

## Corruption in Education – Stealing the Future

Pierre du Plessis

University of Johannesburg

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n23p1308

### Abstract

*Corruption is a major drain on the effective use of resources for education and should be drastically curbed. Corruption in education is particularly damaging because it endangers a country's social, economic and political future. Corruption in education is more detrimental than corruption in other sectors because of its long-term effects. Corruption threatens equal access quantity and quality of education. Its consequences are particularly has for the poor who, without access to education or with no alternative but low-quality education, have a little chance to escape a life of poverty. Corruption is incompatible with one of the major aims in education – producing citizens that respect the law and human rights. If children come to believe that personal effort and merit do not count and that success comes through manipulation, favouritism and bribery, then the very foundations of society are shaken. The article argues that the problems posed by corruption in education have been neglected for too long.*

### 1. Introduction

All parents hope for a good education for their children. It is the key to the next generation's future, particularly for the poor. It equips young citizens with the knowledge and skills to thrive in their country's economy and to participate fully in society. It is a cornerstone of economic and social development, a human right under international law and a constitutional guarantee in most countries.

In a context of budget austerity and pressure on international flows of funds, there is a clear demand for more efficiency in the use of public resources. Recent surveys suggest that leakage of funds from ministries of education to schools represent more than 80% of the total sums allocated (non-salary expenditures) in some countries; bribes and pay-offs in teacher recruitment and promotion tend to lower the quality of public school teachers; and illegal payments for school entrance and other hidden costs help explain low school enrolment and high drop-out rates.

Among the main factors leading to corrupt behaviour, one can mention poverty and the low salaries earned by public officials and civil servants. It thus seems that the poorer a country, the higher the level of petty corruption; in very poor countries, petty corruption is sometimes considered a normal pattern of behaviour or as a norm of buying services (this is not the case for grand corruption, which can be found everywhere and is generated and maintained at a high level of decision-making the power structure of difference societies). Existing literature shows that corruption also has connections with the stability of political systems, the existing legal frameworks, the transparency of public information, the level of accountability of individuals and institutions, the efficiency of the mechanisms of governance in place and the importance and characteristics of foreign aid.

A cursory review of the literature suggests that there are very few documents available dealing in a comprehensive and systematic manner with the various aspects of corruption that exist in the field of education. Yet it is clear that the fight against corruption in the specific sphere of education should be regarded as a major priority as it effects not only the volume of educational services, including the quality and efficiency, but also equity in education and public confidence in educational systems. The International Institute of Education Planning (IIEP) has launched a research project, devoted to "Ethics and corruption in education" where the main objective is to improve decision-making and the management of education systems by integrating governance and corruption concerns in the educational planning.

In reality education is often characterized by poor quality and unequal access. A region-wide survey of Africa's education system showed more than 50 percent of respondents signaling numerous challenges to getting a basic education. Classroom overcrowding, poorly maintained primary schools, absent teachers, lack of textbooks and supplies, and unacceptably high fees and expenses were just some of the problems cited (Bratton, 2005). When it comes to higher education, access in many countries depends more on the parents' purse and social status than the talent, effort and merit of the students. Unfortunately, corruption tends to be one of the principal reasons behind all these problems.

## 2. The Concept of Corruption

Corruption in developing countries is often believed to arise from the clash or conflict between traditional values and the imported norms that accompany modernization and socio-political development. Bureaucratic corruption is seen by some researchers, then, as an unavoidable outcome of modernization and development (Alam 1989, Bayley 1966). David Bayley (1966: 720) argues that "corruption, while being tied particularly to the act of bribery, is a general term covering the misuse of authority as a result of considerations of personal gain, which need not be monetary." Herbert Werlin (1973: 73) defines political corruption as the "diversion of public resources to nonpublic purposes." In Africa many people see corruption as a practical problem involving the "outright theft, embezzlement of funds or other appropriation of state property, nepotism and the granting of favours to personal acquaintances, and the abuse of public authority and position to exact payments and privileges" (Harsch 1993: 33). Joseph Nye (1967: 419) argues that corruption involves "behavior which deviates from the normal duties of a public role because of private-regarding (family, close clique), pecuniary or status gain; or violates rules against the exercise of certain types of private-regarding influence.

Jacob van Klaveren believes that a corrupt bureaucrat regards his office as a business from which he is able to extract extra-legal income. As a result, the civil servant's total compensation "does not depend on an ethical evaluation of his usefulness for the common good but precisely upon the market situation and his talents for finding the point of maximal gain on the public's demand curve" (Klaveren 1990: 26). As part of his definition of corruption, Nathaniel Leff (1964: 8) includes "bribery to obtain foreign exchange, import, export, investment or production licenses, or to avoid paying taxes." According to Carl Friedrich (1990: 15), individuals are said to be engaging in corruption when they are granted power by society to perform certain public duties but, as a result of the expectation of a personal reward or gain (be it monetary or otherwise), undertake actions that reduce the welfare of society or damage the public interest.

Bureaucratic corruption provides civil servants with the opportunity to raise their compensation above what the law prescribes. Through the practice of corruption, private entrepreneurs are able to capture and maintain monopoly positions in the economy. Politicians, who serve as wealth brokers, obtain the resources they need to purchase security and continue to monopolize the supply of legislation. The biggest loser from corruption is society as a whole. Corruption allows inefficient producers to remain in business, encourages governments to pursue perverse economic policies, and provides opportunities to bureaucrats and politicians to enrich themselves through extorting bribes from those seeking government favors. Thus, corruption distorts economic incentives discourages entrepreneurship, and slows economic growth (Mbaku 1992, Gould 1980).

In examining bureaucratic corruption in Africa, it is important to discuss the supply side. Unless entrepreneurs and groups seeking government favors supply the bribes, then most bureaucratic corruption would be limited to nepotism, illegal levies, and the illegal appropriation of public resources. In African countries, payments from entrepreneurs seeking state favors represent an important source of extra-legal income for civil servants. A society's laws and institutions have a significant impact on the level of bureaucratic corruption. State regulatory programs can place a significant burden on business enterprises and entrepreneurship and encourage investors to seek ways to minimize these state-imposed costs. Most intervention schemes, of course, create rents that are usually competed for through a political process. Paying bribes to civil servants has emerged as an important method to compete for those rents. For profit-maximizing enterprises faced with ruinous government regulations, bureaucratic corruption can be viewed as a survival mechanism (Mbaku 1992, Harsch 1993).

It is important to distinguish between political and bureaucratic corruption. While the latter involves efforts by civil servants to enrich themselves through illegal means, the former is used by political coalitions to capture the apparatus of state or maintain a monopoly on power. Political corruption usually includes activities such as vote-rigging, registration of unqualified, dead, or non-existent voters, purchase and sale of votes, and the falsification of election results (Goodman 1990).

### 2.1 What is education corruption?

Corruption in public affairs includes the abuse of authority for material gain. But because education is an important public good, professional standards include more than just material goods, hence the definition of education corruption includes the abuse of authority for both personal as well as material gain. An education system can be corrupt in four ways: (i) through its education functions, (ii) through the supply of goods and services, (iii) through professional misconduct, and (iv) in the treatment of taxation and property. These can include the assessment of student achievement. This includes how grades are assigned, how students are selected to elite training programs and how universities acquire accreditation from government agencies. Students may pay a bribe for a particular grade assigned by a department chair, over and

above the authority of a classroom educator. Between 80-84% of university students in Bulgaria are aware of illegal bribes to gain admission; between 28-36% think that admission test scores can be changed.

The system of licensing (certifying professionals) is responsible for many sources of corruption. University programs are endowed with this authority hence the functions of accreditation and licensing are combined. Whenever higher education institutions are associated with licensure the stakes for accreditation are high, and the private bribe price for accreditation will in turn be high.

## 2.2 *Supply of Goods and Services*

The education system in any country is a massive enterprise. Students need to be supplied with furniture, reading and writing materials, and pedagogical equipment of many types. The buildings in which they work must be constructed and maintained. In 2000, education in North America constituted an industry of 86 billion dollars. In spite of the common political and economic reasons presented, governments have long been known to monopolize the supply of education goods and services for reasons of private pecuniary gain. New socialist nations of East Africa in the 1960s nationalized school supplies in order to levy a hidden tax for attending public schools. School fees were required for attendance. Those fees were to finance school supplies. But the value of the supplies were substantially less than the value of the original fees. The missing monies were used for private purposes of government ministers. Thought necessary for reasons of national pride, writing 'local' textbooks is used by ministers of education as a means to exploit a monopoly over the nations' largest reading population and to enrich themselves.

## 2.3 *Professional Misconduct*

There are many forms of professional misconduct in education. Among the most common:

- Accepting material gifts or rewards in exchange for positive grades, assessments or selection to specialized programs
- Biasing a grade or an assessment because of family or other private requests
- Assigning of grades or assessments biased by a student's race, culture, social class, ethnicity or other ascriptive attributes, i.e. the characteristics with which they were born – race, gender and social status.

This is all examples to confirm that corruption in education is a world-wide problem.

In June 2006 the Daily Champion reported in Nigeria that the chief executive of the National Examinations has authorized the council's officers to accept bribes if offered by desperate students or parents.

In May 2006 The Standard reported in Kenya that recruitment deployment and promotion of teachers were identified as the "hot spots" for potential corruption.

On 9 January 2006 The Korea Times reported that the minister of education will probe private schools over irregularities in the fight against corruption.

The BBC News (United Kingdom) reported on 29 June 2006 that some language schools are being used to sell false papers, enabling immigrants to obtain student visas. Some pay up to 600 pounds for fake documents to extend their stay.

A report from the Education Forum in the USA reported on 18 January 2006 that there is a financial corruption going on in American schools.

The Namibian reported on 26 September 2005, the ministry of Education is to launch an investigation into netting maize meal for its school feeding programme found at a school. 500 bags of maize meal had been stored at a secondary school and not delivered to the intended beneficiaries.

In Business Today (15 June 2005) it was reported that the Mpumalanga education department in South Africa has begun disciplinary hearings for 61 teachers accused of being involved in last year's matrix exam cheating.

**Table 1** – Corruption Cases in Education for the period 2001 – 2006 reported on by the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) on the on-line web only

Year	Africa	Asia	Europe	Australia	N-America	S-America	Total
2001	4	4	1	0	2	0	11
2002	1	11	0	0	1	2	15
2003	7	7	3	1	15	1	34
2004	6	11	4	0	5	3	29
2005	49	17	17	1	7	0	91
2006	12	5	5	0	3	0	25
	<b>79</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>205</b>

**Source:** International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) 2006.

Table 1 indicates how corruption in education is a reality. This is only one on-line web which reported on corruption cases in education over a period of six years. The reported cases in 2006 were only up to the end of June 2006. If this is taken into account the 2006 figure can be much higher. Here it can be seen that corruption in education is not only a problem in one country or continent, but that it is a world-wide problem.

Other examples of articles in newspapers in 2012:

- Forcing pupils to take 'private fee paying lessons' to pass teacher-based assessments of student progress
- Disclosing confidential information about a student
- Sexually or otherwise exploiting, harassing or discriminating against particular students
- Adopting an inadequate textbook or educational product because of a manufacturer's gifts or incentives
- Forcing students to purchase materials where profits accrue to the instructor
- Ignoring the misconduct of colleagues
- Utilizing school public property for private gain.

There have yet to be systematic surveys of misconduct, but there is anecdotal evidence of sexual harassment of students in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. And there are reports that teachers in Latin America force students to pay fees for private lessons before they will be passed on to the next grade.

## 2.4 Property and Taxes

Educational facilities often occupy prime locations in urban areas. These can be rented or leased for both educational and other purposes. Many institutions must supplement public with non-public income. But how should educational property and income be treated: as private or public? Should it be taxed? If so, should it be taxed as the same rate as profit-making institutions? As profit-making institutions which have no public good purposes? This area is in flux. International precedents are unknown and legal principles unexplored. Because of the confusion in terms and the lack of experience, the arena of education property and educational taxes has become a source of illegal activity. Whenever there is significant ambiguity over legal principles and precedent, bribery is common (Heyneman, 2006).

## 2.5 Identification of opportunities of corruption offered in the education sector

Corruption is likely to concern all areas of planning and management, i.e., information systems, the building of schools, recruitment, promotion (including systems of incentives) and appointment of teachers, the supply and distribution of equipment and textbooks, the allocation of specific allowances (fellowships, subventions to the private sector, etc.), examinations and diplomas, out-of-school activities and so forth. We have drawn a typology of the main areas of planning and management that offer opportunities for corruption in education (please find a summary in Table 2 below). Different types of corrupt practices liable to crop up in each of these areas are given, including favouritism, bypassing of criteria, and embezzlement as well as the possible impact of these practices on access, quality, equity, and ethics.

**Table 2 – Typology of opportunities of corruption in education**

Areas	Corrupt practices	Impact on education
School building, rehabilitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fraud in public tendering</li> <li>• Embezzlement</li> <li>• School mapping</li> </ul>	Access Quality <i>Example:</i> bad location of schools; too high or too low use; demand for places unattended
Equipment, Textbooks, Food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fraud in public tendering</li> <li>• Embezzlement</li> <li>• Bypass of criteria</li> </ul>	Equity Quality <i>Example:</i> school meals free to the rich and not available for the poor; lack of consistency between textbooks and curricula
Teacher appointment/management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favouritism</li> <li>• Nepotism</li> <li>• Bribes</li> </ul>	Quality <i>Example:</i> less qualified teachers appointed
Teacher behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Ghost teachers"</li> <li>• Bribes (for school entrance, exams, assessment, private tutoring, etc.)</li> </ul>	Equity Ethics <i>Example:</i> disparity in staffing by schools; discrimination against the poor
Examinations and diplomas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selling of information</li> <li>• Favouritism</li> <li>• Nepotism</li> <li>• Bribes</li> <li>• Academic fraud</li> </ul>	Equity Ethics <i>Example:</i> unjustified credentials available to students who can afford to pay bribes
Information systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manipulating data</li> <li>• Selecting/suppressing information</li> </ul>	Equity Ethics Policy priorities <i>Example:</i> omitting data on repetition/ dropout; less priority on quality improvement
Specific allowances (fellowships, subsidies, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favouritism</li> <li>• Nepotism</li> <li>• Bribes</li> <li>• Bypass of criteria</li> </ul>	Access Equity <i>Example:</i> inflating enrolment figures to increase financial transfers
Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transgressing rules/ procedures</li> <li>• Inflation of costs and activities</li> <li>• Opacity of flow</li> <li>• Leakage of funds</li> </ul>	Access Quality Equity Policy priorities <i>Example:</i> less resources for quality improvement: textbooks, materials, etc.

**Source:** Adapted from Hallak & Poisson, 2002

## 2.6 Examples of corruption in education

Education is often the only way a family can escape a life of poverty and achieve social advancement, so parents naturally want their children to succeed at school. This leaves plenty of scope for abuse by teachers and officials. The most common forms of corruption in education are:

- Parents may be 'recommended' to buy a book or teaching aid that their child's present or future teacher has written
- Parents may be 'advised' to pay for private tuition in which the teacher, after official school hours, teaches their child the essentials of the curriculum
- Parents may be asked to contribute 'voluntary' donations for school infrastructure or extra-curricular activities. Failure to do so might result for example in schools withholding students' records or report cards.

The Economic Crimes Unit of Russia's Interior Ministry reported in October 2004 that 900 criminal cases had been opened since the beginning of the year concerning bribery in education. Many students, fearing expulsion, remain silent about the extortion by teachers, one official said. Some 150 criminal cases had been opened against heads of



educational institutions and officials, including five members of examination boards, three officials from regional education bodies, 10 rectors and deans, 22 professors and assistant professors, and 110 directors and heads of departments. In all, law-enforcement bodies exposed almost 3,500 crimes and instituted 2,500 criminal proceedings, including 878 cases of the theft or misuse of budget and 58 cases of commercial bribery.

Since achieving Education for All (EFA) has been determined as key to development – it forms part of the UN's Millennium Development Goals – school fees are increasingly being removed from basic education. However, fees are not the only cost that parents have to shoulder. Others include school uniforms, contributions for teaching materials, roofing and textbooks etc., or even contributions to salaries and running costs. In extremely under-funded environments, school children may be exploited as unpaid labour to compensate for teachers' or administrators' meager income, or as a direct contribution to the school's budget (World Bank, 2004).

But it is not only students and parents who suffer from corruption in education. Corruption in the appointment, promotion and transfer of teachers is a widespread reality in countries where bad teaching conditions prevail. Positions in isolated, rural areas are not popular. Without checks and balances, and given the high discretion of officials, there is plenty of scope for abuse. Bribes and kickbacks may be required from aspiring educators to secure placements, transfers or promotions.

Teachers also suffer from low or delayed salaries that, in turn, can be a result of corruption at higher levels. Inadequate salaries or late payment have a demoralizing effect on teachers, forcing them to do other jobs to make ends meet. The impact on the quality of education they should provide is obvious.

Teachers can be targets of political intervention. Education employs a large number of civil servants and teachers, who have daily access to a great number of citizens. At election time, it is teachers who are tasked with voter education and ballot counting. To secure their 'services', politicians may interfere in teachers' employment, promotion or transfer.

Corruption also occurs at university level where its consequences are particularly damaging since future economic and political leaders are trained there. Falsified diplomas are becoming an increasing concern. Corruption in the licensing of higher education institutions betrays people's faith in education and leaves students with worthless diplomas. Another worrying trend is the dependency of universities on corporate funding, resulting in conflicts of interest for scholars and jeopardizing the independence of their research.

Corruption exists within ministries and at lower levels of administration. It can distort budget allocation to the detriment of education. Countries with high corruption tend to invest less in public services, leaving the education sector under-resourced. Insufficient resources may be budgeted as a result of bad planning or resources may disappear on their way to schools. Education consumes a significant part of the national budget – as much as 25-30% in some African countries – and therefore is a potential avenue for corruption (Mauro, 1997).

The dismissal of Nigeria's Education Minister Fabian Osuji is an example of high-level political corruption. He allegedly paid six members of the National Assembly US\$400,000 in bribes to vote for a rigged education budget. An aggrieved parliamentarian, who was not satisfied with the amount he received, revealed the scam. Nigeria's Independent Corruption Practices Commission has since indicted Osuji.

Procurement contracts for school building or maintenance, textbooks, teaching materials or feeding schemes provide ample opportunities for collusion between public officials and suppliers. Kickbacks to officials who award contracts are a common form of corruption in all sectors, resulting in the purchase of unnecessary or overpriced equipment, the delivery of sub-standard items or under-deliveries. In education, this theft of resources translates into shabby classrooms, leaking roofs, dysfunctional toilets, defective furniture, inadequate textbooks, lack of chalk, blackboards and textbooks etc.

## 2.7 Monopoly power and lack of accountability mechanisms favor the development of corrupt practices in the education sector

Literature shows that corruption has connections with the existence of monopoly and discretionary power, poor governance and supervision at all levels, poor public information on government decisions, lack of transparency with regard to foreign aid and more. As Klitgaard, Maclean-Abaroa & Parris (2000) illustrate in their formula: *Corruption (C) = M (Monopoly Power) + D (Discretion by officials) – A (Accountability)*. Although problems of corruption tend to be ignored in education, there is a strong case to suggest that this formula also applies to it, where this sector is characterized by lack of competition among providers (monopoly power by state authorities), complex regulation systems, an absence of adequate mechanisms of control and sanction, limited access to information, low salary levels for public officers (including teachers) and weak incentive systems. With on-going trends such as decentralization, privatization and sub-contracting, one would expect an automatic reduction in corrupt practices in education. Unfortunately, the reality shows

the contrary in many cases: the increasingly complex nature of the education sector simply appears to be creating new opportunities for corruption.

## **2.8 *Actors' behaviours (intangible inputs) have a significant impact on problems of access, of quality and of equity in education***

There are a variety of misbehaviour which can disturb the implementation of planned interventions and, particularly, the correct functioning of the teaching/learning process. These include; embezzlement of education finance, demands for unauthorized fees for admission to school or for exams, absence of teachers from schools, leakage of information before examinations, etc. The cost of such unethical behaviour can be very high, as the issue of teacher absenteeism reveals (a recent survey found that a third of all teachers in Uttar Pradesh, India, were absent; World Bank, 2004). Moreover, teachers who indulge in unethical practices are arguably unfit for teaching universal values (civic education, moral values, honesty, integrity, etc.). Nevertheless, plans for addressing issues of access, quality, equity and efficiency in education often focus on the use of quantitative data such as the number of teachers by age/grade/status/level of qualifications and pupil/teacher ratios rather than on "intangible inputs". These "intangible inputs" are however necessary conditions to the delivery of quality education, even if these are not sufficient conditions: a host of other factors are recognised to determine the quality and level of education, e.g. the experience and skills of teachers, the relevance of the curricula and the availability of appropriate textbooks and the involvement of parents in school activities.

## **2.9 *Facilitating access to information and promoting a "citizens' voice" are essential for improving transparency and accountability in the use of educational resources***

A number of strategies to fight corruption have been documented, including the improvement of legislative and regulatory frameworks, the strengthening of control mechanisms, the establishment of reward and penalty systems. However increasing the number of legislations, controls and bureaucracy can also paralyze the administration and foster new varieties of corrupt practices in some instances. This is particularly true in countries where the monopoly of the administration is important, and where the salaries of public officers are low. At the same time, decision makers, academia and advocacy groups have come to recognize the potential of access to information and of public feedback in making the government more responsive and accountable. What can be termed a "citizens' voice" appears especially powerful in cases where the government operates and leaves the user of the services with no real "exit options." In conditions such as this, the "citizens' voice" can indeed become a real catalyst for change – provided they are based on an objective assessment of both quantitative and qualitative aspects of educational services and on close interactions with service providers.

## **3. Effects of a Corrupt Education System**

One universal function of education is to certify the acquisition of knowledge and skills and to identify those who may deserve more specialized training. The assumption is that this process is unbiased by ascriptive characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, religious affiliation, or gender. It is common that ascriptive characteristics do in fact play a role in both of these functions, and this helps explain why it is usually illegal and frequently a subject of political attention, court action, fines, penalties and occasionally prison. Corruption is similar in that it is illegal, but rarely is it the subject of the same political attention as other illegal actions. Often it is ignored. In many instances it is denied. It is embarrassing. Excuses are common. Corruption is attributed to low salaries of educators, or an environment in which traditions have broken down and the economy has declined. Economic hardship is commonly given as a rationale (Braxton, et. al. 1999). In instances where corruption is a function of family influences (e.g.: you mother insists you give your niece a good grade), tradition is given as a rationale (Heyneman, 2001).

Whatever the rationale, the effects are profound. When education loses impartiality, it loses quality. When education loses quality, individual and community economic returns to education investments are reduced. Those who use educational products (employers) have to allocate their own resources to make up for the reduction in educational quality. Where corruption is high, the economic rates of return to education investments may be reduced by as much as 70% and lifetime earnings of individuals might be reduced by as much as 50%. Where corruption in higher education approaches 50% (where over 50% of the students report having had experience with illegal payments), employers cannot trust what graduates will know and be able to do. Employers in Central Asia, for instance, attempt to hire new employees from universities known for a lack of corruption (foreign universities). Employees from potentially corrupt universities have

to be placed in specialized training programs to test whether they had the skills required. Employers are to administer special tests to differentiate those who bought their degrees from those who achieved them legitimately. The use of these sorting devices imposes additional costs on firms, and significant costs on the applicants. For instance, applicants from universities with reputations for corruption are not considered for technical or professional jobs and are regularly screened out of jobs in international firms. Corruption imposes costs even on applicants who may not have engaged in corrupt practices. There is a negative connotation of being an applicant engineer from any country where corruption in higher education is common; many will never be considered credible in international firms with access to job applicants from all regions of the world. It is possible to think of particular areas of the world such as Azerbaijan and Central Asia which have already reached the 'tipping point,' where corruption in the education system is so pervasive that the future social cohesion is in danger (Silova, Johnson & Heyneman, 2007).

### 3.1 What can be done about education corruption?

Necessary measures can be grouped into four categories. These include:

**Structural reforms** necessary to reduce the opportunity for corruption – the establishment of an autonomous examination and accreditation agency, separating the process of certification from higher education institutions, clear ownership of educational property, tax differentiation between for-profit and not-for-profit educational institutions, and the freedom for non-profit educational institutions to seek monetary support without being subject to taxation.

**Mechanisms for adjudication and management** – the establishment of professional boards, university boards of trust, school boards, public ombudsmen, and faculty/student code of conduct boards to hear cases of infractions and to recommend consequences.

**Preventive Mechanisms** – 'Blue Ribbon' committees, annual reports to the public on education corruption, public access to financial statements of educational institutions, codes of conduct for administrators, faculty and students, public advertisements for all codes of conduct, anti-corruption commissions and a free and active education press.

**Sanctions** – criminal penalties for economic and professional misconduct, public exposure, dismissal from employment, fines payable to the victim for professional misconduct, and withdrawal of license to practice.

## 4. Conclusion

All cultures are shamed by unfairness, and no society is absent of rules of fairness within the education system. As a norm in education, fairness is universal. In some instances, sham may prevent someone from admitting the obvious. When this occurs, corruption will remain unaddressed and will spread like cancer until trust is absent and the value of educational investments is reduced to virtually zero.

Education institutions and systems are not free of corruption just because there are no data on corruption. The absence of facts does not lessen corruption's effect. To combat corruption, every education minister, every vice-chancellor at university, every education department must demonstrate that corruption is under control. Those that do not give evidence that corruption is under control will be assumed to be of low quality (Pena & Rodriguez, 2004).

The consequences for individual institutions which ignore the problem include a reduction in student demand, to decline in the willingness to pay the requested price of tuition, a rejection of graduates from employers and prestigious post-graduate programs in universities, and the problem which come from having the degrees and certificates which they issue associated with a "general question mark".

Education is a human right. For people, it may often be the only way to escape a life of poverty; for nations it is crucial to development and growth. Education ideally transmits values such as integrity, equality and social justice, and the sense of shared responsibility that is key to social cohesion and good governance. Corruption in education can have a devastating effect on a country's well being. Perhaps the highest cost of corruption in education is loss of trust. If learners or students come to believe that school or university admission and marks can be bought, a country's economic and political future is in jeopardy. Corrupt practices at schools and universities directly contradict the concept of human rights, solidarity and the public good; destroying the trust necessary to the development of countries.

## References

- Alam, M.S. (1989). Anatomy of Corruption: An Approach to the Political Economy of Underdevelopment. American Journal of Economics and Sociology 48(4): 441-56.  
Bayley, D.H. (1966). The effects of Corruption in a Developing Nation. Western Political Science Quarterly 19(4): 719-32.



- Bratton, M. (2005). Are you being served? Afrobarometer Working Papers. No. 65.
- Braxton, J.M. and Bayer, A.E. (1999). Faculty Misconduct in Collegiate Teaching. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eckstein, M.A. (2005). Combating academic fraud. Towards a culture of integrity. IIEP Series on: "Ethics and corruption in education." Paris: :IIEP-UNESCO.
- Friederich, C.J. (1990). Corruption Concepts in Historical Perspective. In Heidenheimer et al (1990:15-24).
- Goodman, M. (1990). Preserving Privilege in Yucatan. In Heidenheimer et al (1990:639-58).
- Hyeneman, S.P., K.H. Anderson, and Nazym Nuraliyeva. "The Cost of Corruption in Higher Education." Comparative Education Review (2008).
- Heyneman, S.P. "The Growing International Market for Education Goods and Services." International Journal of Education Development 21 (July 2001): 345-361.
- Heyneman, S.P. "The Role of Textbooks in a Modern System of Education." In Bralavsky, Cecilia, ed. Textbooks and the Quality Learning for All: Some Lessons Learned from International Experience. Geneva: International Bureau of Education, 2006. 31-93.
- Hallak, J. & Poisson, M. (2002). Ethics and corruption in education. Results from the Expert Workshop held at the IIEP. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO.
- Hallak, J. & Poisson, M. (2005). Ethics an corruption in education: an overview. Journal of Education for International Development (1).
- Harch, E. (1993). "Accumulators and Democrats: Challenging State Corruption in Africa." Journal of Modern African Studies 31(1):31-48.
- Human Rights Watch. 2001. Scared at school: Sexual Violence against girls in South African Schools. Human Rights Watch, New York.
- Klaveren, van J. (1990). The Concept of Corruption. In Heidenheimer (1990:25-28).
- Klitgaard, R. 1998. International Cooperation against corruption. Finance and Development (March): 3-6.
- Klitgaard, R.E. Maclean-Ahara, R., & Paris, H.L. (2000). Corrupt cities: A practical guide to cure and prevention. Oakland: ICS Press.
- Leff, N.H. (1964). Economic Development through Bureaucratic Corruption American Behavioural Scientist 8(3): 8-14.
- Mbaku, J.M. (1992). Bureaucratic Corruption in Africa: The Futility of Cleanups. Cuto Journal.
- Nye, J.S. (1967). Corruption and Political Development. A East-Benefit analysis. American Political Science Review 61(2): 417-27.
- Peria, M. & Rodriquez, J.S. (2004). Transparency in the education sector: human resource management in Bo-gota (1998-2003). Paris: IIEP-UNESCO.
- Silova, I., Johnson, M., & Heyneman. (2007). Education and the Crisis of Social Cohesion in Agerbaijan and Central Asia Comparative Education Review 51:2 (May 2007):159-180.
- Transparency International. 2005. Stealing the future. Corruption in the Classroom. Berlin: Transparency International.
- Werlin, H.H. (1973). "The consequences of corruption: The Ghanaian Experience" Political Science Quarterly 88(1):71-85.
- World Bank. (2004). Making services work for poor people. World Development Bank 2004. Washington: The World Bank.