

THE KENYA **BRIBERY** INDEX 2007



TRANSPARENCY
INTERNATIONAL
Kenya

CONTENTS

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



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
Education attained					
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
Employment status					
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	4.3
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	5.0
Employed in community sector e.g.Church, N.G.O, Co-operative	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.6	1.4
Government/Parastatal	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4
Income (Ksh.pm)					
Less than 4,999	16.0	18.8	11.3	23.6	34.9
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	26.9
25,000-49,9999	2.0	2.1	3.0	1.1	4.1
50,000-99,999	0.7	0.7	1.2	0.3	1.5
Over 100,000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not stated	2.9	3.0	3.3	2.6	6.0
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
No. of Transactions			
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

Value, % of total			
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
Average bize of bribe, Ksh			
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
Frequency (No. of bribes/person)			
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
Cost (Expenditure per person, Ksh)			
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

	2006	2005	2004
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 (5th), Ministry of Public Works (6th), CDF offices (8th), Lawyers (9th) and Ministry of Labour (10th).

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

1000

1000 1000

1000

1000

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
www.tikenya.org