizing the issue of researchers' rights in accordance with their dignity as rational and free-willed beings. The obligation to respect a person's claims in a research proposal as to their dignity as a human being is limited by the conditions that apply as norms or standards of behavior regarding respect for the dignity of fellow human beings and the environment. A number of Habermas' works related to ethics (1979, 1984, 1987, 1991) specifically highlight the issue of ethical values and norms that must be met by someone when submitting a research proposal to the Research Ethics Commission. As a prominent German philosopher and sociologist, Habermas has explored various ethical concerns across his influential works. His ethical concerns span topics such as communication, rationality, solidarity, and the tension between individual life-worlds and systemic structures. His works contribute significantly to contemporary moral philosophy and the understanding of ethical norms. Especially his work on discourse ethics aims to create a modern ethical framework that considers concepts such as duty, obligation, justice, and solidarity while emphasizing universal acceptability and legitimacy. Habermas' views enrich the role of the Research Ethics Commission in providing approval for submitted proposals should pay attention to the following

conditions as norms for realizing the ethical value of research. Researchers should answer the following questions properly in order to produce good quality of the research.

**First**, are claims stated in the research proposal true? This means that a claim must be in accordance with reality or the objective world. Fulfillment of objective claim requirements is primarily a concern in empirical scientific research.

**Second**, are claims put forward in the research proposal feasible? This means that a claim must respect societal norms in the social world. Fulfillment of ethical requirements applies in social science research.

**Third**, are claims put forward in the research proposal honest? This means that a claim must state a person's personal attitude, whether he is saying something honestly from his personal world. This claim applies to works of art, aesthetics, and religion as personal beliefs.

#### **a. Ethical Clearance**

The main task of the Research Ethics Commission is to provide ethical clearance for research proposals submitted. Ethical clearance is an ethical assessment made by the Research Ethics Commission regarding a research proposal involving humans, animals or dangerous materials. The purpose of ethical clearance is to protect research subjects from physical, psychological, social, or legal risks resulting from participating in research. Ethical clearance also aims to maintain integrity, honesty and fairness in conducting research.

Ethical clearance is divided into categories, depending on the type and scope of research such as social and humanities, health, nuclear, chemicals and hazardous biological materials, etc. Each category has different requirements and procedures for obtaining ethical clearance. Researchers must study and comply with ethical clearance requirements that apply to their research. The Research Ethics Commission assists the research process by working through ethical clearance requirements so that researchers avoid risks, namely, the possibility of undesirable or detrimental things occurring in research. Risks that must be avoided in research are risks that can harm researchers, research subjects, or society, whether physically, psychologically, socially, or legally. Legal risks are risks that can result in sanctions or lawsuits for researchers, research subjects, or society. An example is the risk of violating laws, ethics or professional standards due to research that does not meet requirements, permits or obligations.

#### **b. Preventing Plagiarism**

The Research Ethics Commission has the task of preventing and dealing with acts of plagiarism. Plagiarism is a violation of academic ethics that can damage a person's reputation and integrity as a creator, writer, or researcher. Apart from that, plagiarism can also violate copyright, which is the creator's exclusive right to his intellectual property. Therefore, the Research Ethics Commission has an important role to educate, supervise and provide sanctions against acts of plagiarism.

The Research Ethics Commission must confirm the title of the proposed research, the name of the research implementer, whether individually or as a group, including the name and expertise of the research team leader. The institutional background of the person submitting the proposal must be considered, whether it is in line with the problem to be researched, what the aims and benefits of the research are. The Research Protocol requires researchers that the methodological design for obtaining data from informants/respondents should pay attention to the treatment of participants as human subjects so that no coercion occurs that degrades the dignity of the

416 *Research and the Role of the Research Ethics Commission*  
respondents.

Researchers are required to establish commitment and integrity according to ethical standards that limit the treatment of research subjects, such as not carrying out torture and limiting treatment to the extent of the research objectives. This has been stated by the researcher in this proposal and is clearly visible in the background and informed consent sheet which essentially respects life and upholds the principle of not committing violence against research subjects. It is also explicitly stated about guarantees to maintain the confidentiality of research information so that it is not misused for other purposes.

Research protocol demands must be supported by documents regarding the background of experienced researchers related to the main research issue so that it is hoped that the research will bring results that are useful for the development of science

## **Methodology**

The choice of paradigm, approach, and method depends on the research question, context, and researcher's preferences. Researchers often combine elements from different paradigms and approaches to create a holistic understanding of complex phenomena. The research methodology uses the interpretivism (constructivism) paradigm to understand the cases of plagiarism (William, 2007; Muslim 2016). The research approach used to address the problems of plagiarism is qualitative using the case study method. The data in research comes from various document sources in print media such as books, journals, and reports considering that it is not easy to obtain primary data from plagiarists. The data grouping focused on each plagiarist so that it can provide meaningful information regarding fake earnings as an ethical problem for which adequate solutions can be found. Findings in analysis and discussion of the problem of this study may help in formulating the conclusion of this study.

## **Analysis and Discussion**

### **Data Collection on Plagiarism Cases**

Lako (2012) responded to the rise of plagiarism by publishing an article entitled "Academic Plagiarism and its Prevention". Lako's article was published in the Pos Radar Semarang Daily, June 25, 2012, and was widely discussed by the public. Lako's article highlights unethical behavior, academic people who take shortcuts to get promotions even though what they do is contrary to the principles of research ethics. Lako stated at the beginning of his article as follows.

*A lecturer from the State Islamic University (UIN) Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta was caught committing intellectual crimes in writing scientific articles. He plagiarized or plagiarized the thesis work of students under his guidance for promotion to functional academic positions. The Chancellor of UIN immediately gave the sanction of dismissal as a lecturer to the person concerned (Lako, A (2012, June 25).*

Furthermore, cases of plagiarism repeatedly occur among academics, officials, and public figures as shown in the table below.

<b>Perpetrator's Name</b>	<b>Actor's Agency (Work place).</b>	<b>Media Reference</b>	<b>Time of Incident / Type of Violation</b>
Anggito Abimanyu	Lecturer at the Faculty of Economics and Business, Gadjah Mada University (UGM) and former Director General of Hajj and Umrah Organizers at the Ministry of Religion	<a href="https://daerah.sindonews.com/berita/836509/22/kasus-plagiat-anggito-abimanyu-mundur-dari-ugm">https://daerah.sindonews.com/berita/836509/22/kasus-plagiat-anggito-abimanyu-mundur-dari-ugm</a>	2014 / Plagiarism
Anak Agung Banyu Perwira	a lecturer at the Department of International	<a href="https://www.kompas.com/edu/read/2021/09/22/163804371/kampus-ini-tak-luluskan-mahasiswa-plagiat-tugas-bangun-integritas-akademik">https://www.kompas.com/edu/read/2021/09/22/163804371/kampus-ini-tak-luluskan-mahasiswa-plagiat-tugas-bangun-integritas-akademik</a> .	2015 / Plagiarism

	Relations at Parahyangan University (UNPAR) and former member of the National Human Rights Commission		
Felix Kasim	Lecturer at the Faculty of Computer Science, Bina Nusantara University (BINUS)	<a href="https://www.bing.com/search?q=Inilah+Sepuluh+Tokoh+Indonesia+yang+Terjebak+Kasus+Plagiat+Karya+Ilmia">https://www.bing.com/search?q=Inilah+Sepuluh+Tokoh+Indonesia+yang+Terjebak+Kasus+Plagiat+Karya+Ilmia</a>	2017 / Plagiarism
Runtung Sitepu	Chancellor of the University of North Sumatra (USU)	<a href="https://theconversation.com/kasus-ректор-usu-muryanto-amin-apa-itu-self-plagiarism-dan-bagaimana-seharusnya">https://theconversation.com/kasus-ректор-usu-muryanto-amin-apa-itu-self-plagiarism-dan-bagaimana-seharusnya</a>	2021 / Plagiarism

## Discussion

Scientific misconduct (Strgar, et al., 2018) is described as plagiarism, falsified academic credentials involving deliberate manipulation of data, fabrication of or theft followed by publication of stolen data. When discussing the possible solutions to the problem of scientific

misconduct, researchers most frequently emphasize the need for education regarding integrity in scientific methods. From the legal standpoint, the problem of misconduct in science must be punished to maintain the close relationship between ethical and legal responsibility to work for justice to the whole society. If the law is not properly observed in sanctioning, ethics education will have no impact in increasingly sophisticated practices with greater ease of technology. If the law is not enforced, it will dwarf the number of thieves. Standards of legal conduct must confirm ethical demands to maintain social order. Scientific misconduct and fraud pose significant challenges to the integrity, credibility, and objectivity of genuine research. These issues risk undermining trust among researchers and the public. Data on misconduct relates to ethical and legal responsibilities as shown in the four examples below.

Louis Alvin Day (2003) talks about the importance of ethics courses in university curricula as much as the importance of Research Ethics Commissions in educational and research institutions. However, the existence of ethics courses in educational curricula and Research Ethics Commissions at university institutions does not necessarily end the practice of plagiarism. Humans' desire to commit crimes always arises when there is an opportunity to realize their ambitions through illicit means. If ethical learning is not internalized, it does not change the perpetrator's bad character as a thief. The presence of a Research Ethics Commission will not have an impact on changing the character of researchers if the Research Ethics Commission's ethical assessment of the submitted proposal is not transparent, objective, and fair.

In terms of research, the Ethics Commission must play a role even though fraud in research has a negative impact on the perpetrators, owners of original works, and society. The Ethics Commission seeks to assess transparently, objectively, and fairly every research to empower professional actors in their work to adhere to the principles of implementing the Professional Code of Ethics and accept ethical and legal sanctions for violations in their professional work as researchers.

By looking at various examples of plagiarism cases that occurred in Indonesia from 2000-2023, the research problem can be formulated as a lack of understanding by researchers regarding the values, norms and moral principles that regulate human behavior, namely what is good: rational, objective, and justice must be done otherwise anything that is contrary to rationality, objectivity, and justice must be avoided. A lack of understanding of ethics is reflected in research behavior where researchers simply ignore the norms of courtesy, legal norms, and moral principles which include good and honest intentions and awareness in conducting research. Lack of understanding of ethics in research is a problem that requires the existence of the Research Ethics Commission. The Research Ethics Commission is an institution that pays attention to the quality of research related to human and animal subjects to maintain the dignity, rights, safety, and welfare of all research participants.

#### **a. Anggito Abimanyu**

Anggito Abimanyu has apologized for the mistake that occurred accidentally. However, plagiarism is subject to sanctions, whether the sanctions are in the form of dismissal from work or civil sanctions through compensation or imprisonment if there are criminal elements. Admission of negligence does not exempt the perpetrator from sanctions. This can be seen in Anggito Abimanyu's confession:

*I admit I made a mistake; I made a mistake. My resignation is to maintain UGM's credibility as a university with a commitment to the values of honesty, integrity, and academic responsibility*

In his confession, Anggito admitted his mistake, but this did not free him from sanctions as he said:

*I will hand over the next process to UGM in accordance with applicable regulations. I will not intervene and will prioritize the progress of this process over all my work because this concerns UGM's credibility* (Antara, Kantor Berita Nasional (2014) February 17).

As a PhD graduate scholar and lecturer from the University of Pennsylvania, I would like to apologize to the owner of the original work, the academic community and the public who were harmed by his mistake. An apology was conveyed to the Director General of Hajj at the Ministry of Religion, Anggito Abimanyu's written work published in a national newspaper with the title "Disaster Insurance Ideas" was proven to have plagiarized the written work of UI Lecturer, Hotbonar Sinaga, entitled "Initiating Disaster Insurance" on July 21, 2006. The plagiarism committed by FEB UGM lecturer, Anggito Abimanyu, was revealed in 2014, and Anggito officially recognized it as an error in citing references in a folder on his personal computer.

#### **b. Anak Agung Banyu Perwira**

In 2015, Anak Agung Banyu Perwira, a lecturer at the Department of International Relations at Parahyangan University (UNPAR) and former member of the National Human Rights Commission (Komnas HAM), was fired from his position after being proven to have plagiarized several articles published in The Jakarta Post. It is suspected that Banyu's plagiarism has occurred repeatedly. The article that sparked allegations of plagiarism was published in one of the English language daily newspapers in Indonesia, The Jakarta Post, which was published in November 2009. Banyu plagiarized Richard A. Bitzinger's original article entitled Defense Transformation and The Asia Pacific: Implications for Regional Militaries in the title the shorter RIs defense transformation. The Managing Editor of The Jakarta Post, Ati Nurbaiti, acknowledged Banyu's productivity in diligently sending articles about international relations and various foreign issues to his daily newspaper for years, and never had any problems with Banyu being exempt from sanctions. Banyu resigned as a UNPAR lecturer and apologized to the owner of the original work, the academic community, and the public.

As a professor, Anak Agung Banyu Perwira lost his pride and appreciation because his exemplary character for the younger generation as a professional career leader was tarnished. Banyu's pioneering efforts in fighting for human rights failed because what he did violated the human rights of the owners of original works. Exemplary action in fighting for human rights expresses the freedom to fight for human dignity through one's own original work as an embodiment of the values of individual freedom and respect for others.

#### **c. Felix Kasim**

In 2017, Felix Kasim, a lecturer at the Faculty of Computer Science, Bina Nusantara University (BINUS), was reported by his students for allegedly plagiarizing a number of his students' scientific works (Antara, Kantor Berita Nasional (2014) February 17).

Felix Kasim's track record is undeniable in the world of education. More than just a lecturer, Kasim has been the Chancellor of Maranatha Christian University Bandung since 2012. Kasim's plagiarism was discovered in his publication in the proceedings, namely, a collection of academic papers published at a seminar in Yogyakarta in mid-May 2011. Kasim's alleged plagiarism was confirmed by the owner of his student's original work, Andini D Anjani, without

including the author's name.

#### **d. Runtung Sitepu**

In 2017, Runtung Sitepu from North Sumatra State University (USU) was accused of plagiarism. Runtung and a few lecturers (Mahyuddin KM Nasution, Farhat, Maria Kaban, Kharisma Prasetya Adhyatma, Fauriski F Prapiska, Ginanda Putra Siregar, and Syah Mirsya Warli). Runtung admitted that there were allegations and responded to the accusations by submitting the matter to the Ethics Committee for further action. The USU Ethics Commission sanctioned Runtung's self-plagiarism by delaying his promotion and return of paid scientific work incentives.

#### **Findings**

The existence of ethics and the Research Ethics Commission is expected to provide benefits for the development of science and technology, as well as the welfare of society, without sacrificing moral and human values. The Research Ethics Commission are two important things in the world of research, especially those involving humans as research subjects. Research ethics is a collection of norms, principles and codes that regulate the behaviour of researchers in carrying out research, so as not to harm, endanger or violate the rights and dignity of research subjects. Research ethics also aims to maintain the quality, integrity, and social responsibility of research. The Research Ethics Commission is a body tasked with reviewing research ethics for research plans and ensuring research runs in accordance with applicable regulations, policies, norms, and ethical principles. The Research Ethics Commission is formed by research institutions, universities, or related agencies, according to the field and type of research carried out.

As a research subject, what researchers do presuppose several conditions that must be met so that the planned goals can be achieved. Conditions for treating research subjects: humans, animals, plants are as follows.

a. Human research subjects must be treated with respect for their rights, dignity and well-being. Human research subjects must provide well-informed, free, and voluntary consent. Human research subjects must be protected from unnecessary or disproportionate risks, harms, and inconveniences.

b. Animal research subjects must be treated with respect for their life, health, and welfare. Animal research subjects should be selected taking into account the purpose, relevance and significance of the research. Animal research subjects must be protected from unnecessary or disproportionate pain, suffering, and stress.

c. Plant research subjects must be treated with respect for diversity, balance and environmental sustainability. Plant research subjects should be selected taking into account the objectives, relevance and significance of the research. Plant research subjects must be protected from unnecessary or disproportionate damage, pollution and exploitation.

The relevance of ethics to the work of the Research Ethics Commission maintains that the ethical dimensions of research must be fulfilled in proposals submitted by researchers so that the proposals submitted must be scrutinized to avoid harm to research subjects. Regarding the plagiarism case discussed in this research, there is no ethical assessment from the Research Ethics Commission. As a result, after protests from the aggrieved party, violations of research procedures and processes were discovered which resulted in plagiarism.

Plagiarism perpetrators, such as Abimanyu, harmed research subjects because someone else's original work was taken without the permission of the owner of the original work. Anak Agung Banyu Perwira was accused of disrespect for the owners of the works of a number of people whose works were copied and published in *The Jakarta Post*. Felix Kasim fell into an even more grievous ethical violation of plagiarism because the research subjects who were harmed were students whose scientific work was used as his own work. Runtung Sitepu, Chancellor of the University of North Sumatra (USU), was processed administratively by the Research Ethics Commission at the Ministry of Education and Culture on suspicion of plagiarism in several international journals that had been published in various institutions.

Several cases indicate weaknesses in ethical behavior related to neglect of professional work, violations of moral principles, lack of ethical clearance, and lack of understanding of the aims and benefits of research. Andrew Abbott views professions as having jurisdiction over the right to carry out tasks with different possessions vying for control of jurisdiction over tasks. A profession is a field of work that has been successfully professionalized. It can be defined as a disciplined group of individuals, professionals, who adhere to ethical standards and who hold themselves out as and are accepted by the public as possessing special knowledge and skills in a widely recognized body of learning derived from research, education, and training at a high level, and who are prepared to apply this knowledge and exercise these skills in the interest of others.

Professions tend to be autonomous, which means they have a high degree of control of their own affairs: "professionals are autonomous insofar as they can make independent judgments about their work". This usually means "the freedom to exercise their professional judgement." The concept of autonomy can therefore be seen to embrace not only judgement, but also self-interest and a continuous process of critical evaluation of ethics and procedures from within the profession itself.

## **Conclusion**

The conclusion of this study is about research ethics to play a pivotal role in maintaining the integrity and credibility of scientific endeavours. Ethical clearance is a process of obtaining approval from an ethics committee or board for conducting research that involves human or animal participants. Researchers need ethical clearance before going into the field and writing to ensure that their research design and methods are ethically sound and do not harm or exploit the participants or the environment. Ethical clearance also protects the researchers from legal or moral issues that may arise from their research and enhances the validity and credibility of their findings. Ethical clearance usually involves submitting an ethics application form that describes the research objectives, methods, risks, benefits, and consent procedures. The ethics committee or board then reviews the application and decides whether to approve, reject, or request modifications. The researchers must follow the ethical guidelines and report any changes or problems to the ethics committee or board throughout the research process. Ethical clearance is important for maintaining the integrity and quality of research, as well as respecting the rights and dignity of the participants and the society.

## **References**

- Archer, A & Matheson, B (2019), *Admiration and Education: What Should We Do with Immoral Intellectuals*. *Ethical Perspectives: A Quarterly Review* 26(1), pp. 7-16.
- Aristotle (2001). *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, edited by Richard McKeon. New York: The Modern Library.

- Aristotle (2001). *Ethica Nicomachea: The Basic Works of Aristotle*, Edited by Richard McKeon. New York: The Modern Library.
- Abdul, H (2021, September 23). Norma Hukum, Agama, Kesusilaan, & Kesopanan di Masyarakat. Posted to <https://tirto.id/contoh-norma-hukum-agama-kesusilaan-kesopanan-di-masyarakat-gjve>.
- Antara, Kantor Berita Nasional (2014, February, 17). Anggito Abimanyu mundur dari UGM setelah dituduh plagiat. Posted to <https://www.antaraneews.com/berita/419472/anggito-abimanyu-mundur-dari-ugm-setelah-dituduh-plagiat>
- Beauchamp, T.L (1982). *Philosophical Ethics: An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*. McGraw-Hill.
- Bertens, K. (1990) *Sejarah Filsafat Yunani*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Bertens, K. (1997) *Etika*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia, 1997.
- Bertens, K. (2000). *Pengantar Etika Bisnis*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Bieliauskaite, J (2019). Introduction: Ethical Dilemmas in Academia. *Ethical Perspectives: A Quarterly Review* 26(1), pp.1-3.
- BRIN (2024). Prosedur Klirens Etik. Posted to <http://klirensetik.brin.go.id/prosedur?lang=en>.
- Copleston, Frederick. *A History of Philosophy: Greece and Rome, Vol. 1*. New York: Image Books, 1993.
- Day, L. A (2003). *Ethics in Media Communications: Cases and Controversies*. 3rd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Graf, Hans-Peter and Cole, D (1995). Ethics-Committee Authorization in Germany. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 21(4), pp. 229-233.
- Conel, B (2023, May 10). Contoh Etika Khusus. Posted to <https://www.gonel.id/contoh-etika-khusus/>. Jagad, ID (2024). Definisi Etika. Posted to <https://jagad.id/definisi-etika/>.
- Førde, R. & Vandvik, I. H (2005). Clinical Ethics, Information, and Communication: Review of Cases from a Clinical Ethics Committee. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 31 (2) , pp. 73-77.
- Gultom, Hasiolan Eko P. (2014, February 4). Rektor Maranatha Diduga Plagiat: Mahasiswa Tahu Tapi Tak Bisa Apa-apa. Post to <https://www.tribunnews.com/nasional/2014/02/04/>
- Gunawan, A (2021, January 20). scholar-accused-of-self-plagiarism-rector-appointment-canceled.html Posted to <https://www.thejakartapost.com/paper/2021/01/19/>
- Habermas, J (1979) *Communication, and the Evolution of Society*. Translated from German Text *Sprachpragmatik und Philosophie and Zur Rekonstruktion des Historischen Materialismus* by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press
- Habermas, J (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society, Vol. I*. Translated from German Text *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns, Band 1 Handlungsrationalität und gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung* by Thomas MacCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J (1987) *The Theory of Communicative Action: Life-world and System, a Critique of Functionalist Reason, Vol. II*. Translated from German Text *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns, Band 2, Zur Kritik der funktionalistischen Vernunft* by Thomas MacCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press
- Habermas, J (1991) *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Translated from *Moralbewusstsein und kommunikatives Handeln* by Christian Lenhardt and Shierry Weber NicholSEN. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1991.
- Hadi, A (2021, 24 September) contoh-norma-hukum-agama-kesusil tirto.id – Pendidikan. Posted to [https://tirto.id/contoh-norma-hukum-agama-kesusil-tirto.id - Pendidikan](https://tirto.id/contoh-norma-hukum-agama-kesusil-tirto.id-Pendidikan).
- Jagad, ID (2024). Definisi Etika. Posted to <https://jagad.id/definisi-etika/>.
- Kant, I (1996). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co. Inc.
- Kant, I (1964). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by H.J. Paton. New

York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Kant, I (1981). *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. by James W. Elington. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.

Kant, I (1997). *Critique of Practical Reason*, translated and edited by Marry Gregor with an introduction by Adrews Reath. Cambridge University Press.

Kasih, A.P (2021, September 22). Kampus Ini Tak Luluskan Mahasiswa Plagiat Tugas, Bangun Integritas Akademik. Posted to <https://www.kompas.com/edu/read/2021/09/22/163804371/kampus-ini-tak-luluskan-mahasiswa-plagiat-tugas-bangun-integritas-akademik>.

Keswara, R (2014, Februari 17) Kasus plagiat, Anggito Abimanyu mundur dari UGM, Posted to Sindo News. <https://daerah.sindonews.com/berita/836509/22/kasus-plagiat-anggito-abimanyu-mundur-dari-ugm>

Kompasiana (2015, February 26). etika-moral-norma-dan-nilai. Posted to <https://www.kompasiana.com/endahenny/54f33f897455137d2b6c6d5f/>.

Lako, A (2012, June 25). Plagiarisme dan Pencegahannya. Posted to [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329828632\\_PLAGIARISME\\_AKADEMIK\\_DAN\\_PENCEGAHANNYA#fullTextFileContent](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329828632_PLAGIARISME_AKADEMIK_DAN_PENCEGAHANNYA#fullTextFileContent)

Melsen van. A.G.M. *Wetenschap en Verantwoordelijkheid*. Diterj K. Bertens, Ilmu Pengetahuan dan Tanggung Jawab Kita. Jakarta: Gramedia, 1985.

Rahmat, H (2020, April 27) pengertian-etika-dan-moral/.et/etika-umum-dan-etika-khusus. Posted to <https://www.rajinbelajar.n> <https://www.kitapunya.net/>

Redaksi (2024, Maret 22) Inilah Sepuluh Tokoh Indonesia yang Terjebak Kasus Plagiat Karya Ilmiah. Posted to <https://www.bing.com/search?q=Inilah+Sepuluh+Tokoh+Indonesia+yang+Terjebak+Kasus+Plagiat+Karya+Ilmia>

Strgar.S.S., et al. (2018). *Legal Aspect of Scientific Misconduct: Cases and Possible Solutions. Ethical Perspective: A Quarterly Review*. 25 (1) 2018. Pp.120-123.

The Conversation (2021, February 26) Kasus Rektor USU Muryanto Amin: apa itu self-plagiarism dan bagaimana seharusnya aturannya? .Posted to <https://theconversation.com/kasus-rektor-usu-muryanto-amin-apa-itu-self-plagiarism-dan-bagaimana-seharusnya>

Wenger, N.S., et al. (2002) Hospital Ethics Committees in Israel: Structure, Function and Heterogeneity in the Setting of Statutory Ethics Committees. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 28 (3), pp. 177-182.