

# THE KENYA **BRIBERY** INDEX 2007



TRANSPARENCY  
INTERNATIONAL  
Kenya

## CONTENTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>                                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS .....</b>                      | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>OVERVIEW OF THE FINDINGS .....</b>                    | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Overall Trend .....</b>                               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Corruption Perceptions.....</b>                       | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Corruption Reporting .....</b>                        | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>ORGANISATIONAL RANKINGS.....</b>                      | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Overall Rankings .....</b>                            | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Likelihood of Encountering Bribery.....</b>           | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Impact (Percentage of respondents affected) .....</b> | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Severity.....</b>                                     | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Frequency (Number of bribes paid) .....</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Size of Bribes.....</b>                               | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Cost (Expenditure on bribery) .....</b>               | <b>20</b> |



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the findings of TI-Kenya's sixth national bribery survey. The survey is part of TI-Kenya's effort to inform the fight against corruption with rigorous and objective research and analysis. The survey captures corruption as experienced by ordinary citizens in their interaction with officials of both public and private organisations. Respondents provide information on the organisations where they have encountered bribery during the year, where they paid bribes, how much and for what.

The bribes are categorized into five purposes namely law enforcement (i.e. avoiding consequences of wrong doing and/or harassment by the relevant authority); access to services (e.g. health, school places, water, electricity etc), business (obtaining contracts, expediting payments etc) and employment matters (securing jobs, promotions, transfers, training etc).

The survey was conducted in December 2006 on a random sample of 2,399 respondents in all the eight provinces. On average, each respondent cited 5.6 organisations, which translates to a total of 1,3494 observations. The observations are used to construct six indicators that capture different dimensions of corruption. These are:

- i. **Incidence.** The proportion of an organisation's clients who report encountering bribery situations in their official dealings with an organisation. This provides a measure of the propensity of officials in an organisation to ask for or accept bribes.
- ii. **Prevalence.** The proportion of the survey respondents who are victims of bribery in an organisation (respondents who report paying a bribe or were badly treated or not served for failing to pay a bribe). This provides a measure of the impact of bribery in an organisation on the population.
- iii. **Severity.** The frequency of denial of service if bribe is not paid. This provides a measure of the level of impunity in an organisation.
- iv. **Frequency.** The number of bribes paid per client. This provides a measure of the scale of bribery activity in an organisation.
- v. **Cost.** Average expenditure on bribery per person. This is indicative of the bribery "tax burden".
- vi. **Size.** The average size of bribes paid. This is indicative of the premium that citizens put on a particular service or cost.

An aggregate index is constructed as an unweighted average of the six indicators. The index has a value range from 0 to 100, where the higher the value, the worse the performance. The frequency indicators (i) to (iii) are entered into the aggregate index as raw percentages. For the other three, which are actual values, are scaled by the highest value to obtain a normalized score range of 0 to 100. However, the actual values are reported in this report.

## 2. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The survey interviewed 2,399 respondents in all the eight provinces, 1,302 (53%) of them rural and 1,103 (47%) urban residents respectively. The respondents are evenly distributed between men and women. Over half (54%) of the respondents were young people under thirty years of age, 32 percent were between age 30 and 45, and 14 percent were aged 45 and over.

Just over 60 percent of the respondents had secondary school education or higher. About 30 percent have primary school education and another 10 percent have some post-primary training. One third of the respondents are self-employed, and thirteen percent have formal wage jobs in either private sector, government or community sectors. Over half of the respondents (53%) reported themselves as unemployed, as compared to about 30 percent in 2006 index. This increase may reflect the fact that the survey was conducted in December when school leavers would be reporting themselves as unemployed.

Well over half the sample (62%) reported monthly incomes of Ksh. 10,000 and below, close to 90 percent incomes below Ksh. 25,000 per month. Six percent declined to state their incomes.

**Table 1: Sample Distribution by Socio-Economic Characteristics**

| Age                            | Male | Female | Urban | Rural | Total |
|--------------------------------|------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| 18-24                          | 13.6 | 17.9   | 15.2  | 16.3  | 31.5  |
| 25-29                          | 10.7 | 11.4   | 11.8  | 10.3  | 22.1  |
| 30-34                          | 7.5  | 7.0    | 7.4   | 7.1   | 14.5  |
| 35-40                          | 6.8  | 6.0    | 5.9   | 7.0   | 12.9  |
| 41-44                          | 2.2  | 2.5    | 1.7   | 2.9   | 4.7   |
| 45+                            | 7.8  | 6.5    | 5.2   | 9.0   | 14.3  |
| <b>Education attained</b>      |      |        |       |       |       |
| Primary school only            | 12.6 | 16.4   | 8.8   | 20.2  | 29.0  |
| Post primary training          | 5.3  | 4.9    | 5.2   | 5.0   | 10.2  |
| Secondary school only          | 20.1 | 20.7   | 20.8  | 20.0  | 40.8  |
| Post secondary school training | 8.6  | 7.9    | 9.8   | 6.7   | 16.5  |
| University degree              | 2.0  | 1.4    | 2.6   | 0.7   | 3.4   |
| <b>Employment status</b>       |      |        |       |       |       |
| Unemployed                     | 21.4 | 31.5   | 22.4  | 30.5  | 52.9  |
| Self employed                  | 16.8 | 12.8   | 14.4  | 15.2  | 29.6  |

# THE KENYA BRIBERY INDEX 2007

|  |      |      |      |      |             |
|--|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Employed in family business or farm                          | 2.4  | 2.0  | 2.4  | 1.9  | <b>4.3</b>  |
| Employed in private sector                                   | 4.3  | 2.2  | 4.5  | 2.0  | 6.5         |
| Employed by government, local authority or parastatal        | 2.8  | 2.2  | 2.8  | 2.2  | <b>5.0</b>  |
| Employed in community sector e.g.Church, N.G.O, Co-operative | 0.9  | 0.5  | 0.7  | 0.6  | <b>1.4</b>  |
| Government/Parastatal  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2  | <b>0.4</b>  |
| <b>Income (Ksh.pm)</b>                                       |      |      |      |      |             |
| Less than 4,999  | 16.0 | 18.8 | 11.3 | 23.6 | <b>34.9</b> |
| 5,000-9,999  | 13.8 | 12.9 | 13.2 | 13.5 | 26.7        |
| 10,000-24,9999   | 13.1 | 13.8 | 15.2 | 11.7 | <b>26.9</b> |
| 25,000-49,9999   | 2.0  | 2.1  | 3.0  | 1.1  | <b>4.1</b>  |
| 50,000-99,999  | 0.7  | 0.7  | 1.2  | 0.3  | <b>1.5</b>  |
| Over 100,000   | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  | 0.0  | <b>0.0</b>  |
| Not stated   | 2.9  | 3.0  | 3.3  | 2.6  | <b>6.0</b>  |
| Total  | 48.7 | 51.4 | 47.3 | 52.7 | 100.0       |

**Table 2: Sample Distribution by Province**

| Province      | Number | %     |
|---------------|--------|-------|
| Nairobi       | 422    | 17.6  |
| Central       | 259    | 10.8  |
| Eastern       | 324    | 13.5  |
| Rift Valley   | 474    | 19.8  |
| Nyanza        | 358    | 14.9  |
| Western       | 234    | 9.8   |
| North Eastern | 67     | 2.8   |
| Coast         | 261    | 10.9  |
| Total         | 2399   | 100.0 |

### 3. OVERVIEW OF THE FINDINGS

#### Overall Trend

Overall, the level of corruption as reflected by the experiences of ordinary citizens in the year 2006, remained largely unchanged compared to 2005. The survey respondents encountered bribery in just over half (54%) of their interactions with institutions, both public and private, up from 47 percent in 2005. The average number of bribes paid doubled from 1.2 to 2.5 per person, but the average size of bribe declined from Ksh. 1,700 to Ksh. 1,236. Consequently, the bribery cost burden increased from Ksh. 2,000 to Ksh. 3,000, an increase of 50 percent.

Most organisations that feature prominently in the index registered marked improvement. That these improvements have not translated to a positive trend overall is on account of two factors. The first is emergence of other institutions. The most prominent of these are the Transport Licensing Board and Constituency Development Fund (CDF) offices. The second is a marked increase in bribery relating to employment.

**Table 3: Key Indicators**

|  | 2006  | 2005  | 2004  |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Aggregate Index                        | 19.1  | 19.2  | 14.9  |
| Likelihood of encountering bribery (%) | 54.0  | 47.2  | 34.2  |
| Bribes per person per year             | 2.5   | 1.2   | 0.5   |
| Average size of bribe, Ksh             | 1,236 | 1,703 | 4,958 |
| Average Expenditure, Ksh               | 3,036 | 2,044 | 2,677 |

**Table 4: Analysis of Bribe by Purpose**

|                            | 2006  | 2005 | 2004 |
|----------------------------|-------|------|------|
| <b>No. of Transactions</b> |       |      |      |
| Service                    | 28.5  | 26.4 | 35.9 |
| Regulatory compliance      | 24.3  | 20   | 13.3 |
| Law enforcement            | 36.4  | 46.1 | 41.2 |
| Business                   | 7.2   | 4.3  | 5.4  |
| Employment                 | 3.6   | 3.1  | 4.2  |
| Total                      | 100.0 | 100  | 100  |

| <b>Value, % of total</b>                  |       |       |        |
|---|-------|-------|--------|
| Service                                   | 30.5  | 32.1  | 4.9    |
| Regulatory compliance                     | 21.0  | 11.7  | 3      |
| Law enforcement                           | 24.6  | 38.8  | 88     |
| Business                                  | 2.7   | 8.3   | 2.4    |
| Employment                                | 21.1  | 9.2   | 1.6    |
| Total                                     | 100.0 | 100   | 100    |
| <b>Average bize of bribe, Ksh</b>         |       |       |        |
| Service                                   | 1,320 | 2,068 | 676    |
| Regulatory compliance                     | 1,070 | 996   | 1,127  |
| Law enforcement                           | 836   | 1,431 | 10,588 |
| Business                                  | 472   | 3,243 | 2,189  |
| Employment                                | 7,278 | 5,114 | 1,950  |
| Total                                     | 1,236 | 1,703 | 4,958  |
| <b>Frequency (No. of bribes/person)</b>   |       |       |        |
| Service                                   | 0.70  | 0.31  | 0.19   |
| Regulatory compliance                     | 0.60  | 0.24  | 0.07   |
| Law enforcement                           | 0.89  | 0.54  | 0.22   |
| Business                                  | 0.18  | 0.05  | 0.03   |
| Employment                                | 0.09  | 0.04  | 0.02   |
| Total                                     | 2.46  | 1.18  | 0.54   |
| <b>Cost (Expenditure per person, Ksh)</b> |       |       |        |
| Service                                   | 926   | 641   | 128    |
| Regulatory compliance                     | 638   | 239   | 79     |
| Law enforcement                           | 748   | 773   | 2,329  |
| Business                                  | 83    | 162   | 66     |
| Employment                                | 641   | 205   | 39     |
| Total                                     | 3,036 | 2,006 | 2,662  |

Although law enforcement continues to be the most fertile ground for bribery accounting for 36 percent of the bribes reported, this is a very significant reduction, from 46 percent in 2005. One third of the bribes reported were paid to obtain services (e.g. education, healthcare, utilities), 24 percent to comply with regulations (e.g. obtaining licences), seven percent related to business and 3.6 percent had to do with employment issues such as securing jobs, promotions or other benefits.

As noted above, the premium on employment has continued to rise. The average bribe paid for employment increased sharply from Ksh. 5,100 to Ksh. 7,300, a 42 percent increase. There are at least three factors that are consistent with this trend. First, it is consistent with the continued scarcity of jobs, as more young people enter into the labour force than the jobs being created. Second, it may also reflect increased recruitment activity in the public sector. Third factor is the improvement in the economy, improved incomes translating to willingness and ability to pay more to secure job opportunities.

Conversely, the bribes for business declined sharply from Ksh. 3,000 to Ksh. 472. This is attributable to a decline in the bribery activity reported in state corporations. In previous surveys, state corporations have accounted for the largest proportion of business related bribes. This suggests that the corporate governance and procurement reforms undertaken in that sector are paying off.

Law enforcement bribes and service related bribes also declined significantly, by 42 and 36 percent respectively, while bribes related to regulatory compliance increased marginally. This can be attributed to reforms in the service delivery arena, under the government's Rapid Results Initiative (RRI) which has reduced the "scarcity premium." Examples of this include improved supply of drugs in public healthcare facilities, and improved service delivery by water companies and the "umeme pamoja" electrification programme. As regards law enforcement, the elimination of road licenses in the latter half of the year is a very significant factor.

**Corruption Perceptions**

The public perceived improvement in the institutions that they interacted with. The frequency of positive perceptions increased from 36 percent of encounters, up from 26 percent in 2005, while the frequency of negative perceptions declined marginally from 19 percent to 17.6 percent. The frequency of no change perception declined from 55 to 45 percent. In effect, the positive perceptions replaced perceptions of no change, while the negative perceptions remained largely the same.

**Corruption Reporting**

Willingness to report corruption remains low but growing steadily. Fourteen percent of the respondents stated that they had reported corruption to the authorities, up from 9 percent in 2005. Of those taking action, 26 percent reported to management, another 26 percent to other public officials, 14 percent to law enforcement, and 8 percent complained to the media. Complaining to other public officials (e.g. MPs and councillors) rose sharply, from 7 percent in 2006. Overall however, the number taking action did not change significantly, at 62.5 percent compared to 64 percent in 2005.

**Table 5: Corruption Perceptions**

|           | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 |
|-----------|------|------|------|
| Improved  | 34.9 | 26   | 24.8 |
| A lot     | 15.1 | 11.1 | 9.9  |
| A little  | 19.7 | 14.8 | 14.9 |
| Worsened  | 17.6 | 19.2 | 17.7 |
| A lot     | 10.7 | 12.7 | 12.2 |
| A little  | 6.8  | 6.6  | 5.5  |
| No change | 47.3 | 54.8 | 57.5 |



# THE KENYA BRIBERY INDEX 2007

1000

1000 1000

1000

1000

**Table 6: Corruption Reporting**

|                         | <b>2006</b> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2004</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Reported to authorities | 13.8        | 8.9         | 7.1         |
| Complained to others    | 23.8        | 27.1        | 24.8        |
| No action               | 62.5        | 64.0        | 68.0        |
| Reported/complained to: |             |             |             |
| Management              | 25.7        | 19.6        | 27.7        |
| Law enforcement         | 14.4        | 10          | 7.9         |
| Media                   | 7.7         | 8.6         | 2.4         |
| Other official          | 25.7        | 7.1         | 10.8        |
| Others/not stated       | 26.4        | 54.6        | 51.3        |

## 4. ORGANISATIONAL RANKINGS

The 2006 rankings features 41 organisations/sectors, eight more than in the 2005. There are fourteen organisations/sectors that featured prominently in the index that did not feature previously, and five organisations in the 2005 rankings that do not feature in this index. This shown in Table 7 below.

**Table 7: Entrants and Exits in the 2006 index**

| Entrants                              | Rank | Exits                   | Rank (2005) |
|---------------------------------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| Transport Licensing Board             | 2    | Mombasa City Council    | 10          |
| Ministry of Local Government          | 5    | Nairobi City Council    | 13          |
| Ministry of Public Works              | 6    | Registrar of Persons    | 14          |
| CDF Office                            | 8    | Kenya Revenue Authority | 15          |
| Lawyers                               | 9    | Kenya Commercial Bank   | 33          |
| Ministry of Labour                    | 10   |                         |             |
| Parliament                            | 13   |                         |             |
| Attorney Generals Office              | 14   |                         |             |
| International Organisations/Embassies | 24   |                         |             |
| Kenya Wildlife Service                | 27   |                         |             |
| Insurance Companies                   | 29   |                         |             |
| Public Organisations, other           | 30   |                         |             |
| Kenya Ports Authority                 | 32   |                         |             |
| Kenya Airports Authority              | 36   |                         |             |

### Overall Rankings

The 2006 rankings represent very significant changes in the organisational rankings. Only two of the top ten culprits in 2005 are featuring in the top ten culprits of 2006. These are the Police and Local Authorities. Six of the top ten offenders are taken by organisations that did not feature in the rankings in 2005. These are Transport Licensing Board in second place, Ministry of Local Government (5<sup>th</sup>), Ministry of Public Works (6<sup>th</sup>), CDF offices (8<sup>th</sup>), Lawyers (9<sup>th</sup>) and Ministry of Labour (10<sup>th</sup>).

The Police have retained the position of the most bribery prone institution in the country for the sixth year. However, this was on an improved score of 46.6 down from 60.3 in 2005. In addition, the gap between the police and the second worst ranked organisation has narrowed from 90 percent (a multiple of 1.9) to 30 percent (i.e. a multiple of 1.3). The 2005 gap was itself a significant improvement from a gap of 140 percent (a multiple of 2.4) in 2004. Similarly, the police ranked worst in only two of the six indicators, down from four in 2005, and five in 2004.

# THE KENYA BRIBERY INDEX 2007



The Transport Licensing Board emerged as the second most bribery prone organisation. The Board registered the highest frequency of bribery at 14 bribes per person. The Board's emergence reflects the Government's focus on streamlining the matatu industry. The tertiary education institutions emerged as the third most bribery prone institutions. This is primarily on account of extracting the largest bribes at Ksh. 14,300 on average, in a situation where the average size of bribes in other organisations has fallen. As a result, the tertiary institutions account for 10 percent of the bribery tax burden.

There are some very notable exits and entries into the rankings. The notable exits include the Kenya Revenue Authority, the Nairobi City Council and the Mombasa City Council. For Kenya Revenue Authority, the automation of the customs, and the abolition of the road licenses have drastically reduced direct contact between KRA and the public. In the case of the Nairobi City Council, the removal of informal traders from many parts of the city has eliminated one of the main avenues of bribery.

The notable entries are Lawyers in ninth place, CDF offices in eighth and Parliament in 13th. The entry of lawyers in the top ten, alongside the judiciary moving from sixth to 12th, opens the possibility that this is the case of migration of bribery from the bench to the bar. The entry of the CDF was arguably inevitable, given that it is now one of the biggest spending units at the local level. The entry of parliament is also associated with influence of MPs over resource allocation decisions, including CDF and bursary funds. This has put a premium of access to MPs, and in effect, bribery opportunities for the people who control access to MPs.

The Teachers Service Commission and State Corporations have registered the most significant improvement, reducing their index score by 17 and 16.5 points respectively. Other significantly improved rankings are Prisons Department, the Ministry of Health and Local Authorities. At the opposite end, the Immigration Department, NGOs/CBOs and Religious Institutions have registered the most significant deterioration in their rankings.

**Table 8: Aggregate Index**

| Rank | Organisation                          | 2006 | 2005 | 2005 rank |
|------|---------------------------------------|------|------|-----------|
| 1    | Kenya Police                          | 46.6 | 60.3 | 1         |
| 2    | Transport Licensing Board             | 35.7 |      |           |
| 3    | Public Colleges & Universities        | 32.6 | 23.8 | 11        |
| 4    | Immigration Department                | 28.5 | 20.0 | 16        |
| 5    | Ministry of Local Government          | 27.6 |      |           |
| 6    | Ministry of Public Works              | 25.8 |      |           |
| 7    | Local Authorities                     | 25.1 | 31.3 | 3         |
| 8    | CDF Office                            | 24.0 |      |           |
| 9    | Lawyers                               | 23.3 |      |           |
| 10   | Ministry of Labour                    | 23.0 |      |           |
| 11   | Private Companies, n.e.s.             | 21.7 | 15.5 | 20        |
| 12   | Judiciary                             | 21.3 | 27.8 | 6         |
| 13   | Parliament                            | 21.1 |      |           |
| 14   | Attorney Generals Office              | 21.0 |      |           |
| 15   | Ministry of Education                 | 20.4 | 14.7 | 21        |
| 16   | Provincial Administration             | 20.4 | 25.7 | 7         |
| 17   | Ministry of Lands                     | 19.7 | 25.5 | 8         |
| 18   | NGOs/CBOs                             | 19.2 | 9.8  | 28        |
| 19   | Public Hospitals                      | 18.7 | 16.2 | 19        |
| 20   | Ministry of Health                    | 17.8 | 25.4 | 9         |
| 21   | Electoral Commission                  | 17.7 | 13.7 | 23        |
| 22   | Prisons Department                    | 17.7 | 28.2 | 5         |
| 23   | Central Government, n.e.s             | 16.9 | 23.3 | 12        |
| 24   | International Organisations/Embassies | 16.9 |      |           |
| 25   | Public Schools                        | 16.6 | 11.1 | 27        |
| 26   | Ministry of Water                     | 16.5 | 14.4 | 22        |
| 27   | Kenya Wildlife Service                | 15.0 |      |           |
| 28   | State Corporations, n.e.s.            | 14.5 | 31.5 | 2         |
| 29   | Insurance Companies                   | 14.1 |      |           |
| 30   | Public Organisations, other           | 14.0 |      |           |
| 31   | Teachers Service Commission           | 13.6 | 30.1 | 4         |
| 32   | Kenya Ports Authority                 | 13.2 |      |           |
| 33   | Religious Institutions                | 13.1 | 3.8  | 32        |
| 34   | National Social Security Fund         | 12.8 | 17.4 | 17        |
| 35   | Kenya Power & Lighting Co.            | 12.7 | 9.7  | 29        |
| 36   | Kenya Airports Authority              | 12.3 |      |           |
| 37   | Telkom Kenya                          | 11.8 | 17.0 | 18        |
| 38   | Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock     | 11.6 | 12.7 | 24        |
| 39   | Cooperative Societies                 | 10.2 | 11.3 | 25        |
| 40   | Financial Institutions, n.e.s         | 9.4  | 6.3  | 30        |
| 41   | Posta Corporation                     | 7.9  | 6.0  | 31        |

## Likelihood of Encountering Bribery

This indicator registered a large turnover of the worst offenders. Of the ten worst offenders, only the police, at position ten, was in the top ten in 2005, and six of the organisations in the top ten were not in the rankings at all. The Immigration Department emerged with the worst rank with 77 percent of its customers reporting encountering corruption in the Department, up from 62 percent in 2005. The Teachers Service Commission and the Kenya Prisons are the most improved on this ranking, by 34 and 33 points respectively, followed by the Police, the Ministry of Health and Telkom Kenya. Religious Organisations, NGOs/CBOs and Public Schools top the list of the organisations that have worsened on this index. Overall, the trend is a mixed, with 12 organisations registering improvement, and 13 registering worse scores.

**Table 9: Likelihood of Bribery (% of org's clients encountering bribery)**

| Rank | Organisation                          | 2006 | 2005 | 2005 rank |
|------|---------------------------------------|------|------|-----------|
| 1    | Immigration Department                | 76.7 | 62.4 | 11        |
| 2    | CDF Office                            | 76.4 |      |           |
| 3    | Transport Licensing Board             | 76.0 |      |           |
| 4    | Parliament                            | 75.0 |      |           |
| 5    | Lawyers                               | 73.8 |      |           |
| 6    | Ministry of Public Works              | 71.8 |      |           |
| 7    | Kenya Wildlife Service                | 70.0 |      |           |
| 8    | Ministry of Labour                    | 64.8 |      |           |
| 9    | Local Authorities                     | 64.3 | 66.9 | 8         |
| 10   | Kenya Police                          | 63.5 | 82.3 | 1         |
| 11   | Electoral Commission                  | 62.7 | 46.3 | 18        |
| 12   | Judiciary                             | 61.6 | 72   | 5         |
| 13   | Ministry of Local Government          | 60.2 |      |           |
| 14   | Kenya Airports Authority              | 60.0 |      |           |
| 15   | Attorney Generals Office              | 59.1 |      |           |
| 16   | Prisons Department                    | 58.8 | 91.4 | 1         |
| 17   | Kenya Ports Authority                 | 58.2 |      |           |
| 18   | Ministry of Health                    | 58.1 | 75   | 4         |
| 19   | Ministry of Lands                     | 57.1 | 71   | 6         |
| 20   | Ministry of Education                 | 55.1 | 50   | 16        |
| 21   | Central Government, n.e.s             | 53.6 | 60.8 | 12        |
| 22   | Public Colleges & Universities        | 53.3 |      |           |
| 23   | Public Hospitals                      | 49.6 | 38.4 | 22        |
| 24   | Provincial Administration             | 49.5 | 57.1 | 13        |
| 25   | International Organisations/Embassies | 48.9 |      |           |
| 26   | Ministry of Water                     | 48.4 | 47.1 | 17        |
| 27   | State Corporations, n.e.s.            | 47.8 | 46.2 | 19        |
| 28   | Private Companies, n.e.s.             | 47.7 | 29.3 | 26        |

|    |                                   |      |      |    |
|----|-----------------------------------|------|------|----|
| 29 | Public Organisations, other       | 46.9 |      |    |
| 30 | NGOs/CBOs                         | 46.4 | 19.5 | 28 |
| 31 | National Social Security Fund     | 45.0 | 50.1 | 15 |
| 32 | Kenya Power & Lighting Co.        | 44.9 | 32   | 24 |
| 33 | Public Schools                    | 44.0 | 18.7 | 29 |
| 34 | Insurance Companies               | 42.1 |      |    |
| 35 | Religious Institutions            | 40.0 | 7.7  | 32 |
| 36 | Telkom Kenya                      | 37.5 | 54   | 14 |
| 37 | Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock | 36.5 | 33.8 | 23 |
| 38 | Cooperative Societies             | 35.4 | 39.7 | 21 |
| 39 | Teachers Service Commission       | 32.6 | 66.8 | 9  |
| 40 | Posta Corporation                 | 31.0 | 11.5 | 30 |
| 41 | Financial Institutions, n.e.s     | 30.8 | 10.6 | 31 |

### Impact (Percentage of respondents affected)

This indicator registered less change, with seven out of the ten worst ranked organisations in 2005 remaining in the same peer group. The Police and Public hospitals retained their positions as the worst ranked, both with worse scores. Cooperative Societies moved up nine places to eighth, reflecting the recovery of agricultural sector over the last few years. Public Schools, Religious Organisations and Private Sector registered significantly worse score on the indicator, and none registered significant improvement.

**Table 10: Impact of Bribery (Victims as % of survey respondents)**

| Rank | Organisation                  | 2006 | 2005 | Rank 2005 |
|------|-------------------------------|------|------|-----------|
| 1    | Kenya Police                  | 36.7 | 32.0 | 1         |
| 2    | Public Hospitals              | 29.6 | 22.4 | 2         |
| 3    | Public Schools                | 24.9 | 7.5  | 5         |
| 4    | Religious Institutions        | 20.5 | 4.0  | 10        |
| 5    | Ministry of Local Government  | 19.7 |      |           |
| 6    | Provincial Administration     | 19.6 | 21.9 | 3         |
| 7    | Private Companies, n.e.s.     | 18.2 | 6.1  | 7         |
| 8    | Cooperative Societies         | 9.3  | 2.3  | 17        |
| 9    | Local Authorities             | 8.2  | 12.3 | 4         |
| 10   | CDF Office                    | 7.4  |      |           |
| 11   | Attorney Generals Office      | 6.3  |      |           |
| 12   | NGOs/CBOs                     | 5.6  | 3.9  | 10        |
| 13   | Ministry of Lands             | 5.4  | 3.0  | 14        |
| 14   | Central Government, n.e.s     | 5.3  | 5.2  | 8         |
| 15   | Kenya Power & Lighting Co.    | 5.1  | 3.0  | 13        |
| 16   | Financial Institutions, n.e.s | 4.6  | 1.1  | 26        |

|    |                                       |     |     |    |
|----|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|----|
| 17 | International Organisations/Embassies | 4.6 |     |    |
| 18 | Judiciary                             | 4.4 | 2.5 | 16 |
| 19 | Immigration Department                | 4.3 | 2.6 | 15 |
| 20 | State Corporations, n.e.s.            | 4.1 | 3.5 | 12 |
| 21 | Transport Licensing Board             | 4.1 |     |    |
| 22 | Ministry of Water                     | 3.8 | 1.7 | 19 |
| 23 | Public Colleges & Universities        | 3.1 |     |    |
| 24 | Parliament                            | 2.6 |     |    |
| 25 | Ministry of Education                 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 18 |
| 26 | Lawyers                               | 2.5 |     |    |
| 27 | Posta Corporation                     | 2.4 | 0.4 | 32 |
| 28 | Ministry of Public Works              | 2.3 |     |    |
| 29 | Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock     | 1.9 | 1.0 | 27 |
| 30 | Ministry of Health                    | 1.8 | 1.5 | 20 |
| 31 | Electoral Commission                  | 1.5 | 0.8 | 30 |
| 32 | Ministry of Labour                    | 1.5 |     |    |
| 33 | Kenya Ports Authority                 | 1.3 |     |    |
| 34 | Telkom Kenya                          | 1.0 | 1.3 | 23 |
| 35 | Kenya Wildlife Service                | 0.9 |     |    |
| 36 | Prisons Department                    | 0.8 | 1.3 | 22 |
| 37 | National Social Security Fund         | 0.8 | 1.2 | 25 |
| 38 | Insurance Companies                   | 0.7 |     |    |
| 39 | Public Organisations, other           | 0.6 |     |    |
| 40 | Teachers Service Commission           | 0.6 | 0.8 | 29 |
| 41 | Kenya Airports Authority              | 0.3 |     |    |

## Severity

This indicator has registered very significant change. Seven of the ten worst offenders are new entrants, including the top five in the group. The Teachers Service Commission and the Police registered very significant improvement, by 27 and 22 points respectively. Other significantly improved are the National Social Security Fund, the Electoral Commission and the Ministry of Water. NGOs/CBOs, Public Schools and Religious Organisations registered significantly worse scores.

**Table 11: Severity (Likelihood of being denied service)**

| Rank | Organisation             | 2006 | 2005 | Rank 2005 |
|------|--------------------------|------|------|-----------|
| 1    | Lawyers                  | 52.5 |      |           |
| 2    | Ministry of Public Works | 34.6 |      |           |
| 3    | Parliament               | 33.3 |      |           |
| 4    | Ministry of Labour       | 33.3 |      |           |

|    |                                       |      |       |    |
|----|---------------------------------------|------|-------|----|
| 5  | CDF Office                            | 31.8 |       |    |
| 6  | Prisons Department                    | 26.5 | 31.43 | 5  |
| 7  | Judiciary                             | 25.0 | 31.71 | 4  |
| 8  | Insurance Companies                   | 23.7 |       |    |
| 9  | Ministry of Lands                     | 20.8 | 21    | 10 |
| 10 | Transport Licensing Board             | 20.2 |       |    |
| 11 | Local Authorities                     | 20.0 | 25.62 | 6  |
| 12 | Ministry of Health                    | 18.9 | 18.75 | 14 |
| 13 | Provincial Administration             | 18.0 | 24.3  | 7  |
| 14 | Ministry of Education                 | 17.8 | 17.39 | 18 |
| 15 | Police                                | 17.2 | 38.82 | 1  |
| 16 | NGOs/CBOs                             | 17.2 | 7.11  | 27 |
| 17 | Ministry of Local Government          | 17.2 |       |    |
| 18 | State Corporations, n.e.s             | 15.9 | 17.93 | 16 |
| 19 | Immigration Department                | 15.8 | 18.81 | 13 |
| 20 | Public Organisations, other           | 15.6 |       |    |
| 21 | Private Companies, n.e.s.             | 15.6 | 13.43 | 20 |
| 22 | International Organisations/Embassies | 15.4 | 20    |    |
| 23 | Attorney Generals Office              | 15.4 |       |    |
| 24 | Public Colleges & Universities        | 14.6 |       |    |
| 25 | Central Government, n.e.s             | 14.5 | 20.1  | 12 |
| 26 | Public Hospitals                      | 14.4 | 8.75  | 25 |
| 27 | Public Schools                        | 13.9 | 5.99  | 28 |
| 28 | Religious Institutions                | 13.2 | 5.11  | 30 |
| 29 | Telkom Kenya                          | 12.5 | 10.71 | 22 |
| 30 | Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock     | 11.9 | 5.41  | 29 |
| 31 | Electoral Commission                  | 11.9 | 21.95 | 9  |
| 32 | Kenya Power & Lighting Company        | 11.7 | 9.65  | 23 |
| 33 | Ministry of Water                     | 10.5 | 17.65 | 17 |
| 34 | Kenya Wildlife Service                | 10.0 |       |    |
| 35 | Teachers Service Commission           | 9.3  | 36.67 | 2  |
| 36 | Financial Institutions                | 9.2  | 3.85  | 31 |
| 37 | Cooperative Societies                 | 8.4  | 8.09  | 25 |
| 38 | National Social Security Fund         | 7.5  | 22.81 | 8  |
| 39 | Posta Corporation                     | 7.5  | 3.85  | 31 |
| 40 | Kenya Ports Authority                 | 7.3  |       |    |
| 41 | Kenya Airports Authority              | 0.0  |       |    |



## Frequency (Number of bribes paid)

Most organisations deteriorated on this indicator. Thirty organisations registered one bribe per person, twice as many as in 2005. The Transport Licensing Board registered the highest number of bribes paid, an average of fourteen bribes per customer, almost three times the highest number in 2005. The Police in second place, registered an increase from 5.1 to 7.7 bribes per customer. The Immigration Department registered the most significant increase, from 0.7 to 4.7 and as a result moved up from eighteenth to fourth. Other organisations that worsened significantly are the Electoral Commission, the Teachers Service Commission and Local Authorities. Telkom Kenya and the Prisons Department are the only organisations that registered significant improvement on this indicator.

**Table 12: Frequency (Average number of bribes p.p.)**

| Rank | Organisation                          | 2006 | 2005 | Rank 2005 |
|------|---------------------------------------|------|------|-----------|
| 1    | Transport Licensing Board             | 14.0 |      |           |
| 2    | Kenya Police                          | 7.7  | 5.1  | 1         |
| 3    | Local Authorities                     | 5.4  | 3.0  | 2         |
| 4    | Immigration Department                | 4.7  | 0.7  | 18        |
| 5    | Ministry of Local Government          | 4.7  |      |           |
| 6    | Ministry of Public Works              | 3.9  |      |           |
| 7    | Electoral Commission                  | 3.4  | 0.2  | 27        |
| 8    | Attorney Generals Office              | 3.1  |      |           |
| 9    | Teachers Service Commission           | 3.1  | 0.3  | 25        |
| 10   | Ministry of Health                    | 2.9  | 2.7  | 3         |
| 11   | Judiciary                             | 2.8  | 1.2  | 11        |
| 12   | Ministry of Labour                    | 2.6  |      |           |
| 13   | Provincial Administration             | 2.6  | 1.3  | 9         |
| 14   | Public Organisations, other           | 2.5  |      |           |
| 15   | CDF Office                            | 2.4  |      |           |
| 16   | Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock     | 2.4  | 1.2  | 10        |
| 17   | International Organisations/Embassies | 2.3  |      |           |
| 18   | Ministry of Lands                     | 2.2  | 1.4  | 7         |
| 19   | National Social Security Fund         | 2.1  | 1.1  | 14        |
| 20   | Public Colleges & Universities        | 2.0  |      |           |
| 21   | Parliament                            | 1.7  |      |           |
| 22   | Public Hospitals                      | 1.7  | 0.5  | 21        |
| 23   | Private Companies, n.e.s.             | 1.6  | 1.0  | 15        |
| 24   | Central Government, n.e.s.            | 1.4  | 0.9  | 17        |
| 25   | Kenya Airports Authority              | 1.3  |      |           |
| 26   | Lawyers                               | 1.3  |      |           |
| 27   | State Corporations, n.e.s.            | 1.2  | 1.2  | 12        |
| 28   | Ministry of Water                     | 1.1  | 0.7  | 20        |

|    |                               |      |      |    |
|----|-------------------------------|------|------|----|
| 29 | NGOs/CBOs                     | 1.1  | 0.4  | 23 |
| 30 | Kenya Ports Authority         | 1.0  |      |    |
| 31 | Kenya Wildlife Service        | 0.9  |      |    |
| 32 | Prisons Department            | 0.8  | 2.0  | 4  |
| 33 | Public Schools                | 0.8  | 0.3  | 26 |
| 34 | Cooperative Societies         | 0.7  | 0.7  | 19 |
| 35 | Financial Institutions, n.e.s | 0.4  | 0.01 | 33 |
| 36 | Insurance Companies           | 0.4  |      |    |
| 37 | Religious Institutions        | 0.3  | 0.1  | 31 |
| 38 | Kenya Power & Lighting Co.    | 0.3  | 0.3  | 24 |
| 39 | Ministry of Education         | 0.3  | 0.4  | 22 |
| 40 | Posta Corporation             | 0.1  | 0.2  | 28 |
| 41 | Telkom Kenya                  | 0.02 | 1.5  | 6  |

### Size of Bribes

The largest bribes were paid to access tertiary education, as was the case in 2005. NGOs registered the second largest bribes. Most of the NGOs bribes relate to employment. State Corporations and the Teachers Service Commission registered the most significant reductions in the average size of bribes. Other significant reductions were registered by the Immigration Department, Public Schools and Financial Institutions. NGOs, Ministry of Water, Prisons Department and Telkom Kenya registered the most significant increases in the average size of bribes.

**Table 13: Average Size of Bribes Paid, Ksh**

| Rank | Organisation                   | 2006   | 2005   | Rank 2005 |
|------|--------------------------------|--------|--------|-----------|
| 1    | Public Colleges & Universities | 14,287 | 16,359 | 1         |
| 2    | NGOs/CBOs                      | 5,429  | 2,538  | 14        |
| 3    | Ministry of Education          | 3,383  | 2,040  | 15        |
| 4    | Ministry of Public Works       | 2,569  |        |           |
| 5    | Telkom Kenya                   | 2,505  | 1,028  | 23        |
| 6    | Central Government, n.e.s      | 2,503  | 4,278  | 5         |
| 7    | Ministry of Lands              | 2,490  | 3,901  | 8         |
| 8    | Ministry of Water              | 2,477  | 982    | 26        |
| 9    | Teachers Service Commission    | 2,395  | 11,325 | 2         |
| 10   | Judiciary                      | 2,353  | 5,053  | 4         |
| 11   | Insurance Companies            | 2,166  |        |           |
| 12   | Prisons Department             | 1,979  | 931    | 27        |
| 13   | Private Companies, n.e.s.      | 1,870  | 1,797  | 16        |
| 14   | Ministry of Labour             | 1,806  |        |           |
| 15   | Kenya Power & Lighting Co.     | 1,616  | 999    | 24        |

|    |                                       |       |        |    |
|----|---------------------------------------|-------|--------|----|
| 16 | Transport Licensing Board             | 1,337 |        |    |
| 17 | Attorney Generals Office              | 1,224 |        |    |
| 18 | Financial Institutions, n.e.s         | 1,134 | 3,657  | 9  |
| 19 | Kenya Police                          | 1,066 | 1,465  | 18 |
| 20 | Ministry of Health                    | 968   | 629    | 28 |
| 21 | Local Authorities                     | 927   | 995    | 25 |
| 22 | Electoral Commission                  | 923   | 1,458  | 19 |
| 23 | Ministry of Local Government          | 896   |        |    |
| 24 | National Social Security Fund         | 865   | 1,236  | 20 |
| 25 | Immigration Department                | 861   | 3,153  | 11 |
| 26 | Public Hospitals                      | 718   | 1,059  | 22 |
| 27 | Public Schools                        | 680   | 2,986  | 12 |
| 28 | Provincial Administration             | 594   | 1,136  | 21 |
| 29 | State Corporations, n.e.s.            | 529   | 10,783 | 3  |
| 30 | Kenya Ports Authority                 | 508   |        |    |
| 31 | CDF Office                            | 421   |        |    |
| 32 | Parliament                            | 411   |        |    |
| 33 | Kenya Airports Authority              | 389   |        |    |
| 34 | Cooperative Societies                 | 360   | 605    | 29 |
| 35 | Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock     | 350   | 1,658  | 17 |
| 36 | Public Organisations, other           | 308   |        |    |
| 37 | Religious Institutions                | 254   | 527    | 31 |
| 38 | Kenya Wildlife Service                | 253   |        |    |
| 39 | Lawyers                               | 218   |        |    |
| 40 | International Organisations/Embassies | 165   |        |    |
| 41 | Posta Corporation                     | 163   | 2,590  | 13 |

## Cost (Expenditure on bribery)

The Police force remains the most costly institution to the public in terms of bribery. The estimated bribery burden of the police increased by Ksh. 100, from Ksh. 740 per person to Ksh. 840. However in relative terms, the share of the total burden declined from 37 percent to 27 percent. The bribery burden of the Immigration Department increased twelve fold, moving the department up twelve places from 14th to second. Significant escalation was also registered by the Ministry of Education, up twenty five places to fifth, and the Ministry of Water, up seventeen places to tenth. Several organisations have registered significant improvement on this indicator. The most notable are the Judiciary, which has improved from eleventh to the best ranked, Public Schools, Public Hospitals, State Corporations and the Teachers Service Commission.

**Table 14: Cost of Bribery (Average expenditure per person, Ksh)**

| Rank | Organisation                          | 2006 | 2005   | Rank2005 |
|------|---------------------------------------|------|--------|----------|
| 1    | Kenya Police                          | 843  | 740.40 | 1        |
| 2    | Immigration Department                | 291  | 23.80  | 14       |
| 3    | Ministry of Local Government          | 245  |        |          |
| 4    | Private Companies, n.e.s.             | 204  | 96.10  | 5        |
| 5    | Ministry of Education                 | 179  | 3.60   | 29       |
| 6    | International Organisations/Embassies | 128  |        |          |
| 7    | Attorney Generals Office              | 122  |        |          |
| 8    | Local Authorities                     | 113  | 138.40 | 4        |
| 9    | Provincial Administration             | 107  | 142.00 | 3        |
| 10   | Ministry of Water                     | 91   | 5.80   | 27       |
| 11   | Public Universities & Colleges        | 85   | 30.70  | 13       |
| 12   | CDF Office                            | 72   |        |          |
| 13   | State Corporations, n.e.s.            | 59   | 243.20 | 2        |
| 14   | Ministry of Labour                    | 58   |        |          |
| 15   | Public Schools                        | 54   | 79.90  | 7        |
| 16   | Transport Licensing Board             | 40   |        |          |
| 17   | Posta Corporation                     | 38   | 4.00   | 28       |
| 18   | National Social Security Fund         | 24   | 7.90   | 23       |
| 19   | Kenya Ports Authority                 | 19   |        |          |
| 20   | Ministry of Lands                     | 17   | 55.70  | 10       |
| 21   | Telkom Kenya                          | 16   | 9.00   | 20       |
| 22   | Kenya Airports Authority              | 14   |        |          |
| 23   | Public Hospitals                      | 13   | 81.50  | 6        |
| 24   | Financial Institutions, n.e.s         | 11   | 1.40   | 31       |
| 25   | Kenya Power & Lighting Co.            | 10   | 8.00   | 22       |
| 26   | Public Organisations, other           | 9.40 |        |          |

# THE KENYA BRIBERY INDEX 2007

|    |                                   |      |       |    |
|----|-----------------------------------|------|-------|----|
| 27 | Central Government, n.e.s         | 7.70 | 79.20 | 8  |
| 28 | Religious Institutions            | 7.60 | 6.30  | 25 |
| 29 | Parliament                        | 7.15 |       |    |
| 30 | NGOs/CBOs                         | 6.25 | 44.90 | 12 |
| 31 | Insurance Companies               | 5.25 |       |    |
| 32 | Lawyers                           | 4.30 |       |    |
| 33 | Kenya Wildlife Service            | 4.10 |       |    |
| 34 | Ministry of Public Works          | 2.25 |       |    |
| 35 | Prisons Department                | 2.00 | 6.80  | 24 |
| 36 | Cooperative Societies             | 1.80 | 6.00  | 26 |
| 37 | Ministry of Health                | 1.60 | 8.50  | 21 |
| 38 | Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock | 0.50 | 15.60 | 16 |
| 39 | Teachers Service Commission       | 0.40 | 10.80 | 18 |
| 40 | Electoral Commission              | 0.30 | 1.30  | 32 |
| 41 | Judiciary                         | 0.20 | 51.50 | 11 |

1000

15 AUGUST 2004

AYY4455328

1000



3rd Floor, ACK Garden House  
1st Ngong Avenue  
P.O. Box 198 00200  
City Square, Nairobi Kenya  
Tel: +254 020 272 7763/5, 273 0324/5  
Fax: +254 020 272 9530  
Email: [transparency@tikenya.org](mailto:transparency@tikenya.org)  
[www.tikenya.org](http://www.tikenya.org)