

# Philosophical Analysis and Classification of Corruption and Its Types

Latipov Sardor Shavkatovich\*

Internal Affairs Directorate of Navoi region, Head of the Department of Internal Affairs of Zarafshan City, Navoi, Uzbekistan.  
Corresponding Author (Latipov Sardor Shavkatovich) Email: sardorlatipov086@gmail.com\*



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46431/MEJAST.2025.8304>

Copyright © 2025 Latipov Sardor Shavkatovich. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Article Received: 12 May 2025

Article Accepted: 24 July 2025

Article Published: 27 July 2025

## ABSTRACT

This article systematically analyzes the scientific and theoretical foundations, classification criteria, and approaches to the types of corruption. Corruption cases from various sources are examined based on objects, subjects, and levels of authority. The article also highlights corrupt practices in public administration, parliament, enterprises, and electoral processes, as well as the misuse of resources for personal interests. In addition, the article proposes a classification of corruption based on the status of the subjects involved, territorial scope, recurrence rate, and field of activity, with particular attention given to corruption in the private sector and international corruption cases.

**Keywords:** Corruption; Classification; Government; Society; Human Rights; Public Administration; Political Ethics; Transparency; Accountability; Electoral Integrity; Resource Management; Anti-Corruption Strategies.

## 1. Introduction

Currently, different approaches to the typology of corruption are observed based on classification: by objects, subjects, by level of authority. However, it should be noted that at present, there are different approaches to the classification of corruption in the scientific literature. It should be noted that H.A.Akhmetova's statement that "most of the presented classification schemes are one-dimensional in nature, that is, they do not claim to fully reflect the forms and types of corrupt practices, but are limited to one, maximum two signs of the phenomenon under study" are not sufficiently justified, since not every classification can be divided and comprehensive. S. Rouse-Ackerman proposes to classify corruption on two grounds:

- according to the type of bribe-takers – political and administrative, where the former is related to the adoption of laws, the main type of bribe-takers are representatives of the government and heads of state, the second – using state laws;
- by type of bribe market: centralized (there is a relatively small market for corruption proposals) and decentralized corruption (payment for services with bribes happens everywhere) [1].

Classifying corruption on the basis of separate acts, S. Rottenberg identified three types of corruption. The first type of corruption means that there are circumstances in which the payment of corruption is receivable for such a service, which must be made without the existence of it. The latter, on the contrary, involves taking a fee for not doing something that requires compliance with rules and norms. The third type of corruption occurs when the payment of a particular act involves a direct violation of the laws [2].

J. Scott noted two types of corruption:

- organic, it is a system in which the favor of representatives of power is determined by kinship or friendly relations;

➤ a market in which power, privileges, privileges are taken by those who can offer the highest payment to the official [3].

Another researcher of corruption processes proposed the following classification of corruption to Lee Muto:

- improper use of state resources, as a rule, aimed at satisfying the personal interests and personal interests of officials;
- the practice of bribery and extortion, which involves the taking of a fee as a commission by a public servant or an employee of a commercial organization [4].

### 1.1. Study Objectives

- 1) to analyze the theoretical foundations of corruption classification;
- 2) to identify and compare various typologies of corruption in academic literature;
- 3) to assess corruption in public administration, parliament, enterprises, and elections;
- 4) to propose a new classification based on subject status, territorial scope, and recurrence;
- 5) to highlight the role of corruption in private and international sectors;
- 6) to provide recommendations for future anti-corruption strategies.

## 2. Literature Review and Methodology

M. Museshe took corruption as the basis for separating the level of coverage, defining it broadly, and classified the phenomenon under study as follows:

- individual corruption that manifests itself in the context of a person's evasion of responsibility, refusal to report to himself and other people. Here, corruption is characterized by a sharp change in the system of values and priorities, an increase in the influence of greed on the individual;
- family corruption, this is a distorted form of the distribution of labor between spouses, violations in the family budget;
- institutional corruption pervasive in all spheres of society;
- national corruption can find its mark in political patronage, large-scale theft of public funds, human rights violations;
- the international level of corruption is characterized by dangerous political fraud, inadequate trade relations, and economic blackmail [5].

Depending on the field of activity, different authors, including S.M. Proyava [6], distinguish types of corruption in the field of public administration, parliamentary corruption, corruption in enterprises, and corruption during elections.

This article employs scientific methods such as synergistic approaches, generalization, dialectical methods, analysis and synthesis, retrospective analysis, and comparative analysis.

### 3. Discussion and Results

Within the framework of this classification, the first type of corruption concerns the ability of a civil servant to dispose of public resources and make decisions based on his own interests, and not on the basis of the interests and needs of the state and society.

Parliamentary corruption is, in fact, various forms of lobbying the interests of certain social, very narrow groups, and consists of passing laws containing norms, which involve assigning a certain privileged position to a particular group.

As mentioned above, since an employee of an organization as well as an official may dispose of resources that do not belong to him, a corrupt attitude expressed by an act or omission that violates the interests of his organization may arise.

In foreign countries, often, the buying of voter votes during an election becomes a separate type of corruption.

The basis for the classification of corruption, proposed by I. Ahmedov [7], is the degree of participation of an official in receiving profits from the organization, in this connection he emphasizes progressive corruption, which includes corruption aimed at increasing profits by entrepreneurs obtained as a result of granting privileges and opportunities by an official, and creating certain obstacles to the implementation of entrepreneurial activities.

This approach to classification, as well as the classification proposed by A. Heidenheimer (the essence of which is presented in the previous chapter), implies that there are functional aspects of assessing corruption processes, as in white or progressive corruption.

In addition, a number of foreign corruption researchers have found that depending on the level of activity of the behavior of corrupt interaction subjects:

- active corruption, active bribery by an interested person to a national or foreign official or extortion of illegal wages by officials in connection with their professional activities;
- passive corruption, understood as passive bribery, that is, illegal remuneration by an official for lawful actions in the service [8].

It is also necessary to distinguish corruption according to the types of socio-economic relations, on the basis of which it is possible to distinguish between Western and Eastern corruption.

In Western corruption, this phenomenon “functions as a kind of market for corruption services, in which the parties temporarily enter into one-time buy-and-sell relations”.

In the case of Eastern corruption, corruption gradually forms a certain system of social relations, which in turn is closely related to other social relations, including kinship, corporate, professional relations, which makes corruption in a particular state a systemic factor.

Secondly, a number of researchers, including Yu. G. Naumov, classified corruption according to the goals of the subjects' activities [9]. Thus, a division into economic and political corruption is proposed.

Under economic corruption Yu.G. Naumov understands corruption aimed at ownership, redistribution, the use of all forms and resources of ownership, access to which is provided by an official position. At the same time, political corruption is understood as corruption in which individuals desire to redistribute power.

At the same time, in our opinion, it does not seem entirely correct to draw such a line of demarcation, since the political goal (power) is in defined terminology and the economic goal is the possibility of disposing of resources.

In our opinion, it is desirable to classify corruption on the following grounds: the status of subjects of corruption relations, the level of subjects, the scope of territorial coverage, the degree of recurrence of corruption relations.

Thus, according to the status of the subjects, corruption can be divided into public and private.

State type of corruption is the commission of acts of corruption within the competence of a state body. Perhaps this type of corruption is the biggest threat because separate groups of people use public power only for personal purposes and interests, not really under the control of society.

Recently, corruption in the private sector has been on the rise, including the concentration of vast resources in the hands of individual organizations.

The head of such an organization, like any other employee with the ability to allocate resources, can make and act contrary to the company's mission and vision, causing him certain damage, the purpose of which is to enrich himself.

It is also recommended to distinguish corruption processes by the scope of territorial coverage, dividing domestic (the situation in which corrupt acts are committed on the territory of one country, regardless of the status of the subject of corruption) and international corruption (actions aimed at corrupting officials of foreign states or joint corrupt activities of citizens and officials of several states).

#### 4. Conclusion

Depending on the degree of repetition of corrupt acts, it is desirable to distinguish between single (or accidental) corruption, which involves single facts of corruption, and systemic corruption, which occurs during periodically repeated corruption interactions, which in one way or another covers all aspects of social life, gradually turning into a socially acceptable phenomenon.

Perhaps in its most general form, corruption can be divided into administrative and business. Administrative corruption is related to the activities of public authorities. It is understood to be a deliberate alteration of the processes of proper execution of the rules and norms that govern a particular area in order to grant benefits to certain actors. At the same time, in our opinion.

#### 5. Future Suggestions

- 1) Conduct comparative studies on corruption classification systems across different legal traditions;
- 2) Develop quantitative tools to measure corruption intensity in both public and private sectors;
- 3) Explore the role of emerging technologies in detecting and preventing corrupt practices;

- 4) Examine the socio-cultural factors influencing the prevalence of corruption in different regions;
- 5) Propose policy frameworks for international cooperation against transnational corruption.

**Declarations****Source of Funding**

This study received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Competing Interests Statement**

The author declares no competing interests related to this work.

**Consent for publication**

The author declares that he/she consented to the publication of this study.

**Authors' contributions**

Author's independent contribution.

**Institutional Review Board Statement**

Not applicable for this study.

**Informed Consent**

Not applicable for this study.

**References**

- [1] Rottenberg, S. (1975). Comment. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 18.
- [2] Musheshe, N. (1994). NGO and mobilization against corruption. In *Africa Leadership Forum, Corruption, democracy and human rights in East and Central Africa*, Pages 133–134, Entebbe, Republic of Uganda: Ibadan.
- [3] Scott, J.C. (1972). *Comparative political corruption*. New York, Pages 88.
- [4] Proyava, S.M. (2008). *Economization of corruption. Counteraction mechanism: Monograph*, Pages 32–33.
- [5] Akhmedov, I. (2003). *Corruption lawlessness. Monitor*.
- [6] Beken, T.V. (2002). A European view on the Russian draft federal law 'On the fundamentals of anti-corruption policy'. *State and Law*, (6): 118.
- [7] Naumov, Y.G. (2007). *Corruption and society: Theoretical, economic and applied research. Monograph*.
- [8] Sobirovich, T. (2025). New Uzbekistan and political reform: The role of national strategies in strengthening governance. *Indonesian Journal of Public Administration Review*, 2(2): 12–12.
- [9] Sobirovich, T.B. (2024). Socio-Philosophical Analysis of Society's Ideosphere. *Indonesian Journal of Social Development*, 2(1).