

Analysis of Corruption Risky Areas in Public Secondary Schools in Nyandarua and Nakuru Counties in Kenya

Richard Ngatia, Johannes Njagi Njoka & Lucy Ndegwa

Karatina University, Kenya

ABSTRACT: Citizens and stakeholders in education continue to express great concerns regarding the escalating cases of academic dishonesty, misappropriation and misuse of resources in education in the world and Kenya in particular. Corruption activities manifest themselves in all areas of education especially in teaching and learning processes, academic dishonesty, and utilization of educational resources as well as in the development of policies. The purpose of this study was to analyse the corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nyandarua and Nakuru Counties in Kenya. Specifically the study sought to establish the corruption risky areas in public secondary schools and compare the levels of corruption in public secondary schools in Nakuru and Nyandarua counties in Kenya. The study tested the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference in corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nyandarua and Nakuru Counties. The descriptive survey research design was used to guide the study. The target population for the study comprised all secondary school principals, heads of departments and bursars. The sample size was determined using the Cochran sampling formula which yielded a total of 321 respondents. Data was collected using a questionnaire. Descriptive statistics and t-tests were used to analyse data with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0. Results of the study revealed the corruption risky areas in public secondary schools as the charging of extra levies, teachers missing lessons, unreported teachers absenteeism, falsification of information on student enrolment data and irregular procurement of goods and services. Hypothesis testing revealed that corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nakuru and Nyandarua Counties were largely similar, thus the null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted. The study recommended the need to broaden the scope of school auditing to cover all areas of academic life as opposed to the current practice that only focuses majorly on financial management.

KEY WORDS : *Auditing, academic dishonesty, corruption, corruption risky areas, risk assessment.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Nations of the world allocate huge proportions of their budget to education due to the value attached to the educated citizenry and human capital on national development. Education is also expected to stimulate socio-economic transformation of societies and progress. In the contemporary world, education is championed as the universal remedy to the challenges bedeviling societies. These problems include ignorance, poverty and disease. According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2008) the education sector in most countries around the world constitutes the major beneficiary in terms of budgetary allocation. Unfortunately, it is also the single most sector where great acts of corrupt practices take place. Corruption in educational institutions erodes public confidence in the quality and relevance of education provided to the citizens. Since education is believed to be a major driver of change and transformation of societies, corruption greatly stifles societal progress and development. Corruption in education has a ripple effect to the rest of the sectors in the economy since the national goals of education of producing high level manpower is grossly compromised. Lawal and Tobi (2006) affirms this position and argues that unethical practices has now become a global problem which has pervaded deeply all sectors of the society. In education corruption has been exemplified in misappropriation and embezzlement of financial resources, dilapidated infrastructure, bribery and favoritism in the appointment of staff and abuse of office for personal gain. UNDP (2008) define corruption as the abuse of delegated authority for personal advantage by engaging in practices such as extortion, bribery, favoritism, or fraud. According to Transparency International (2010) corruption refer to abuse of delegated authority for personal advantage. Hallak and Poisson (2007) defines corruption as the methodical use of a public office for personal gain which negatively impacts on the provision of quality education. OECD (2018) points out that the common corruption risky areas in education occur in the use of financial resources, academic dishonesty, procurement procedures and hiring of staff. These manifestations of corruption activities pose challenges to the provision of quality

education to the citizens. Compromise on the provision of quality education has tremendous effects on the future performance of school graduates in the economy as workers, job creators and innovators.

In any organization, unethical conduct is likely to occur particularly in the spheres of its key operations, commonly referred to as the corruption risky areas (Mills, 2011). The corruption risky areas describes operational areas in schools where the menace is likely to take place such as the fiscal activities, security, academics, human resources functions and infrastructural development undertakings. In educational institutions, the menace of corruption ranges from the more severe acts such as bribery to subtle activities like teacher absenteeism from work, lateness in class attendance and gross acts of financial misappropriation (McDevitt, 2011). In this regard the prevalence of corrupt practices such as the engagement in unethical behavior and lack of integrity among others, occur partly due to intentionally planned criminal acts and partly because of deficiencies in professional capacities. Corruption is also fueled by peoples' deficiencies in life skills like honesty and integrity. Existence of inadequate or unclear guidelines, poor monitoring and in some cases negligence is also reported as reasons that promote the vice. Consequently, public organizations need to manage their own internal risks as well as the threats potentially inherent in partnerships while dealing with the private sector (Hallak & Poisson, 2007). There is critical need to broaden the meaning of the term corruption to cover all areas of academic life.

Corruption risk assessment tries to detect flaws in an organization which may provide avenues for dishonest individuals to engage in malpractices (McDevitt 2011). Blais and Shenkelaars (2009) point out that assessment of corruption risk is principally designed to identify possible areas where systems may be compromised by individuals to perpetuate unacceptable behaviours within the organization. Corruption risk assessment is not meant to find out if corruption is prevalent or to point out corrupt individuals, rather, it is an undertaking to map out areas where corrupt activities are most likely to occur. According to USAID (2009) corruption risk assessment can be conducted at various levels, such as country wide, targeting an entire sector, a selected institution or region, or evaluate a particular programme or task. Some of the approaches employed in risk assessment assume a cascading format, starting with the institutional framework followed by in-depth assessment in departments (ADB, 2008). CoE (2010) adds that assessment of corruption risk in management practices is normally carried out to update anti-corruption strategies of the probable weaknesses of particular organizational structures, processes and systems. Thus, assessment of corruption risk is a worthy prospect to pinpoint institutional processes, departments, or tasks that may fail to work successfully and reliability and ascertain to the causes of their performance.

Consequently, corruption risk evaluation in education is a crucial constituent in developing healthy compliant programmes which are vital for public learning institutions to lead them as specified by the guidelines of the ministry of education. UNESCO (2017) conducted a study on corruption in educational institutions which mapped potential avenues of the practices globally. In Poland, the study noted that procurement process was often abused where well-connected firms were listed as suppliers of goods and services in schools. Moreover, inflation of costs and flouting of procurement rules and regulations were reported as common practices. Similar flaws were reported in Philippines. The suppliers to the department of education pointed out that bribery in supply of instructional materials was in the range of 20-65% of the net worth of the contract. Further, the procurement process was interfered with by politicians who fronted their cronies to win the tenders often at exorbitant prices (Fjeldstad, 2006). These findings indicate that corruption in education is a global menace. It is not only a third world or developing countries' issue. The vice straddles across the entire spectrum of both the developed and developing countries in Africa, Asia, Europe and Americas.

Stakeholders in education continue to express concerns regarding persistent corrupt activities in public secondary schools in Kenya. Corruption in schools is exemplified in acts such as embezzlement and misappropriation of resources, fraudulent procurement procedures and abuse of office in educational institutions in the world and Kenya in particular. Corruption activity also manifest itself in other areas of education such as teaching and learning processes, consumption of education resources and in the development of education policies to suit vested interests. Cases of corruption in education and particularly in public secondary schools in Kenya are hardly ever investigated. Neither is there any structured effort towards mapping-out corruption risky areas in secondary schools in Kenya. It is in this light that this study sought to assess corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nyandarua and Nakuru Counties in Kenya.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Policy makers and stakeholders in education continue to decry the escalation of acts of corruption in education in the world and especially in Kenya. The vice of corruption manifest itself in all areas of education especially in teaching and learning processes, administrative and governance systems of the institutions. The vice is also experienced in the development of policies in education where in some situations there is blatant breach of ethics to suit vested interests. Cases of corruption in education and particularly in public secondary schools in Kenya are hardly ever investigated. Systems audit that are regularly conducted in secondary schools normally

focus on financial and fiscal related activities. Rarely are issues pertaining to teaching and learning, academic dishonesty, absenteeism, lateness and class attendance by teachers audited in schools. These risk areas are left to be managed by the routine principals' and school supervision and administrative functions. However, when these critical areas are only left to internal control mechanisms, there is immense potential threat of compromise and cover-up. It is in this light that this study sought to assess corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nyandarua and Nakuru Counties in Kenya with a view to map-out and alert school managers to be vigilant in forestalling them.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to analyse the corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nyandarua and Nakuru Counties in Kenya.

Objectives of the study

The study was guided by the following objectives, to;

- i. Map-out the corruption risky areas in public secondary schools.
- ii. Compare the levels of corruption in public secondary schools in Nakuru and Nyandarua counties in Kenya.

Hypothesis of the study

The study tested the following null hypothesis;

H01: There is no statistically significant difference in corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nyandarua and Nakuru Counties in Kenya.

III. METHODOLOGY

Zimbardo (2007) Lucifer effect theory formed the theoretical framework for the study. The target population comprised of 420 principals, 840 heads of departments and 420 bursars. The sample size was determined using Cochran (1977) sampling formula which yielded a total of 321 respondents. Data was collected through structured questionnaires that had items that gathered both qualitative and quantitative information. Validity of the research instruments was ascertained by use of expert opinion while reliability was computed using Cronbach alpha coefficient. A reliability coefficient of 0.791 was yielded which was higher than the $r = 0.7$ recommended by Kerlinger as the threshold of acceptance. Data was analysed using inferential and descriptive statistics with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0. Data was analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations while the inferential statistics used was t-test.

Literature review

The menace of corruption is extensively investigated in matters relating to governance and financial management. However, the vice is scantily researched in education especially as it relates to the teaching and learning processes. Auditing in education, just like in other public administration sectors, has essentially focused on financial management. This tends to ignore other equally important systems such as the teaching and learning processes, administration of examinations, appointments and any other educational function that has a bearing on the quality of education. Corruption apparently influences education in fundamental ways like in the absenteeism by teachers and lateness in availing themselves for lessons.

The need to control corruption and reinforce quality instruction at basic and higher education levels is a significant step towards improvement of the efficiency and adaptability of a nation's workforce (Ugoani, 2016). There are instances where teachers make arrangements to teach extra lessons outside the officially permitted hours which can be termed as corruption especially where such teachers only cover some of the specified curriculum during normal hours and then extort money from students to have the remaining content taught or put undue pressure on the students to take extra classes to secure good grades (Heyneman, 2010). The student will be adversely affected in the two cases as failure to take the classes leads to dismal performance.

In the worst case, a form of blackmail arises in which teacher teaches only half of the students who have paid for extra lessons. The role of teachers in imparting knowledge values on learners cannot be over emphasized. This role can be greatly compromised if such issues as bias, close relationships, friendship and bribery prevail in aspects such as appointments, transfer and promotion of teachers (Ekeh, 2007). Heyneman (2010) found corruption to be particularly problematic where teachers provide supplementary tutoring of their mainstream students after schools hours. In the worst case, a form of blackmail arises in which teacher teaches only half of the students who have paid for extra lessons. Corruption in education influences the preparation of educators and their output. For instance, an ongoing report indicated that around 80 percent of grade teachers in North West, Nigeria, Sokoto State, specifically were unfit, coming about to monstrous disappointment of Pupils in the West African Examination Council and National Examination Council led assessments (Ugoani, 2014). The

menace of corruption hence can greatly compromise the quality of teachers especially when the trainees are admitted to training institutions fraudulently.

Transparency International (2013) carried out a survey on avenues for corruption in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The results of the survey indicated that students considered manipulation of university entry examination, favoritism of children of employees, nepotism and cronyism in the academic community. The respondents also cited oral examinations with no evidence of test takers contribution and failure to give tests within scheduled times. They also pointed out that the diplomas and degree awarded are not genuine scores but are based on skewed marks.

Nigeria has been ranked as a very highly corrupt country. It is reported that corruption lays in wait for students in Nigeria on the day of their first trial to gain admission into the gates of early childhood education. The same situation remains throughout the other levels of the education system. Security men at the gates of learning institutions in Nigeria were reported to receive bribes from students, parents and visitors to gain entry. Similarly, upon entry parents are asked to give bribes to get admission for their children notably in prestigious institutions. Additionally, in colleges students bribe to get marks and may not even work hard as they know they will get away with it.

In Kenya, Thurairaja (2017) ranks Kenya's education system high in relation to corruption. The study cites admissions and examinations as critical areas where corrupt practices take place. Kenyans value admission of students to best performing and prestigious institutions particularly in form one. There is a prevailing belief that securing a vacancy in a good performing school is a sure ticket to the access of appropriate and marketable career progress. As a result, the study noted that many parents may go a long way to bribe school principals heading such schools that produce good results to secure vacancies for their children. Principals have also been found to issue admission letters to undeserving children who did not score the required performance necessary for admission in such schools. On examinations, the study noted that the value attached to passing examinations due to their placement function had years formed a platform for corrupt practices. To this end, widespread cheating in examinations was reported in Kenya. However, the results of the 2016 Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) and the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) where there was critical and radical decrease of the quantity of students scoring grade A because of enhanced invigilation and supervision of the assessments proved that the vice can be controlled. This is demonstrated from the outset that there had been a lot of cheating in the assessments in both public and private schools in Kenya (Oduor, 2018). With concerted and structured efforts, it is possible to control cheating and offer credible exams in schools in Kenya.

UNESCO (2007) mapped potential avenues of the vice globally. In Poland, procurement process was often abused where well-connected firms were listed as suppliers of goods and services in schools. Moreover, inflation of costs and blatant flout of procurement rules and regulations were reported as common practices. Similar flaws have been reported in Philippines. The suppliers to the department of education claimed that bribery in the provision of learning materials ranged from 20-65% of the value of the contract. Further, the procurement process is interfered with by politicians who fronted their cronies to win the tenders often at exorbitant prices (Anticorruption Resource Centre, 2006). However, despite the vice, it is due to the expected returns from education that the sector receives inordinately huge allocation of funds every financial year in many countries in the world.

The growing recognition on the importance of education has led nations of the world to increase allocation of funds for this sector. Many international and philanthropic organizations are participating in the implementation of educational policies. Political consensus has been reached among international and local actors on the importance of achieving universal access to education and improving its quality. In spite of this increased attention, there are serious shortcomings on fundamental educational indicators like universal access, gender equity, or academic achievement in several developing countries. This paradox of growing attention and poor education results may be explained by different obstacles, both financial and non-financial.

Cohen and Bloom (2005) suggest several non-financial obstacles to achieving universal access to education. These include economic disincentives, opportunity cost of attending school versus working for income and competing demands on limited resources to education. Since governments allocate funding to other programs like health or roads, there is lack of information or limited access to credible data on performance of educational systems. This hampers equitable allocation of funds to education. Another non-financial obstacle that may contribute to explaining shortcomings in educational outcomes is the limited institutional capacity of education. Any organization, public or private, will face administrative inefficiencies, inadequate implementation of policies, or erroneous allocation of resources. However, unlike the effects of "unintentional" inefficiencies due to omission or ignorance, corrupt practices will systematically result in goal displacements within organizations. Van Klaveren (1957), in Heidenheimer (1989) reports that corrupt public officials use public offices as avenues of personal enrichment by maximizing their personal profits at the detriment of the organization.

Mismanagement and unethical practices may affect implementation of policies. This is usually associated with weak institutional capacity and organizational cultures that fail to support an adequate distribution of educational opportunities. This type of organizational culture and the practices that facilitates and condones it, is

what is referred to as educational corruption. This is a notion based on Nye's definition of corruption (Heidenheimer et. al., 1989). According to Nye corruption is behaviour which is not aligned to the official duties assigned to an individual. Corruption is motivated by the urge for personal gain, and encompasses such acts as bribery, presenting a reward to a person in authority for him/her to pervert justice, favouritism to a person's relatives.

In the Philippines, for example, teacher candidates bribe educational authorities to be hired (Chua 1999), with the likely outcome that those hired are not necessarily the candidates most capable to teach. In Mexico, embezzlement of public education funds often results in insufficient distribution of textbooks to the schools (Martinez, 2004), affecting academic achievement of students. In Africa, high attrition rates result, in part, from illegal enrolment fees (Cockroft, 1998). It is likely that students drop out of school because of their inability to afford these illegal payments are those from the poorest families. In the United States, teachers cheating on standardized tests pervert incentive programs which have the likely results of their students receiving a substandard education (Jacob and Levitt, 2003). In Uganda, Kenya and India, teacher absenteeism is a common problem in rural communities (Reinikka & Smith, 2004; Banerjee & Duflo, 2005). The practice tremendously diminishes the opportunities for children in these schools to learn the intended curriculum.

Corruption in education may manifest itself through construction of poor quality classrooms, leaking roofs, inappropriate furniture, poor teachers and inefficient school management due to hiring of mediocre personnel as a result of compromised standards and procedures. Endemic instruction debasement negatively influences the quality of education. There is the danger of hindering the realization of the government's goal of promoting access, relevance, quality and gender parity in education for her citizens (Iyanga, 2014). This clearly demonstrates that corruption is one single enemy that has the inherent potential of completely disorganizing and destroying education in a country.

Corruption in education presents an urgent challenge to governments in view of the fundamental role played by education as a social equalizer. Schools are social institutions put in place for the purpose of successfully bringing about a balance of the diverse components inbuilt in the social environment. Educational institutions also ensure that every citizen enjoys the opportunities available in their country to rise above the limitations of the families of their birth (Dewey, 1917). Therefore, governance and viability of social institutions greatly depend on having an effective and progressive education system.

Supporting schools to accomplish such complex tasks demands constant involvement from central education systems, particularly through the provision of different inputs like educational materials, technical support, or a qualified teaching force. An insufficient or inadequate distribution of resources will hinder the academic achievement of an ample number of students, with shortcomings disproportionately affecting socially disadvantaged groups. These inefficiencies will contribute then to deepening existent social inequalities across ethnic groups or to the institutionalization of social exclusion. Therefore, identifying possible sources of ineffectiveness in the allocation of these resources becomes a key task for administrators, political leaders, international agencies and other organizations.

Corruption in education is an important issue to be confronted by the state and non-state actors. Hallak and Poisson (2002) argue that corruption in the education arena has an impact on the quantity of educational services. It also has a bearing on equity in education and public confidence in educational systems. Although there are several studies describing characteristics and effects of corrupt practices in education systems, credible estimation of these effects is still scarce, mainly because of restrictions in the availability of data. Indeed, finding appropriate methodologies to measure corruption is still a pending challenge. McMullan (1961) argued that corruption is not an issue to be understood from responses captured in interviews and questionnaires. And even if it was to be understood this way, in principle, there would be no practical possibility of doing so.

The challenge of addressing questions on the effects of corruption in education will require a comprehensive conceptual framework that identifies the forms of corruption and the underlying mechanisms through which they impact the delivery of education opportunities. The consequence of the diversion of resources from their intended public education purposes towards private purposes or gains, is perhaps the most studied effect of educational corruption (Chua 1999; Morduchowicz, 2003; Martinez, 2004; Segal, 2004; Chapman, 2005). This results typically in under-provision of essential education inputs relative to the resources budgeted to procure them.

Okun (1975) metaphor of the "leaks in the bucket" in the process of redistributing resources arise from detrimental practices among public officials, like the case described by Chua (1999) in The Philippines. Chua (1999) found that under-delivery of goods represented up to 60% of the total value of public acquisition contracts. Corrupt practices may affect different areas within education systems. As it has been reported in several developing countries, schools suffering from ineffective monitoring are a fertile place for corruption. For instance, illegal enrolment fees may easily hinder academic opportunities of children from economically disadvantaged families. This is because they simply cannot afford to make these illegal payments to continue their education.

Additional evidence supports the argument that corruption has a differentiated effect across social groups. Corruption has the potential to hurt most the poorest of the populations. For instance, Azfar and Gurgur (2001) report that in rural municipalities in The Philippines, corruption “significantly reduces the success rate of students, unlike in the case of similar urban communities. Cockroft (1998) reports that illegal enrolment fees by the amount of £10 established by a headmistress in Tanzania had the potential of deterring possible enrolment of poor children whose parents earn only £5 per month. In both cases illegal enrolment fees determine who gets access to education and could explain low enrolment rates in both countries.

Other authors support the argument that underserved groups are more affected by corrupt practices. Cruz (2004) found in El Salvador people with the lowest levels of education are more prone to ignore and misunderstand the dimensions and effects of corrupt practices. A likely consequence of this lack of awareness is that the lower the educational level, the more difficult it will be for ordinary citizens to detect, denounce, and defend themselves against corrupt public officials. Reinikka & Svensson (2003; 2004) observe that schools situated in rich neighbourhoods experienced less corruption. This was explained due to their members having access to means of obtaining information pertaining to their rights and freedoms of expression which they exercised unearthing such vices publicly.

How educational corruption may be related to the reproduction of deleterious social values among students is the topic with fewer findings reported in the reviewed literature. There is the view that there is scanty research on how attitudes and behaviours from teachers on corruption affect students’ perceptions. Although it seems plausible that principals and teachers’ permissible attitudes towards corruption may induce and be reproduced by their students.

Lloyd (2001) points out how within the “hidden curriculum” to be is found the true rich culture of the community. Teachers transmit their own beliefs, values, and in some cases misconceptions on specific issues like gender bias. There exists broad case studies used as reference points while discussing corruption. However, there is critical scarcity of examples regarding approaches or tools from which to generalize on how to tackle the menace. Kuranchie, Twene, Mensa and Arthur, (2014) in their study in Ghana on the perceived academic corruption and conditions that promote the vice, uncovered bias, nepotism and assessment misbehaviors. They further indicated that dread of exploitation, fear of school authority and administration in managing such issues were the few conditions that advanced the problem. This work is relevant to our study in that it revealed the conditions that promote and initiate academic corruption in tertiary institutions.

Adedimeji (2015) aver that the backlashes of academic corruption are very clear in society. Educational institutions are loaded up with awkward educators who had been pushed through higher foundations of learning. Such educational leaders who are themselves products of corruption, as a consequence have the potential of proliferating the practice that produced them. Priye, (2015) in his study on the corrosive effect of corruption on Nigerian educational system showed that there is a relationship between corruption and lack of infrastructural development and the poor state of academic standards. He emphasizes that the mushrooming of private educational institutions in Nigeria and amorality in the socio political system are antecedents of such systems. This study is relevant to our study in that it revealed some of the major negative effects of academic corruption in tertiary institutions. It is worthy to note that our tertiary institutions are littered with numerous uncompleted projects and lack adequate facilities to accommodate its normal academic activities. Structures breakdown and fatalities happen in light of the fact that poor instructing and poor learning brought about hypothetical architects that are deprived of value. Unremarkable experts and beginner specialists command national skylines running and destroying the country.

Transparency International is unequivocally dedicated to accomplishing a debasement free society. She (2015) reports that the enormous funds allocated to education by governments ranging from 15- 30% for the acquisition of merchandise and enterprises are lost to corruption. Tostem the vice, experts recommended involvement of the public to ensure transparency and accountability. The Anti-Corruption Helpdesk of Transparency International (2015) must be given kudos for giving stages to examine that are intended to address the danger of defilement. She (2015) noticed that since the information about debasement spreads across various orders the world over, techniques intended to battle it are frequently dissipated and incoherent. The receptiveness to tending to inquiries on debasement sent to her must be lauded as a stage in helping individuals who are covetous to direct examinations planned for controlling defilement.

From the reviewed literature, it is apparent that there is compelling need to map-out corruption risky areas in education in Kenya. This study sought to analyse corruption risky areas in education in order to provide information to act as signal and awareness on the sectors to keep eye on. The context of the study was Nyandarua and Nakuru counties in Kenya

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study sought to map-out the corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nyandarua and Nakuru Counties in Kenya. Corruption risky areas in public secondary schools were measured by means of a likert scale with 10 items in a five point scale that ranged from Strongly Agree (1), Agree (2), Undecided, Disagree

(4) and Strongly Disagree (5). The scales were collapsed where the strongly agree and agree formed the “agree” and strongly disagree and disagree was combined to become “disagree” and undecided remained as it was. The collapsed levels were used to compute a mean score and a standard deviation for each statement and an aggregate mean score for each corruption risky area. A mean score below 3.0 was interpreted to indicate high corruption, 3.0 – 3.99 indicated moderate risk and scores of 4.0 and above were considered to indicate that corruption risk was low (Warmbrod, 2014). The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1Corruption Risky Areas in Public Secondary Schools

Corruption Risky Areas	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	n	\bar{x}	s
1. Exam cheating taking place in School	35(13%)	68(25%)	173(63%)	276	3.84	1.06
2. Charging extra levies to motivate students and teachers	243(88%)	10(4%)	22(8%)	275	1.80	1.01
3. Teachers missing lessons	249(90%)	11(4%)	18(6%)	278	2.02	.76
4. Unreported teachers absenteeism	243(87%)	13(5%)	22(8%)	278	2.07	.79
5. Falsification of information on student enrolment data	215(77%)	8(3%)	55(20%)	278	2.37	1.28
6. Irregular procurement of goods and services	140(51%)	51(19%)	84(31%)	275	2.87	1.30
7. Procurement of RQG to take care of interested parties	122(44%)	38(14%)	118(42%)	278	3.17	1.30
8. Tendering procedures not adhered to	142(51%)	24(9%)	110(40%)	276	3.04	1.44
9. Wastage in use of school resources	139(50%)	44(16%)	93(34%)	276	3.01	1.30
10. Inflated prices on goods purchased	74(27%)	49(18%)	155(56%)	278	3.60	1.41
Overall mean (\bar{x}) = 2.78, standard deviation (s) = .81						

Table 1 shows that majority, 173(63%) of the respondents disagreed that examination cheating was taking place in schools, 68(25%) were undecided, 35(13%) agreed; the mean score and standard deviation of this statement was ($\bar{x} = 3.84$) which indicated that a moderate corruption risky. On charging extra levies to motivate students and teachers, 243(88%) agreed, 10(4%) were undecided, 22(8%) disagreed, the mean score obtained was ($\bar{x} = 1.80$) which indicated that the respondents rated the statement as a high risky area. On whether teachers missed lessons, 249(90%) agreed, 11(4%) were undecided, 18(6%) disagreed; the mean score for this statement was ($\bar{x} = 2.02$) which indicated a high risky area. On whether there were unreported cases of teacher absenteeism, majority 243(87%) agreed, 13(5%) were undecided, 22(8%) disagreed; the mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.07$) thus demonstrating a high risky area. Falsification of information on student enrolment data, 215(77%) agreed, 8(3%) were undecided, 55(20%) disagreed; mean score ($\bar{x} = 3.84$) indicated that the respondents rated the statement as a moderately risky area.

On whether the school engaged in irregular procurement of goods and services, majority 140(51%) agreed, 51(19%) were undecided, 84(31%) disagreed; mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.87$) indicated a high risky area. On whether the school engaged in procurement of low quality goods to take care of interested parties, 122(44%) agreed, 38(14%) were undecided, 118(42%) disagreed; mean score($\bar{x} = 3.17$) indicated that this was a moderately risky area. On whether the tendering procedures were not adhered to, 142(51%) agreed, 24(9%) were not sure, 110(40%) disagreed; mean score ($\bar{x} = 3.04$) indicated the respondents rated the statement as a moderately risky area. When the respondents were asked if there was wastage in use of school resources, 139(50%) agreed, 44(16%) were undecided, 93(34%) disagreed; mean score ($\bar{x} = 3.01$) thus indicating that this was a moderately risky area. Lastly, on whether prices were inflated on goods purchased, 74(27%) agreed, 49(18%) were undecided, 155(56%) disagreed; mean score ($\bar{x} = 3.60$) indicated that the risk was rated as moderate.

The study revealed high corruption risky areas in public secondary schools which were charging extra levies to motivate students and teachers, teachers missing lessons and unreported teachers absenteeism. The falsification of information on student enrolment data and irregular procurement of goods and services was also reported. The study also established that areas of moderate corruption risk were cheating in examinations, inflated prices on purchases and failure to adhere to tendering procedures. The wastage in use of school resources and procurement of low priced goods to take care of interested parties emerged as potential risks. The computed overall mean score and standard deviation for all the ten items on corruption risky areas was ($\bar{x} = 2.78$) which indicated that the respondents on average rated corruption risk in public secondary schools in the two counties as high. The high risk of corruption in schools is likely to compromise the quality of instructional processes, equity in access, teacher and learner motivation and overall attainment of educational goals and objectives. It is likely to ignore meritocracy, thus depriving the country of competent and talented personnel. So long as the education system is not founded on merit, honesty and impartiality, a country jeopardizes its future socio-economic and governmental endeavors.

These findings concur with a report published by Transparency International (2014) which observed that corruption is rife in Sub Saharan Africa and permeates every sector of society. The existence of corruption in schools is indisputable, noting that the disease had been domesticated in Kenya. Similarly, United Nations Convention against Corruption (2013) asserts that individuals in all hierarchies of the education system, from the top to the bottom, were threatened by some form of corrupt practices at particular situations. This occurrence

has been attributed to the fact that it is not until recently that scholars have turned their attention on corruption in schools. There have been inadequate mechanisms to address the vice presumably because of the concern that such a move would erode public confidence in schools and therefore decrease the allocation of resources to education. Narayan (2014) in a meta-analysis of existing research on corruption in schools discovered adulteration of instruction and political interference in the management of schools led to abating of the vice. This means that politicians may shield and defend school managers who reward them with business opportunities personally or through proxies to supply goods and services.

Analysis of Corruption Risky areas by County

The study compared corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nakuru and Nyandarua Counties. Corruption risk was assessed by means of 10 items in a five point likert scale that ranged from strongly agree (1), agree (2) undecided (3) disagree (4) and strongly disagree (5). The mean score and standard deviation of each county was computed and used to rate the corruption risk in each county. A mean score below 3.0 was interpreted to indicate a high risk, 3.0 – 3.99 indicated moderate and scores of 4.0 and above were considered to indicate a low risk of corruption (Warmbrod, 2014). The responses are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Corruption Risky areas in Public Secondary Schools by County

County	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Nakuru	2.7900	179	.81685
Nyandarua	2.7571	99	.78854
Total	2.7783	278	.80561

Table 2 shows that the mean scores for corruption risky areas for secondary schools in Nakuru County was ($\bar{x} = 2.7900$, $s = .81685$) while for Nyandarua County ($\bar{x} = 2.7571$, $s = .78854$). The overall computed mean score for both counties combined was ($\bar{x} = 2.7783$, $s = .80561$). These findings revealed that corruption risky areas were high in both counties and that the levels of risk were almost similar. These findings were in agreement with the Transparency International Kenya (2010) which revealed high incidence of corruption in schools. Several key corruption concerns were identified as widespread mismanagement, lack of accountability and lack of openness in infrastructural development projects. The pervasive powers of the government in making opaque appointments, multiplicity of institutions, overlapping roles and a weakly enforced legal framework guiding the sector were cited as the reasons that facilitated the menace.

Transparency International (2013) reported that corruption in schools could take the form of leakages and embezzlements, illegal fees and bribery. Procurement malpractices, ghost schools, nepotism in appointments, fake certificates, and teacher absenteeism from school were great areas of concern. In Kenya, education budget leakages is widely experienced. The year 2004-2009, USD 48 million meant for education was reportedly misappropriated (TI, 2013). Charging of illegal fees in schools was another glaring risk in the education sector. The Children's Act (2001) clause 7(1) declares that it is the right of every child to access education. The Constitution of Kenya (2010) in Article 53 (1) provides that every child has a right to free education and obligatory essential training' (Government of Kenya, 2010). It is extremely important to know as corruption or any other crime relates to the probability of being caught and punished, fear of which might influence one's decision. The legal and constitutional provisions hence stress the fact that every child has a right to education and training. If corruption is not controlled, it has the potential of alienating such rights from being appropriately enjoyed by the Kenyan children. The net effect could be widespread rural poverty, underdevelopment and backwardness in the nation.

Results of tests of hypothesis

Independent-samples t-test was used to find out if there were significant differences in Nakuru and Nyandarua counties on corruption. Results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Results of t-test Analysis on Corruption risky areas by County

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Corruption Risky Areas	539	.464	.325	276	.745	.03288	.10107	-.16608	.23184
Equal variances assumed			.329	208.426	.743	.03288	.10004	-.16434	.23010
Equal variances not assumed									

The findings in Table 3 indicate that there was no significant difference in the scores for Nyandarua ($\bar{x} = 2.7571$, $s = .78854$) and Nakuru ($\bar{x} = 2.7900$, $s = .81685$); $t = (276) = 0.325$, $p = 0.745$. Thus the null hypothesis was accepted. The conclusion was that corruption risky areas in public secondary schools in Nakuru and Nyandarua Counties were largely similar.

The education sector integrity study identified integrity issues in education. The issues included irregular payments to contractors as a significant aspect of questionable integrity within the procurement system of the Ministry of Education. Analyses of the Controller and Auditor General's report (2002/2003 – 2004/2005) also found integrity issues in education. The Kenya National Audit Office (KENAO) in 2009/2010-2011/2012) reveal irregular payments, overpayments, payments for goods and services not delivered or payments not sanctioned by the relevant authorities. Throughout the years, quality evaluation and review reports have indicated that there are instances of inappropriateness in monetary administration and feeble responsibility systems. Though very good audit reports exist, there is inherent system failures to hold culprits accountable for the identified audit queries. The systemic failures have only resulted to only documenting cases of rampant corruption by the office of the Auditor General without tangible sanctions on the perpetrators.

Conclusion and recommendations

From the findings of the study, it was concluded that there exists corruption risky areas in education that school managers and stakeholders should be keen and vigilant to control. The vigilance and control should be conducted by streamlining and enforcing the accountability procedures to ensure culprits of corruption are punished in order to deter escalation of the vice in education.

The study recommended the need to broaden the scope of school auditing to cover all areas of academic life as opposed to the current practice of only focusing majorly on financial management. When this is done, it will be possible to control acts of corruption that are non-financial in nature such as teachers missing classes, absenteeism and lateness in attending classes.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Asian Development Bank. (2008). Guidelines for implementing ADB's second governance and anticorruption action plan (GACAP II). Manila.
- [2]. Blais, D. & Schenkelaars, F. (2009). *Institutional risky assessment best practices compendium. private publication*. <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/unpan/unpan039112.pdf>
- [3]. Chikomwe, J. (2012). *Tender and tender administration*. Harare: The Zimbabwe Independent, 17 July. 5.
- [4]. Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- [5]. Coe, C. (2010). *Public financial management*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ Prentice Hall.
- [6]. Fjeldstad, O. H. (2006). *Revenue administration and corruption*. Utstein: Anti-Corruption Resource Centre.
- [7]. Government of Kenya. (2010). *The constitution of Kenya*. Nairobi: Government Printers
- [8]. Government of Kenya. (2016). *The public procurement and asset disposal Act, 2015*. Nairobi: Government Printers
- [9]. Hallak, J., & Poisson, M. (2007). *Corrupt schools, corrupt universities: What can be done?* Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.
- [10]. Heyneman, P. (2010). Education and corruption. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24: 637–648.
- [11]. Kavula, J., Kalai, J.M., & Migosi, J. (2014). Determinants of implementation of public procurement regulations in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Research and Reviews*, 2(1), 9-16.
- [12]. Kenya Anti-corruption Commission.(2007-2011). Annual report of activities and financial statement for the FY 2007/2008.Nairobi.
- [13]. Lawal, G. & Tobi, A. (2006). Bureaucratic corruption, good governance and development: The challenges and prospects of institution building in Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Science Research*, 2(10), 642-649.
- [14]. McDevitt, A. (2011). *Corruption risky assessment topic guide*. available on: http://gateway.transparency.org/files/uploads/Corruption_Risky_Assessment_Topic_Guide.pdf.
- [15]. Mills, A. (2011). Corruption risky factors: a review of 100 NSW ICAC inquiries. paper presented at Australian Public Sector Anti-corruption Conference Fremantle November 2011
- [16]. Narayan, L. (2014). Corruption in education-nature and causes. *International Journal of research*, 1(8), 211-225.
- [17]. Nwaokugha, D. O., & Ezeugwu, M. C. (2017). Corruption in the education industry in Nigeria: implications for national development. *European Journal of training and Development studies*, 4(1), 1-17.
- [18]. OECD. (2018). Education for integrity: Teaching on anti-corruption, values and the rule of law. Resource book. Public Sector Integrity Division, OECD Directorate for Public Governance.
- [19]. Onyinkwa, J. (2013). Factors influencing compliance to procurement regulations in public secondary schools in Kenya. A case of Nyamache District, Kisii County. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(1),
- [20]. Transparency International. (2010). Good governance lessons for primary education: AEW survey data.

- [21]. Transparency International. (2013). *Global corruption report: Education*, op. cit.
- [22]. Transparency International. (2014). *Anti-corruption helpdesk: On-demand research on corruption, Accountability*. [Http://Www.Transparency.Org/What Edo/Activity/Our...Hel pdesk...On...](http://www.transparency.org/What%20We%20Do/Activity/Our%20Work/Helpdesk/On-demand-research-on-corruption-accountability)
- [23]. Transparency International. (2014). *Corruption perception index (CPI)*, Retrieved from; [www.transparency.org>.....>Research>Corruption perception index>CPI](http://www.transparency.org/research/cpi)2014 Corruption is threatening Economic growth of all
- [24]. UNDP (2008). *Primer on corruption and development: Anti-corruption intervention for poverty reduction, realization of MDGs and promoting sustainable development democratic governance group, Bureaucratic for Development Policy*: New York.
- [25]. UNESCO. (2017). *Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments. Global Education Monitoring Report, Youth Version, 2017/8*.
- [26]. United Nations Convention Against Corruption (2013). *Progress report*.
- [27]. *Corruption assessment handbook*. Available on: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadv270.pdf.
- [28]. Warmbrod, J. R. (2014). Reporting and interpreting scores derived from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 55(5), 30-47.
- [29]. [https://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/publication/un_convention_againstcorruption_progress_report_2013](https://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/publication/un_convention_against_corruption_progress_report_2013).
- [30]. USAID. (2009). *Anti-c*