

Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission



“CORRUPTION ERADICATION” INDICATOR FOR PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS IN PUBLIC SERVICE

A GUIDE FOR CORRUPTION BASE LINE SURVEY

*Preventive Services Directorate
Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission
December 2008*

On the frontline against corruption

1. Preamble

Following the inclusion of the “Corruption Eradication” indicator in the performance contracts, all public institutions are expected to mainstream anti-corruption strategies in their management systems. Part of this entails conducting a baseline survey to determine the levels of corruption.

The Anti-Corruption and Economic Crimes Act of 2003, the Public Officer Ethics Act of 2003 and the Public Service Integrity Programme provide the foundation and environment for developing, implementing and sustaining a sound and effective integrity system across the public sector and eradicating corruption. The corruption eradication indicator in the Performance Contracts provides the basis for mainstreaming mechanisms for prevention and detection of corruption in public institutions. The corruption eradication indicator entails fulfilling the following key measures:-

- Formulation of an institutional Anti-Corruption Policy
- Operationalizing Corruption Prevention/Integrity Committees
- Developing Corruption Prevention Plans
- Developing a Code of Conduct
- Integrity Training
- Baseline survey on corruption perception

2. Objectives of this Guide

Overall, the Survey will seek to monitor corruption levels in institutions over time and to evaluate the impact of corruption prevention programmes. The main objective of this guide is to ensure a uniform process in conducting the institutional based survey on corruption in a scientific manner. Specifically, the guide:

- Provides a standard and structured methodology of conducting institution specific survey on corruption across all public institutions implementing performance contracts
- Provides key inputs/process that must be taken into account when conducting the survey so as to ensure quality control in the survey process

3. Corruption Eradication Structures

All public institutions are expected to evaluate existing corruption eradication structures. The survey will assess whether public institutions have complied with the requirement of establishing the structures. Data collected will also be used to assess the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies put in place by institutions.

4. Key Corruption Indices

Corruption indices provide an assessment about the scope and the aspects of corruption in public institutions. The Survey output will measure the level of corruption, the magnitude of corruption and service delivery ratings within the institution. To ensure that these measures are captured as required, focus and emphasis will be placed on:

- i) **Corrupt practices:** The Survey should be able to establish the kind of corrupt practices that are taking place in an institutional setting – within its functional and service delivery areas. A clear understanding of the activities and actors/players involved in creating a situation for corrupt practices (the exercising of pressure) and the actual act of corrupt behavior must be generated. This will be based on

the anonymous admissions of respondents. It should assist in measuring the level of proliferation of corruption

- ii) **Corruption Pressure:** This will measure the degree to which the customers are subjected to direct or indirect pressure to participate in corrupt practices within the institution. It accounts for cases in which the public officer shows they expect corrupt behavior from the customer. This will record cases when a customer is asked for money, gift, or favor in order to have a service provided or problem solved. It measures the level of potential corruption in this institution over a given period of time.
- iii) **Magnitude of Corruption:** This will reflect the customer's assessment of the spread of corruption in the institution. The customer's assessment of the spread of corruption reflects the general social environment and prevailing outlook on corruption, as well as the related image of the institution. This will provide the level corruption in the institution.
- iv) **Expectations about the Future of Corruption:** This will reflect the expectations of the customer/client about the capacity of the institution to curb corruption in the institution. Customers' expectations will reflect the degree of public confidence of public institutions in handling corruption.

5. General guidelines and principles

- i) **Survey Methodology:** An appropriate methodology should be developed and applied that emphasizes efficiency and effectiveness of resource application in the survey to cover data collection, processing, analysis and reporting. Specifically,
 - Data should be collected from clients, staff and management.
 - Adequate instruments should be developed to capture information on all the key aspects of the baseline survey. Whereas a sample questionnaire has been developed for this purpose, institutions are free to customize it to meet their requirements where necessary. However, the following questions provided in the sample questionnaire must be included in the Customer/Client instruments (i.e Question 8, 9 19, 20 & 21 of Appendix 1). These questions are essential in constructing corruption indices.
 - The methodology should emphasize internal control and management of the research process to ensure quality and timelines of outputs and efficiency in resource utilization during the survey process. Hence, the research and/or planning department of the institution (where applicable) should in all cases lead and direct the survey process in terms of developing the appropriate methodology, instruments for data collection, data processing, analysis and reporting.
- ii) **Sampling:** Respondents should be sampled appropriately.
- iii) **Time Frame:** The assessment exercise should cover the period beginning 2007/2008 to date.
- iv) **Frequency of Survey:** There will be periodic monitoring of a set of indicators characterizing the way in which customers perceive corruption and also their

involvement in different forms of corrupt practices as outlined above. This will enable monitoring changes in corruption levels overtime.

v) **Reporting:** The institution will be required to forward an analytical report of their findings to Public Sector Reforms and Performance Contracting and the KACC by the last quarter of the financial year.

- The report should comment on the effectiveness of the Corruption eradication structures.
- The report should also provide indices based on the following formulas to allow future monitoring:

6. Corruption indices to be measured

A. Corrupt practices/service satisfaction

Were you satisfied with the service that you were given in this Ministry/Institution?

(Circle as appropriate)

1. Very satisfied 0 (86)
2. Satisfied 1 (44)
3. Moderately satisfied 2 (50)
4. Not satisfied 3 (20)
5. Don't Know

Note that the number of respondents is in parenthesis. Total number of respondents is 200.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Corruption Practices Index} &= 3 \times 20/200 + 2 \times 50/200 + 1 \times 44/200 + 0 \times 86/200 \\ &= 1.02 \end{aligned}$$

The value of the index ranges between 0 and 3. The closer this value is to 3, the more widespread is corruption and the value to zero the less corruption is there.

B. Corruption Pressure

How much pressure was exerted on you by public officers of this Department/Institution/Ministry to engage in corruption? (Circle as appropriate)

1. A lot of pressure 3 (56)
2. A fair amount of pressure 2 (100)
3. A little pressure 1 (34)
4. No pressure at all (10)

Note that the number of respondents is in parenthesis. Total number of respondents is 200.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Corruption Pressure Index} &= 3 \times 56/200 + 2 \times 100/200 + 1 \times 34/200 + 0 \times 10/200 \\ &= 2.01 \end{aligned}$$

The value of the index ranges between 0 and 3. The closer this value is to 3, the more widespread is corruption and the value to zero the less corruption is there.

C. Magnitude of Corruption: Spread of Corruption

In your own assessment, how widespread is corruption among the following groups (categories of employees) in this Ministry/Department?

1. Almost all state officials are involved in it 3 (38)
2. Most state officials are involved in it 2 (84)
3. Only a few state officials are involved in it 1 (76)
4. Hardly any state officials are involved in it 0 (2)
5. Don't Know/Not Applicable — —

Note that the number of respondents is in parenthesis. Total number of respondents is 200.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \textit{Spread of Corruption Index} &= 3 \times 38/200 + 2 \times 84/200 + 1 \times 76/200 + 0 \times 2/200 \\
 &= 3 \times 0.19 + 2 \times 0.42 + 1 \times 0.38 + 0 \times 0.01 \\
 &= 0.57 + 0.84 + 0.38 \\
 &= \mathbf{1.79}
 \end{aligned}$$

The value of the index ranges between 0 and 3. The closer this value is to 3, the more widespread is corruption and the value to zero the less corruption is there.

D. Expectations about the Future of Corruption

What are your expectations next year in corruption levels?

1. Very high 3 (100)
2. Moderate 2 (40)
3. Low 1 (50)
4. No corruption 0 (10)
5. Don't know

Note that the number of respondents is in parenthesis. Total number of respondents is 200.

Expectations about the Future of Corruption Index

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 3 \times 100/200 + 2 \times 40/200 + 1 \times 50/200 + 0 \times 10/200 \\
 &= 3 \times 0.50 + 2 \times 0.2 + 1 \times 0.25 + 0 \times 0.05 \\
 &= 1.5 + 0.4 + 0.25
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= 2.15$$

The value of the index ranges between 0 and 3. The closer this value is to 3, the more widespread is corruption and the value to zero the less corruption is there.

Each of the four indices should be standardized to 10. For example the magnitude of corruption index of 1.79.

$$= 1.79 \times 10/3$$

$$= 5.97$$

All the institutions are expected to move towards zero in all the indices (corruption free).

Appendix 1: Customer/Client Questionnaire (Sample)

1. Gender of the respondents: (Circle as appropriate)

1. Male
2. Female

2. Age of respondent:

3. Education Level: (Circle as appropriate)

1. None
2. Primary education
3. Secondary school
4. Tertiary College
5. University

4. Main occupation of the respondent: (Circle as appropriate)

1. Student
2. Professional
3. Technical worker
4. Businessman/woman
5. Farmer
6. Laborer
7. Other (specify) -----

5. Employment status: (Circle as appropriate)

1. Student
2. Formal employment
3. Informal employment
4. Unemployed
5. Self employment

- 6. Retired
- 7. Other specify.....

6. Department/section where the service was sought

7. How many times have you visited this institution?

8. Were you satisfied with the services offered (Circle as appropriate)

- 1. Very satisfied
- 2. Satisfied
- 3. Moderately satisfied
- 4. Not satisfied
- 5. Don't Know

9. Service satisfaction

Department (s)	How long did it take to be served? (Minutes)	Were you satisfied with the time you spent to obtain the service
		1. Very satisfied 2. Satisfied. 3. Moderately satisfied 4. Not satisfied 5. Don't know

10. What form(s) or practice(s) of corruption did you encounter or experience in the course of seeking services (Do not read the options)?

- 1. Abuse of office
- 2. Bribery demand
- 3. Extortion
- 4. Favouritism
- 5. Tribalism/nepotism
- 6. Misuse and misappropriation of government resources
- 7. Un-procedural tendering
- 8. Other (specify)-----

11. At the place or office where service was being offered, did you give a bribe/unofficial payment or a favour in order to get the services (Circle as appropriate)

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

12. If yes, how many times did you give a bribe

13. If you gave money/gift, how much? (state the value)

14. What made you give? (Circle as appropriate)

- 1. I voluntarily offered as a token
- 2. I usually give to obtain service
- 3. Too much delay in service delivery

- 4. It was demanded
- 5. Others (specify).....

15. How would you rate the level of corruption in this institution today? **(Circle as appropriate)**

- 1. Very high
- 2. Moderate
- 3. Low
- 4. Don't know

16. When rating the level of corruption in this institution, what do you base your assessment on? **(Circle all that apply)**

- 1. Personal experience
- 2. Discussions with relatives and friends
- 3. Information from the institution
- 4. Information from the media
- 5. Information from Kenya Anti Corruption Commission
- 6. Information from politicians
- 7. Information from a place of worship
- 8. Other(Specify) -----

17. Compared to 1 year ago, how has the level of corruption changed in the institution?

- 1. Increased
- 2. Reduced
- 3. Remained the same
- 4. Don't Know

18. What would you attribute your answer in 17 above to:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

19. What are your expectations next year in corruption levels

- 1. Very high
- 2. Moderate
- 3. Low
- 4. Don't know

20. How much pressure was exerted on you by public officers of this Department to engage in corruption? (Circle as appropriate)

- 1. A lot of pressure
- 2. A fair amount of pressure
- 3. A little pressure
- 4. No pressure at all

21. In your own assessment, how widespread is corruption among the following groups (categories of employees) in this Ministry/Department?

1. Almost all officials are involved in it
2. Most officials are involved in it
3. Only a few officials are involved in it
4. Hardly any officials are involved in it
5. Don't Know/Not Applicable

22. Who usually initiates a bribe (**read the options and Circle as appropriate**)

1. A service provider indicates or asks for a payment
2. The person offers a payment on his/ her own accord
3. It is known before hand how to pay and how much to pay
4. Do not Know
5. No opinion

23. What would you do if you experience delays while waiting for the services in this institution? (**Circle as appropriate**)

1. Won't worry, just wait, until it comes
2. Offer a bribe or a gift to the official
3. Use influential people to help you
4. Lodge a complaint to the top management
5. Report to Kenya Anti- Corruption Commission
6. Do nothing and give up
7. Other (Specify) -----