

# Analysis and Prevention Mechanism of Criminal Risks under Multi-subject Participation in the Education Industry

Mengxi Wei

Asia Pacific University of Technology & Innovation (APU), Malaysia 57000

**Abstract:** With the continuous diversification and innovation of educational operation modes, multiple stakeholders including schools, teachers, students, parents, and educational enterprises have deeply participated in various educational activities, bringing about increasingly prominent and diversified criminal risks. Based on the Risk Society Theory, Criminal Compliance Theory, and Multi-center Governance Theory, this study adopts a combination of empirical statistical data and typical judicial cases to systematically investigate the current status of multi-subject participation in the modern education industry. It systematically identifies major criminal risk categories in the educational field, including education and training fraud, citizen personal information infringement, illegal enrollment, and duty-related crimes, and further explores the internal logical relationship between multi-subject behavioral characteristics and criminal risk generation. The results reveal that lagging legal norms, decentralized subject responsibilities, insufficient cross-departmental regulatory coordination, and inadequate technical defense capabilities are the core driving factors of criminal risks in the education industry. The current industrial risk prevention system suffers from incomplete legal coverage, inefficient organizational collaboration, and backward technical prevention and control capabilities. In response to the above deficiencies, this study proposes optimized governance strategies from four dimensions: standardized criminal compliance system construction, collaborative cross-departmental supervision, intelligent technology empowerment, and universal legal education. The research aims to construct a multi-subject linkage prevention and control system for educational criminal risks, so as to promote the standardized, legalized, and high-quality development of the modern education industry.

**Keywords:** Education Industry; Multi-subject Participation; Criminal Risk; Risk Prevention; Collaborative Governance

**DOI:**10.12417/3029-2328.26.05.026

## 1. Introduction

With the in-depth advancement of industry-education integration and educational informatization 2.0, the participation structure of the education industry has become increasingly complex. Diversified operational modes such as in-depth school-enterprise cooperation, off-campus social training, and intelligent campus digital management have greatly improved educational efficiency, while also triggering a continuous surge in various criminal risks, including commercial bribery, personal information leakage, contractual fraud, and duty-related violations. The overlapping and cross-application of multiple laws such as the Education Law of the People's Republic of China and the Minor Protection Law of the People's Republic of China have blurred the legal judgment boundary of multi-subject behaviors, further increasing the difficulty of standardized risk identification and precise supervision.

Existing academic studies mostly focus on single-subject or single-type educational risks, lacking systematic exploration of risk transmission mechanisms, criminal imputation logic, and collaborative prevention paths under multi-subject interactive scenarios. Against the background of educational modernization and safe campus governance, this study deconstructs the generation and diffusion mechanism of criminal risks in multi-subject educational scenarios, and defines the collaborative governance path for risk prevention and control. Focusing on three typical high-risk scenarios — qualification fraud in school-enterprise cooperation, data abuse in online education platforms, and illegal financing of private educational institutions — this research provides theoretical support and practical references for hierarchical early warning and comprehensive governance of criminal risks in the education field.

## **2.Literature Review and Theoretical Basis**

Foreign research on educational risk governance is based on the Risk Society Theory, regarding modern educational institutions as complex compound risk carriers affected by both internal management and external social factors. Mature research paradigms including educational standardized compliance management and multi-center collaborative governance have been formed. Scholars abroad emphasize joint risk prevention and control by the government, social organizations, and third-party institutions, and have formed complete institutional norms and practical systems such as third-party independent risk detection mechanisms.

Domestic research mainly focuses on three dimensions: the revision and improvement of educational legal norms, the construction of standardized campus risk management systems, and the research and development of intelligent dynamic early warning platforms. Current studies have achieved fruitful results in the prevention of occupational embezzlement in educational projects, enterprise criminal compliance construction, and risk monitoring of private colleges and universities.

This study constructs a three-dimensional analytical framework based on four core theories. First, the Risk Society Theory explains the formation mechanism of institutional and structural risks in the operation of modern educational systems. Second, the Legal Intersubjectivity Theory clarifies the regulatory vacuum caused by intertwined interest relationships and scattered responsibility boundaries among multiple educational subjects. Third, the Criminal Compliance Theory serves as the core theoretical tool for standardized risk governance of educational organizations. Fourth, the Multi-center Governance Theory provides practical guidance for building a multi-subject joint prevention and control mechanism.

## **3.Current Situation of Multi-subject Participation in the Education Industry**

The modern education industry has formed a typical networked governance pattern with multi-subject joint participation, dominated by school-enterprise cooperative operation, off-campus social training, and online home-school interactive management. Statistical data shows that the number of school-enterprise cooperation projects approved by the Ministry of Education reached approximately 15,000 in 2021, and increased sharply to 115,000 in 2025, realizing a substantial expansion of industry-education integration scale. In terms of social off-campus training, the number of licensed off-campus educational institutions nationwide was 142,000 in 2024, with a market scale of 170 billion yuan. By 2025, the number of standardized institutions dropped to 124,000, while the overall market scale further rose to 186.23 billion yuan, reflecting the structural adjustment and iterative upgrading of the off-campus education industry.

The rapid expansion of multi-subject participation has been accompanied by a high incidence of educational criminal cases. From 2023 to 2025, the annual growth rate of education and training fraud cases exceeded 35%, with a year-on-year growth of 42% in 2025 and a total involved amount of over 1.2 billion yuan. In the context of digital transformation, home-school communication and student data management have been fully online, and frequent cross-platform data circulation has induced prominent hidden dangers. Relevant empirical data shows that 63% of campus safety and information security incidents are caused by ambiguous responsibility division among multiple subjects. In addition, lagging legal and institutional norms, fragile trust mechanisms between cooperative subjects, and missing ethical constraint systems for artificial intelligence educational applications have further amplified the systemic criminal risks of the education industry.

## **4.Main Types of Criminal Risks and Identification Mechanisms**

Based on judicial statistical data and industry risk monitoring results, the criminal risks of the modern education industry are mainly categorized into three major types, with corresponding targeted identification mechanisms:

First, educational and financial fraud risks, which constitute the dominant criminal risk in the industry. In 2025, fraud cases accounted for 75% of all criminal cases in the education sector. Fraudsters mainly adopt deceptive tactics

such as "guaranteed certification and examination passing", "package employment", and "exempted examination for academic upgrading". Such crimes present obvious group-based, network-based, and institutionalized operation characteristics, with the maximum involved amount of a single case reaching 22 million yuan. Relying on multi-source heterogeneous data fusion analysis, dynamic price threshold early warning, and full-process financial audit traceability technology, it can effectively identify suspected illegal behaviors such as fund-raising fraud and contractual fraud in educational services.

Second, personal information infringement risks. In 2025, the data leakage volume of the education and training industry accounted for 17% of the total social data leakage, ranking among the highest-risk industries for personal information security. The maximum number of leaked personal information in a single case exceeded 700,000 pieces, covering student and parent identity information and learning trajectory data. The main risk sources include illegal data resale by internal staff and unauthorized information collection by third-party outsourcing institutions. The industry has constructed a dual-track risk identification system combining technical defense and behavioral monitoring. By applying privacy computing, blockchain permission solidification, and staff abnormal operation monitoring algorithms, the early warning accuracy of information leakage risks can reach 89.3%.

Third, on-campus duty-related crimes and personal injury crimes. Such risks mainly include embezzlement and dereliction of duty by school administrators, as well as minor infringement and intentional injury crimes committed by teachers relying on professional convenience. These risks are mostly derived from institutional management loopholes and unsupervised professional behaviors. Combined with multi-modal monitoring technologies such as video surveillance, Internet of Things sensing, and crowd density analysis, real-time perception, dynamic early warning and rapid disposal of on-campus safety risks can be realized.

## **5. Correlation between Multi-subject Behaviors and Criminal Risks**

Different educational participation subjects have distinct behavioral characteristics and power boundaries, which directly determine the type, frequency and diffusion degree of criminal risks:

**Teachers:** As the core subjects of on-campus education and management, teachers have long-term close contact with minor students and asymmetric power advantages. Individual teachers abuse professional trust and behavioral convenience to commit illegal and criminal acts such as minor infringement and intentional injury, which fully exposes the deficiencies of current teachers' ethics supervision and abnormal behavior early warning mechanisms.

**School administrators:** They control core management authority including student enrollment, campus procurement, and asset allocation. The lack of standardized supervision easily leads to power rent-seeking, embezzlement and other duty-related crimes. Meanwhile, the widespread failure to perform mandatory reporting obligations and daily supervision duties has become an important inducement for campus safety incidents.

**Off-campus training institutions and cooperative enterprises:** Driven by commercial interests, educational enterprises and training institutions often break through the public welfare attribute of education. Illegal behaviors such as false publicity, prepaid fee absconding, and collusive bidding occur frequently, becoming the main subjects involved in educational fraud crimes.

**New criminal gangs:** Professional criminal gangs take advantage of the prepaid operation mode of the education and training industry to carry out contractual fraud. With virtual subject identities and concealed fund transfer paths, they form new-type educational criminal risks, highlighting prominent loopholes in industrial subject qualification examination and fund supervision mechanisms.

In general, information asymmetry among multi-subjects, vague division of rights and responsibilities, and uncontrolled risk transmission are the fundamental reasons for the large-scale diffusion of criminal risks in the education industry.

## **6.Existing Risk Prevention Mechanisms and Deficiencies**

At present, the education industry has initially formed a three-dimensional risk prevention and control system covering legal regulation, organizational management, and technical prevention. In terms of legal norms, basic laws including the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China and Education Law of the People's Republic of China clearly define the boundary of illegal and criminal acts in educational scenarios. In terms of organizational management, high-quality educational institutions have set up special compliance committees to implement full-process supervision on high-risk links such as enrollment and procurement. In terms of technical prevention, the national "Safe Campus" project has realized full coverage of campus intelligent monitoring, and intelligent financial audit systems have effectively curbed the occurrence of fund-related criminal acts.

Nevertheless, the existing prevention system still has prominent structural deficiencies. First, the legal supervision system has blind spots, and there are obvious disputes in the legal application of private education and mixed-ownership vocational education. Second, the cross-subject collaborative governance mechanism is ineffective, with ambiguous rights and responsibilities among families, schools and enterprises, leading to out-of-control supervision of cross-platform data circulation. Third, group and cross-regional school-running modes cause cross-regional diffusion of risks and break the original supervision chain. Fourth, the industry's technical safety standards lag behind the iterative development of artificial intelligence and big data technology, resulting in insufficient response capacity for data ethics and new-type technical risks.

## **7.Analysis of Typical Cases**

This study selects three typical judicial cases in the education industry to deeply analyze the internal causes of criminal risks:

First, the school-enterprise cooperation embezzlement case. In the process of joint construction of training bases by vocational colleges and cooperative enterprises, both parties colluded to inflate equipment procurement prices, misappropriating 1.83 million yuan of special financial funds. This case exposes the deficiencies of school-enterprise cooperation contract review, asset supervision and power restriction mechanisms. The vague property right boundary of cooperative projects leads to the concurrence of multiple criminal liabilities, forming a high-risk area for power rent-seeking and fund embezzlement.

Second, the campus physical punishment injury case. A primary school teacher repeatedly punished students physically and caused minor injuries. The school's middle and senior management failed to conduct investigation and disposal, resulting in the breakdown of the internal governance chain. This case reflects the unclear criminal identification standard of campus physical punishment behaviors, and the failure of the home-school-society collaborative prevention and control mechanism, as well as the serious problem of decentralized risk supervision responsibilities.

Third, the online education platform data leakage case. Outsourced technical staff illegally stole and sold hundreds of thousands of students' personal information. The platform failed to implement network security level protection assessment and daily risk monitoring. This case reveals the new-type criminal risks brought by third-party service subjects in the process of educational digital transformation, as well as the prominent deficiencies in enterprise data governance and technical defense systems.

In summary, scattered multi-subject responsibilities and inadequate hierarchical supervision are the core common causes of various educational criminal risks.

## **8.Optimization Suggestions for Criminal Risk Prevention Mechanisms**

### **8.1 Improve the standardized criminal compliance system**

Referring to the ISO 37301 international compliance management standard, construct a full-process criminal compliance system for the education industry. Revise the unified standard text of school-enterprise cooperation

contracts, add criminal liability restraint clauses and third-party independent supervision clauses. Apply blockchain technology to solidify the whole-process evidence chain of educational data circulation, and build an intelligent early warning platform integrating big data and artificial intelligence to realize real-time identification and early warning of multi-subject abnormal behaviors.

### **8.2 Strengthen cross-departmental collaborative supervision**

Establish a special joint prevention and control center for educational criminal risks to smooth the connection channel between administrative law enforcement and criminal justice. Implement penetrating supervision on private educational institutions, strictly verify capital sources and operation qualifications, and prevent illegal fund-raising and financial fraud risks. For AI educational application scenarios, implement algorithm filing and sandbox supervision mechanisms to standardize the application of intelligent technology in education.

### **8.3 Clarify subject responsibilities and strengthen legal education**

Implement regular legal risk inspection and compliance oath systems for educational practitioners, and carry out scenario-based targeted legal publicity and education. Clarify the risk prevention responsibilities of schools, families and social institutions, improve the campus safety mandatory reporting system, and build a rapid linkage disposal mechanism between schools and public security organs for emergencies.

### **8.4 Make up for technical prevention and control deficiencies**

Unify the national safety access standards for educational mobile applications and digital platforms, strengthen the qualification examination and regular safety assessment of third-party cooperative institutions, and fully implement network security level protection obligations to comprehensively improve the technical defense capability of educational data and campus safety.

## **9. Conclusion and Prospect**

Under the multi-subject collaborative participation mode, the criminal risks of the education industry present complex, transmissible and digital evolutionary characteristics. Vague property right boundaries in school-enterprise cooperation, data abuse in smart campus construction, illegal financing of private educational institutions, and ineffective multi-subject collaborative governance are the main sources of current educational criminal risks. The existing prevention and control system has structural defects such as broken supervision chains and disconnected subject responsibilities, which cannot fully adapt to the risk governance needs of the developing education industry.

Future research and practical governance can be promoted from three dimensions. Theoretically, construct an organizational immune mechanism and closed-loop risk identification system for educational governance to enrich the theoretical system of educational risk prevention. Practically, build a dynamic criminal compliance management system and full-life-cycle risk early warning map, and improve the property right registration and supervision system for industry-education integration projects. Politically, formulate hierarchical response guidelines for educational criminal risks, integrate criminal compliance education into teachers' professional training system, and build a standardized, safe and legalized educational ecological environment, so as to further promote the modernization of educational governance capacity and system.

## **Reference:**

- [1] Zhang Y,Zhu X Y.Logical Framework and Practical Approach of Risk Prevention and Control of"Civil-to-Criminal"Cases from the Perspective of Preventive Justice[J].Journal of Shanxi Politics and Law Institute for Administrators,2025,38(02):83-87.
- [2] Wang L M."Parallel Application of Criminal and Civil Law":The Basic Principle for Resolving Cross Cases of Criminal and Civil Law[J].Chinese Journal of Criminal Law,2024(02):18-33.
- [3] Zhang B.Dual Causality and Binary Criteria:The In-depth Jurisprudence of Handling Principles for Cross Cases



- of Criminal and Civil Law[J].Journal of Southwest Minzu University(Humanities and Social Sciences),2024,45(09): 42-53.
- [4] Chen H.Research on Litigation Issues of Cross Cases of Criminal and Civil Law[D].Supervisor:Tang L.Southwest University of Political Science and Law,2022.
- [5] Wu Y M.Research on Litigation Mode of Cross Cases of Criminal and Civil Law[D].Supervisor:Xiao B S,Liang F.Tiangong University,2025.
- [6] Liu S F.Reflection and Reconstruction of Litigation Mode for Cross Cases of Criminal and Civil Law[D].Supervisor:Wu G H.Guangxi Minzu University,2023.
- [7] Research Group of Huzhou Intermediate People's Court of Zhejiang Province.Research on Prevention Mechanism and Governance Path of"Civil-to-Criminal"Cases[J].People's Judicature,2023(25):112.