JOURNAL OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Volume: 4 Issue: 2 | Feb–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

Corruption: a Multifaceted Phenomenon and its Impact on the Educational Sector

Nozimakhon Sobirova
Lecturer, Department of Criminal Law, Criminology and Anti-Corruption, Tashkent State University of Law

Abstract: Corruption in the education sector is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that negatively impacts the accessibility, quality, and equity of educational services. International anti-corruption norms, including the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), establish frameworks for combating corrupt practices such as bribery, embezzlement, abuse of power, and illicit enrichment. In educational institutions, the most prevalent forms of corruption include bribery, financial fraud, falsification of academic achievements, and extortion. Examples include bribing faculty members and admissions committee officials, manipulating diplomas and academic grades, and financial mismanagement in the allocation of educational funds.

Corruption in education undermines trust in the system, leads to inefficient resource allocation, and reduces students' motivation to engage in honest learning. Developed countries also experience corruption cases, including exam result manipulation and diploma forgery. An effective approach to combating this phenomenon requires legislative reforms, transparent resource management, and strengthened international cooperation. Analyzing the root causes of corruption through a cost-benefit assessment allows for the development of targeted prevention strategies aimed at enhancing transparency and accountability within the education sector.

Keywords: corruption, education, UNCAC, bribery, academic integrity.

Corruption is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that defies a single, universally accepted definition. In international discourse—exemplified by the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)—there is a deliberate avoidance of offering an all-encompassing definition. Instead, UNCAC delineates and classifies various corrupt practices as criminal offenses, including bribery, misappropriation, abuse of influence for personal gain, misuse of official position, and illicit enrichment (Articles 15–22, UNCAC). With 189 state parties as of November 2021, the Convention's provisions have achieved near-universal recognition, thereby establishing an international framework for addressing and prosecuting diverse corrupt acts. Detailed expositions on the manifestation of these practices in both the public and private sectors are provided in Modules 4 and 5 of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) series on combating corruption.

Within educational systems, bribery and misappropriation are identified as the most prevalent forms of corruption. Bribery in education typically involves the exchange of monetary or non-monetary benefits to influence decisions. For example, a faculty member might offer a bribe to a member of a university admissions committee to secure a position for a less qualified candidate, or a professor might endorse a substandard thesis in return for a material benefit—such as receiving a new car gifted by a student's parent with vested interests.

A notable case of misappropriation was documented by Reijnakke and Svensson (2004) in Ugandan schools, where only 13% of the allocated grants reached their intended beneficiaries. This instance not only highlights the scale of resource diversion but also underscores the critical need for robust financial oversight and transparency in the allocation of educational funds. Further discussion and additional examples of corruption in the educational realm are provided by Hallak and Poisson (2007),

Volume: 4 Issue: 2 | Feb–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

who explore the multifarious nature of corrupt practices and their detrimental impact on educational quality.

In addition to bribery and misappropriation, fraudulent activities and extortion are also prevalent in education. Fraud involves deliberate deception aimed at securing economic gain. A pertinent example is the operation of "diploma mills," where fraudulent institutions sell counterfeit academic credentials online. When a university or another educational institution produces and distributes fake diplomas, such conduct may be classified as an abuse of official position—especially under Article 19 of UNCAC in the context of state-run institutions.

Extortion in education is characterized by the use of coercion, threats, or violence to extract benefits. This form of corruption can manifest when an educator demands sexual favors or other illicit payments from students or their parents in exchange for better grades or the awarding of diplomas. In cases where these coercive practices have a sexual dimension, the term "sexual extortion" or "sextortion" is employed, as elaborated in Module 8 of the UNODC anti-corruption series.

It is also important to recognize that scenarios in which a teacher's request for sexual favors is not overtly coercive—or where such favors are exchanged for favorable academic outcomes—may be classified as either bribery or abuse of official position, and are sometimes referred to as sexual corruption. In this context, UNCAC mandates that state parties establish criminal liability for bribery, abuse of official position, and related corrupt practices, defining the benefits obtained from such transactions broadly as "illicit advantages." This expansive interpretation encompasses both tangible and intangible gains, including sexual services, which can engender a sense of obligation between the involved parties.

Administrative Corruption and Breaches of Academic Integrity

Beyond direct acts of corruption, breaches of academic integrity—such as plagiarism and chronic absenteeism among educators—are, in some contexts, also viewed as manifestations of corruption (TI, 2013). Furthermore, administrative corruption within educational institutions, particularly in areas such as procurement, financial management, and human resources, poses significant challenges. Such practices not only compromise institutional accountability but also undermine the equitable distribution of educational resources.

The available evidence underscores that corruption in the educational sector exerts a deleterious impact on both the financial resources allocated for education and the overall quality and equity of educational services. By integrating empirical findings with the legal frameworks established by international conventions such as UNCAC, policymakers and stakeholders can develop comprehensive strategies to combat corruption. A multifaceted approach—encompassing legislative reform, international cooperation, and the implementation of transparent resource management practices—is essential to mitigate the adverse effects of corruption and to foster an environment of integrity within the educational sphere.

Assessing the Prevalence and Dimensions of Corruption in the Education Sector

To evaluate the prevalence of various corrupt practices within the education sector, it is essential to adopt a multi-dimensional framework that identifies the institutional level at which corruption arises, the stage of education at which it occurs, the stakeholders involved, and the nature of the transactional exchange. Hallak and Poisson (2007, pp. 60–61) emphasize that a systematic classification—encompassing these dimensions—is fundamental for the development of targeted anti-corruption strategies. In this context, the following categories are pivotal:

Volume: 4 Issue: 2 | Feb–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

- **Institutional Level:**

Corruption can manifest at multiple administrative tiers, including the ministry of education, state agencies, regional authorities, local districts, schools, or even within individual classrooms. Each level presents unique opportunities for corrupt behavior, thereby necessitating differentiated preventive and corrective measures. For instance, strategies to curb corruption among secondary school educators must differ from those designed to address malpractices within a government ministry.

- **Educational Stage:**

The form and intensity of corruption often vary with the level of education. In early educational stages, corrupt practices might involve undue pressure on parents—for example, influencing the selection of teachers—whereas at higher levels of education, corruption tends to be more closely associated with enrollment procedures and academic credentialing.

- **Stakeholders Involved:**

The spectrum of individuals and entities implicated in educational corruption is broad, including administrators, private suppliers of school resources, teachers, students, and the families of students. This diversity underscores the necessity of multifaceted oversight mechanisms to ensure accountability at every level.

- **Nature of the Exchange:**

The exchange underlying corrupt acts may be initiated by either the recipients or the providers of educational services. Understanding whether the exchange is driven by a demand or an offer can be crucial for designing effective interventions.

Various methodologies have been proposed to assess corruption risks and their underlying factors within these categories. Kirya (2019), for example, advocates for approaches such as political economy analysis, power and influence mapping, corruption risk assessments, systematic mapping, and the INTES (Integrity in Education Systems) methodology. These tools are instrumental in developing effective anti-corruption strategies and robust mechanisms to address the pervasive issue of corruption in education.

Corruption across Developed and Developing Contexts

It is important to note that corruption in education is not confined to developing countries; it is a phenomenon observed in both developed and developing nations. Factors such as shrinking education budgets, increased reliance on performance ratings, and intense competition for grants contribute to cost-saving measures that may compromise educational quality. In major market-driven education systems like those in the United States and the United Kingdom, for example, deliberate manipulation of standardized test results has been identified as a common corrupt practice (Jacob and Levitt, 2003). Moreover, cross-border corruption in education—including the purchase of counterfeit accreditations and the bribery of enrollment agencies—poses significant challenges even in highly developed countries (Vincent-Lankrin, 2013).

A foundational principle shared by all educational systems is the notion that the classroom should serve as a safe space where teachers and students can engage in open and honest discourse on complex subjects. However, this ideal is severely compromised when corruption infiltrates educational institutions.

Differentiating Educational Deficiencies from Corruption

Before addressing the causes, consequences, and remedial measures associated with corruption in education, it is crucial to distinguish between poor-quality education and corruption per se. While substandard educational outcomes may result from unacceptable practices by educators, these are not

Volume: 4 Issue: 2 | Feb–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

necessarily attributable to corruption if they do not involve the abuse of power for personal gain. For example, if a university library suffers from a limited collection due to budgetary constraints, the deficiency stems from resource limitations rather than corrupt behavior. In such cases, the appropriate remedy is the allocation of additional resources. Conversely, if a teacher illicitly removes books from the library, this constitutes theft—a criminal act that necessitates appropriate sanctions, including the restitution or replacement of the stolen materials. Similarly, if a shortage of books arises from an administrator's embezzlement of library funds, or if an educator pays an administrator to overlook such theft, these instances clearly represent corruption.

Economic and Social Costs of Corruption in Education: An Analytical Overview

Corruption inflicts profoundly destructive impacts on society, undermining not only economic stability but also the very foundations of democratic values and human rights. Quantitative studies have demonstrated that even marginal increases in corruption levels can be associated with reductions in per capita GDP by several hundred dollars (Dreer & Herzfeld, 2005). However, the intangible costs—ranging from the erosion of democratic principles to, in extreme cases, the loss of life—are even more devastating.

Economic Consequences

In the realm of education, corruption has both direct and indirect economic ramifications. One immediate outcome of awarding diplomas and qualifications through bribery rather than merit is the appointment of unqualified individuals to critical roles. This misallocation of human capital results in a significant waste of talent and unrealized potential. In the worst-case scenarios, it leads to financial losses and the destruction of livelihoods. Economists describe this phenomenon as "inefficient resource allocation" (Banerjee, Mullainathan, & Hanna, 2012). Moreover, the decline in the quality of education not only hampers individual development but also creates a fertile ground for further corrupt practices, perpetuating a self-reinforcing cycle of underinvestment in human capital.

Social Implications

Corruption in education also manifests extensive social costs. It acts as a barrier to education by inflating its cost or by resulting in the outright denial of educational services. When academic qualifications are obtained through favoritism or bribes, the implicit social contract between educational institutions and their stakeholders is severely compromised, leading to an erosion of trust. This degradation of trust is compounded by a decline in student motivation; for instance, if students perceive that bribery can substitute for genuine academic effort—such as preparing rigorously for challenging examinations—they may become disillusioned with the meritocratic process. Consequently, this distorted perception can extend into professional and everyday practices, further entrenching corrupt behaviors.

The issue is particularly acute for disadvantaged and vulnerable populations, thereby exacerbating economic and social inequalities and impeding social mobility. Data from the Global Corruption Barometer (2010–2011) indicate that impoverished individuals are twice as likely to face demands for bribes compared to wealthier counterparts. In cases where the poor lack the financial means to pay, they may be subjected to alternative forms of extortion, such as sexual exploitation, or be denied access to educational services that are supposed to be free or affordable. Although there are instances where the poor might appear to benefit from practices like cheating or the fabrication of academic results, such apparent gains merely obscure the underlying issues of chronic underinvestment in skills and policy delays, which in reality perpetuate inequality (Borkan, Lindal, & Mitrut, 2017).

Volume: 4 Issue: 2 | Feb–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

Causes of Corruption in Education: A Cost-Benefit Perspective

Understanding the roots of corruption in education requires an examination of the cost-benefit analyses that individuals undertake before engaging in such behavior. Becker and Stigler (1974) famously posited that individuals participate in criminal activities when they perceive that the benefits outweigh the potential costs, such as legal sanctions—including conviction, fines, or imprisonment—and the probability of detection. Although this calculation applies broadly across sectors, in education the specific nature of both the incentives and the risks can vary considerably.

Incentives Driving Corruption

1. High Income Prospects:

The prospect of securing a well-paid position through the attainment of academic qualifications provides a strong incentive for engaging in corrupt practices. In systems where educational achievements are directly linked to economic opportunities, some individuals may resort to bribery or other forms of corruption to embellish their academic records or obtain formal credentials. Additionally, when school funding or teacher remuneration is contingent upon student performance, educators and administrators may be driven to engage in fraudulent practices—such as cheating or forming illicit agreements to attract more students—to secure financial or professional benefits. Jacob and Levitt (2003) critically examine the inherent risks associated with performance-based incentive structures in education.

2. Low Salaries for Public Officials and Educators:

In many contexts, the salaries of teachers and public officials are insufficient to meet basic living standards or are perceived as unfairly low relative to the workload. Such economic disparities create a fertile environment for corruption, as educators may abuse their positions to obtain supplementary monetary or non-monetary benefits. For example, empirical research from Romania demonstrated that a 25% salary reduction among teachers, driven by austerity measures, corresponded with a marked increase in cheating on national examinations (Borkan, Lindal, & Mitrut, 2014). In a similar vein, the pursuit of leadership positions may also incentivize the exchange of bribes, thereby institutionalizing corrupt practices.

Conclusion

The evidence underscores that corruption in the education sector not only diminishes economic efficiency by misallocating human capital but also exacerbates social inequities and erodes trust in educational institutions. The drivers of corruption—ranging from the allure of high income and the inadequacy of public salaries to the inherent risk-reward calculations of individuals—demand a comprehensive, multifaceted approach. Effective strategies to combat corruption in education must therefore integrate rigorous oversight, equitable compensation policies, and robust accountability mechanisms, thereby ensuring that both economic and social costs are minimized and that the integrity of educational systems is upheld.

Reference

1. Banerjee, A. V., Mullainathan, S., & Hanna, R. (2012). Corruption. National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w17968
2. Becker, G. S., & Stigler, G. J. (1974). Law enforcement, malfeasance, and compensation of enforcers. The Journal of Legal Studies, 3(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1086/467507
3. Borkan, L., Lindal, T., & Mitrut, A. (2014). Cheating in national exams: Evidence from a policy experiment in Romania. University of Gothenburg Working Paper.

Volume: 4 Issue: 2 | Feb–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

4. Dreher, A., & Herzfeld, T. (2005). The economic costs of corruption: A survey and new evidence. Public Choice, 124(1–2), 75–85. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-005-2050-4
5. Hallak, J., & Poisson, M. (2007). Corrupt schools, corrupt universities: What can be done? International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP).
6. Jacob, B. A., & Levitt, S. D. (2003). Rotten apples: An investigation of the prevalence and predictors of teacher cheating. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118(3), 843–877. https://doi.org/10.1162/00335530360698441
7. Kirya, M. (2019). The role of political economy analysis in tackling corruption in education. U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre.
8. Reijnakke, J., & Svensson, J. (2004). Local capture: Evidence from a central government transfer program in Uganda. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 119(2), 679–705.
9. Transparency International. (2013). Global corruption report: Education. Routledge.
10. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2020). Anti-corruption module series. United Nations.