

Tay Keong TAN
Radford University, USA

THE ETHICS OF TEACHING ANTI-CORRUPTION AND INTEGRITY

Summary. Attitudes and anti-corruption activities, integrity, honesty and diligence should be the fundamental features of modern managers both in companies as well as in public organizations. However current social and economic reality issues a challenge and carries a lot of temptations that make it difficult to managers to behave ethically and take morally right decisions. In this article the author focuses on the role of teachers, especially academic, in shaping of future professionals and preparing them to right and honest management of organizations

Keywords: integrity, honesty, ethics, anti-corruption behaviors, teaching

ETYKA NAUCZANIA POSTAW ANTYKORUPCYJNYCH

Streszczenie. Postawy i działania antykorupcyjne, prawość, uczciwość i rzetelność winny stanowić fundamentalne cechy współczesnych menedżerów, zarówno w przedsiębiorstwach, jak i organizacjach publicznych. Dzisiejsza codzienność społeczno-gospodarcza rzuca jednak wyzwanie i niesie ze sobą wiele pokus, które utrudniają etyczne zachowania menedżerów i podejmowanie moralnie właściwych decyzji. W artykule autor koncentruje się na roli nauczycieli, zwłaszcza akademickich, w przygotowaniu przyszłych profesjonalistów do prawego i uczciwego zarządzania organizacjami.

Słowa kluczowe: prawość, uczciwość, etyka, zachowania antykorupcyjne, nauczanie

1. Introduction

Teachers of anti-corruption and integrity in universities and colleges have an important role to play in society. They have the duty and opportunity to help prepare the future professionals and public officials to work without corruption and live with integrity when they graduate from university. This mission is especially critical in societies where corruption is rife; where preparedness to deal with corruption may mean success or failure of these young people in pursuing a career without corruption or living a life of integrity. In challenging governance environments, university graduates and young professionals who wish to behave ethically and live according to their moral values face a daunting task. In these contexts, lying, cheating, and stealing have become accepted as a way to get ahead in professions. Bribery, fraud and kickbacks are systematically used and even encouraged in corporations as a means of doing business. In lowly-paid government jobs in some countries, pressure from superiors to extort citizens for money in exchange for public services or special treatment is a common malpractice. Even in the charity or civil society sector, the competition for resources can also drive people to use “whatever means possible” to win grants, contracts, and to secure public acclaim.

Although some executives consider integrity as a “personal matter”, its practice is often deeply embedded in social situations and organizational contexts. People working in organizations are profoundly affected by the organizational culture, policies and processes in their decisions and conduct (Paine, 1994). Graduates must not only know what they believe in and how to reason ethically in real-life situations, they must also content themselves with pressures, expectations and obligations that come with being a member of an organization. These may cause the incumbent to make moral compromises in order to achieve the expected results, or just to keep their job. They might also induce a member of the organization to overlook ethical hazards and moral consequences of questionable practices in order to fit in with the work group. In other instances, pressures from corrupt supervisors and colleagues may force a professional to take part in a conspiracy for malfeasance or cover-up of a wrongdoing. Organizational dynamics, hence, can make it even harder for young professionals in resisting corruption and working with integrity.

Universities around the world offer courses in various disciplines to prepare students for the real world of work; they train the students in acquiring professional knowledge, solving problems, or undertaking administrative roles, as required by the professions. They typically offer curricula to enable their students to gain a competitive edge and to compete and function adequately in different sectors, professions and organizations. Invariably, graduates from universities in corruption-prone societies and industries will have to content themselves with corruption and other moral issues in their professions and daily lives when they graduate

from college. For most of them, the only opportunity, if any, for learning how to cope with corruption and the difficult ethical issues in the workplace might indeed be the courses on anti-corruption and integrity.

However, universities often overlook the need to prepare their graduates to safeguard their integrity in challenging ethical situations and corrupting work environments. When business schools teach only idealized “textbook” models and theoretical constructs on how the business world works, which is not how they function in real life, they may leave out the thorny issues and more realistic practices such as cut-throat tactics and competitive strategies involving the use of bribery and fraud. It is not uncommon for students of public administration to be taught the skills and knowledge of the art and craft of government – as they should be, not as they are practiced in real life. This orientation will not adequately prepare future civil servants for a challenging career in the civil service where government officials are lowly paid, and are constantly exposed to the practices of bribery, kickbacks and nepotism. Similarly, if a law professor teaches only what is in the law books, but ignores the realism of how court cases are actually prosecuted and the judgments to the cases made, is he fully informing and adequately preparing his students for their future legal practices?

Among the pantheon of courses offered in universities around the world, courses on anti-corruption are very few and far between. Take China for example. There were over 400 academics and researchers writing and publishing in the subject area of anti-corruption in 2011, and they come from some 45 universities, colleges and research centers. However, only 7 universities were known to offer semester-length courses in anti-corruption and integrity. The subject area of anti-corruption is considered sensitive to some university administrators in China, and content of these courses may also be closely monitored. Some administrators even perceive these courses as being critical to or subversive of the practices in the Chinese government and business elites, and hence look at such courses with suspicion. New courses in anti-corruption often have to compete with existing courses for time slots in the fully-packed curricula, and hence introducing them will not be easy. Where these courses exist, teachers of anti-corruption and integrity may be the only people standing between the cohorts of students learning the skills of their trade and professions and their future work-lives ridden with temptations of corruption.

To meet this pressing need for ethical competence, the roles of teachers of anti-corruption and integrity must be more broadly defined to help students meet the challenges of the real world (Applbaum, 1999). A teacher’s mission in the classroom is not merely to teach a good course, engage students in the subject matter, organize and grade their assignments, and turn in the grades on time. These are the basic minimum requirements of a teaching professional. Her more challenging and meaningful task is to imbue in her students the skills, knowledge and values for living a life of integrity and working without corruption. In other words, anti-

corruption courses must be aimed at and organized around the imperatives of preparing future graduates to practice their professions with integrity and without corruption in business, government and civil society.

2. Difficult Ethical Quandaries

With this more inclusive role and mandate for educators, the work of teaching anti-corruption is elevated from the cozy realm of doing-the-minimum in teaching of a satisfactory course to a much more challenging mission that would test the ability of any teacher. She now faces several challenging ethical questions of her own. Is she able to fulfill her duty and mission with honesty, competence, and accountability? Is she fully ready to deal with the most salient and most difficult moral dilemmas of her trade? Three questions epitomize her moral quandaries:

1. What is the real impact on students when they complete an anti-corruption course? Would they be able to live and work with integrity when they graduate from university and enter a competitive commercial environment, where many are willing to lie, cheat, steal and bribe to get what they want?
2. Would some of the students have a real chance to practice in public service what they learned in class, particularly in societies where civil servants have very low salaries (barely above the living wage) and the corrupt bureaucratic cultures pressure members to fit in or get out?
3. How do professors deal with the issue of corruption in universities in which they have very little influence over the institutional environment; where admissions fraud, cheating in examinations, sexual harassment of students by teachers, and plagiarism are commonplace?

A morally reflective professor in the field of anti-corruption, integrity or ethics (or for that matter, any teacher in a professional school) who cares about the future and welfare of her students must be concerned with these questions. These questions relate to the accountability and professional competence of teachers because they address the real impact and moral consequences of their anti-corruption courses on the future graduates' ability to cope with actual problems of practicing their professions. Teachers of anti-corruption have a duty to adequately prepare students to resist corruption and manage the related ethical problems that they might commonly face in the work life. They have a moral duty to account for the type of skills, knowledge and values that students learn in their classrooms; a duty to the students, their parents, and even the university. Apart from relevance and realism, the third of the three quandaries also highlights the ethical issues of how authentic or truthful

anti-corruption courses are in addressing integrity gaps in the classrooms and on campus. Corruption in universities ranges from admissions fraud, cheating in examinations, sexual harassments of students by teachers, plagiarism and even procurement corruption in the construction of university buildings and the purchasing of textbooks and teaching equipment. Are anti-corruption teachers able and willing to address some of these issues as part of the discussion on how corruption manifests itself in university life?

Some 700 academics and teachers from over 50 countries around the world belong to a loosely connected community of practice known as the Public Integrity Education Network. The network was managed by Tiri – Making Integrity Work, an international non-governmental organization and funded by various international donors. Its members were academics who are teaching anti-corruption, integrity, ethics and related subjects or scholars who are researching in these fields. The network organizes regular meetings for sharing of resources, mutual learning and networking on topics such as curriculum development and teaching methods in anti-corruption and integrity. I served as the Director of Integrity Education at Tiri – Making Integrity Work from 2009 to 2011 and was responsible for managing the network and its activities. During the network meetings, I have often discussed the above three ethical issues and moral dilemma with participants from many different nationalities, universities, and disciplines. Many of them were actively engaged in days of heated discussion and deep sharing concerning the practice of anti-corruption and integrity education and related issues of their research interests. Although very few of them could offer comprehensive solutions to these questions that are intimately connected to their teaching and scholarly pursuits, diverse insights and ideas were gleaned from these exchanges. Without exception, the scholars agree that the questions are highly germane to their work and intimately related to the ethical issues of accountability, authenticity and competence of an anti-corruption teacher.

The scholars of the Public Integrity Education Network agreed that temptations and trials for fresh graduates from universities are many, and how they are handled will have severe and lasting moral consequences on careers and lives. In China, for instance, young professionals have to “look the other way” when kickbacks from contracts are distributed within the company itself (Xin, Wang, 2011). “Corruption is a pervasive and endemic problem that affects everyone in China – in the classrooms, marketplace, hospitals, and practically every public service. These practices benefit a lot of people. Bribes are usually used to get permits from corrupt officials. Small car sales skyrocketed in China because developers buy them to bribe officials and are a powerful means of getting permits, licenses and protection. More BMW 7-Series cars are sold in Shanghai than in the whole of Europe! Businesses cannot tackle these problems alone, as the corrupt usually have political backing from high level authorities. It would be very difficult for professionals to stay clean if they

want to get ahead! ” These are the lamentations of a senior manager at an international chemical company in Beijing. He also opined that anti-corruption and integrity education has its role in China, but the prospect of fully practicing in the real-world what is learned in the classroom is bleak.

The governance environment is equally challenging in Indonesia, where many students are enrolled in over 2,300 universities and colleges. In Jakarta, there is a course on investigative reporting at Paramadina University, where undergraduate students from the second year were sent out in teams to ferret out corrupt practices from all walks of life in Jakarta. They used hidden cameras, camcorders, voice recorders and a myriad other devices to document evidence of corrupt, fraud and abuse in many sectors and professions, beginning with the university campus itself. Each year, students returned with recorded observations and multi-media evidence spanning many different professions that they can gain access to. Their evidence ranged from the overcharging of clients at food outlets and cheating of passengers by taxi drivers to kickbacks at vehicle toll booths and the issue of fake university certificates to students in the black market. Their findings and many reports, year after year, confirmed what the public already knows and is commonly reported in the news media: corruption is alive and well and its practitioners are regularly inventing more novel and sophisticated ways to derive wrongful gain and evade detection.

In the sections that follow, the ideas, emerging practices and solutions by the members of the Public Integrity Education Network are analyzed and evaluated to create a clearer picture on how the critical ethical quandaries could be tackled in practice around the world. Anti-corruption educators who are confronted with these key ethical questions relating to their practice must seek solutions or suffer from moral dissonance as a result. The issues of the intended impact on their students’ ethical competence and decision making, the relevance of their teachings to professional practice and public service, and the questions on corruption in universities are simply too important to their mission as educators to be left unanswered.

3. The Usual Answers

The first two sets of questions are closely inter-linked as they deal with the relevance and impact of anti-corruption courses to the real world. One relates more to impact on work in the private sector and the other is clearly concerned about public sector careers: *How can integrity educators prepare their students for a competitive, cut-throat marketplace, where many are willing to lie, cheat, steal and bribe to get what they want? How could future graduates practice their public service careers without corruption, particularly where civil servants are poorly paid and are under pressure from corrupt colleagues to do what*

everyone does or do as they are told? Both these questions drew parallel responses and very similar solutions from anti-corruption scholars around the world, particularly those in the Public Integrity Education Network. Many anti-corruption professors were challenged by these questions about the outcome of their courses in the students' lives and careers after graduation. They are directly concerned with many of the professors' professional mission and ethos as transformers of young minds in the cause of anti-corruption. Nevertheless, these are not problems faced by anti-corruption educators alone, as questions of relevance and impact of tertiary courses could easily have been directed at scholars from a myriad other disciplines or professional schools.

With the anti-corruption teachers within the Public Integrity Education Network, answers that emerged from our discourse to the questions on relevance and impact typically fell into three categories: (1) I don't care (or it is not part of my job!); (2) I can't tell (or how they work and live after my course I have no way of knowing!); and (3) I can't do anything about it (or what can I do to change these students in just one semester!). The first category of responses is embedded in a narrowly defined educator's role: her job is to teach a good course and that is what the university or school paid her to do. Her professional mandate was to impart knowledge to her students; not to change their professional ethos. This category of scholars may be genuinely defining their vocation as one focusing on transferring knowledge, engaging students in class, and testing their understanding and recall of course materials, and certifying their completion of a course. One such scholar quipped: "Whether my students will live a life of integrity when they leave the university is really up to them! My work is done when the course ended and the tests are graded. It is the students' job to determine how to pursue their careers and seek their own paths in life after graduation." Such an approach to teaching is very common in academic institutions where teachers are explicitly instructed to teach a certain prescribed course and not stray from the authorized syllabi and pedagogical approaches. They are expected to use primarily the lecturing approach to convey knowledge of the subjects within the syllabus and test the students for their understanding and recollection of this knowledge. For instance, several lecturers of universities in Armenia admitted that their sole method of instruction is to give lectures, and all tests they give the students on the subject are random selections of what was presented in the classrooms and the course materials. Given the low salaries of professors in Armenia, some of them have to teach 13 class sessions a week in different schools or universities. Given this daunting workload, an efficient approach is to focus almost exclusively on the delivery of identical lectures and use of standardized tests. An Armenian lecturer argued: "How can we expect to do more for each class when we are pay a few hundred dollars a month for teaching each semester? What I am responsible for is to teach each class, conduct the assessments and tests, and hope that some lessons will stick in the students' mind when they graduate!"

The second category of professors had their answers focused on the difficulty of determining how the knowledge (perhaps values and skills if they are taught in class) from anti-corruption courses could be assessed to be internalized or used by the students post-graduation. A lecturer in this category sees himself as ill-equipped to measure or to gather evidence to show if his classes could really equip the students to resist corruption and embrace integrity in the workplace, years after graduation. His argument is that an educator is not responsible for something he does not know. He is unable to manage or influence the students' learning for professional application, if he has very little information on the latter. Educators lament the fact that they are interested in knowing the impact of their courses on actual behavior but they have limited resources to track and measure it in graduates dispersed into various localities, industries and organizations. One teacher from Cairo, Egypt, who pondered these questions, replied: "We cannot easily follow the career paths of students and monitor their private moral decisions! Even when we interview or survey them, how many will tell the truth about their moral decisions and admit to corrupt practices?" A professor in Indonesia commented: "Even if we can find out how our students behaved ethically in their professional careers, how can we assign credit or blame for such behaviors on the anti-corruption course they have taken some years ago? We are lecturers. Not counselors, coaches or mentors for all the students that came through my classes. I think my students will look back one day and remember some of my lessons, but they will likely forget most of what I taught them after a few years!"

The third and last category of responses contends that an anti-corruption teacher can teach the knowledge of the subject, but he cannot be held responsible for their application in the trenches of the professions. There is often a significant time lag between the taking of an anti-corruption course and the opportunities to apply its knowledge in the professions. It is difficult, if not impossible, to empirically isolate the outcomes of a semester-long course (much less shorter anti-corruption modules) on students' conduct and behavior in the work place. An educator, who is highly motivated to influence his students' ethos and behaviors, may design her course and conduct his classes to impart practice-oriented knowledge and skills that are relevant to ethical problem solving in real life. However, he cannot follow through in promoting their actual use in the hard moral choices in their careers. A Lebanese university lecturer from Beirut reflected on the concern for impact in her anti-corruption course and commented: "Even if I have the means to find out how they lead their lives, practice their trade, or behave in their offices [after graduation], what can I do in a semester's time to change all that? How can I possibly attempt to influence their most difficult ethical decisions concerning corruption and integrity in real life? I can feed their minds, but I cannot change their morality." This is a compelling argument, as academics may be experts in their field of study, they are not specifically trained or institutionally equipped to change moral

attitudes and work ethos. An anti-corruption teacher from Beijing, China, made a related observation: “While my course on anti-corruption teaches them how to recognize and resist wrong practices, the other courses in the school, parents’ expectations, difficult life experiences, and peer pressure may influence the young person to get rich and win promotions at all costs! Influenced by the media and popular culture, so many of our young people today want material success quickly, and they are willing to compromise their morals to get there.”

In most universities, beyond the occasional anecdotal evidence, very little data is collected to demonstrate how much of university course materials are actually learned and applied. Testing of the comprehension of course content and the recollection of course material is possible with continuous assessment and examinations, although these are still imperfect measures of how anti-corruption knowledge and skills were internalized. The effective application of anti-corruption knowledge and skills in practice requires mastery as well as the conviction and courage to make difficult moral decisions. It is not easily tested. Furthermore, ethical decisions often come at a cost, and moral dilemmas are commonly resolved through mobilizing the strength of character and a clear conscience, all of which are difficult to teach in class.

4. Some Answers and Residual Issues

The questions on how to prepare students of anti-corruption courses to practice their professions with integrity present an interesting ethical dilemma for anti-corruption educators around the world. Most teachers of anti-corruption are acutely aware that they are morally obligated to teach students to recognize and resist corruption and its related malpractices. Indeed, some of their syllabi explicitly mentioned imparting knowledge to students to raise their awareness and improve their abilities to understand and tackle corruption-related issues commonly found in society. Most would even agree that they must have good answers for those students who wish to learn how to apply the theories and frameworks of their classes to their professional lives. Yet, many of these teachers also feel that they are powerless to help students resolve corruption-related problems in real life situations. Through the interviews and discussions, most of them especially feel inadequate in dealing with the quandary of how graduates could survive in competitive, cut-throat work environments, where integrity and governance is not valued or rewarded, and where corrupt people tend to survive and thrive. Others are resigned to the fact that they cannot find viable solutions or good advice for students who aspire to work in the public service, where civil servants are poorly paid and are under constant pressure to go along with or participate actively in corrupt practices. Indeed,

many cohorts of graduates have entered public service and private corporations, and yet few universities have been able to identify models of integrity among alumni who have become successful in government and business. In fact, most of the corrupt practitioners in society – crooked business leaders, corrupt officials, and dirty politicians – who have been caught or exposed through the mass media – are graduates from universities. This led one senior university official from Indonesia to comment: “If universities cannot produce people who fight and resist corruption, they are producing corruptors! You can read in the news that the majority of the corrupt are university graduates!”

To these challenges, we have a few answers, if not partial solutions, that may help educators resolve these persistent quandaries. First, while anti-corruption courses may not be able to cure all the ills of workplace corruption and immunize students from this harm, they can provide a first line of defense in terms of raising awareness and promoting understanding of corruption and its consequences on individuals, organizations and society. Courses typically highlight the malevolent impact of bribery and fraud on the personal integrity of professionals, on the morale and reputation in organizations and the loss of public trust and social welfare for society as a whole. The knowledge of the consequences of one’s action can assist future professionals in making more informed decisions when they are presented with difficult choices and ethical decisions. Lessons on anti-corruption can also alert students to the various forms of corruption as forewarnings, or familiarize them with the provisions of the laws and civil service regulations that proscribe these practices. Class discussion on the convicted corruption cases can warn future public servants and deter some of them from such mistakes. Anti-corruption courses, through case teaching and problem solving approaches, may also present strategies and tactics on how to avoid being ensnared in conspiracies for wrongdoing and prevent corrupt practices from taking place. Studies on procurement governance, for example, may provide ideas to future executives on how to prevent malpractices in procurement, using good practices such as open call for bids, selection by a committee, and the segregation of duties in the entire bidding process.

Another approach is to increase the level of engagement in class activities through interactive and problem-solving activities to raise students’ interest and make it easier for them to internalize the lessons learned for future application. Studies have shown that teaching methods that involve students in interactive learning, research and writing, and participating in group work tend to promote understanding and recollection than more passive methods such as listening to lectures and reading (citation). To create a deeper and more lasting impact on students, courses can be taught in interactive, student-centered teaching styles that engages the students’ imagination and sensory faculties. In addition to being informative and persuasive, these courses must also empower students. If educators only teach students to identify the problems, without providing insights into practical solutions and

effective alternatives, their courses may actually engender cynicism and disenchantment. Hence, it would be of greater benefit if anti-corruption courses can combine insights from lectures and classroom exercises with real-world engagement such as legal clinics, investigative reports by students, field visits, and social monitoring. Traditional forms of rote learning and random memorization are not particularly effective in nurturing the students' moral courage and ethical convictions to resist corruption and to initiate positive change for integrity (citation). Hence, anti-corruption lessons that seek a greater real-world impact, must consider the more creative and engaging pedagogical methods ranging from case studies and scenario exercises to role-playing and creative writing. While anti-corruption teachers typically cannot track the careers and moral trajectory of their students after graduation, they can certainly do so within the given time of a semester to make their courses and lessons more engaging and empowering.

From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that educators at the driving seat of students' learning can do a lot to help maximize the chances of students internalizing and applying the values, knowledge and skills of anti-corruption. In many countries, these may be the only courses the students will ever take that has content in moral reasoning and ethical problem solving before they begin their careers. Courses can provide the moral concepts, ethical frameworks and practical solutions that students may turn to later in life; hence they can significantly influence how students think about moral issues and live their lives. By constantly improving their courses, renewing course content, updating teaching methods, teachers of anti-corruption can also greatly strengthen the interests of students in the subject matter. Much can be done by them to make courses practical, relevant to the problems of the day and grounded in the realities of the societies into which the students will graduate. These activities are within the academic mandate and role of university teachers, even in those institutions where pedagogical content and methods are centrally controlled and closely monitored.

While individual professors may not have the resources and know-how to track the impact of their courses in the students' lives after graduation, most universities may have resources (such as centers for instruction or teaching) that can study the impact of various course contents and teaching methods. Paramadina University in Jakarta, Indonesia used simple text messages and emails to survey their students on alumni records for up to three years from graduation to get a sense of the how they perceive the relevance of the mandatory anti-corruption course they took in school. The results may not be highly statistically robust but they indicated that recall rates were good for the first two years before sharply declining. Alternatively, published research results widely accessible in the public domain or presented in conferences may help to update their content and inform on their teaching methods. Hence, the concerns of circumscribed mandate, limited resources, and inadequate knowledge are less

of a real constraint to those professors who are committed to improving the impact of their courses in real world practice.

The issue of the impact of anti-corruption education is one that deserves deeper and broader study. Educational programs in anti-corruption are typically rated in terms of their outputs and activities (e.g. number of students who successfully completed the course, or the number of classes taught) rather than the larger social impact of the courses (i.e. ascertained student learning and understanding of concepts, or change in attitudes and behavior toward corrupt practices). In recent years the MIT Poverty Action Lab (Poor Economics, 2008) is at the forefront of a new approach of using randomized controlled trials (RCTs) in international development projects to test the efficacy of different designs, incentives and interventions. A randomized controlled trial is a type of scientific experiment using clinical trials, most commonly used in testing the effectiveness of social change programs, such as healthcare services or educational approaches. The distinguishing feature of the RCT is that the subjects of the interventions (students of anti-corruption courses) are randomly assigned to different types of treatments (e.g. interactive learning approaches vs. lectures). Research similar to this can also focus on knowledge transfer (lectures, class discussions) versus those using social involvement and “reflective” approaches (e.g. investigative reporting, internships and action research). The subjects (must be at least two groups) are then observed/followed up in exactly the same way (e.g. interviewed every 6 months, tested annually). The observed outcomes or impact will testify to the efficacy of different approaches in the teaching of anti-corruption courses. The most important advantage of randomization is that it reduces allocation bias, and help to balance the allocation or spread of relevant attributes, in the assignment of treatments to give comparable treatment groups. To-date, there is little attention given to evidence-based approaches to show how results are linked to factors relating to anti-corruption education such as, training of lecturers, and the lecturers’ use of interactive case studies and films. Universities have done very little inquiry on how different pedagogy and content can make a more lasting impact on the professional integrity of their graduates. Research in these areas can shed light on the emerging field of anti-corruption practice around the world.

A third approach to help resolve the dilemma is to go beyond the fight against corruption with an integrity building focus. While professors of anti-corruption may not be able to solve the most entrenched problems of corruption in their university and classrooms for their students, they can do much to build their integrity. As an antidote against corruption, integrity is an attractive value and a powerful principle. Practically everyone we know wants to work and live in an integral manner. Organizations around the world hold it up as a core value. Companies big and small profess allegiance to integrity as their ethos for doing business. Religions from both east and west consider versions of this virtue as cornerstone of the pious life. Anti-corruption courses can take a strong tag in teaching students the values, practices,

and principles of integrity and how to apply them in professional and personal life. Integrity-building skills include the art of moral reasoning, awareness of the rights and interests of others and the public, respect for the laws of the land and rules of organizations, and practices of transparency and accountability in organizational life. These competencies provide a strong foundation for living a morally good life, and practicing one's profession with honesty and dignity. At Harvard Business School, the faculty is considering offering ethics and integrity lessons with planted "tiny time pills" that will be activated later in the students' careers (Rosenberg, 2006). Equally important, ethics and integrity are the underpinnings of a strong character that resists temptation and pressures for moral compromise.

While most anti-corruption courses focus on the fight against corruption on the national, organizational and personal levels, a few courses are beginning to experiment with a strong integrity-building focus. One anti-corruption trainer based in Indonesia observed: "Courses of anti-corruption tend to be so corruption-focused that students are exposed to various forms of corruption throughout the semester. I wonder if they are given ideas on how to do wrong. Very few of them would graduate into jobs in anti-corruption agencies anyway. If courses are more oriented towards learning about integrity and its practices, its relevance to the students may be even greater." Indeed, many anti-corruption courses present case after case of corrupt practices to students, but they do not always provide solutions or counter-measures to corruption. Thus, these lessons leave students wondering if corruption might be inevitable and if anything can be done about it. In the shift of focus towards integrity, a group of teachers and administrators at the Nantong University in Southern China were able to advocate to the university's leadership to have an 8-hour and 16-hour anti-corruption module taught in the Moral Education core curriculum for all basic degree students. Such modules have their content focused on addressing corruption and also on building integrity and the moral character of students. The modules are also taught with case methods and they utilize actual cases of corruption drawn from court document and media articles from all over China. Today more than 6000 students each year undergo the standardized anti-corruption curriculum.

Integrity is more than the absence of corruption. Building the integrity of students will do more for them in their professional lives than strategies to overcome the pressures from corrupting business and bureaucratic environments. Through lessons on integrity competence, students will learn the principles of integrity: sound moral judgment; uprightness, honesty, sincerity, and also involving the firm adherence to codes of ethical conduct. They will learn how organizations can improve policies and practices to strengthen integrity. Integrity in one's work life may also include the quality of being complete and undivided, being true to the mission and mandate of the organization as well as being trustworthy, and being diligent in honoring personal obligations and professional

commitments. To prepare for a professional life of integrity, students learn how to manage their ethical conduct and actions in an organizational setting. In social discourse and relationships with others they learn how to adhere to truth-telling, promise-keeping and respecting the rights of others and rules of society. These integrity practices will open up an anti-corruption course to an array of theories, concepts, skills and practical examples. At the very least, they will bring a balance to those courses that are totally focused on the study of corruption.

5. Corruption in Universities

Another set of difficult ethical questions for anti-corruption educators is related to university corruption. These questions have drawn both heated debate in some countries and cautious muted discussions in others, but the interest of the academics in this topic was undeniable. The university lecturers who teach anti-corruption were generally willing to discuss corruption in society and specific cases published in the mass media. However, they tended to be cautious to criticize university governance and practices that might incur the displeasure or backlash from university administrations. Scholars did not feel safe to make accusations about hidden practices without sufficient evidence, even where suspicions are strong. Their usual answers are identifiable with three main themes: (1) I don't know (I cannot make accusations without proof of malpractices); (2) I don't care (this is beyond the scope of my syllabus!); and (3) I can't change things around here (these are matters to be dealt with by the administration).

The first category of responses was elicited from a wide range of academics. One young and eloquent college professor in a university in Makassar, Indonesia, opined: "Such things exist at many universities, we know. Students copying from one another [in tests and exams], faculty members plagiarizing research, wealthy parents buying good grades and examination questions, and even students purchasing university degree certificates from the black market. But we have to be careful not to make strong statements on corruption about our universities without evidence or first-hand experience. What we say can get to the ears of the authorities!" Nevertheless, most of the scholars interviewed have personally experienced the effects of admissions fraud, cheating in examinations, sexual harassments of students by teachers, and plagiarism during their careers. They have seen them in their earlier times as students of universities, and now as teachers and researchers. Most of them have also suffered from poor quality workmanship of buildings on campus or the use of sub-standard classroom equipment that are most likely the result of procurement corruption in university purchases.

The second category of answers expressed the assertion that corruption on campus is not part of the syllabus of an anti-corruption course. A semester-length course on anti-corruption typically resides in the disciplines of political science, public administration, business administration or in the case of Indonesia, religious studies. Some shorter modules (1-3 classes in most cases) on corruption may be incorporated into a professional course, such as law, finance or engineering. Long courses are generally taught from social science lenses that focus on the theory and concepts of corruption in a society at large and around the world. Short modules deal with corruption cases and risks that are relevant to the particular professions. Very few, if any, of these courses and modules, explicitly deal with university corruption. Whether professors consider this to be a sensitive topic to be included in their syllabi or that it may raise too many unanswered questions and embarrassing issues, corruption in the classrooms and colleges is very rarely spoken of publicly in academic circles, much less taught in classes. A bold exception to this might be Paramadina Universitas, the privately-managed university in Jakarta that organized mandatory anti-corruption courses for all its undergraduate students. In its widely popular course on investigative reporting earlier mentioned, student groups gathered evidence of corrupt practices and abuse. They were allowed to investigate into cases of corruption in the university itself, and some groups have unearthed evidence ranging from minor cases of absenteeism of university security guards to suspected mismanagement of university building projects. The enlightened university leadership chose not to censor such findings but to openly address them and use them as catalysts for reforms to improve university management. A senior administrator at the university opined: "Unless we openly deal with issues of mismanagement on campus, how can we have the legitimacy to teach students about corruption in the larger society?"

Respondents with the third category of answers appeal to a narrow definition of their role on morality. They have a similar approach as those who circumscribe their teaching mission to exclude anything beyond teaching the course and grading assignments. In their view, university governance is the responsibility of administrators and overseers. If they come across a case of plagiarism or cheating in tests, they would report the matter up the chain of command. Beyond that, they would content themselves with teaching their courses and not "rock the boat". When Chinese academics were asked about how they would deal with allegations and convicted cases of sexual harassment, plagiarism and cheating in the schools, they would prefer to discuss them as part of official case studies. When it comes to remedial measures and reforms, their refrains were: "The authorities will deal with this; as a lecturer I can't change things around here. All I can do is to report misconduct to my superiors. When cases are published in the news media, I may use them as lessons from real life and a warning to my students."

6. Some Answers and Residual Issues

Questions on corruption in the universities present professors of anti-corruption with an equally severe moral dilemma as the questions about the relevance and impact of their teaching. Professors are bound by their intellectual honesty and pride in their craft to address practical issues raised by students in relation to the subject area. Yet the many manifestations of corrupt practices in universities have a great impact on the legitimacy of anti-corruption lessons in the eyes of students and the learning environment on the campuses. Take for example when there are huge integrity problems in the classroom, with students bribing teachers for higher grades, cheating in tests, and abuse of authority by lecturers. Lessons on fighting corruption sound like hollow theoretical exercises. In the larger university governance context, where there is wanton plagiarism in research by lecturers, widespread admissions fraud and nepotism in the hiring of university staff, the strife for excellence and honest competition for results will be seriously stifled. The university loses its edge as an institution promoting intellectual honesty, enterprise, creativity and learning.

Arguably, the teaching of anti-corruption in a corruption-ridden setting can create much dissonance in the minds of students. These students might actually internalize the lesson that corruption practitioners are so powerful they can get away with anything, even in public institutions of higher learning. An Indonesian lecturer noted: “When students witness poor workmanship, sub-standard equipment and badly managed university construction projects, the lessons they take away with them from their university experience: corruption is inevitable, or you can do anything to get ahead as long as you do not get caught. These lessons are more powerful and influential than the theories and practices of anti-corruption we teach them in the classrooms.” These abovementioned moral dilemmas relating to university governance must be resolved as a pre-condition for effective anti-corruption teaching in the classrooms, for they cannot be easily side-stepped by educators seeking to teach students to resist and fight corruption in real life.

There are several approaches or strategies to this moral problem faced by teachers of anti-corruption working in poorly governed universities. First, the lecturers may not be able to change the larger system of university governance, but they can do much to shape the atmosphere and management of their anti-corruption courses. Course governance may be safeguarded through clear and enforced rules and guidelines against plagiarism in student research and writing, cheating in tests and examinations, faculty’s and students’ responsibility for punctuality and accountability in conduct in the classrooms, and even an atmosphere of respect throughout the course. Taken together these create an enabling environment that promotes intellectual honesty, fairness, and personal responsibility that shore up the integrity of the course and all its participants. Several courses on anti-corruption,

for example, have a significant part of their first organizing sessions focused on the course governance principles and expectations before delving into the course contents in subsequent sessions.

Second, anti-corruption lecturers can indirectly deal with issues of corruption in universities by using case studies from published cases of university corruption or plagiarism in their home country or abroad. When they do not have the evidence or data to deal with suspected cases of corruption within their own campuses, these are the next best option. Students do not need actual cases close to home to vicariously learn lessons of corruption on campus; they can gain as much insight through other universities' experiences. They may learn about the pitfalls of plagiarism in doing research, the consequences of cheating in tests, methods for preventing nepotism in university hiring, and the strategies for reporting suspected wrongdoings. From the reported cases in the mass media, classes can learn how dishonorable or irresponsible behavior has ruined the careers of scholars and derail the academic promise of students. Classes may also use examples from around the world to examine how fraud and corrupt practices have brought down university administrators and tarnished the reputations of established institutions. In fact, faculty and students can be more objective and less emotional when they speak to the experience of others rather to deal with issues of their own.

Third, students concerned with university governance problems would also benefit from learning about integrity interventions or governance reforms in academic institutions, beyond studying the corrupt practices in universities. The discourse in the class can go beyond "what is wrong" to "how to do right". This is akin to complementing the learning about corruption with acquiring knowledge on how to build integrity in the professions. How do some other countries address the issues of university reform and governance? What reforms and interventions are effective and sustainable in the academic environment? What does it take to transform a university that is vulnerable to corruption to one that is strong in governance? More interestingly, how does an institution improve its integrity in an environment where good governance is not valued and continuously challenged? In many countries, a good university degree is a passport to good jobs and a promising career; the stakes involved in academic pursuits are high. Consequently, life in university presents many integrity traps and temptations, as students and university staff alike seek ways to get ahead in a competitive environment.

Students, in particular, may not yet have the ethical competence to deal with the competition for grades and admission to programs. Lessons on academic integrity and university governance will strengthen students' knowledge about how to conduct themselves with integrity; they will also deter some from the painful mistakes of dishonesty or irresponsibility. From the above discussion, it is evident that much can be done to address the

issues of corruption in a university within the roles, responsibilities, and resources of anti-corruption educators. Through creative and flexible approaches, they can address the students' concerns, teach the lessons and yet avoid the risks of critiquing their own institutions and its members.

7. Concluding Remarks

Anti-corruption educators in universities have a special role and responsibility to change the way their students think about corruption. Their students will form the future professionals and public leaders of society. Anti-corruption activists in many countries around the world often wage a lonely and dangerous battle against the powerful forces of graft in high places and the widespread street-level corruption. With only rare exceptions, the political and business elites of all countries are graduates of universities. Universities are among the rare institutions that can produce a critical mass of integrity builders to confront these challenges. Yet, institutions of higher learning have produced politicians, public officials, military leaders, and business executives who are heavily represented amongst those indicted or convicted for corrupt practices. The corrupt behaviors and abuses of graduates entering these professions suggest that the universities responsible for educating them for professional life can do more to equip them with the knowledge, skills and knowledge needed to practice their professions with integrity. Hence, the questions addressed above are not just moral quandaries for university professors seeking to teach anti-corruption to their classes of students. They must be the concern of university administrators, parents, employers and leaders of all sectors of society. How a country's universities prepare its graduates for real life must go beyond the transfer of knowledge and skills to enable them to become productive members of society and responsible citizens of the nation. They must be taught the competencies on how to act and behave with integrity, and to confront and resolve the ethical problems that professional careers present them. Only then, could society count on their best and brightest to respond to these problems in the workplace, manage corporations and lead public institutions with high standards of integrity.

Bibliography

1. Applbaum A.I.: Ethics for Adversaries: The Morality of Roles in Public and Professional Life. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1999.
2. Rosenbergm J.: Teaching Business Students Life Lessons in Leadership. "Harvard Magazine", September-October 2006, p. 42-53.
3. Paine L.S.: Managing for Organizational Integrity. "Harvard Business Review", March/April, 1994, p. 106-117.
4. Xin K., Haijie W.: Culture Clash in the Boardroom. "Harvard Business Review", September 2011, p. 129-133.