Corrupt problems in the Thai education system

Name Surname: Yuvares Ludpa
Office and Institution: Lecturer, Faculty of Political Science and Public Administration Rajabhat Maha Sarakham University
E-mail: yuvares_lp@hotmail.com

Abstract

Currently, Thailand meets many challenges and problems from several factors and changing environments such as globalization, devolution the new technologies, economies, society, politics, and the competition. They are likely to result in fraud-prone which relate to value and corrupt behavior. Corruption is a cause's loss in developing countries in many aspects. These problems result from several factors, including politics, administration of school services, education financing, the budget allocation process, budget management, the usage of education resources, examinations and accreditation, and teacher management and classroom conduct. Educations are similarly affecting by corruption because education is the future direction of social work in Thailand as well as competition between students is quite high. Therefore, Thailand should inculcate ethics and morals for the whole society, including parents, students and educational personnel, in order for them to understand and recognize the impact of corruption in education. In order to improve the quality of education and society, they should be against corruption. Therefore, the researcher interest studies on cause and solving solution corruption in Thai Education System in order to approach solving the corruption in Thai Education System.

Keywords: Corruption, Thai education system, Thai societies, corrupt behavior.

66 ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATIONS INSTITUTIONS OF THAILAND
UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF HER ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCESS MAHA CHAKRI SIRINDHORN

p66-76 Yuvares Ludpa.indd   66   9/8/2559 BE   12:32

Introduction

Academic corruption does not only happen in Thailand; it is happening in other countries as well, which can be observed in the last ten years. For example, a case in Brazil found distortions in resources, they have converted the cost of education (Gordon et al., 2005). A case in Indonesia found ghost teachers not going to work, but with a list of salaries (Baines, 2005). A case in the Philippines found the production and distribution of textbooks, and a case in Haiti found officials using public property for their business (Hallak & Poisson, 2007). As noted above, this review presents the fact that corruption in education can be seen. Corruption at the core of education is not a new thing.

Thailand has experienced corruption in education several times. As a matter of fact, fraud and corruption are the norm at all levels of society, and incompetency is the sum of the failure (Bunnag, 2007). For example, cheating was detected in a police examination (Panyawan 2010), an army entrance examination, and the three grades of Dharma studies exam and in a teacher examination (Visalo 2008). As noted above, these are obvious incidents of academic dishonesty in Thailand, suggesting in turn a total failure of the system, which is caused by the negligence of the education system of Thailand, including academic dishonesty to obtain an academic position (Young, 2013).

This report studies the characteristics of society in Thailand more deeply in order to review the reasons leading to the corruption in education. The goal of the literature review is to review the factors or reasons related to the moral development of students in Thailand in the relation to the cultural environment of their operations by exploring attitudes about prejudice in the culture. Then it compares academic dishonesty in local universities with other parts of the world. Finally, the literature review concludes with a discussion of the information obtained and conclusions about the potential level of corruption. The researcher sincerely hopes that the study of the factors or causes that lead to corruption in education will be a guide to those who are interested in solving the problem of corruption in education further.

Corruption

The definition of corruption may be divided into two varieties: (1) a global perspective, and (2) perceptions of the meaning in Thailand. First, in the universal meaning, corruption is an official in the public sector doing something for their own benefit (Klitgaard, Abaroa & Parris, 2001). Corruption continues to cause havoc in both the developed and developing countries around the world (Klitgaard, 1998). The common definition of corruption is that it is the fault of the government for their trying to benefit from any private person or entity. USAID describes a corrupt model of government as is involving corruption, nepotism, communication between the public and private sectors by bribery, and extortion. The influence of corruption can usually be seen in the offices of the political and bureaucratic sectors (USAID, 1999)

In 2002, many countries there were political problems, so their consideration was to avoid the problem of corruption when the fight against corruption began (USAID, 2004). Some governments experience a particular form of corruption such as nepotism (USAID, 2004). Corruption is an opportunity for fraud, bribery and political patronage, corruption in procurement and collusion in

selecting a contractor by using criteria other than the lowest bid price. In addition, it also has bribe prevent unlawful forced to liability under the rules and regulations including theft or misappropriation of public property. Moreover, people can be promoted to a position by means of nepotism, which is a form of corrupt governance and a corrupt career path (Asian Development Bank, 2000). On the one hand, the main perceptions of the meaning of corruption in Thailand are called "Cho raj Bung luang". The meaning of these words is "corruption"; it is one form of corruption practice by an employee, who, collects misappropriates funds (Buosonte, 2003).

Corruption in education

Corruption in education is a system for personal gain which affects the quality of public goods and services, including the quality of education in different parts of the education system (Hallak & Poisson, 2002). According to Hallak and Poisson (2002), it can be separated into three components. First, there is the use of public office for personal gain. Second, there is a scope of behavior that is consistently observed to be a fault in the system and mainly due to the attitude of the people in that these behaviors are linked to the impact caused by their behavior such as the reduction of resources and quality of life. Third, there is a reduction in well-being as well as unfair distribution.

Regarding the above, corruption in education is related to private gain, the behavior of officials and people who are connected to the education systems, and unfair resource distribution. Those are the main causes of corruption in education. Therefore, education systems should fight against

and prevent corruption based on regulation enforcement, moral practices for official s' minds and fair resource distributions principles. In addition, the public sector should provide a budget for people for their quality of life in a way that is sufficient to provide public goods, safety and well-being.

There is also a concept of corruption that has five different forms (Hallak & Poisson, 2007). First, embezzlement is the use of state resources by the government for their own benefit. Second, bribery is to pay for the return of a fraud to obtain benefits, or economic crime involving deceit. Third, fraud is a form of corruption such as a ghost teacher, who does not work but gets a salary. Fourth, extortion is the use of intimidation, violence or the threat to use force to one's advantage to acquire money or property such as the case of parents who have to pay a fee if they want their kids to go to a school. There are many examples of bias in education, including the recruitment of nepotism as well as systemic patronage. Finally, favoritism is a mechanism of power abuse such as nepotism or when the state authorizes power according to the importance of their family members (Amundsen, 2000).

As noted above, the corruption in education includes embezzlement, bribery, fraud, extortion and favoritism in the education system. There is corruption in education methods which is related to officials and people's practices. For example, parents hope for a better education for their children because it is especially important in the future. Poverty drives young people to obtain the knowledge and skills to power the economic growth of the country and to participate in society. Education is the cornerstone of the economic and

social development of the country. In fact, the quality of education systems is poor, and there exists unequal access to education (Bratton, 2005). In the case of Africa's education systems, it was found that more than 50 percent receive basic education in overcrowded classrooms, with teacher shortages, a lack of textbooks and support and higher fees than would be acceptable (Bratton, 2005).

Regarding access to higher education levels, the main factors many countries the financial status of parents as well as social status rather than those who have the talent and make the effort. This problem is likely to be one of the main reasons behind corruption. The corruption problem over the purpose of education means that education is not based on the merit system and that there is money involved. The education system has been corrupted; students do not learn the skills and knowledge that are meaningful to the economy and social development of the country. Instead, they learn to know the means and value of corruption since childhood, and they accept it as the norm for them and society (Transparency International, 2007).

In addition, there is also the theme of corruption in the education sector, which is also divided into five forms of malpractice that can be considered as the damage (Hallak & Poisson, 2007) as follows. First, there is corruption in procurement such as illegal and misused purchasing. Second, there is corruption in an institution such as when they keep fee than public authority. Third, there is bribery in order to get the job done in difficult circumstances. Fourth, there is a cultural difference of individuals such as giving a gift to the teacher. Finally, there is an abuse of authority over financial

management such as funds provided that leading to corruption (Chapman, 2002).

As noted above, the public education system in most countries is often misused even when the federal government is decentralized. However, the state often has a monopoly on control of the key systems, on the budget, a the teacher payroll and budget oversight. A monopoly is a cause of various forms of corruption in education in that there are three levels. First, political interference financial and human resources; it consumes only 20 to 30 percent of the national budget. It is caused by several forms of corruptions in the national budget and multiple channels for various forms of corruption. At election time, politicians may use their power for teachers to campaign for them in the classroom. In addition, the influence of politics also may be used to determine the location and type of school to be built (Chua, 1999).

Second, at the administration level there is corruption in different levels of management. For example, corruption between a local school and a district means that the auditors who work in a district organization may request bribes from the local school in order to meet the educational targets and pass the report to the Ministry of Education. Corruption between an individual and an organization including teachers and others related in the school system means that they cooperate to engage in corruptions for their own gain and financial benefit, such as when equipment and educational materials distributed for free to help the school are sold instead. Furthermore, schools and universities may enforce the levying of a fee that is not allowed according to government policy. Finally, school level corruption means personal behavior that concerns the

education systems in schools, such as when teachers may not teach according to the curriculum and extort money from students, including the sexual exploitation for students, which is a common form of corruption in many countries (Chua, 1999).

A form of corruption in education finance is the misallocation of government expenditure. In 1997, the overall level of corruption in the education system and consequent loss of public resources was low. On the other hand, the distribution of financial powers to the local level had increased and the risks of fraud at the local level also increased. In particular, there was no monitoring and capacity building measures were inadequate. In addition, the staff and executives who were involved in the education and financial system had opportunities for fraud and corruption (Mauro, 1997).

Allocation in high corruption countries has little investment in the public service (Berlin, 2005). In particular, rural areas may have been allocated funding as an opportunity for personal gain such as when a school buys a book and provides school meals, when officials often look for bribe and opportunities for nepotism. Also, the allotment of funds to schools may be using false information. For example, the numbers of students enrolled may be higher than actual. On the one hand allocation is risk on foreign donors, when they transfer money directly to the school. They are not through government agencies or civil society organizations (CSOs) (Berlin, 2005).

The budgets may be distributed to schools and universities, but they may have been embezzled by officials that are personal benefits. The auction process blocking potential lead to higher prices as a survey of the World Bank found that between 10 to 87 percent of spending is not wages education. In some cases, school has received the resources or the funds, but they may not be used. The purpose may be to sell their textbooks instead of providing them for free. Spending may be made by school officials using fake receipts and the price was exaggerated. The result may be a textbook which is of insufficient quality as well as infrastructure not being built, and learning materials may not be delivered (Hallak & Poisson, 2007).

Patterns in the allocation of capital and resources may be, agreed with the schools and universities as a way to reduce the power over budget decisions. This may result in greater equality in education, and transfer of cash directly to the school can also limit the opportunity for corruption. However, enforcement of financial rules and regulations needs to be available and effective as well as required skills and independence in the audit. Stakeholders at the local level, including the parents, teachers and students, need to be able to participate in policy and decision making in the quality of teaching materials. In addition, they have been able to engage the community through the school board to control budget effectively and reduce- corruption (Chaudhury, et al 2006).

They are opening of tenders and set up evaluation criteria that are clearly needed in the education system of procurement. It helps ensure that students receive the best products and services. In particular, public access to procurement auctions can also help reduce corruption (Transparency International, 2007). Moreover, at the higher education level, technologies and competition among students have led to opportunities for academic fraud and

corruption. The buying and selling of grades and diplomas occur frequently, especially in Southeast Europe and the former Soviet Union (Hallak & Poisson, 2005). For example, a bribe for attending the University has been valued at around 30 million rubles (Gazeta, 2005). Education officials perpetuate academic fraud as they are frequently bribed by students to get good grades. Special private teaching sales documented for examination, these forms of corruptions occur frequently in China (Rumyantseva, 2005)

Corruption in institutions in teaching and training has increased though often students have to be in the regulatory framework of the state. But through these channels students find it easy to benefit from bribery such as fraud in the certification. In addition, students receive a license in professional standards coupled with guaranteed results in being corrupt. Therefore, clear and transparent evaluation criteria and rules are needed in both the examination of the accreditation process for the students and the institution. Teaching can reduce the chances of corruption and fraud, as well as appropriate measures to monitor the issue and safe storage of documents from public examinations. It is also important to establish an independent committee in order to receive accreditation without interference from the outside. In addition, there must be transparent standards as set out by UNESCO and the European Council for the evaluation (UNESCO-CEPES & Council of Europe, 2007).

Finally, regarding teachers and management practices in the classroom, although teachers play an important role in the study and expect to receive high standard but corruption in the management of teachers may occur in the payroll system. For example, there may be ghost teachers with the name specified in the payroll but who in fact do not teach. Ghost teachers may be the result of poor management of the administrative record or a deliberate conspiracy of teachers and administrators to keep the salaries of teachers who died, retired or are not authorized (Patrinos & Kagia, 2007).

Special education in private school has increased in many parts of the world. It will become driven to corruption while France, Australia and Singapore ban teachers from receiving money from teaching. However, their legacy is a common practice in Bangladesh, Cambodia and other countries. Special education evolved into a form of corruption where teachers teach only half of the course during office hours and ask students to pay to learn in special education classes. It also may affect the lower grades for students who do not take special education classes. Teachers would be unaccepted the low salaries in many countries and the work environment may be undesirable, which may lead to contempt for teachers. These dimension need to be resolved. On the one hand, the policy changes in salaries should come together with measures provided to raise the social status of teachers (Bray, 2003).

A survey about corruption and exploitation in 2012 found that corruption and seeking political gain was the biggest issue for the year 2012. On the one hand, the field of study that is most worrying is the parents who use different methods of corruption such as bribery, extortion, or any way to ensure their child's success in admission to educational institutions. As a matter of fact, in Thailand, corruption is not a serious matter ("Poll," 2012). In almost every area of Thailand, both in

the public and private sector, there exists the corruption problem, such as in 2012, an investigation found that Royal Thai Police Academy charged nearly $ 10,000 for cadets to get documents for exams to assure them that they will pass examinations (Jirakittikul, 2013). Corruption is a problem that has a long history and is deeply rooted in the values and culture of Thailand (Warsta, 2004). The Department of Special Investigation (DSI) found cheating occurred in the assistant teacher examination in four provinces, namely Khon Kaen, Udon Thani, Nakhon Rachasima and Yasothon. As for the corruption method, test takers cheated on the test by using technology devices and cooperating with personnel of the Ministry of Education, which means the test results needed to be voided (Jirakittikul, 2013).

Education is a basic human right and important key driver of human development and economic systems (Transparency International, 2007). It strengthens society in terms of the life styles. Corruption in education affects the classroom environment, leading to a crowded classroom, and books and materials are supplied for free, but schools instead sell them. Schools and universities enforce fees higher than permitted, grades or study can be purchased, and teachers force students to pay tuition outside the classroom. The study in many countries showed that corruption through the education system leads to social acceptance (Transparency International, 2007). As noted above, transparency and access to information should control and prevents corruption in the financing of education. There are no stronger deterrents to corruption than notice and public participation in the budget statement, as well as education programs. It is likely that public pressure

can achieve respect for policies and regulations (Patrinos & Kagia 2007).

Corrupt behavior in Thai society

Currently, Thailand is in a period of globalization, but the essence of the culture and traditions still remain the same. The new generation has been trained by those who still preserve the values of ancient Thai society (Noisuwan, 2005). Merit-based professional relationships developed in western society, but Thailand has retained a spoil system in the form of a patron-client relationship. However, such a relationship may be not unlike traditional practices, and the controversy about corruption is how to distinguish gifts from bribes (Sangsit & Pasuk 1996).

In 1932, the absolute monarchy was abolished, and Thailand experienced the administration and management of a democracy (Sangsit & Pasuk, 1996). At the same time, the government established a campus in Thailand aimed at providing opportunities for people to get an education. Equality of civil servants was also opened up to everyone. It was not just limited to the upper class, and a formal evaluation system of promotion was made official (Chantwit, 1997). In fact, Thailand is still a conservative patronage system seen with a nominating State, with enterprises with high salaries, annual bonuses and other benefits. However, the principle of the rule is not written.

If someone is getting a position as a benefactor or an influential worker in traditional conditions they will be called: "dek sen" (referring to a character that has a line) or "dek fak" (a man who can get assignments) (Noisuwan, 2005). The existence of nepotism and favoritism of certain clients of the patron in Thailand can be divided into several

levels depending on how influence is exerted. The patron is "sen yai" (the patron); he or she is bigger than "sen lek" (the client). The word sign for a patron does not mean the connection but the power or influence (Nithi, 1999). Formerly, patrons used their power for the benefit of their followers (Sangsit & Pasuk, 1996).

Corruption damages governance; it has a significant negative impact on the growth of the economy and on society, and the corruption increases. The challenges in the governance of the country are to build confidence powerful and executive government. But, the country is faced with serious difficulties. The daunting challenges are differences of culture, the dominance hierarchy and vote-buying in rural areas. Several observers say that Thailand has some of the characteristics of a culture that makes it difficult to get rid of corruption. Homage to regulation is strong, as is adherence to hierarchy and authority in general and the concept of "kreng jai", which is the expectance of belief in and respect for a position (Khampha, 2000).

Pasuk and Sungsidh (1999) conducted a study on the attitudes of Thai people towards corruption. They found many people still have to pay fees to authorities and give them gifts and items not considered a form of corruption. As well as many other things, which they regarded as of little or no damage, they found that corruption is like taking a pencil from a work office back home. However, people still want to have more than fraud and corruption (Phongpaichit & Piriyarangsan, 1999).

Elimination of corruption in the country should come from the grassroots with a basic knowledge of the people and the country by way of good governance and the punishment of corruption. Government should start from childhood, and all levels of education should be educated to good governance including transparency and corruption involved. In particular, Education sector should be required to raise the issue of fighting corruption in the courses of instruction at all levels. However, solely the commitment of government and legislation is not strong enough to fight corruption because they need the support of the people in order to reject the corruption and greed of officials (Khampha, 2000).

Nepotism still exists in Thailand. However, one of the traditions of Thai people that may have led to corruption at the present time is the souvenir system. Officials are officially assigned to serve their customers and formally receive a salary. However, any kind of service requires a kind of souvenir. For example, farmers and businessmen still believe that money should be given to corrupt officials, but it is not a symbol of compassion (Noisuwan, 2005). These examples are but the influence of traditional practices that affect Thai society, as mentioned above. Although there have been many changes in Thailand's society, people still use the old way of life. Also, some people are trying to adjust to a new social structure to comply with the changes that occur. However, many people find that certain patterns of behavior that Thailand has experienced of corruption in the form of patronage for a long time, but it may be difficult to change or express ideas about the history of the extent of corruption in Thailand (Phongpaichit & Piriyarangsan, 1999).

The anti-corruption organization of Thailand has declared corruption in the country is severe (Saiyasombut, 2013). Corrup Thai people lack an awareness of the importance of taking bribes,

it is necessary to fix the problem, and looks like it does not want to fix the problem in a serious way. The lack of awareness to combat corruption in turn is caused by a failed education system. Socials should inculcate integrity and responsibility in the minds of students at a young age.

Some business lobbying will be made concessions from the large projects. Experience failure and lack of awareness may be useless if the business has not been taught about the dangers of selfishness. If the country's education system is a failure, cannot expect good results, the quality of education is reflected in the quality of politicians, police, judges and businessmen (Yoon, 2013).

People is not strong enough to combat corruption, but all everyone should struggle to accept the oversight of good governance, and the fight against corruption must be instilled in every Thai child (Saiyasombut, 2013). Therefore, scholars and non- profit groups offer a quality education by following the below guidelines (Yoon, 2013). First, education needs to be audited so that it is neutral and independent of political influence. Second, cooperation needs to be promoted between stakeholders, such as the private sector, NGOs, parents, community and society in general, who can influence changes at both the micro and macro levels of the education system as well as deal with the problems of the education system. Third, a way of working needs to be created that is consistent with the strategy of education reform. Fourth, concentrat to all the problems needs to be focused on in all of its aspects, such as the production of qualified teachers. Fifth, a new framework is required to create innovative and professional teaching. Finally, a review of the

mechanisms to select the leaders of teachers is required so that they have the power and ability to improve administration (Yoon, 2013).

Conclusion

Currently, the education system of Thailand faces many obstacles, such as the problem of preparing and developing Thai people's skills for the ASEAN Economic Community. On the one hand, they must change Thai education system to meet universal standards, so that the education system of Thailand complies with the best standards of the ASEAN community. Unfortunately, there are still problems. The major problem must be solved in order to reduce the negative impact on the quality of education and on student s' learning skills. These problems result from several factors, including cultural in their society, politics, administration of school services, education financing, the budget allocation process, budget management, the usage of education resources, examinations and accreditation, and teacher management and classroom conduct.

Recommendation

Considering all the major factors in corruption presented above, if all the stakeholders or the people who are involved in the education system collaborate to solve the problems and drive forward the quality of education, the corruption problems might be alleviated and discontinued. Such impacts affect Thailand entirely, including the values and culture. Parents and students who believe that education is a fraud lead to the problem of corruption in education. Therefore, Thailand should inculcate ethics and morals for the whole society, including parents,

students and educational personnel, in order to understand and recognize the impact of corruption in education. In order to improve the quality of education and society, they should be against corruption. If there is the corruption-free society in education, the result is a livable society; it will be a cause of social equality and reduces the gap between the rich and the poor.

References

Asian Development Bank. (2000). **Description and answers to frequently asked questions.** : Manila: ADB.

Amundsen, I. (2000). Corruption. **Definition and concepts.** Bergen, Norway: Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation and Chr. Michelsen Institute Development Studies and Huma Rights.

Baines, S. (2005). **Towards more transparent financial management: Scholarships and grants in Indonesia (Ethics and corruption in education series).** Paris: IIEP-UNESCO.

Berlin, G. (2005). **TI workshop on 'Corruption in education'.** : Washington, DC: World Bank.

Bratton, M. (2005). **Are you being served? Popular s atisfaction with health and education services in Africa.** [Afrobarometer Working Paper no. 65. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Bray, M. (ed.) (1999). **The shadow education system: Private tutoring and its implications in nine post-socialist countries.** .New York, NY: Open Society Institute.

Bray, M. (2003). **Adverse effects of private supplementary tutoring: Dimensions, implications and government responses.** Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.

Bunnag, S. (2007, May 25). **Cheating at university on the rise.** The Bangkok Post.

Buosonte, R. (2003). **Corruption in educational management of Thailand: A case study in Lower Northern Region.** Naresuan University Journal, 11(2), 75-92.

Chapman, D. (2002). **Corruption and the education sector.** Sectoral Perspectives on Corruption. Washington, D.C.: USAID.

Chanwit, K. (1997). **Arayatham Thai puenthan tang prawattisa, (Thai civilization - the historical background).** Bangkok: Ton Or Grammy Publishing.

Chua, Y.T. (1999). **Robbed: An iInvestigation of corruption in Philippine education.** Manila: Philippine enter for Investigative Journalism.

Chaudhury, N., Hammer, J., Kremer, M., Muralidharan, K., and Rogers, F.H. (2006). **Missing in action: Teacher and health worker absence in developing countries.** Journal of Economic Perspectives, 20, (1), 91-116.

Gordon, Nora, and Emiliana Vegas. 2005. **"Educational Finance, Equalization, Spending, Teacher Quality, and Student Outcomes: the Case of Brazil's FUNDEF."** In Incentives to Improve Teaching: Lessons from Latin America, edited by Emiliana Vegas. Washington D.C.: The World Bank

Hallak, J.m & Poisson, M. (2005). **Academic fraud and quality assurance: facing the challenge of internationalization of higher education.** Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.

Hallak, J., & Poisson, M. (2007). **Corrupt schools, corrupt universities: What can be done?.** Paris: UNESCO.

Jirakittikul, S. (2013). **The Department of Special Investigation. NNT Bangkok.** Retrieved (2014, May 23) from http://thainews.prd.go.th.

Khampha, P. (2000). **Patronage is behind continued corruption in Thailand.** Bangkok: O.S. Printing House. Klitgaard, R. (1998). Controlling corruption. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Klitgaard, R., MacLean-Abaroa, R., & Parris, H. L. (2001). **Corrupt cities: A practical guide to cure and prevention.** Washington, DC: World Bank Institute.

Mauro, P. (1997). **The effects of corruption on growth, investment, and government expenditure: A cross-country analysis.** IMF Working Paper, 96, 98.

Nithi, E. (1999, September 6). **sen (line).** Matichon, p.19.

Noisuwan, M. (2005). **Culture corruption in Thai society: The case of Thai journalists.** Thammasat review journal, 10, 170.

Patrinos, H. & Kagia, R. (2007) **Maximising the performance of education systems.** The case of teacher absenteeism: World Bank, Washington.

Poll. (2012). **Poll: Corruption a major problem in Bangkok. Bangkok post, Retrieved 2014,** June 22 from http://www.bangkokpost.com/news/local/2734   25/poll-coruption-is-a-biggest-problems.

Pasuk, P & Sangsit, P (1994). **Corruption & democracy in Thailand.** Bangkok: O.S. Printing House.

Punyawan, W. (2010). **Widespread cheating uncovered in Royal Thai police exam.** Pattaya Daily News. Retrieved (2011, June 22) from http://www.pattayadailynews.com/en/2010/09/24.

Rumyantseva, N. (2005). **Taxonomy of corruption in higher education.** Peabody Journal of Education, 80, .1.

Saiyasombut, S. (2013). **Anti-corruption-spirit-needed.** Bangkok post. Retrieved (2014, June 25) from http://www.bangkokpost.com/breakingnews/339502/anti-corruption-spirit-needed

TI.(2001). **Minimum standards on public contracting.** TI. Retrieved 2011, June 22 from www.transparency.org/global_priorities/public_contracting/

TI. (2007). **Corruption in the education sector.** Berlin: Germany.

UNESCO-CEPES and Council of Europe. (2007). **Revised Code of Good Practice in the provision of trans-border education.** UNESCO. Retrieved 2014, May 29 from www.aic.lv/ace/ace_disk/Recognition /leg_aca/Code_TE_rev2007.pdf.

USAID. (1999). **Fighting Corruption.** Woshington, D.C.: USAID.

USAID. (2004). **Practice anti-corruption measure for prosecutors and investigators.** Woshington, D.C.: USAID.

Warsta, M. (2004). **Corruption in Thailand.** Zurich: Asia Swiss Federal Institute of Technology.

Yoon, S. (2013). **Low education standards high corruption level, The Nation.** Retrieved 2014, June 20 from http://www. Low education standards = HIGH CORRUPTION LEVELS - The Nation.htm.

Young, D. (2013). **Perspective on cheating at a Thai university.** Language Testing in Asia, 3, 6.