



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime



Global Resource for Anti-Corruption
Education and Youth Empowerment



Knowledge tools for academics and professionals

Module Series on Anti-Corruption

Module 9

Corruption in Education



Knowledge tools for academics and professionals

UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption

MODULE 9 CORRUPTION IN EDUCATION



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Background information

The UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption offers 14 Modules focusing on a range of core anti-corruption issues. This includes corruption's varied definitions and devastating effects, responses to corruption, and linkages between corruption and different topics such as good governance, comparative politics, whistle-blowing, justice systems, human rights, gender, education, citizen participation, peace and security.

The Modules are designed for use by both academic institutions and professional academies across the world. They are built to help lecturers and trainers deliver anti-corruption education, including those who are not dedicated anti-corruption lecturers and trainers but would like to incorporate these components into their courses. Lecturers are encouraged to customize the Modules before integrating them into their classes and courses. The Modules include discussions of relevant issues, suggestions for class activities and exercises, recommended class structures, student assessments, reading lists (with an emphasis on open access materials), PowerPoint slides, video materials and other teaching tools. Each Module provides an outline for a three-hour class, as well as includes guidelines on how to develop it into a full course.

The Modules focus on universal values and problems and can easily be adapted to different local and cultural contexts, including a variety of degree programmes as they are multi-disciplinary. The Modules seek to enhance trainees and students' ethical awareness and commitment to acting with integrity and equip them with the necessary skills to apply and spread these norms in life, work and society. To increase their effectiveness, the Modules cover both theoretical and practical perspectives, and use interactive teaching methods such as experiential learning and group-based work. These methods keep students and trainees engaged and help them develop critical thinking, problem solving, and communication skills, all of which are important for ethics education.

The topics of the Modules were chosen following consultations with academics who participated in a meeting of experts convened by UNODC, in Vienna in March 2017. The experts emphasized the need for increased anti-corruption education globally and advised on core areas to be addressed through the Modules. They considered it paramount that the Modules prepare university students and trainees for value driven effective action, keep students engaged, lend themselves to adaptation to different regional and disciplinary contexts, and allow lecturers to incorporate them as anti-corruption components within existing university courses and disciplines.

To achieve these objectives, the experts recommended that the Modules have a range of characteristics, ultimately being able to:

- » Connect theory to practice
- » Emphasize the importance of integrity and ethics to everyday life
- » Encourage critical thinking
- » Stress not only the importance of making ethical decisions but also demonstrate how to implement the decisions
- » Use innovative interactive teaching methods
- » Balance general ethics with applied ethics
- » Draw on good practices from practitioners
- » Link integrity and ethics to other global issues and the SDGs
- » Adopt a multi-disciplinary and multi-level approach
- » Focus on global ethics and universal values while leaving room for diverse regional and cultural perspectives
- » Employ non-technical and clear terminology
- » Be user-friendly

Drawing on these recommendations, UNODC worked for over a year with more than 70+ academic experts from over 30 countries to develop the 14 University Modules on Anti-Corruption. Each Module was drafted by a core team of academics and UNODC experts, and then peer-reviewed by a larger group of academics from different disciplines and regions to ensure a multi-disciplinary and universal coverage. The Modules passed through a meticulous clearance process at the UNODC headquarters before finally being edited and published on its website as open-source materials. In addition, it was agreed that the content of the Modules would be regularly updated to ensure that they are in line with contemporary studies and correspond to current needs of educators.

The present knowledge tool has been developed by the UNODC Corruption and Economic Crime Branch (CEB), as part of the Education for Justice initiative under the Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration.

Disclaimers

The contents of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Member States or contributory organizations, and neither do they imply any endorsement. The designations employed and the presentation of material in these modules do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the UNODC concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. UNODC encourages the use, reproduction, and dissemination of material in these modules. Except where otherwise indicated, content may be copied, downloaded, and printed for private study, research, and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of UNODC as the source and copyright holder is given and that UNODC endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

Materials provided in this document are provided "as is", without warranty of any kind, either express or implied, including, without limitation, warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose and non-infringement. UNODC specifically does not make any warranties or representations as to the accuracy or completeness of any such Materials. UNODC periodically adds, changes, improves or updates the Materials in the module without notice.

Under no circumstances shall UNODC be liable for any loss, damage, liability or expense incurred or suffered that is claimed to have resulted from the use of this module, including, without limitation, any fault, error, omission, interruption or delay with respect thereto. The use of this module is at the User's sole risk. Under no circumstances, including but not limited to negligence, shall UNODC be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special or consequential damages, even if UNODC has been advised of the possibility of such damages.

The User specifically acknowledges and agrees that UNODC is not liable for any conduct of any User.

Links to Internet sites contained in the present modules are provided for the convenience of the reader and are accurate at the time of issue. The United Nations takes no responsibility for their continued accuracy after issue or for the content of any external website.

Preservation of immunities

Nothing herein shall constitute or be considered to be a limitation upon or a waiver of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations, which are specifically reserved.

The United Nations reserves its exclusive right in its sole discretion to alter, limit or discontinue the Site or any Materials in any respect. The United Nations shall have no obligation to take the needs of any User into consideration in connection therewith.

The United Nations reserves the right to deny in its sole discretion any user access to this Site or any portion thereof without notice.

No waiver by the United Nations of any provision of these Terms and Conditions shall be binding except as set forth in writing and signed by its duly authorized representative.

These modules have not been formally edited.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction | 07 |
| Learning outcomes | 07 |
| Key issues | 08 |
| Manifestations of corruption in education | 09 |
| Costs of corruption in education | 10 |
| Causes of corruption in education | 14 |
| Fighting corruption in education | 19 |
| Conclusion | 29 |
| References | 30 |
| Exercises | 34 |
| Pre-class exercise 1: What kind of environment are students and lecturers familiar with? | 34 |
| Pre-class exercise 2: Ice-breaker | 35 |
| Exercise 1: Corruption Survey | 35 |
| Exercise 2: "Buy your degree" case study | 35 |
| Exercise 3: "Bribes for admission" case study | 37 |
| Exercise 4: "Sexual corruption" case study | 37 |
| Possible class structure | 38 |
| Core reading | 39 |
| Advanced reading | 40 |
| Student assessment | 42 |
| Additional teaching tools | 43 |
| Powerpoint presentations | 43 |
| Video material | 43 |
| Websites | 43 |
| Case studies, news reports and blogs | 43 |
| Guidelines to develop a stand-alone course | 45 |



Introduction

Quality and inclusive education is essential for a prosperous and empowered society, and is a key to equality and development. When corruption permeates education, it undermines the ability of education to achieve these goals. Corruption in education has far-reaching negative impacts on society, from stifling knowledge and misallocating skills in the economy, to increasing social inequality and breeding more corruption. This Module is designed to help lecturers introduce students to the manifestations, causes and consequences of corruption in education. Drawing on examples from various countries, the Module reviews the different acts of corruption that are found in both public and private schools and universities, such as cheating, bribery and sexual corruption. Since the causes of corruption are complex and context-specific, some factors that are particularly relevant to the education sector are brought to the fore. The Module discusses the effects of corrupt practices on the quality of education and their wider ramifications for society. The impacts of corruption in education are diverse, far-reaching and difficult to reverse. This is why preventive measures aimed at increasing transparency and accountability are preferable.



Learning outcomes

- Identify different kinds and risks of corruption in education
- Relate the causes and consequences of corruption in education to relevant prevention strategies
- Describe the challenges to anti-corruption in different educational contexts
- Critically discuss possible anti-corruption strategies for the education sector



Key issues

The education sector, one of the largest budget items in many countries, presents many opportunities for corrupt practices. Corruption in this sector is particularly devastating as it can lead to poor quality education, inferior performance and higher drop-out rates, which in turn can lead to increased levels of poverty, unemployment and inequality. While corruption in the education sector is difficult to measure, it is a recognized challenge for many countries. Indeed, with youth making up approximately one-fifth of the total population in many developing regions, including the Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, North Africa, and South Asia, investing in education and strengthening integrity and transparency in this sector will have a positive impact on preventing and addressing the challenges of corruption.

Education, whether public or private, has been recognized as a fundamental human right and a vehicle to attaining other human rights (see articles 13 and 14 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights¹; article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights²). The absence of corruption is a necessary condition not only to achieve quality education, but also to enable access to and assure equity in education (Hallak and Poisson, 2002). However, education systems worldwide are vulnerable to many acts of corruption. Examples of corruption in education include the admission of students for cash or as a favour to family or friends, the awarding of undeserved pass marks in exchange for sexual favours, and the undue churning out of degrees to gain institutional advantage. These are just some of the many examples of how corruption can manifest in education. Owing to the fundamental role of education in developing reliable human capital to support viable economies, there is a special need to safeguard education from corruption.

This Module intends to create awareness of the importance of corruption-free education, and to point out the challenges involved in recognizing and eradicating corruption in educational institutions. The Module outlines key considerations for studying this phenomenon, and encourages discussions on ways to prevent, detect and address corruption in education. Some common factors known to draw actors in education into corrupt practices are described. The Module provides opportunities to engage with relevant issues by, for example, shedding light on the cost implications borne by societies when education processes and skills allocation are distorted by corruption. Finally, the Module invites critical reflection on possible anti-corruption strategies tailored for this sector. The discussion below is structured as follows: manifestation, costs and causes of corruption in education, and how to fight this corruption.

¹ Available at www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cescr.aspx.

² Available at www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/.

> Manifestations of corruption in education

Corruption is a complex phenomenon, without a uniform definition. An overview of the different forms and definitions of corruption, as well as its harmful effects across the globe, is available in Module 1 of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption. For present purposes, it should be noted that the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)³ refrains from providing one overarching definition of “corruption”. Rather, it defines various acts of corruption and classifies them as criminal offences, such as bribery and embezzlement (in both the public and private sectors); trading in influence; abuse of functions; and illicit enrichment (UNCAC arts. 15-22). With 189 States parties (as of November 2021), UNCAC has attracted nearly universal adherence, and the different acts of corruption as defined by the Convention can be considered internationally accepted. Module 4 and 5 of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption include more detailed discussions on how these various acts of corruption manifest in the public and private sectors, respectively.

In education systems, bribery and embezzlement have been described as the most common acts of corruption. Bribery in education involves money or non-monetary advantages, for example, when a lecturer pays a member(s) of the selection committee of a university for being recruited over other, more qualified applicants or when a professor approves a flawed dissertation because the student's father, a car dealer, provides the professor with a brand new vehicle. Embezzlement could be the use of government money, which was meant to upgrade the school's library, for a vacation for a school principal and his or her family. One case of embezzlement made famous by Reinikka and Svensson (2004) is the theft of funds intended for non-wage expenditure in Ugandan schools. Only 13 per cent of the disbursed grants reached the schools. For a further discussion and additional examples of corruption in education, see Hallak and Poisson (2007, pp. 57–58).

The related crimes of fraud and extortion have also been identified as common in education (Amundsen, 2000). Fraud involves some kind of trickery intended to generate an economic gain⁴. An example of fraud in the area of education is the existence of “diploma mills”, which sell fake degrees over the Internet. If a university or another education institution produces and sells fake degrees, this could constitute the offence of abuse of functions under article 19 of UNCAC (at least in relation to public institutions). Extortion is the use of coercion, violence or threats to extract something from another person (this definition is discussed in more detail in Module 4 of the UNODC Modules Series on Organized Crime). An educator demanding sexual favours or non-required fees from students or their parents, so that the students can receive better grades or their degrees, are examples of extortion in the education field. When the extortion has a sexual nature, it is sometimes called sexual extortion or sextortion, as explained in Module 8 of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption.

Cases where the educator's request for sexual favours is non-coercive, or where sexual favours are offered by the student in exchange for a certain grade or degree, could constitute bribery or abuse of functions, and are sometimes called sexual corruption. When UNCAC requests States parties to criminalize bribery, abuse of functions and other forms of corruption, the Convention refers to the benefits involved in the corrupt transaction as “undue advantage”.

³ Available from the corruption section of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime website (www.unodc.org).

⁴ For a definition of fraud, see e.g. www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fraud.

Undue advantage is intended to apply as broadly as possible, including in cases where intangible items or non-pecuniary benefits (such as sexual favours) are offered insofar as they create or may create a sense of obligation among the involved parts. See further discussion in Module 8 of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption.

Additional integrity breaches in the education sector, that in some contexts are considered corruption, include plagiarism and educator absenteeism (TI, 2013). There are also cases of corruption in the administration of schools, particularly in the areas of procurement, finance and human resources.

To assess the prevalence of various corrupt acts in education, it is useful to identify the institutional level of occurrence (e.g. ministry, municipality, school), the level of education where it occurs (e.g. primary, secondary, tertiary), the actors involved, and the nature of the exchange (Hallak and Poisson, 2007, pp. 60–61):

- The level of occurrence: Corruption can take place at the level of the ministry of education, government department, region, district, school or classroom. Each level comes with specific opportunities for corruption, and requires different solutions and responses. For example, dealing with corrupt high school teachers requires measures that are different from those required for dealing with corruption in the Ministry.
- The level of education: Corruption may take different forms depending on whether it takes place at the primary, secondary or tertiary education levels. For example, educators exerting pressure on parents (or vice versa) to accept a tutor for their children is more likely to occur at earlier educational stages, while admissions corruption is more likely to occur at later stages of the academic career.
- The actors: Actors involved in corrupt practices could be administrators, private companies supplying goods to the school, faculty, students or student families.
- The nature of the exchange: The exchange can be initiated by the beneficiaries of education or by the suppliers of education.

There are different ways to assess corruption risks and risk factors related to the above categories. Kirya (2019), for example, suggests political economy analysis, power and influence analysis, corruption risk assessments, system mapping, and the Integrity of Education Systems (INTES) methodology as reliable approaches that could inform the development of effective anti-corruption strategies and tools to address corruption problems in the education sector⁵.

It should be stressed that corruption in education occurs in both developed and developing countries. The ever-diminishing education budgets and the increased reliance on rankings and competition for grants have encouraged corner-cutting to the detriment of education quality even in the largest market-based education systems, such as those of the United States and the United Kingdom. For example, a prevalent act of corruption in education in the United States is the deliberate manipulation of test scores in schools (Jacob and Levitt, 2003).

⁵ For a detailed discussion on these approaches, see www.u4.no/publications/education-sector-corruption-how-to-assess-it-and-ways-to-address-it.pdf.

Corruption in cross-border education, including buying fake accreditations and bribing agencies for student recruitment, also involve developed countries (Vincent-Lancrin, 2013). An underlying principle common to all education systems is that the classroom should be a safe space where educators and students can discuss difficult subjects openly. This is seriously threatened by corruption.

Before embarking on a discussion on the causes and impacts of corruption and the responses to addressing corruption in education, it is worth clarifying the distinction between low quality education and corruption in education. The distinction is critical to enable the choice of appropriate corrective measures. Low quality education may stem from unacceptable behaviour by school and university educators brought about by causes other than the abuse of power for private gain. If a university has relatively few books in the library because it cannot afford an adequate collection, the lack of books will have a negative impact on students' education. In this case it is not corruption that has brought about the lack of books. To correct the deficiency, the library must be provided with more resources. However, if an educator steals books from the library, then the crime of theft has been committed and appropriate penalties must be imposed on the educator, who should also be required to return or replace the books⁶. By the same token, if the lack of books is the consequence of an administrator siphoning off library funds for his or her own benefit, or an educator paying an administrator to erase the theft of books without taking appropriate action, then these examples would constitute corruption.

➤ **Costs of corruption in education**

Corruption, in general, has extremely damaging effects on society. Some scholars have tried to quantify the negative effects of corruption on the economy, with figures showing that even small increases in the incidence of corruption are related to decreases of a few hundred dollars in GDP per capita (see, e.g., Dreher and Herzfeld, 2005). However, the non-material costs of corruption are even more destructive, ranging from the erosion of democratic values, human rights and freedoms, to the loss of human lives.

Corruption in education has immediate impacts, both economic and social. Economically, one direct result of obtaining degrees and other qualifications based on bribes, rather than on ability, is that unsuitable people are allocated to jobs and positions of authority. At best, talent is wasted and the potential for development is unrealized, and at worst, financial losses are incurred and lives and livelihoods are destroyed. This is what economists call "allocative inefficiencies" (Banerjee, Mullanaithan and Hanna, 2012). The quality of education itself decreases, which creates a breeding ground for further corruption and a self-perpetuating underprovision of human capital.

Socially, corruption in education has a wide range of consequences. Corruption acts as a barrier to education, either because it makes the cost of acquiring an education prohibitive, or because the act of education simply does not take place in the designated space. It follows that, where educators are absent, individuals are deprived of the fundamental right of education. When qualifications are obtained, not by merit but through favouritism or bribes, the implicit contract between education recipients and the institutions or educators is breached, leading to an erosion of trust in people and institutions. Another serious consequence is the lack of motivation that corruption causes among students.

⁶ For a relevant discussion, see www.faculty.ucr.edu/~eschwitz/SchwitzAbs/EthicsBooks.htm.

For example, students could start wondering what the point is of studying for two weeks for a difficult exam when they can bribe the professor and pass anyway. Moreover, students develop the understanding that the system works in corrupt ways and that bribes are necessary to get things done – a modus operandi which students later transfer to their professional and daily activities.

Corruption in education is particularly problematic because it affects the disadvantaged and most vulnerable disproportionately, raising serious obstacles to achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). According to the 2010/2011 Global Corruption Barometer, the poor are twice as likely to be asked to pay bribes than the wealthy. When the poor cannot afford to pay bribes, they are either subjected to extortion in other ways, for example through sexual exploitation, or are denied access to education services, which should be free or affordable. As a consequence, corruption in education deepens economic and social inequality and hinders social mobility. In some cases, the poor may seem to benefit from widely accepted corrupt practices such as cheating and appearing to perform better than they would in the absence of corruption. However, this deceptive performance only serves to hide the actual underinvestment in skills and delays policies which can reduce the true inequalities (Borcan, Lindahl and Mitrut, 2017).

> Causes of corruption in education

Where does corruption in education come from? A useful way to think about why and when individuals would engage in corruption is to start from the rewards and drawbacks of such acts. A leading model of crime was developed by Becker and Stigler (1974), who showed that individuals will engage in a criminal activity if they calculate that they have more to gain than to lose from it. Benefits may come in the form of money or non-financial advantages, while potential losses or costs may come in the form of punishment, for example shaming, fines or prison. In their mental calculation, individuals also estimate how likely it is that they will be caught and punished – which is based on the probability of detection. This accounting is common across sectors, but the costs, benefits and the chance of detection take specific forms in education. According to Hallak and Poisson (2007, pp. 40–41), the main factors that explain corruption in education are:

On the benefits side:

- **The high rate of return:** Because people hope to get a well-paid job through educational degrees, some people are willing to pay bribes or engage in other corrupt practices to improve their records on paper or gain a formal qualification. Where school funding or educator remuneration is tied to student performance, there are strong incentives for malfeasance among educators and principals, be it cheating or illicit agreements to attract more students. Jacob and Levitt (2003) discuss the perils of high-powered incentive education systems.
- **Low salaries of public officials and educators:** In some countries, the salaries of educators do not support even a basic livelihood, or are perceived as unfairly low relative to the workload – which may lead educators to use their position of power to extract payments and other benefits. Borcan, Lindahl and Mitrut (2014) showed how a 25 per cent austerity-driven wage cut for all teachers in Romania led to more cheating in a national exam. As in other sectors, officials and educators may have paid a bribe to gain their position in the first place, so continued fraudulent acts are a predictable outflow.

On the costs side:

- **Weak ethical norms and poor rule of law:** In places where corruption is widely prevalent, the moral resistance to engaging in corruption is substantially reduced. This factor makes it more difficult to fight corruption in many sectors and countries, including in those experiencing economic crisis or political transition. Moreover, if law enforcement is known to be weak, then punishments and the possibility of detection are virtually absent, making it worthwhile to take part in corruption. To learn more about ethics, see the UNODC Module Series on Integrity and Ethics.

On the detection side:

- **The complexity of education and lack of transparent governance:** The multiplicity of goals of educational institutions and the over-centralization or decentralization of decision-making processes often make institutional rules opaque to the beneficiaries and the general public. Accountability is diffused across many beneficiaries of education and regulating bodies, making it unclear to whom schools and universities truly answer. The balance often tips towards the bureaucrats, and when they are themselves corrupt, the very concept of accountability becomes moot. On top of this, abuses of confidentiality principles and ad hoc decision-making without a proper paper trail mean that corrupt decisions are more easily covered up and harder to detect.
- **The size and distribution of education:** Schools, staff and accompanying administrations represent resources that are usually spread across the length and breadth of countries. This makes tracking resources more difficult and oversight of potentially corrupt conduct more complex.

Corruption in education intersects with questions of integrity and ethics in both the private and public sectors, which are discussed in further detail in Module 11 and 13 of the UNODC Module Series on Integrity and Ethics and in Module 4 and Module 5 of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption. For a general discussion of professional ethics, which also applies to education, see Module 14 of the UNODC Module Series on Integrity and Ethics.

> **Fighting corruption in education**

The importance of fighting corruption in education

While corruption in general has received a great deal of attention from the media and researchers in the past decades, corruption in education is underresearched. This is, however, beginning to change with a growing number of studies focusing on this area (see e.g. Huss and Keudel, 2020). Executives in the education sector may have avoided scrutiny for fear that a tarnished reputation would diminish the sector's resources (Poisson, 2010, p. 1). However, given the detrimental effects of corruption, it is of paramount importance to recognize and address corruption in education. Below are a number of core arguments which support the combating of corruption in education. These arguments are universal and relevant to learning environments in both developed and developing countries.

Firstly, the education sector shapes individuals from early life until adulthood, with effects felt at a personal level in terms of lifetime earnings, health, family life and subjective well-being, and at a societal level in terms of the country's stock of skills which feed into its economic growth, income distribution and intergenerational mobility (Burgess, 2016). Corruption nullifies the gains from education at both levels, and it creates net losses when skills and jobs are mismatched.

Secondly, corruption in education is targeted particularly at vulnerable individuals. Students, as well as parents who want the best for their children, are thwarted in their ambitions. This may, for example, lead to parents being willing to pay a fee demanded by a school administrator to secure a place for their child at school, or to pay a fee demanded by an educator to ensure a favourable report card for their child. Another example is sexual exploitation of students by educators in situations where students or parents are too poor to pay in the conventional way. Paying by means of sexual favours and other acts of corruption in the educational environment is of deep ethical concern because this perverts the relationship between educators and students entrusted to their care (Poisson, 2010).

Thirdly, corruption in education replaces good values and morals with a cynical view of the world when young and highly impressionable students learn that fighting corruption does not pay off – but siding with it might. Corruption has “disastrous consequences” when it interferes with the “development of attitudes and values related to citizenship and justice” (Poisson, 2010, p. 11). If citizens do not trust the education system to be fair and impartial, then all senior positions, whether in business, science or politics, are perceived to have been gained through privilege rather than achievement. This erodes the credibility of and trust in educational institutions, creates frustration and disengagement, and damages aspirations and social cohesion that are necessary for all successful societies (Altbach, 2015; Heyneman, 2004, p. 638).

Fourthly, education is key to sustainable development, as recognized by Goal 4 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). By undermining the quality of education and access to it, corruption significantly hampers the attainment of the SDGs.

Fifthly, high quality and accessible education empowers societies and individuals, and is thus one of the most effective channels for advancing a productive and moral society. Corruption negates all that.

Detecting corruption in education

Before we can fight corruption we must be able to detect and uncover it. A general discussion on detecting corruption is available in Module 6 of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption. Several tools for preventing and detecting corruption have been adapted for the education sector: physical audits of the education processes, public expenditure tracking surveys, and drawing comparisons between reported and actual performance. These are discussed below:

- **Physical audits of education processes.** This involves spot checks at education facilities to verify that managers and educators are carrying out their duties. This approach was, for instance, used to gauge and reduce teacher absenteeism in India, where staff absence from duty had spiralled out of control (Duflo, Hanna and Ryan, 2012).
- **Public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS):** These were originally developed in developing countries where budget data in public institutions were neither systematically recorded nor reliable. These surveys are used for collecting detailed data from different government tiers and

frontline service providers on financial transfers and accountability mechanisms. The surveys allow the tracking of financial flows from the donor or government all the way to the intended beneficiary. Thus, they can identify precisely at which tiers the leaks occur (by detecting information asymmetries) and also clarify any misunderstandings between institutions operating these transfers. PETS have been used particularly in the health care and education services, but they are applicable to other services as well. The first country to carry out PETS was Uganda in 1996 (a case closely studied by Reinikka and Svensson, 2004), followed by other countries such as Tanzania, Ghana and Honduras.

- **Indirect measures based on differences between reported and actual performance (cross-checking).** These include innovative methods for assessing actual education outcomes and contrasting them with reported outcomes. For instance, Lucifora and Tonello (2014) compared national test outcomes in Italian schools and classes in two environments: on the one hand where the exam was invigilated by an external inspector and there were no opportunities for cheating, and on the other hand where the exam was invigilated by a teacher. Borcan, Lindahl and Mitrut (2017) compared national test scores in Romanian schools with CCTV (closed circuit television) surveillance and those without video surveillance to uncover a large gap of up to 20 per cent between stated and actual pass rates.

This list of tools is by no means exhaustive. Surveys with questions about experiences and reports of corruption are also commonly used.

Anti-corruption strategies in education

The most appropriate anti-corruption strategy and its best application in a particular environment is a complex matter, because it depends on the functioning of the rule enforcement system and how entrenched corruption norms are. There are also potentially harmful unintended effects. In its 2011 report on corruption in the education sector, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) observed that there are four main categories of tools used to combat corruption:

- 1) Rule of law (control and sanction)
- 2) Public administration and systems (corruption prevention)
- 3) Transparency and accountability (duty bearers and rights holders, non-state actors, information, awareness)
- 4) Capacity development (individual, organizational and institutional capacity-building)

Applying this to the education sector, Poisson (2010) identified five factors necessary to prevent corruption, some which overlap with the suggestions of UNDP:

- 1) Transparency of standards and procedure
- 2) Capacity-building and management automation
- 3) Outsourcing of management and verification processes
- 4) Codes of conduct for educators
- 5) Access to information

To the instruments noted above, Heyneman (2004, p. 645) added: "Sanctions required to demote or punish when infractions occur".

Anti-corruption strategies can be informed by the Becker-Stigler model of crime (see the section above on “Causes of corruption in education”), and could place emphasis on increasing the cost of violations, through more severe punishments for educators, staff and students, and increasing the probability of violations being detected, e.g. by higher transparency in hiring, firing, accreditation processes and exam protocols. These two components are best applied together, as it makes little difference if punishments are tough, but never applied; or if violations are known, but only mildly sanctioned or not at all. This somewhat simple accounting, however, omits an all-important part of what drives corrupt behaviour: socialization, norms, peer effects and beliefs about what others might do in a situation susceptible to corruption. These behavioural mechanisms have been underresearched and should be examined in each individual context and embedded in anti-corruption policies.

There is a certain pessimism regarding anti-corruption efforts in education (Poisson, 2010, p. 23), but there are also success stories, and – given the new focus on corruption in the education sector – the chances of improvement have increased considerably. A few examples of success stories include:

- **Transparency of standards and procedures:** The city of Bogotá in Colombia published specific descriptions of staffing procedures, postings and transfer standards, which “boosted school enrolments by more than one third, with only a limited number of extra teachers taken on due to the gains in efficiency that were made” (Poisson, 2010, p. 9).
- **Monitoring combined with incentives or punishment:** In India, increased teacher salaries and monitoring of attendance with tamper-proof cameras reduced teacher absenteeism (Duflo, Hanna and Ryan, 2012). In Romania, CCTV cameras were introduced in national exams in 2011 together with substantially tougher punishments for teachers and students, whereafter the national pass rate fell from close to 80 per cent in 2009, to 41 per cent in 2012 (Borcan, Lindahl and Mitrut, 2017).
- **Capacity-building and management automation:** In Lebanon, moving exam administration to be handled by computers and using automation regarding matters such as test and staff selection, placing exam candidates in examination rooms, test marking and results processing allowed the system to detect and punish those who broke the rules (Poisson, 2010, p. 13).
- **The right to information:** In Uganda, public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS) identified that on average 49 per cent of the grant paid to primary schools were embezzled (Reinikka and Svensson, 2004).

After reviewing cases which demonstrated successful anti-corruption strategies, Hallak and Poisson (2007, p. 23) observed that “no measure taken in isolation can combat corruption effectively”. Poisson (2010) highlighted three measures as particularly promising: 1) development of transparent regulation systems and standards; 2) building management capacity; and 3) fostering greater ownership of the processes by the community at large.

Any sound anti-corruption strategy in education and beyond should account for potential undesired side effects and should be complemented by measures to mitigate those effects. For example, when CCTV cameras were introduced in Romanian exam rooms, the performance of financially disadvantaged students dropped more than that of wealthy students, partly because in-class cheating was replaced by individual bribery by students who could afford it. Fisman and Golden (2017) urge decision makers

to design policies with their recipients in mind: “When you install CCTVs to prevent students cheating on [sic] exams, think like a desperate student who has not bothered to do his homework all year”. For a more general discussion of anti-corruption strategies in the public and private sector, see Module 4, 5 and 13 of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption.

> **Conclusion**

By discussing the grave effects of corruption in education, and exploring specific examples of such corruption, the Module has sought to create awareness of the importance of corruption-free education and to empower students to critically discuss possible anti-corruption strategies in the education sector. It has also sought to encourage action in this regard, despite the various challenges to anti-corruption in different educational contexts.

> References

Altbach, Philip G. (2015). Academic corruption: The continuing challenge. *International Higher Education*, vol 38, pp.5-6.

» Available from <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/download/7454/7918>.

Amundsen, Inge (2000). *Corruption: definition and concepts*. Bergen, Norway: Chr. Michelsen Institute.

» Available from https://etico.iiep.unesco.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/corruption_definitions_and_concepts.pdf.

Banerjee, Abhijit, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Rema Hanna (2009). *Corruption*. NBER Working Paper Series. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

» Available from www.nber.org/papers/w17968.pdf.

Becker, Gary, and George Stigler (1974). Law Enforcement, Malfeasance, and Compensation of Enforcers. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, vol. 3, issue 1, pp. 1-18.

Borcan, Oana, Mikael Lindahl and Andreea Mitrut (2017). Fighting Corruption in Education: What Works and Who Benefits? *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, vol. 9, issue 1, pp. 180-209.

Burgess, Simon (2016). *Human Capital and Education: The State of the Art in the Economics of Education*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 9885. Institute of Labor Economics.

Dreher, Axel, and Thomas Herzfeld (2005). *The Economic Cost of Corruption: A Survey and New Evidence*. SSRN Electronic Journal.

» Available from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=734184.

Duflo, Esther, Rema Hanna and Stephen Ryan (2012). Incentives Work: Getting Teachers to Come to School. *American Economic Review*, vol. 102, no. 4 (June), pp. 1241-78.

Fisman, Raymond, and Miriam Golden (2017). How to fight corruption. *Science*, vol. 356, issue 6340 (May), pp. 803–804.

Hallak, Jacques and Muriel Poisson (2002). *Ethics and corruption in education* (Policy Forum No. 15). Results from the Expert Workshop held at the IIEP, Paris, France, 28-29 November 2001. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO.

Hallak, Jacques and Muriel Poisson (2007). *Corrupt Schools, Corrupt Universities: What Can Be Done?* Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

» Available from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000150259>.

Heyneman, Stephen (2004). Education and Corruption. *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 24, issue 6 (November), pp. 637–648.

Huss, Oksana and Oleksandra Keudel (2020). *Open government in education: Clarifying concepts and mapping initiatives*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Institute for Educational Planning.

» Available from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373142/PDF/373142eng.pdf.multi>.

Jacob, Brian A., and Steven D. Levitt (2003). Rotten Apples: An Investigation of The Prevalence And Predictors Of Teacher Cheating. Quarterly Journal of Economics, vol. 118, issue 3 (August), pp. 843-877.

» Available from <http://pricetheory.uchicago.edu/levitt/Papers/JacobLevitt2003.pdf>.

Kirya, Monica (2019). Education sector corruption: How to assess it and ways to address it. Bergen, Norway: U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, Chr. Michelsen Institute.

» Available from www.u4.no/publications/education-sector-corruption-how-to-assess-it-and-ways-to-address-it.pdf.

Lucifora, Claudio, and Marco Tonello (2014). Students' Cheating as a Social Interaction: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in a National Evaluation Program. Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, vol. 115.

Poisson, Muriel (2010). Corruption and Education. Education Policy Series. Paris: International Academy of Education.

» Available from www.iaoe.org/downloads/WEB_11_corruption_and_education_final_.pdf.

Reinikka, Ritva, and Jakob Svensson (2004). Local Capture: Evidence from a Central Government Transfer Program in Uganda. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, vol. 119, no. 2 (May), pp. 679-705.

» Available from www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/pe/PEAMCourse04/RitvaBackground2.pdf.

Transparency International (TI) (2013). Global Corruption Report: Education. Berlin.

» Available from www.transparency.org/gcr_education.

United Nations Development Programme (2011). Fighting Corruption in the Education Sector: Methods, Tools and Good Practices. New York.

» Available from: www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/anti-corruption/fighting_corruptionintheeducationsector.html.

Vincent-Lancrin, Stéphan (2013). Cross-border higher education: Addressing corruption, ensuring opportunity. In Global Corruption Report: Education. Berlin: Transparency International.

» Available from www.researchgate.net/publication/269040498_Recruitment_and_Admissions_Fostering_Transparency_on_the_Path_to_Higher_Education.

Exercises and case studies

This section contains suggestions for in-class and pre-class educational exercises, while a post-class assignment for assessing student understanding of the Module is suggested in a separate section.

The exercises in this section are most appropriate for classes of up to 50 students, where students can be easily organized into small groups in which they discuss cases or conduct activities before group representatives provide feedback to the entire class. Although it is possible to have the same small group structure in large classes comprising a few hundred students, it is more challenging and the lecturer might wish to adapt facilitation techniques to ensure sufficient time for group discussions as well as providing feedback to the entire class. The easiest way to deal with the requirement for small group discussion in a large class is to ask students to discuss the issues with the four or five students sitting closest to them. Given time limitations, not all groups will be able to provide feedback in each exercise. It is recommended that the lecturer makes random selections and tries to ensure that all groups get the opportunity to provide feedback at least once during the session. If time permits, the lecturer could facilitate a discussion in plenary after each group has provided feedback.

All exercises in this section are appropriate for both graduate and undergraduate students. However, as students' prior knowledge and exposure to these issues vary widely, decisions about the appropriateness of exercises should be based on their educational and social context. The lecturer is encouraged to relate and connect each exercise to the key issues of the Module.

It is recommended that lecturers begin building a conducive and sympathetic environment at the start of class and before conducting the very first exercise. This can be done by breaking the ice in a supportive way, by respectfully examining students' starting orientations to corruption, and by demonstrating genuine interest in their perspectives. Once students come to see the lecturer as respectful, genuinely interested in their orientation to the material, and consistent in policing any snide or unsupportive comments by class members, that safe environment will enable effective learning and development.

To prepare for using case studies as a teaching methodology, lecturers can consult the short but informative "Leading Case Discussions"⁷ from the Illinois Institute of Technology.

The case studies and the exercises that follow lend themselves to a variety of teaching techniques, including individual and group-based discussion, debates, and role plays. Using traditional or digital polling tools, students can take an initial vote on how to resolve a problem, then discuss the problem with the lecturer, and then vote again to see if they have altered their views. If classrooms have access to the Internet, lecturers can consider using a software for creating and editing documents online (such as Google Docs) to record written responses of either individual students or groups. Debates are well-suited to students who are hesitant to express their personal views, because students are expressing a view that they do not have to defend as their own personal view. Role plays are well-suited for creating awareness of the variety of persons and interests involved in ethical issues, and may also help to create empathy.

⁷ Available at <http://ethics.iit.edu/teaching/leading-case-discussions>

From among the case studies suggested in Exercises 2-4 below, lecturers should choose the material best suited to the challenges posed by their context. For more examples, from different parts of the world, lecturers can review the following articles:

Denisova-Schmidt, Elena (2015). Academic Dishonesty or Corrupt Values: the Case of Russia. ANTICORRP Project.

» Available from <http://anticorrrp.eu/publications/academic-dishonesty-or-corrupt-values-the-case-of-russia/>.

Chen, David W. (2017) CUNY Lecturer Charged With Running Fake Health Certificate Program. The New York Times, 29 September.

» Available from www.nytimes.com/2017/09/29/nyregion/cuny-lecturer-charged-with-running-fake-health-certificate-program.html?_r=0.

Hicks, Bill (2017). Who lost the most marks when cheating was stopped? BBC, 15 March.

» Available from www.bbc.co.uk/news/business39254634-.

Osipian, Ararat (2019). The rise and rise of ghost-written dissertations. University World News, 27 July.

» Available from: www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190722132702600.

Paredis-Solis, Sergio and others (2011). Reducing corruption in a Mexican medical school: impact assessment across two cross-sectional surveys. BioMed Central Ltd.

» Available from <https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/-11-6963-1472/10.1186/S-2S13>.

Sawahel, Wagdy (2019). Academics call for more action over dissertation mills. University World News, 22 July.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190722084402994.

The World University Rankings (2018). Seven lecturers arrested in Italian anti-corruption probe.

» Available from www.timeshighereducation.com/news/seven-lecturers-arrested-italian-anti-corruption-probe.

Woldegiyorgi, Ayenachew (2017). The Vicious Circle of Quality in Ethiopian Higher Education. International Higher Education, no. 90. Chestnut Hill, MA: Center for International Higher Education.

» Available from <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/10001>.

➤ **Pre-class exercise 1: What kind of environment are students and lecturers familiar with?**

The lecturer can assign students to take either before or during the class the quiz “How corrupt are you?”⁸ and then share the resulting percentages with the students. Results will likely be most relevant if quiz takers base their answers on the perceptions of the majority of people in their country. The lecturer facilitates a discussion of the quiz results, different environments, and the difficult issues raised.

⁸ Available at www.ganintegrity.com/compliance-training/test-your-corruption-knowledge/.

➤ Pre-class exercise 2: Ice-breaker

In the class, as an ice-breaker exercise, Internet and digital technology permitting (e.g. immediate response devices or clickers), the lecturer can ask students to write the first word that comes to mind when thinking about corruption in education. The technology should be used to collect responses and generate a word cloud, which is a visual display of how frequent the different words appear (which are the most popular and obvious) and which are the words and concepts less thought of. The lecturer can use this as a departure point for introducing the diverse and often less obvious manifestations of corruption in education (see discussion in Key issues section on “What is corruption in education”).

➤ Exercise 1: Corruption Survey

Before class, have students review the UNODC Manual on Corruption Surveys⁹. In class, select one of the corruption problems students have identified with education, preferably one that impacts students directly. In groups, ask students to draft a short survey. Ask students to give their survey to another group of students in the same class, and then lead discussion on the results.

Lecturer guidelines:

A more complex but rewarding experiential exercise would take students into the school or community to administer and then discuss the survey, although this would take considerably more time, effort and preparation and would have to be accompanied by discussions and approvals regarding privacy and research ethics.

➤ Exercise 2: “Buy your degree” case study

A student working full-time at a low paying job sees an advertisement for an undergraduate degree in business that does not require class attendance. Compared to other online degrees, this university is quite low in price, something the student can afford. There are no prerequisites to register for the course, and no minimum required time allocated for course-taking and study. The student pays the low fees, and after doing minimal work in a few courses, receives the degree. The student then applies for a job and is hired for a position based on this degree.

Lecturer guidelines:

To support this case study, the lecturer can assign the Global Corruption Report on Education of Transparency International¹⁰. Use the following questions to guide student discussion of the case:

- Does this case study raise the issue of corruption? If yes, what act of corruption and by who?
- What prompted the student to seek this degree?
- What conditions allow the university to offer this kind of substandard programme?
- What does quality assurance mean, generally, and in the context of corruption in education?
- What are the red flags that a degree does not have sufficient quality and credibility, and may in fact be the object of a corrupt transaction?

⁹ Available at www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crime-statistics/CorruptionManual_2018_web.pdf.

¹⁰ Available at www.transparency.org/gcr_education.

➤ Exercise 3: "Bribes for admission" case study

An elite university in a developing country has an established practice of students paying bribes to be admitted, with additional payments required to secure a scholarship. On the other hand, an elite university in a developed country has an established practice of accepting large contributions from donors to create scholarships, fund research and construct buildings in their name, which in turn greatly increases the likelihood that the donor's children will be admitted.

Lecturer guidelines:

The two cases are meant to prompt reflection on the corruption issues raised when payments are made to secure university admission for students in developing compared to developed countries. However, lecturers may also choose only one of the two examples to focus on, depending on the time available and the context relevant to students. To supplement these cases studies, and for more detail on how bribes for entry into university arise in these contrasting cases, lecturers can assign this article of Johnson (2008) available in the Core Reading section¹¹.

Use the following questions to guide student discussion of the case:

- Are the elite universities in these countries engaging in corruption, and if yes, why is it corruption?
- How are the activities of the universities similar and how are they different?
- What do you think are the actual and potential costs to and benefits for these universities to engage in such admission practices?
- Does the fact that the first payment is undisclosed to the university and the second payment is disclosed make a difference? Why or why not?
- What factors might make disclosed payments appear less like corruption, e.g. the amount or the timing?
- Would it make a difference in either country if the university was private or public?

➤ Exercise 4: "Sexual corruption" case study

Assume you are on the university committee in the respective universities charged with determining how to respond to the lecturers' actions described below. Address each case separately and then compare the two cases.

Scenario one: a lecturer threatens a student with course failure, unless the student provides sexual favours to the lecturer.

Scenario two: A student performs acceptably in the class, and after the class is completed the student begins to assist the lecturer with research for a book. To thank the student for this assistance, the lecturer takes the student to lunch, where they have a long talk. The student feels "a connection" to the lecturer, and eventually they begin dating. The student has never had a romantic relationship before. After a while, the lecturer and the student have sex in the lecturer's office on two occasions. Once reported to the ethics board of the institution, the lecturer insists that the two had a romantic relationship.

¹¹ On the subject of bribery in developed countries, the lecturer can also review Jim Jump (Inside Higher Ed), "Ethical College Admissions: Bribery", 30 July 2018. Available at www.insidehighered.com/users/jim-jump?page=15.

Lecturer guidelines:

The two cases are meant to prompt reflection on the ethical and corruption issues raised when lecturers have sexual relations with students, in two different circumstances. However, lecturers can also determine that one of the examples better addresses the challenges raised in their country and focus on that one. If the lecturer wants to use this comparative approach but feels that discussing sexual matters is inappropriate in their context, the lecturer can modify the case studies by referring to gifts or other favours.

To support this case study, the lecturer can assign the article of Yusuph (2016) available in the Advanced reading list of this module. The lecturer can also note that the second case study is based on the case of Tey Tsung Hang, a lecturer at the NUS Faculty of Law in Singapore¹². Additional reading material on sexual exploitation in education includes Fiona Leach's article on corruption as abuse of power in the TI's Global Corruption Report: Education¹³.

Use the following questions to guide student discussion of the case:

- Was there corruption in these cases? Why or why not?
- What are the similarities and differences between the two cases?
- In the second case, was there any unacceptable or corrupt behaviour while the student was in the lecturer's course? What about after the student was no longer in the lecturer's course?
- What is the problem posed by a lecturer who has sex with a student not currently in his course, but in a degree programme that he/she teaches in? For example, how would it be relevant if the student could take further courses with the lecturer? How is a student, or his/her peers, vulnerable in this context?
- In both cases, what is the appropriate penalty for the lecturer, and should the penalties be different for the various cases?
- Some countries might impose a penalty on the student, would that be the right thing to do? Why or why not?
- What policies would you want to design to deter the corrupt behaviours identified in these examples?

¹² For more information, see <https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/sex-for-grades-case-takes-a-surprising-turn>.

¹³ See note 10.

Possible class structure

This section contains recommendations for a teaching sequence and timing intended to achieve learning outcomes through a three-hour class. The lecturer may wish to disregard or shorten some of the segments below in order to give more time to other elements, including introduction, icebreakers, conclusion or short breaks. The structure could also be adapted for shorter or longer classes, given that class durations vary across countries.

Introduction to Corruption and Education (15 minutes)

- Ask students what they think corruption is in general and what they think corruption in education is in particular (if possible, use proposed pre-class exercise 1 or 2). Give examples of different manifestations of corruption in education.
- Present a basic outline of the Module and learning outcomes.

Recognizing the Symptoms of Corruption in Education (20 minutes)

- Ask students whether their country has corruption in education, and how their country compares to other countries or do an interactive activity like suggested in Exercise 1.
- Present the main manifestations of corruption in education.

The Mechanisms and Impacts of Corruption in Education in Real Life (45 minutes)

- Either have a short lecture by the lecturer, or a short presentation by students with in-class preparation time, on recognizing the different institutions and levels where corruption in education occurs, as well as the actors and the types of exchanges that exist (Hallak and Poisson, 2007).
- Ask the students to discuss what they think the consequences of corruption in education are (either work in teams, or collect individual views through Padlet or Google Doc and bundle them in categories which should then be presented to all students).
- Select and present a case study from those suggested in the Exercises section. Engage students to answer questions and lead the discussion, summarizing the main points.

Causes of Corruption in Education (30 minutes)

- Discuss how corruption affects the different groups of human rights and the various approaches • Divide students in teams and give them flipcharts. Ask half of the teams to think about and outline the factors driving actors in education to engage in corruption. Ask the other half to think of policies which they believe can deter corruption in education. Ask pairs of teams from each side to present their conclusions (use visual aids like arrows on flipcharts or pair students in such a way that one student delivers “the problem” and the other student delivers “the solution”).

Possible Policies (10 minutes)

- Present the main types of possible anti-corruption policies in the education sector.
- Pick real-world examples of policies and discuss them with the students. Ask the students if these policies could be successfully implemented in their university or country.

Case Study (45 minutes)

- Select one of the case studies suggested in the Exercises section to examine and discuss in class (e.g., the one in Exercise 2 is likely to spark discussion). Lecturers can either choose the case study, or ask the students to vote and select one.
- Provide short in-class review time of the case study, then ask students to discuss among themselves for a few minutes. What are the issues they see?
- Make a list of the issues to discuss, contributing to the discussion to ensure the main issues are raised and covered.
- Assign different questions to different small groups, allow additional time for discussion, and ask each group to assign a team member as rapporteur to share the group's ideas.
- Discussion will at some point likely begin to shift from what the problem is to what to do about the problem, by for example addressing what immediate action to take or what long-term responses are appropriate. This discussion may arise when a student says 'nothing can be done' or 'that is the way things are'. When this shift occurs, lecturers can do a short review of the possible responses to corruption, discussed in the Key issues section. Each group should then take at least one possible response and evaluate the potential impact and difficulties it poses.

Conclusions and Assessment Instructions (15 minutes)

- Introduce and explain the student assessment.
- Conclude by providing a summary overview of key issues discussed and close with a few key take-away points, especially in terms of anti-corruption policies.



Core reading

This section provides a list of (mostly) open access materials that the lecturer could ask the students to read before taking a class based on this Module.

Hallak, Jacques and Muriel Poisson (2007). *Corrupt schools, corrupt universities: what can be done?* Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

» Available from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000150259>.

Huss, Oksana and Oleksandra Keudel (2020). *Open government in education: Clarifying concepts and mapping initiatives*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and International Institute for Educational Planning.

» Available from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373142/PDF/373142eng.pdf.multi>.

Johnson, Vincent (2008). *Corruption in Education: A Global Legal Challenge*. Santa Clara Law Review, vol 48, issue 1.

Kirya, Monica (2019). *Education sector corruption: How to assess it and ways to address it*. Bergen, Norway: U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, Chr. Michelsen Institute.

» Available from www.u4.no/publications/education-sector-corruption-how-to-assess-it-and-ways-to-address-it.pdf.

Transparency International (TI) (2013). *Global Corruption Report: Education*. Berlin.

» Available from www.transparency.org/gcr_education.

United Nations Development Programme (2011). *Fighting Corruption in the Education Sector: Methods, Tools and Good Practices*. New York.

» Available from www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/anti-corruption/fighting_corruptionintheeducationsector.html.

Advanced reading

The following readings are recommended for students interested in exploring the topics of this Module in more detail, and for lecturers teaching the Module:

Borcan, Oana, Mikael Lindahl and Andreea Mitrut (2014). The impact of an unexpected wage cut on corruption: Evidence from a “Xeroxed” exam. *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 120 (December), p.p. 32–47.

Borcan, Oana, Mikael Lindahl and Andreea Mitrut (2017). Fighting Corruption in Education: What Works and Who Benefits? *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, vol. 9, issue 1, pp. 180-209.

Bretag, Tracey (2013). Short-cut students: From academic misconduct to academic integrity. In *Global Corruption Report: Education*. Berlin: Transparency International.

» Available from www.transparency.org/gcr_education.

Denisova-Schmidt, Elena, Martin Huber, and Yaroslav Prytula (2015). An experimental evaluation of an anti-corruption intervention among Ukrainian university students. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, vol. 56, issue 6, p.p. 713–734.

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (2004). *Preventing Corruption in the Education System: A Practical Guide*. Eschborn.

» Available from https://toolkit.ineesite.org/resources/ineecms/uploads/1038/Preventing_Corruption_In_The_Education_System.pdf.

Hallak, Jacques, and Muriel Poisson (2002). Ethics and corruption in education (Policy Forum No. 15). Results from the Expert Workshop held at the IIEP, Paris, France, 28-29 November 2001. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO.

Heyneman, Stephen (2004). Education and Corruption. *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 24, issue 6 (November), p.p. 637–648. Elsevier.

Heyneman, Stephen (2014). How Corruption Puts Higher Education at Risk. *International Higher Education*, no. 75 (Spring), p.p. 1–6.

» Available from <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/view/5425>.

Heyneman, Stephen, Kathryn H. Anderson and Nazym Nuraliyeva (2008). The Cost of Corruption in Higher Education. *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 52, no. 1 (February), p.p. 1–25.

Leach, Fiona (2013). Corruption as abuse of power: Sexual violence in educational institutions. In *Global Corruption Report: Education*. Berlin: Transparency International.

» Available from www.transparency.org/gcr_education.

Lucifora, Claudio and Marco Tonello (2014). Students' Cheating as a Social Interaction: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in a National Evaluation Program. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, vol. 115.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2015). *Consequences of Corruption at the Sector Level and Implications for Economic Growth and Development*. Paris.

» Available from www.oecd.org/publications/consequences-of-corruption-at-the-sector-level-and-implications-for-economic-growth-and-development-9789264230781-en.htm.

Osipian, Ararat L. (2012a). Economics of corruption in doctoral education: The dissertations market. *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 31, issue, 1 (February), p.p. 76–83.

Osipian, Ararat L. (2012b). Will bribery and fraud converge? Comparative corruption in higher education in Russia and the USA. *Compare* (October), p.p. 252-273. Taylor and Francis.

Poisson, Muriel (2010). *Corruption and Education*. Education Policy Series. Paris: International Academy of Education.

» Available from www.iaoed.org/downloads/WEB_11_corruption_and_education_final_.pdf.

Reinikka, Ritva and Jakob Svensson (2004). Local Capture: Evidence from a Central Government Transfer Program in Uganda. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 119, no. 2 (May), pp. 679-705.

» Available from www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/pe/PEAMCourse04/RitvaBackground2.pdf.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2015). *Corruption-Risk Assessment in the Kosovo Education Sector*.

» Available from www.ks.undp.org/content/dam/kosovo/docs/SAEK/UNDP_CorruptionEdu_report_ENG.pdf.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (2016). *Advisory statement for effective international practice: combatting corruption and enhancing integrity: a contemporary challenge for the quality and credibility of higher education*.

» Available from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000249460>.

* Resources on fighting corruption through education:

Another aspect of the education–corruption nexus is that education could be a powerful tool for preventing corruption. Although this topic is not discussed in Module 9, it is relevant to the broader discussion on how to fight corruption in a sustainable and effective manner, which is the cross-cutting theme of the UNODC Module Series on Anti-Corruption. Lecturers and students who are interested in this issue may wish to consult the following resources:

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2018). *Education for Integrity: Teaching on Anti-Corruption, Values and the Rule of Law*. Paris.

» Available from www.oecd.org/governance/ethics/education-for-integrity-web.pdf.

Taylor, Veronica (2002). Anti-Corruption and Asian Legal Professions. In *Corruption in Asia: Rethinking the Governance Paradigm*, Tim Lindsay and Howard Dick, eds. Annandale, NSW: The Federation Press.

United Nations, Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Education in schools and universities on anti-corruption efforts (article 13, paragraph 1 (c) of the United Nations Convention against Corruption). 28 May 2018. CAC/COSP/WG.4/2017/2/Rev.1.

» Available from www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/WorkingGroups/workinggroup4/2017-August-21-23/CAC-COSP-WG4-2017-2-Education.REV.1_E.pdf.

Yusuph, Kambuga (2016). Sextortion in Education Sector and Response to Criminal Legal System in Tanzania – A Review. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 1 (January), pp. 56-63.

» Available from <https://oaji.net/articles/2016/1710-1465284991.pdf>.

Whalen-Bridge, Helena (2017). The Rhetoric of Corruption & The Law School Curriculum: Why Aren't Law Schools Teaching About Corruption? In *Legal Education in Asia: From Imitation to Innovation*, Andrew Harding and others, eds. Brill.

Student assessment

This section provides suggestions for post-class assignments for the purpose of assessing student understanding of the Module. Suggestions for pre-class or in-class assignments are provided in the Exercises section.

The proposed exercises can be used as formative assessments (e.g., to support student learning and provide feedback) and this should be made explicit in the class. The case study can also be used as a formative assessment, since the lecturer can give immediate feedback to the students on their answers and presentation structure.

To assess the students' understanding of the Module, the following post-class assignments are proposed. Some require class time and some do not, so lecturers should adjust their class structure as needed.

> **Assignment 1: Group presentation or video**

Before the second class, ask students to research issues that are emphasized in the Module, and prepare a short individual or group presentation for the class. Possible issues to assign are examples of corruption in education or strategies to combat corruption in education. If the students have access to a video recording tool (available on many smart phones), the lecturer can ask students to make a short video illustrating an example of corruption in education¹⁴. Lecturers should be sure to review presentation materials or videos prior to discussing them in class. In addition to serving as an assessment tool, selected assignments (with the students' permission) delivered in and interspersed throughout the class meeting can energize class discussion.

> **Assignment 2: Written essay**

1) Select one corruption problem arising in education, either one identified during the earlier class discussion, or another corruption problem in education with approval from the lecturer, and submit a written evaluation of: (1) the problem, conceptualized in terms of costs, benefits and conditions surrounding the corrupt act (e.g. detection mechanisms), as well as the consequences on society; and (2) solutions, including resources required, difficulty of implementation, and likelihood of success.

2) Lecturers can also use the suggested activity regarding principle-agent and collective action theory as the basis for an assessed essay. Class discussion should include a review of the principle-agent and collective action theory. After that, students can take a problem approved by the lecturer, such as one of the problems identified by students in the first half of the class, or one of the case study problems, and in a written essay explain whether the principle-agent versus collective action theory would respond differently to the same problem, evaluating the respective responses.

¹⁴ See, e.g. www.youtube.com/watch?v=AvmSJFKnVwo.

➤ **Assignment 3: Community assignment**

Lecturers with more available resources, such as access to a social experiments lab or digital devices for field interviews can consider an assignment that takes students into the community to address a problem faced by a professional community and propose solutions. Problems raised by the Internet, such as degree mills or students purchasing paid research papers, can also be focused on. Lecturers would have to organize the logistics ahead of time, but if, for example, there is a current issue of corruption in education in the news or known to students, lecturers can identify persons to interview and resources to check and assign work to individuals or groups of students. Students should be advised to come to class with the results, which can be discussed in class, and then students can submit a report incorporating their research and making suggestions for resolution or improvement. This could make a more ample piece of coursework, or even developed into a dissertation.

Additional teaching tools

This section includes links to relevant teaching aides, such as PowerPoint slides and video material, that could help the lecturer teach the issues covered by the Module in an interactive and engaging manner. Lecturers can adapt the slides and other resources to their needs.

> Powerpoint presentations

Why Anti-Corruption Policies Fail: Systematic Corruption as a Collective Action Problem (prepared by Prof. Bo Rothstein, Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg).

» Available from http://doc.contraloria.gob.pe/conferenciaanticorruccionperu/2014/files/1_Bo_Rothstein.pdf.

> Video material

The Cartel – Corruption in Public Schools (2019). Bowdownmedia (5:55 minutes). This clip from the documentary film “The Cartel,” by Bob Bowdon, discusses corruption occurring in some of New Jersey’s Public Schools.

» Available from www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vo9nORIOzvo.

Corruption in Education (2016). Youth Educational Forum (14:21 minutes). This series of five short documentaries explores the efforts of youth in organizing and networking in combating corruption in youth’s everyday educational life in South East Europe. The video shows how female reporters were sexually harassed, propositioned and put under pressure by senior lecturers at the academic institutions.

» Available from www.youtube.com/watch?v=bEATZ7QH2J0.

‘Sex for grades’: Undercover in West African universities (2019). BBC Africa Eye (13:44 minutes). This short documentary is about the work of undercover journalists inside universities in West Africa, which have increasingly been facing allegations of sexual harassment by lecturers.

» Available from www.bbc.com/news/av/world-africa-49907376.

Social Psychology Videos: Social Dilemmas (2017). Nils Köbis and Paul van Lagne, In-Mind Magazine (5:45 minutes). This short video provides a social psychology angle for describing corruption as a social dilemma.

» Available from www.youtube.com/watch?v=PGNf61jVGn8.

Student suicides due to corruption in the education system (2011). Mohit Khurana (8:15 minutes). This is a video of a role play performed by students in India.

» Available from www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xuop2hqybpk.

The Kenyan ghost writers doing ‘lazy’ Western students’ work (2019). BBC (3:02 minutes). This short video shows how university students in Europe and the US are paying Kenyans to do their academic work for them. The global market for academic writing is estimated to be worth \$1bn (£770m) annually.

» Available from www.bbc.com/news/av/world-africa-50126963.

> Websites

The **ETICO platform** provides a vast range of resources on ethics and corruption in education.

» Available from <http://etico.iiep.unesco.org/en>.

Integrity Action is an organization, which offers a broad collection of case studies on academic integrity and corruption in education.

» Available from <https://integrityaction.org/what-we-are-learning/learning/>.

> Case studies, news reports and blogs

Adegboyega, Ayodeji (2019). 'Manipulation' of young girls prevalent in West Africa's educational system – ECOWAS Official. Premium Times, 17 May.

» Available from www.premiumtimesng.com/news/more-news/-330339manipulation-of-young-girls-prevalent-in-west-africas-educational-system-ecowas-official.html.

Barrera, Cathy, Stephanie Hurder, and Ashley Lannquist (2019). Here's how blockchain could stop corrupt officials from stealing school lunches. World Economic Forum, 17 May.

» Available from www.weforum.org/agenda/05/2019/heres-how-blockchain-stopped-corrupt-officials-stealing-school-dinners/.

BBC (2019). Felicity Huffman handed prison time over college admissions scandal, 13 September.

» Available from www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada49693193-.

Chu, Mei Mei and Yimie Yong (2019). Fake degrees: A worrying trend in Malaysia. The Star Online, 6 May.

» Available from www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/06/05/2019/a-worrying-trend-in-msia/.

Denisova-Shmidt, Elena (2019). What can universities do to stop students cheating? World University News, 20 April.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190415143459825.

Khaled, Ashraf (2019). Lecturer, administrators sacked over 'pants-for-pass' class. University World News, 16 April.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190415144131918.

Kirby, Dean (2019). Education Secretary names and shames universities over 'unethical' admission practices. iNews, 5 April.

» Available from <https://inews.co.uk/news/education/education-secretary-calls-out-universities-over-unethical-admission-practices/>.

Kokutse, Francis (2019). Lecturers in BBC sex-for-grades documentary face probe. University World News, 9 October

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=2019100907500956.

Levi, Lennart, and Bo Rothstein (2018). Universities must lead on Sustainable Development Goals. University World News, 9 November.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20181106131352348.

Myklebust, Jan Petter (2019). Rigging of academic positions – How to change a culture? University World News, 23 November.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20191122070839500.

O'Malley, Brendan (2019). Admissions scandal parents charged with money laundering. University World News, 10 April.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190410145920641.

O'Malley, Brendan (2019). Call to fight corruption in higher education globally. University World News, 13 April.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190412095537415.

Osipian, Ararat (2019). The rise and rise of ghost-written dissertations. University World News, 27 July.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190722132702600.

Ponniah, Kevin (2014). Cambodia crackdown on corruption in schools scores low with exam cheats. The Guardian, 2 September.

» Available from www.theguardian.com/global-development/2014/sep/02/cambodia-corruption-crackdown-exam-cheats.

Rappler (2019). COA to La Union state university: Explain 'diverted' funds, 28 April.

» Available from www.rappler.com/nation/-229202coa-orders-dmmsu-la-union-explain-diverted-funds.

Rahman, Mahmudur (2019). Ridding our universities of corruption. Dhaka Tribune, October 24.

» Available from www.dhakatribune.com/opinion/op-ed/19/09/2019/ridding-our-universities-of-corruption.

Sawahel, Wagdy (2019). Academics call for more action over dissertation mills. University World News, 22 July.

» Available from www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190722084402994.

The Jakarta Post (2019). Corruption on campus, 8 August.

» Available from www.thejakartapost.com/academia/08/08/2019/corruption-on-campus.html.

UrduPoint (2019). Values based education can help prevent corruption: acting director NAB, 16 May.

» Available from www.urdupoint.com/en/pakistan/values-based-education-can-help-prevent-corru622801-.html.

Wysmulek, Ilona (2017). Bribe-giving experience and perceived corruption levels in public schools across Europe. ETICO Blog, 31 August.

» Available from <http://etico.iiep.unesco.org/en/bribe-giving-experience-and-perceived-corruption-levels-public-schools-across-europe>.

Kahfi, Kharishar (2019). Corruption major issue in rector election. The Jakarta Post, 6 August.

» Available from www.thejakartapost.com/news/06/08/2019/corruption-major-issue-in-rector-election.html.

Guidelines to develop a stand-alone course

This Module provides an outline for a three-hour class, but there is potential to develop its topics further into a stand-alone course. The scope and structure of such a course will be determined by the specific needs of each context, but a possible structure is presented here as a suggestion.

| Session | Topic | Brief description |
|---------|---|---|
| 1 | Module Introduction | Introduce Module themes, learning outcomes, and assessment structure. Explore student familiarity with corruption in general and corruption in education. |
| 2 | Defining Corruption: Generally and in Education | Review UNCAC's approach, which does not define corruption specifically, and contrast with provisional definitions in the literature. Why should you adopt a definition, and why not? What do some definitions leave out? How is corruption in education defined and measured? What are the most promising techniques to measure corruption? |
| 3 | Causes of Corruption: Introduction | To orient students before going into the details of corruption in education, provide an overview of corruption literature, including the principle-agent and collective action theories. Present a simplified version of the Becker-Stigler (1974) model of crime and use it to explain corruption decisions as a cost-benefit analysis. Engage the students in illustrating the causes of corruption in general, in terms of the costs, benefits and detection mechanisms. Are the causes similar or different in different countries? |
| 4 | Causes of Corruption in Education | Apply the framework presented in the previous lecture to the context of education. Review and critique the literature on the causes of corruption in education, and consider the aspects of education which make it vulnerable to corruption. Use a case study (e.g. the case study on the fake diploma) to start a discussion and generate a practical example of the general principles discussed. |
| 5 | Tackling Corruption in Education: Student Selection & Scholarship Processes | The second part of the course should be dedicated to anti-corruption policies tailored to the different contexts and causes discussed previously and to the different types of corruption in education. Begin by addressing the particular problems raised in student selection and scholarship processes, and strategies for combating corruption in this area. |

| Session | Topic | Brief description |
|----------------|--|---|
| 6 | Tackling Corruption in Education: Grade and Degree Processes | Address the particular problems raised in grade and degree processes, and strategies for combating corruption in this area. |
| 7 | Tackling Corruption in Education: Teacher Selection and Misbehaviour | Address the particular problems raised in teacher selection and misbehaviour, and strategies for combating corruption in this area, including professional codes for teachers and educators. |
| 8 | Tackling Corruption in Education: Financing | Address the particular problems raised by financing in education, including budgets and procurement, and strategies for combating corruption in this area. |
| 9 | Tackling Corruption in Education: Student Corruption | Address the particular problems caused by students, alone and in concert with others, as a source of corruption, and strategies for combating corruption in this area. |
| 10 | Guidelines for possible projects | OPTIONAL – if a project is to be developed by students, particularly if it requires data collection or experiments involving human subjects, one lecture should be dedicated to guidelines on how to design and carry out this research. This would be a good opportunity to present the different tools available to assess corruption. |
| 11 | Student presentations or guest lectures | As a wrap-up for the course and segue into the real world, the final session should be reserved for student presentations on challenging issues of corruption in education, or a group discussion with a guest lecturer who can share his or her experience addressing corruption in education. If a guest lecturer cannot be physically present, a suggestion is to have a video presentation by a practitioner or lecturer specialized in anti-corruption programmes or strategies. |



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Vienna International Centre, P.O. Box 500, 1400 Vienna, Austria
Tel.: +43-1-26060-0, Fax: +43-1-26060-5866, www.unodc.org