



## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Age, gender and residence.....	3
Education attainment.....	4
Employment and income.....	4
<b>OVERVIEW OF THE FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL RANKING .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Aggregate Index.....	9
Incidence of Bribery.....	10
Prevalence.....	11
Severity of Bribery.....	12
Expenditure on Bribery.....	13
Frequency.....	14
Size of Bribes.....	16



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents a summary of the findings of TI-Kenya's third national survey on the magnitude of bribery in Kenya. The survey is part of TI-Kenya's effort to inform the anti-corruption effort with objective, rigorous research. The survey is conducted using a structured questionnaire administered by personal interviews in households. The survey was conducted in December 2003. A total of 2,407 individuals were interviewed in all the eight provinces, 1,160 in urban residences and 1,247 in rural residences.

The survey captures corruption as experienced by ordinary citizens in both public and private organizations. Respondents provide information on their experience with bribery in the last year— in which organizations they encountered bribery, where they paid bribes, how much they paid and what they paid for. Bribes are categorized into five purposes as follows:

- Law enforcement (i.e. avoiding the legal consequences of wrong doing, or harassment by the relevant authority)
- Regulatory (e.g. obtaining licenses)
- Access to Services (e.g. health, school places, utilities)
- Business (e.g. to obtain a contract or expedite payment)
- Employment (e.g. to get a job, promotion, transfer, training)

The respondents to the 2003 survey provided 9027 observations, which translates to an average of 3.75 organizations per respondent. The responses were used to construct six indicators that capture different dimensions of the magnitude and impact of problem as follows:

- i **incidence.** This ranks an organization according to the likelihood (probability) that a person visiting the organization will be asked, or feel it is necessary, to offer a bribe.
- ii **prevalence.** This ranks organizations in order of the percentage of population affected by bribery in them.
- iii **severity.** This captures the level of impunity, that is, whether service is denied for declining to bribe.
- iv **frequency.** This ranks organizations according to the level of bribery activity, measured by the average number of bribes paid per person per year.
- v **cost.** This ranks organizations according to the estimated proceeds from bribes, and can be interpreted as the "bribery tax" per adult citizen.
- vi **size.** This ranks organizations according to the average size of bribes paid, and is reflective of the cost to the individuals who pay the bribes.

An aggregate index was constructed as an unweighted average of the six indicators. The Index has a value range from 0 to 100, where the higher the value is the worse the performance. The frequency indicators (i) to (iii) are computed as percentage of observations. The value indicators (iv) to (vi) are scaled by the highest value to obtain a normalized score with values between 0 and 100 (the actual values are reported).

## 2. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

**Age, gender and residence.** A total of 2,407 respondents were interviewed, of whom 1,160 (48 percent) and 1,247 (52 percent) were urban and rural residents respectively. The sample was gender balanced, 50.4 percent men and 49.6 percent women. Close to half (48 percent) of the respondents were young people under 30 years of age, 40 percent were in the 30 – 50 age group, and the other 12 percent were aged 50 years and above.

Table 1: Sample distribution by province

Province	Number	%
Rift Valley	492	20.4
Nairobi	424	17.6
Nyanza	344	14.3
Eastern	325	13.5
Coast	262	10.9
Central	260	10.8
Western	233	9.7
North Eastern	67	2.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,407</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 2: Sample distribution by socio-economic characteristics

	National	%	Urban	%	Rural	%	Male	%	Female	%
<b>Age bracket</b>										
< 20	188	7.8	106	4.4	82	3.4	85	3.5	103	4.3
20 – 29	936	38.9	519	21.6	417	17.3	458	19.0	478	19.9
30 – 39	605	25.1	290	12.0	315	13.1	286	11.9	319	13.3
40 – 49	359	14.9	150	6.2	209	8.7	204	8.5	155	6.4
50 – 59	189	7.9	64	2.7	125	5.2	106	4.4	83	3.4
60+	130	5.4	31	1.3	99	4.1	73	3.0	57	2.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,407</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,160</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>1,247</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>1,212</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>1,195</b>	<b>49.6</b>
<b>Education attainment</b>										
Primary school only	551	22.9	182	7.6	369	15.3	252	10.5	299	12.4
Post primary training	175	7.3	62	2.6	113	4.7	107	4.4	68	2.8
Secondary school only	728	30.2	393	16.3	335	13.9	381	15.8	347	14.4
Post secondary school training	504	20.9	323	13.4	181	7.5	268	11.1	236	9.8
University degree	148	6.1	119	4.9	29	1.2	92	3.8	56	2.3
None	301	12.5	81	3.4	220	9.1	112	4.7	189	7.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,407</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,160</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>1,247</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>1,212</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>1,195</b>	<b>49.6</b>
<b>Employment status</b>										
Unemployed	933	38.8	453	18.8	480	19.9	352	14.6	581	24.1
Self employed	568	23.6	274	11.4	294	12.2	327	13.6	241	10.0
Employed in family business or farm	308	12.8	58	2.4	250	10.4	155	6.4	153	6.4
Private sector	207	8.6	160	6.6	47	2.0	140	5.8	67	2.8

Public Sector	256	10.6	157	6.5	99	4.1	147	6.1	109	4.5
Community sector	53	2.2	29	1.2	24	1.0	29	1.2	24	1.0
Retired	82	3.4	29	1.2	53	2.2	60	2.5	22	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,407</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,160</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>1,247</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>1,210</b>	<b>50.3</b>	<b>1,197</b>	<b>49.7</b>
<b>Household Income (Ksh)</b>										
Less than 4,999	831	34.5	225	9.3	606	25.2	403	16.7	428	17.8
5,000-9,999	659	27.4	315	13.1	344	14.3	347	14.4	312	13.0
10,000-24,9999	487	20.2	328	13.6	159	6.6	254	10.6	233	9.7
25,000-49,9999	150	6.2	123	5.1	27	1.1	75	3.1	75	3.1
50,000-99,999	69	2.9	59	2.5	10	0.4	33	1.4	36	1.5
Over 100,000	211	8.8	110	4.6	101	4.2	100	4.2	111	4.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,407</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,160</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>1,247</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>1,212</b>	<b>50.4</b>	<b>1,195</b>	<b>49.6</b>

**Education attainment.** Twenty three percent of the respondents indicated that they were primary school graduates, and 7 percent had some post-primary training. Thirty percent were secondary school graduates only; 27 percent had tertiary education, comprising 6 percent university graduates and 21 percent other tertiary education. Twelve and a half percent indicated that they had no formal education.

**Employment and Income.** Close to 40 percent of the respondents indicated that they were unemployed, 24 percent were self-employed and another 13 percent stated that they were employed in family enterprises. Eleven percent reported employment in the public sector, 9 percent in the private sector and 2 percent in the community sector while 3.4 percent classified themselves as retired. With regard to income, 35 percent indicated household incomes below five thousand shillings, 27 percent incomes between five and ten thousand shillings, 20 percent indicated incomes between ten and twenty five thousand shillings, and 18 percent incomes over twenty five thousand shillings a month. The majority of rural respondents reported income in the lower brackets. This should not be interpreted to mean that the rural respondents are poorer, but rather, that rural households have less money income than urban ones. The percentage of unemployed, 38 percent, is rather high as compared to last year's survey (20 percent). This is explained by the timing, as the survey was conducted in December when many young people had just completed school.

### 3. OVERVIEW OF THE FINDINGS

The survey indicates a very significant decrease of bribery from 2002. The percentage of encounters in which bribes were demanded or offered declined from 65 to 40 percent. Rural respondents reported a more significant reduction, from 67 percent to 36 percent, while the urban respondents reported a reduction from 64 percent to 44 percent. The experience is reflected across all socio-economic categories, that is across age, employment and income groups.

Table3: Key indicators 2003 compared to 2002 survey

	National		Urban		Rural	
	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002
Index (Average)	18.2	25.6	19.1	21.4	15.8	24.5
Highest ranked institution	57.3	69.4	57.6	69.7	55.9	68.2
Lowest ranked institution	2.4	3.2	2.6	0.2	0.0	5.1
Number of bribes per person per year	9.4	28.8	9.8	25.4	7.7	35.7
Expenditure on bribery, Ksh. per person per month	1,261	3,905	1,958	4,898	612	3,254
Average size of bribe, Ksh	3,958	2,318	4,480	3,154	4,926	3,159

The survey indicates a very significant reduction in the cost of bribery to citizens, as measured by the average expenditure reported. This declined from an average of 3,905 shillings per person per month reported in 2002, to 1,261 shillings per person per month. Rural respondents reported a more significant reduction, from 3,254 shillings to 612 shillings translating to an 80 percent decrease. Urban residents reported a 56 percent decrease from 4,900 shillings to 1,960 shillings per person per month.

This reduction reflects reduced bribery activity, i.e., people are paying fewer bribes, than before, as opposed to smaller bribes. Indeed the average size of bribes rose from 2,300 to 3,960 shillings. The rural average bribe size increased more significantly, by 56 percent, while the urban average increased by 44 percent. This trend, a reduction in the average cost alongside an increase in the average size of bribes lends itself to two interpretations. First, it suggests a significant reduction in petty bribery. Second, it is also consistent with the perception of increased likelihood of being punished if caught, hence officials require bigger inducement to take the risk. The reduced bribery is reflected in an improvement in the aggregate index by 7.6 points, from an average 25.6 to 18. This in turn reflects a more significant improvement in the rural index, from 24.5 to 15.6. The urban index improved only marginally from 21.4 to 19.1.

Of the ten worst ranked organizations in 2002, the Ministry of Health registered the most significant improvement with an index score reduced from 34.6 to 12.7, a 63 percent improvement, followed by Other Local Authorities (excluding Nairobi, Mombasa and Kisumu) and the Immigration Department. Of the twenty worst ranked, the Ministry of Health, Other Local Authorities, Immigration Department and Public Hospitals retain the top positions, and are followed by Public Hospitals, the Registrar of Persons and the Judiciary.

**Table 4: Most Improved Organizations**

	Aggregate Index			Overall Rank	
	2003	2002	Change (%)	2003	2002
<b>Most improved organizations ranked in the worst 10 in 2002</b>					
Ministry of Health	12.7	34.6	63.4	26	8
Local Authorities, n.e.s.	17.3	36.1	52.1	20	6
Immigration Dept	30.1	49.7	39.5	4	2
<b>Most improved organizations ranked in the worst 20 in 2002</b>					
Ministry of Health	12.7	34.6	63.4	26	8
Local Authorities, n.e.s.	17.3	36.1	52.1	20	6
Immigration Dept	30.1	49.7	39.5	4	2
Public Hospitals	21.9	33.0	33.8	14	10
Registrar of Persons	21.0	28.5	26.6	16	20
Judiciary	24.0	32.4	25.9	12	11

Respondents were also asked to indicate their perceptions of change in the organizations that they dealt with as compared to the previous year. The perception of significant improvement increased from 5 to 14 percent of the responses, and perception of marginal improvement from 9 to 18 percent of the responses. Perceptions of significant deterioration declined from 23 percent to 9 percent and marginal deterioration from 11 percent to 4 percent of the responses. The percentage of responses citing no change did not register significant alteration.

**Table 5: Perceptions of change in corruption (% of responses)**

Perception	National		Urban		Rural	
	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002
Much improved	13.9	5.1	15.2	5.2	12.6	5.0
A little better	18.2	8.8	19.4	8.0	17.0	9.3
Much worse	8.5	23.4	7.7	21.9	9.2	24.2
A little worse	4.4	10.8	4.1	10.2	4.7	11.1
No change	55.1	52.0	53.7	54.7	56.5	50.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The survey also sought to gauge citizen’s willingness to report corruption to the authorities by asking respondents what kind of action they took, if any, on encountering bribery. The results show that in the majority of instances, the respondents bribed and kept quiet about it (58 percent), while in 18 percent of the cases, they declined to bribe and also kept quiet. In 14 percent of the cases, respondents bribed and talked about it to people other than the authorities, and in 5 percent of the instances, they declined and discussed it with people other than the authorities.

**Table 6: Inclination to take action about corruption (% of responses)**

Action taken	Total	% of total freq.			% of period freq.		
		Always	Jan/June	Jul/Dec	Always	Jan/June	Jul/Dec
Reported to authorities	4.3	1.1	2.3	0.9	2.8	5.8	4.4
Bribed	2.7	0.5	1.6	0.6	1.4	4.1	2.7
Declined	1.6	0.6	0.7	0.3	1.4	1.7	1.7
Complained to others	19.7	7.1	7.9	4.8	17.8	19.9	23.0
Bribed	14.5	4.8	6.0	3.7	12.0	15.2	17.7
Declined	5.3	2.3	1.9	1.1	5.8	4.7	5.4
Kept quiet	75.9	31.5	29.2	15.2	79.4	74.3	72.6
Bribed	57.6	20.7	24.2	12.7	52.2	61.4	60.6
Declined	18.3	10.8	5.1	2.5	27.2	12.9	11.9

Reported/Complained to:							
Management	22.6	8.6	9.3	4.7	25.2	22.2	19.6
Police	5.1	1.0	3.1	0.9	3.0	7.4	3.9
Other public official	13.2	4.2	6.4	2.5	12.5	15.3	10.4
Media	3.8	0.9	2.4	0.5	2.7	5.7	2.2
Others	55.3	19.3	20.8	15.2	56.5	49.5	63.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>42.1</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Reporting to the authorities occurred in only 4 percent of the instances. Of those instances reported, respondents were more likely to bribe and report than to decline and report. Reporting to the authorities declined marginally from 6 percent of the encounters during the first half of the year, to 4.8 percent during the second half. However, the likelihood of encountering bribery also declined significantly. Management was the most preferred authority, followed by other public officials (MPs', chiefs etc), and the police was the least preferred. The inclination to report to the authorities was higher during the first half of the year.

The overall results provide strong indication that the Government's campaign against corruption has had a significant positive impact on the vulnerability of ordinary citizens to corruption, and petty bribery in particular. It is important to note however, that the survey does not adequately capture corruption at the higher levels—for instance, bribery in big public procurement projects. Similarly, a representative sample of the population will not adequately capture the bribery in an organization that affects a very specific, small segment of the population, even though this may be systemic and severe.



## 4. ORGANIZATIONAL RANKING

The 2003 league table features 38 organizations and sectors, 12 less than the 2002 survey. This reflects reduced citations by the respondents of some ministries and parastatals that featured in both the 2001 and 2002 rankings, that is, the citations did not reach the sample significance criteria to be included separately. These have been aggregated as “Central Government n.e.s” and “State Corporations n.e.s.” categories. The most significant ones are the Forestry Department, the Kenya Ports Authority and the Kenya Sugar Authority, which were ranked 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> respectively in 2002. There are also some new entrants. These are Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Water, public colleges, cooperative societies, trade unions and the Postal Corporation.

### Aggregate Index

The police force retained the top position in the bribery league, but with a significantly improved aggregate index score of 57.3, down from 69.4. The improved performance is reflected equally in urban and rural areas, but with marginally higher improvement in the urban index. The Department of Defence moved up one position to second worst offender, but also with a significant 9 point performance improvement, reflected more in rural than urban performance. State corporations sector (parastatals other than those individually ranked), jumped to third worst offenders from position 37 in 2002, with an aggregate index score of 30.1, an 18 point deterioration. This reflects the inclusion in the category of the state corporations that have dropped out of the index. The Immigration Department ranks fourth, down two places, with a very significant 19.6 point improvement. The Kenya Revenue Authority ranks fifth, up 9 places, which reflects lack of improvement —only 1.5 points, relative to overall performance. The provincial administration ranks sixth, up 6 places, with a marginally improved index score of 26.7 from 30.5. The Nairobi City Council is in seventh place, up 2 places from 2002, but with a significant 7.6 point performance improvement. Other Central Government ranks eighth, up 21 places, reflecting lack of improvement in the index score. The Ministry of Public Works registered an index score only marginally better than in 2002, and as a result, moved 12 places up the league from 21st to 9th. A very significant 18 point improvement in the Ministry of Works’ rural index is dampened by a 1.6 point deterioration in the urban index. The Ministry of Lands completes the top ten offenders list, reflecting its below average improvement. A significant 10 point improvement in the Ministry’s urban index is offset by a 2.6 point deterioration in the rural index.

Of the ranked organizations, the Ministry of Health leads with a 22 percentage points improvement in the overall index, registered in both rural and urban indices. Local authorities, other than those individually ranked follow with a 19 point improvement, closely followed by Agriculture/Livestock Development with an 18 point improvement, followed by Civil Society Organizations with a 16 point improvement. Private financial institutions are the only category that registered a notable deterioration, by 3.1 points.

TABLE 7: AGGREGATE INDEX 2003

RANK	ORGANIZATION	2003			2002		
		NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL
1	Kenya Police	57.3	57.6	55.9	69.4	69.7	66.3
2	Department of Defence	37.7	35.2	41.8	46.7	37.8	47.3
3	State Corporations n.e.s.	30.1	37.5	10.5	20.7	19.3	20.2
4	Immigration Dept	30.1	31.8	24.9	49.7	50.8	29.6
5	Kenya Revenue Authority	28.8	25.3	28.0	30.3	30.1	25.9
6	Provincial Administration	26.7	23.9	31.8	30.5	30.4	31.0
7	Nairobi City Council	26.2	27.8	16.6	33.8	35.7	29.9
8	Central Government, n.e.s.	25.5	22.7	31.1	25.4	23.3	26.7
9	Ministry of Public Works	24.7	26.6	8.3	27.9	24.9	26.8
10	Ministry of Lands	24.5	21.2	31.4	30.3	31.9	28.9
11	Kisumu City Council	24.0	23.8	32.4	29.6	29.2	30.5
12	Judiciary	24.0	24.7	23.6	32.4	31.8	29.3
13	Mombasa City Council	22.6	23.6	18.1	29.2	27.7	34.3
14	Public Hospitals	21.9	24.1	17.3	33.0	31.1	35.8
15	Public Universities	21.6	21.9	16.6	27.8	9.7	24.4
16	Registrar of Persons	21.0	20.5	21.9	28.5	28.9	27.7
17	Ministry of Labour	19.8	21.7	16.1			
18	National Social Security Fund	18.8	18.8	18.7	20.3	20.2	17.2
19	Teachers Service Comm.	18.7	24.2	12.2	25.2	24.0	19.8
20	Local Authorities, n.e.s.	17.3	17.0	18.1	36.1	35.2	38.9
21	Private Sector	17.0	17.3	15.9	25.2	22.1	30.9
22	Ministry of Education	14.3	12.8	16.2	25.8	25.3	25.2
23	Kenya Railways	13.5	15.6	0.0	16.1	15.4	14.2
24	Public Colleges	13.2	16.9	4.3			
25	KPLC	12.9	12.7	15.8	19.6	20.8	18.0
26	Ministry of Health	12.7	12.3	13.2	34.6	30.6	35.0
27	Cooperative Societies	12.5	15.0	12.0			
28	Telkom Kenya	10.1	11.0	6.2	20.3	21.5	14.9
29	Ministry of Water	8.9	12.3	4.2			
30	International Organizations	8.9	8.8	5.6	20.4	27.0	15.6
31	Public Schools	8.5	11.7	5.1	22.5	18.7	26.9
32	Financial Institutions n.e.s.	8.2	11.1	3.9	5.1	6.3	6.2
33	CSOs	7.3	7.0	8.0	23.4	18.2	12.2
34	Trade Unions	7.1	9.3	0.0			
35	Min. of Agric/Livestock	5.8	14.9	5.4	23.7	25.5	17.4
36	Postal Corporation	4.0	5.4	2.3			
37	Kenya Commercial Bank	3.8	3.1	4.5	11.1	13.5	9.8
38	Religious Organizations	2.4	2.6	2.6	9.7	11.2	6.9

### Incidence (Likelihood of Encountering Bribery)

The Immigration Department emerges as the organization where citizens are most likely to encounter bribery, with bribery experience reported in 90 percent of interactions with the department. This, however is an improvement of 4.8 percentage points from 2002. The Police force retains its second position on this, but with a significant improvement, particularly marked in the rural areas, where the percentage of incidences that could translate into a bribe decreased by 20 percent from 97 percent to 77 percent. The Ministry of Labour, which did not rank individually in 2002, is ranked third. The Department of Defence moved up three places to fourth place, despite registering a significant 18.5 point improvement. The Mombasa City Council moved up four places with a reduced, but still very high, incidence of 75 percent, down from 93 percent in 2002. The Nairobi City Council follows, up from 21st, reflecting a below average performance improvement. The Ministry of Lands follows in 7th place, down four places from third, on account of a very significant 27 point performance improvement, and is followed by the Ministry of Public Works and Registrar of Persons, both of which have moved up the scale. The Judiciary completes the worst ten offenders list, down five places accountable to a very significant 28 point performance improvement.

Public universities emerge with the most significant performance improvement, registering a 70 percentage point decline in bribery encounters. This however, reflects a mixed picture, a very significant improvement in the rural index, and a marginal deterioration in the urban index. This suggests that the high incidence cited in 2002 was a reflection of a specific event or activity that was highly vulnerable to corruption. Other very significant improvements are registered by the Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock, public schools, public hospitals, the Provincial Administration, Kisumu City Council, and the Ministry of Health in that order.

TABLE 8: LIKELIHOOD OF ENCOUNTERING BRIBERY (% OF ENCOUNTERS)

RANK	ORGANIZATION	2003			2002		
		NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL
1	Immigration Dept	89.6	90.0	85.7	94.3	93.8	96.1
2	Kenya Police	82.1	86.0	76.8	96.9	96.9	96.9
3	Ministry of Labour	76.2	83.3	66.7			
4	Department of Defence	75.0	72.7	77.8	93.5	89.1	98.1
5	Mombasa City Council	75.0	75.0	75.0	93.3	91.7	100.0
6	Nairobi City Council	74.1	74.2	66.7	84.5	84.6	82.4
7	Ministry of Lands	73.2	69.7	74.7	95.5	94.7	96.4
8	Ministry of Public Works	71.4	73.7	50.0	84.2	84.4	83.3
9	Registrar of Persons	67.6	65.6	71.4	90.9	92.2	89.1
10	Judiciary	66.7	66.7	66.7	94.4	94.1	94.9
11	National Social Security Fund	65.9	55.2	86.7	75.8	74.6	77.5
12	Kenya Revenue Authority	63.8	60.0	78.6	91.2	89.3	97.6
13	Central Government, n.e.s	60.8	55.2	71.4	78.5	77.3	80.0
14	Kisumu City Council	60.0	57.9	100.0	98.8	100.0	93.3
15	Teachers Service Commission	55.2	69.0	41.4	84.2	87.2	77.8
16	Provincial Administration	53.4	56.3	52.0	93.3	91.8	94.3
17	Local Authorities, n.e.s.	52.5	59.3	47.5	76.1	72.9	80.3
18	Ministry of Education	42.7	39.6	46.3	61.7	60.6	63.4
19	Public Hospitals	41.2	45.1	38.2	86.8	87.3	86.2
20	Ministry of Health	39.4	40.0	38.5	77.5	78.8	76.0
21	Private Sector	37.9	37.7	38.2	50.7	47.0	56.4
22	State Corporations n.e.s.	37.6	38.6	35.9	66.1	61.5	72.3
23	Kenya Railways	37.5	42.9	0.0	65.7	62.5	72.7
24	Telkom Kenya	36.9	38.9	27.3	61.9	66.1	46.2
25	Cooperative Societies	33.6	35.6	33.0			

26	Ministry of Water	33.3	45.7	13.6			
27	KPLC	29.2	26.4	45.0	51.8	54.2	43.2
28	Public Colleges	24.3	28.2	15.6			
29	CSOs	22.3	20.0	23.6	40.7	41.3	38.5
30	Trade Unions	21.2	28.0	0.0			
31	International Organizations	19.7	20.9	16.7	51.4	56.0	40.0
32	Min. of Agriculture/Livestock	15.4	15.4	15.4	80.4	90.9	70.8
33	Public Schools	14.3	17.5	12.3	56.1	56.2	55.9
34	Financial Institutions n.e.s.	14.1	15.0	13.0	10.2	8.3	15.4
35	Kenya Commercial Bank	13.3	11.8	15.4	28.8	24.4	35.8
36	Public Universities	12.2	14.7	6.7	81.0	12.1	95.2
37	Postal Corporation	11.7	14.6	6.9			
38	Religious Organizations	5.6	5.9	5.4	20.9	25.8	15.6

### Prevalence (Percentage of Respondents Affected)

The police force registered the most significant improvement in the number of victims of bribery with 28 percent of respondents reporting bribery encounters, down from 70 percent in 2002. Still it retained the worst ranking on this indicator. Public hospitals follow, up two places from fourth place in 2002, but with a 7 percentage point decrease in the number of victims. The provincial administration moved three places from sixth to third, on a marginally deteriorated performance by 1.1 percentage points. The Private Sector and local authorities follow in fourth and fifth, both down two places from 2002, with very significant 27 percentage point improvement. Other significant improvements on this indicator are the Ministry of Education, by a very significant 27 percentage points, the Kenya Power and Lighting Company by 14 percentage points, the Registrar of Persons by 13 points and the Nairobi City Council by 10 points.

TABLE 9: PREVALENCE (BRIBERY ENCOUNTERS AS % OF RESPONDENTS AFFECTED)

RANK ORGANIZATION	2003			2002		
	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL
1 Kenya Police	28.4	34.7	22.5	70.7	72.3	68.0
2 Public Hospitals	23.7	22.7	24.7	31.3	30.0	33.5
3 Provincial Administration	20.3	14.1	26.0	19.1	12.3	30.8
4 Private Sector	6.3	9.0	3.8	33.9	30.1	40.3
5 Local Authorities, n.e.s.	6.0	5.4	6.5	33.3	28.5	41.3
6 Public Schools	5.2	4.9	5.5	13.7	12.1	16.5
7 Nairobi City Council	4.1	8.4	0.1	14.1	21.5	1.6
8 Judiciary	3.7	3.6	3.7	13.1	13.1	13.0
9 Registrar of Persons	3.4	4.4	2.6	16.8	15.5	19.0
10 Ministry of Lands	3.2	1.7	4.6	4.6	3.7	6.2
11 Cooperative Societies	2.9	1.6	4.2			
12 KPLC	2.5	4.0	1.2	16.3	21.1	8.1
13 Central Government, n.e.s.	2.3	2.8	1.8	4.6	4.0	5.6
14 Immigration Dept	2.2	4.0	0.5	10.0	12.5	5.7
15 State Corporations n.e.s.	2.1	2.7	1.8	6.7	5.7	8.5
16 Religious Organizations	2.0	1.7	2.2	2.7	2.7	2.7
17 CSOs	1.7	1.1	2.2	1.0	1.3	0.6
18 Kenya Revenue Authority	1.5	2.2	0.9	7.2	8.6	4.8
19 Ministry of Education	1.5	1.6	1.4	28.3	26.6	31.2
20 Teachers Service Commission	1.1	1.5	0.7	2.1	2.3	1.6
21 Financial Institutions n.e.s.	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.4	0.4	0.5
22 National Social Security Fund	1.0	0.9	1.0	3.2	3.0	3.6
23 Mombasa City Council	0.9	1.6	0.2	3.6	4.5	2.0
24 Public Colleges	0.9	1.6	0.3			

25 Telkom Kenya	0.8	1.6	0.2	11.6	15.6	4.9
26 Ministry of Water	0.7	1.2	0.2			
27 Ministry of Labour	0.6	0.8	0.4			
28 Ministry of Public Works	0.5	1.0	0.1	1.4	1.8	0.6
29 Ministry of Health	0.5	0.6	0.4	3.4	2.8	4.4
30 International Organizations	0.5	0.3	0.2	1.6	1.9	0.9
31 Kisumu City Council	0.4	0.8	0.1	3.6	4.8	1.6
32 Kenya Railways	0.4	0.7	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
33 Department of Defence	0.3	0.5	0.6	4.4	3.4	6.0
34 Postal Corporation	0.3	0.7	0.2			
35 Trade Unions	0.3	0.3	0.0			
36 Kenya Commercial Bank	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.7	1.4	2.2
37 Public Universities	0.2	0.4	0.1	3.5	0.5	4.7
38 Min. of Agriculture/Livestock	0.2	0.2	0.3	1.6	1.4	2.0

### Severity (Likelihood of Service Denial)

The Department of Defence retains the worst performance on this indicator, but with a significant decrease in the frequency of severe consequences at 40 percent, down from 75 percent in 2002. It is closely followed by the Ministry of Public Works, with a severity frequency of 38 percent, up five places from 2002 owing to a below average improvement. The Police force follows in third place, also up 7 places from 10th, followed by the Immigration Department, also up 7 places from 11th. Other Central Government is fifth, from 21st in 2002, due to below average improvement. The others in the ten worst offenders list are the Ministry of Lands, down one position to sixth, Registrar of Persons, up six places from 13th, Nairobi City Council from 20th place in 2002, the Ministry of Labour in 9th place was not ranked separately in 2002, and the Kenya Revenue Authority, which ranked 18th in 2002.

Although the worst ranked, the Department of Defence registered the most significant improvement by 35 percentage points, the same as Kisumu City Council. Other very significant improvements on this index are registered by the Teachers Service Commission and Public Universities by 28 percentage points, the Judiciary and Public Hospitals by 27 points, Foreign Missions and International Organizations by 26 points, Mombasa City Council by 25 points, Other Local Authorities and the Ministry of Lands by 22 points. Financial Institutions and the Kenya Commercial Bank bucked the trend towards improved performance with a 5 and 4 percentage point deterioration respectively.

TABLE 10: SEVERITY (% OF DECLINATIONS RESULTING IN SERVICE DENIAL)

RANK ORGANIZATION	2003			2002		
	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL
1 Department of Defence	40.0	36.4	44.4	75.0	74.5	75.5
2 Ministry of Public Works	38.1	42.1	0.0	47.4	43.8	66.7
3 Kenya Police	31.7	28.9	35.4	45.7	46.7	43.9
4 Immigration Dept	25.4	25.0	28.6	44.7	44.6	45.1
5 Central Government, n.e.s.	23.5	23.9	22.9	32.6	30.7	35.0
6 Ministry of Lands	21.4	27.3	19.0	50.9	49.1	52.7
7 Registrar of Persons	20.4	16.1	28.6	42.1	46.5	36.1
8 Nairobi City Council	19.1	19.5	0.0	39.7	39.1	52.9
9 Ministry of Labour	19.0	16.7	22.2			
10 Kenya Revenue Authority	18.8	18.2	21.4	40.1	40.7	38.1
11 Provincial Administration	16.2	16.5	16.0	37.6	36.9	38.1
12 Mombasa City Council	15.6	14.3	25.0	40.4	36.1	58.8
13 Ministry of Health	15.2	10.0	23.1	35.3	25.0	46.0
14 Judiciary	13.3	13.3	13.3	40.5	47.3	28.8

15 Private Sector	13.2	12.8	14.0	17.1	15.0	20.3
16 Kenya Railways	12.5	14.3	0.0	14.3	16.7	9.1
17 Trade Unions	12.1	16.0	0.0			
18 State Corporations n.e.s.	9.7	8.9	10.9	22.9	23.7	21.8
19 Local Authorities, n.e.s.	9.1	8.1	9.8	30.7	27.4	34.8
20 Public Colleges	8.7	11.3	3.1			
21 Public Hospitals	8.7	8.4	9.0	35.6	34.3	37.7
22 Cooperative Societies	8.4	6.8	8.9			
23 Kenya Commercial Bank	8.3	5.9	11.5	4.3	4.7	3.8
24 International Organizations	8.2	0.0	11.1	34.3	44.0	10.0
25 Ministry of Water Development	7.0	8.6	4.5			
26 National Social Security Fund	6.8	3.4	13.3	23.2	28.8	15.0
27 Ministry of Education	6.7	6.3	7.3	28.1	27.9	28.4
28 Financial Institutions n.e.s.	6.3	8.0	4.3	1.0	1.4	0.0
29 Public Universities	6.1	5.9	6.7	34.0	8.6	33.3
30 KPLC	6.0	4.4	15.0	16.4	17.4	13.0
31 Min. of Agriculture/Livestock Dev.	5.1	15.4	0.0	30.4	36.4	25.0
32 Kisumu City Council	5.0	5.3	0.0	40.0	38.6	46.7
33 Public Schools	5.0	6.4	4.1	24.1	23.8	24.4
34 Telkom Kenya	4.6	5.6	0.0	21.1	21.7	18.7
35 CSOs	4.5	5.3	3.9	16.9	19.6	7.7
36 Postal Corporation	3.9	4.2	3.4			
37 Teachers Service Commission	3.4	3.4	3.4	31.6	33.3	27.8
38 Religious Organizations	3.4	3.6	3.3	7.6	7.7	7.5

### Expenditure on Bribery

Police officers retain the top position for extracting the most money from the public through bribery. However, this has fallen very considerably from a rate of 1,270 shillings to 250 shillings per person per month. State corporations are in second place, up 19 places from 21<sup>st</sup> position in 2002, at 190 shillings per person. This reflects the fact that some of the corporations prominent in 2002 are now included in this aggregate. Public hospitals follow in third place, up six places up from 9<sup>th</sup> at 109 shillings, about the same as in 2002. The Provincial Administration is fourth at 90 shillings, four places up from ninth, followed in fifth place by the private sector, down two places at 57 shillings, down from 250 shilling in 2002. The others in the top ten are the KPLC and the Judiciary at 45 shillings, the Immigration Department (44 shillings), and the Ministry of Lands and the Department of Defence at 40 shillings.

As noted, the survey registered a very significant decrease in the expenditure spent on bribing the police. Other organizations registering significant decreases are the Immigration Department by 460 shillings, the Private Sector and Local Authorities by 195 shillings, and the Department of Defence by 107 shillings.

A number of organizations also registered increases in expenditure, notably the Teachers Service Commission by 23 shillings per person per month, Public Universities by 7 shillings, the Ministry of Lands (5 shillings), the NSSF (5 shillings) Kenya Railways (4 shillings) and the Ministry of Public Works (2 shillings)

TABLE 11: COST OF BRIBES (AVERAGE EXPENDITURE PER RESPONDENT, KSH)

RANK	2003			2002		
	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL
1 Kenya Police	251.59	366.58	144.63	1269.52	1643.88	716.39
2 State Corporations n.e.s.	191.89	392.44	5.33	33.28	45.06	42.89
3 Public Hospitals	109.17	190.43	33.59	109.24	96.14	165.38
4 Provincial Administration	90.61	90.37	90.83	114.71	164.99	87.60
5 Private Sector	56.81	78.46	36.67	251.68	241.61	352.95
6 KPLC	45.80	75.36	18.31	87.77	120.04	17.46
7 Judiciary	44.69	51.97	37.93	158.09	187.83	159.01
8 Immigration Dept	43.46	87.05	2.90	504.27	786.23	54.12
9 Ministry of Lands	40.23	14.30	64.35	35.67	43.40	41.87
10 Department of Defence	39.63	48.53	31.34	146.65	185.58	228.31
11 Public Schools	39.17	73.42	7.31	125.88	57.15	276.63
12 Central Government, n.e.s.	37.42	49.67	26.02	59.04	43.97	99.06
13 Kenya Revenue Authority	31.90	59.73	6.01	95.93	151.44	24.52
14 Teachers Service Commission	31.07	49.68	13.76	7.95	12.85	6.59
15 Nairobi City Council	28.06	57.70	0.49	99.86	157.40	3.37
16 Public Colleges	24.72	49.74	1.45			
17 Ministry of Education	22.62	17.48	27.40	96.65	152.09	86.99
18 Public Universities	20.84	28.88	13.37	14.17	28.11	9.91
19 Local Authorities, n.e.s.	17.59	15.64	19.40	213.24	192.59	276.01
20 Cooperative Societies	12.55	15.16	10.11			
21 Financial Institutions n.e.s.	12.43	23.97	1.68	0.34	0.21	0.58
22 National Social Security Fund	11.87	22.41	2.07	6.90	12.31	2.29
23 International Organizations	9.94	20.55	0.06	25.32	32.53	34.69
24 CSOs	6.73	6.16	7.26	16.55	22.67	9.69
25 Registrar of Persons	6.64	11.44	2.18	53.21	55.37	67.00
26 Ministry of Public Works	5.57	11.55	0.00	3.51	5.75	48.84
27 Telkom Kenya	4.94	9.67	0.53	48.49	77.86	89.86
28 Kenya Railways	4.39	9.11	0.00	0.86	1.92	0.22
29 Ministry of Health	3.49	5.43	1.68	37.58	48.83	29.28
30 Mombasa City Council	3.34	6.65	0.27	12.53	11.37	15.94
31 Ministry of Labour	2.95	5.83	0.27			
32 Kisumu City Council	2.75	5.62	0.08	11.80	17.22	5.24
33 Religious Organizations	2.03	0.68	3.29	4.34	4.52	5.62
34 Min. of Agriculture/Livestock Dev.	1.42	2.51	0.40	3.65	5.56	1.89
35 Ministry of Water Development	1.13	1.34	0.94			
36 Trade Unions	0.98	2.03	0.00			
37 Postal Corporation	0.28	0.49	0.08			
38 Kenya Commercial Bank	0.01	0.01	0.00	5.40	10.19	3.50

**Frequency (Number of Bribes Paid)**

Police officers are still the most frequently bribed public officials, at an average of 13 bribes per client per year. However, this is a remarkable 77 percent less than the frequency reported in 2002 (54 bribes per person per year). Kisumu City Council follows, up 6 places with 10 bribes per person per year, down from 17 in 2002, followed by the Kenya Revenue Authority which is up 15 places through maintaining a frequency of 9 bribes per client. Other Central Government and Nairobi City Council are tied in fourth place at 6 bribes, down from 12 and 29 respectively in 2002. The Mombasa City Council follows in the same position as last year, but with a much lower frequency of 5.2, down from 19 in 2002. The Judiciary moved up from 27<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> place, because of a below average improvement, from 7 to 4.7 bribes, and the Immigration Department jumped 24 places from 31<sup>st</sup> to seventh, as a result of a similarly marginal improvement from 5 to 4 bribes per

client. The other leading culprits on this indicator are Provincial Administration at 4 bribes, Registrar of Persons and Ministry of Public Works both at 3.8.

The Ministry of Health registered the most significant improvement reported, from 45 to 2 bribes per client, followed by the Police with an equally remarkable improvement from 54 to 13. Other improvements are registered in the Nairobi City Council (from 29 to 6 bribes per client, other Local Authorities (from 31 to 3.5) Public Hospitals (from 18 to 1.2) and Mombasa City Council (from 19 to 5).

Three organizations registered an increase in the frequency of bribery. The Ministry of Public Works registered 3.8 bribes per client up from 2.1 in 2002, the Teachers Service Commission registered 3.4, up from 1.2, and Kenya Railways 3 bribes per client, up from one in 2002.

RANK ORGANIZATION	2003			2002		
	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL
1 Kenya Police	12.5	12.4	12.7	53.9	49.6	62.3
2 Kisumu City Council	9.6	9.5	12.0	16.7	14.4	28.0
3 Kenya Revenue Authority	9.0	6.0	7.9	9.1	11.6	3.1
4 Central Government, n.e.s.	5.8	4.2	9.0	12.2	10.5	15.3
5 Nairobi City Council	5.8	5.8	4.0	28.9	28.9	29.2
6 Mombasa City Council	5.2	5.9	0.3	18.8	15.9	29.4
7 Judiciary	4.7	5.7	3.7	6.3	7.1	6.0
8 Immigration Dept	4.2	4.2	3.9	5.1	2.9	14.5
9 Provincial Administration	4.1	3.8	4.2	8.1	12.3	6.2
10 Registrar of Persons	3.8	4.1	3.4	6.4	6.3	7.4
11 Ministry of Public Works	3.8	4.2	0.0	1.6	2.1	1.0
12 National Social Security Fund	3.5	5.0	0.7	2.5	3.4	1.0
13 Local Authorities, n.e.s.	3.5	2.9	3.9	30.6	34.5	26.0
14 Teachers Service Commission	3.4	5.6	1.2	1.4	1.8	1.6
15 State Corporations n.e.s.	3.3	4.7	1.1	4.0	3.6	5.4
16 Kenya Railways	3.0	3.4	0.0	1.0	1.5	1.0
17 Cooperative Societies	3.0	5.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
18 Ministry of Lands	2.9	1.5	5.4	10.3	18.3	4.8
19 Private Sector	2.2	2.4	1.2	9.5	10.0	9.6
20 Department of Defence	2.1	3.1	0.8	3.1	5.4	1.6
21 Ministry of Health	1.9	1.9	1.8	46.4	35.4	55.6
22 KPLC	1.6	1.5	2.0	8.5	10.1	3.1
23 International Organizations	1.5	1.9	0.7	11.0	1.6	24.9
24 Telkom Kenya	1.5	1.6	1.1	6.9	7.7	3.8
25 Min. of Agriculture/Livestock Dev.	1.4	0.2	2.0	2.3	3.9	2.1
26 Ministry of Education	1.4	0.9	2.0	5.3	3.7	8.9
27 Ministry of Water Development	1.4	2.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
28 CSOs	1.3	1.4	1.5	3.8	4.4	3.2
29 Public Hospitals	1.2	1.3	1.0	17.8	13.7	23.5
30 Postal Corporation	1.0	1.6	0.41	0.0	0.0	0.0
31 Ministry of Labour	0.7	1.2	0.11	0.0	0.0	0.0
32 Public Colleges	0.7	0.8	0.41	0.0	0.0	0.0
33 Trade Unions	0.5	0.7	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0
34 Public Schools	0.4	0.5	0.38	7.2	2.6	13.9
35 Public Universities	0.3	0.4	0.27	1.6	2.6	1.5
36 Financial Institutions n.e.s.	0.3	0.3	0.17	6.5	13.0	1.0
37 Religious Organizations	0.1	0.02	0.23	12.2	14.5	7.7
38 Kenya Commercial Bank	0.03	0.06	0.0	14.1	23.4	1.0

### Size of Bribes

Public universities registered the highest average, at 35,000 shillings, three and a half times the highest average registered in 2002, and a seven fold increase in the average for public universities in 2002. The Department of Defence retained second worst ranking by registering an average of 27,000 shillings. Public colleges, which were not ranked last year, have the third highest average at 10,700 shillings. They are closely followed by state corporations with an average of 10,200 shillings up 16 places from 20<sup>th</sup> position in 2002. Financial Institutions (Ksh. 7,500), Ministry of Labour (Ksh. 5,700), Ministry of Education (Ksh. 5,200), Teachers Service Commission (Ksh. 4,500) and the Immigration Department (Ksh. 3,600) complete the top ten offenders on this indicator. The education sector features very prominently on this list, with four of the five ranked education service providers being among the top ten culprits, and the fifth (public schools) not far behind in 13<sup>th</sup> position.

Although the overall trend was upward, several organizations registered significant decreases in the average size of bribes reported. Notable ones are CSOs by 7,000 shillings, the Immigration Department by 6,000 shillings, Ministry of Agriculture by 1,860 shillings, Telkom Kenya by 1,700 shillings and the Ministry of Public Works by 1,225 shillings. Others are the Judiciary by Ksh. 490, the Kenya Revenue Authority by Ksh. 490) and the Kenya Commercial Bank by Ksh. 435.

TABLE 13: AVERAGE SIZE OF BRIBE, KSH

RANK	2003			2002		
	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL	NATIONAL	URBAN	RURAL
1 Public Universities	35,412	30,923	50,000	4,644	6,750	2,923
2 Department of Defence	27,917	19,871	67,000	9,433	8,451	21,038
3 Public Colleges	10,658	12,822	1,669			
4 State Corporations n.e.s.	10,188	11,574	1,108	1,911	3,390	1,442
5 Financial Institutions n.e.s.	7,477	10,428	1,575	738	277	6,000
6 Ministry of Labour	5,680	5,800	4,000			
7 Ministry of Education	5,226	5,407	5,125	2,001	4,437	1,079
8 Teachers Service Commission	4,555	4,295	5,719	3,120	3,819	2,428
9 Immigration Dept	4,467	4,771	1,607	10,450	22,523	714
10 Ministry of Lands	3,620	4,063	2,250	944	923	1,571
11 KPLC	3,180	3,113	3,468	1,079	981	11,104
12 International Organizations	3,053	3,532	69	1,341	12,400	719
13 Public Schools	2,746	5,977	454	1,850	2,536	1,807
14 National Social Security Fund	2,212	2,151	3,100	1,489	1,673	1,686
15 Ministry of Public Works	2,035	2,035		3,260	3,358	601
16 Judiciary	1,836	1,694	2,056	2,328	2,459	2,498
17 Central Government, n.e.s.	1,816	2,478	1,232	1,008	931	1,219
18 Kenya Railways	1,761	1,761		1,415	1,982	375
19 Public Hospitals	1,731	2,881	557	279	372	258
20 Private Sector	1,686	1,490	3,430	1,245	1,217	1,543
21 Ministry of Health	1,625	1,988	1,050	275	672	118
22 Trade Unions	1,572	1,572				
23 Kenya Revenue Authority	1,486	2,535	818	1,976	2,094	2,126
24 Telkom Kenya	1,485	1,602	667	3,120	3,819	2,428
25 Nairobi City Council	863	866	617	314	325	92
26 Min. of Agriculture/Livestock Dev.	746	17,500	114	2,609	3,611	931
27 CSOs	720	832	554	7,683	8,281	6,250
28 Provincial Administration	636	998	477	955	1,429	586
29 Kenya Police	635	778	443	354	489	142
30 Mombasa City Council	585	564	4,000	232	202	311
31 Cooperative Societies	484	720	332			
32 Local Authorities, n.e.s.	457	557	403	327	285	439
33 Religious Organizations	455	1,343	404	431	341	1,074
34 Ministry of Water Development	414	253	2,800			
35 Kisumu City Council	414	435	100	318	412	175
36 Registrar of Persons	352	422	194	579	635	584
37 Postal Corporation	104	89	100			
38 Kenya Commercial Bank	100	100		535	635	4,519