

Integration of Moral Values in School Curriculum to address Corruption in Africa: A case of Tanzania

Dr. Hamdun Ibrahim Sulayman*

ABSTRACT

In this paper, the question of how to address corruption in African society is considered from the view point of integrating teaching values in school curriculum to build a strong moral foundation that will empower the youth to abhor and resist corruption now and in the future. It is argued that by strengthening teaching of values to provide a foundation in values as alternatives for students to consider, may impact their decisions while still at school and later in life as adults and leaders for them to resist corruption when encountered. Such education provided in schools is best thought of as panacea to all malice acts and corruption in African society which has been a blocking stone of development endeavours in Africa. The Transparency International surveys consistently ranking most African countries early in the new millennium amongst the ten most corrupt countries internationally, serves as a motivation factor for this paper.

Key words: Corruption, Values, Curriculum, Tanzania.

مستخلص:

إدماج القيم الأخلاقية في مناهج المدارس لمواجهة الفساد في إفريقيا - دراسة حالة
تنزانيا

تناولت هذه الدراسة كيفية مواجهة الفساد في المجتمعات الإفريقية من وجهة نظر
إدماج القيم التربوية في مناهج المدارس من أجل بناء أساس أخلاقي متين، يقوي

* Muslim University of Morogoro – Tanzania
h_sulayman@yahoo.com

الشباب لمقاومة الفساد ومقته في الحاضر والمستقبل. وقد أظهرت الورقة أن تقوية القيم التدريسية من أجل وضع أساس للقيم قد يؤثر على قراراتهم وهم في المدرسة، وأيضاً عندما يصبحون شباباً وقادة، لمقاومة الفساد في حياتهم العملية. وهذا التعليم الذي يقدم في المدارس يجب أن يكون علاجاً عاماً لكل الأمراض الاجتماعية، من بينها الفساد في المجتمعات الإفريقية، والذي شكل عائقاً أمام التنمية في إفريقيا. وقد أدرجت منظمة الشفافية العالمية في تصنيفها للفساد عشرين من الدول الإفريقية بوصفها أكثر الدول فساداً في العالم، وهذا أيضاً كان دافعاً لكتابة هذه الورقة.

كلمات مفتاحية: الفساد، القيم، المناهج، تنزانيا.

1. Introduction

In line with the institution of the Presidency, the institution of PCB, legislation, and the institution of presidential commissions, this article arguing for adding the institution of education as a means of laying a foundation in values and addressing corruption in Africa, and Tanzania in particular in a way that impacts on youth's lives whilst still at school. The motivation for the idea to integrate moral value in a school curriculum arises from Transparency International surveys consistently ranking most African countries including Tanzania early in the new millennium amongst the 10 most corrupt countries internationally. The argument thus, is an endeavour to urge for use of education as an instrument to build positive values in students in schools to educate future leaders of the country, through collaborative, participatory and empowerment evaluation methods to guide their actions in future and inform their decision when in responsible positions. This being part of his PhD Thesis, the author argues that adopting this approach may contribute to ensuring a Tanzania free of corruption and place among the respectable nations in the world.

1.1. Level of corruption in Tanzania

For the four decades of political independence, Tanzania has been addressing corruption through the institutions of the Presidency, the law enforcement and legislation and through Presidential commissions but the problem still remains unsolved (TI, 2003). The CPI statistics on the level of corruption aims not to discourage or praise countries for being corrupt or above corruption, but to improve their capacity to deliver services to ordinary citizens and bring about prosperity in these countries. The CPI is a matrix that points to the levels of corruption in a country. The CPI is published annually by TI and reflects the perceptions of business people, academics and risk analysts, both resident and non-resident (www.transparency.de). The statistical work is co-ordinated by Professor Dr Johann G. Lambsdorff, an economist at Passau University, and advised by a group of international specialists (www.transparency.de).

The CPI scores range between 10 [least corrupt] and a 0 [most corrupt]. Following the CPI of five years, from 1998 to 2002, most underdeveloped countries score less than 3 on a scale of 1-10, indicating a high level of corruption in these countries. In the CPI of 1998, Tanzania scored 1.9 points, in 4 surveys, and it was fourth among the most corrupt countries in the world, but better than Honduras (1.7), Paraguay (1.5), and Cameroon (1.4), which was the most corrupt country in the world in the 1998 CPI matrix. South Africa was the 33rd and scored 5.2 points in 10 surveys (www.transparency.de).

With reference to the number of surveys done to assess a country's performance, 17 surveys were used in the 1999 CPI and at least 3 surveys were required for a country to be included into the 1999 CPI. The 1999-October CPI reveals that Tanzania scored 1.9 CPI points in 4 surveys used, and was ranked the 5th most corrupt country in the world, ahead of Honduras and Uzbekistan (1.8), Azerbaijan and Indonesia (1.7), Nigeria (1.6), and Cameroon (1.5), which was again the most corrupt country in the index. (www.transparency.de). In the year 2000 the Tanzanian ranking showed some improvement from 5th to 10th in the year 1999 by

scoring 2.5 points out of 10, in 4 assessments, leaving a tail of 9 countries, including the two neighboring countries Kenya and Uganda. However, the country dropped from the tenth position in the year 2000 to the sixth most corrupt country in the year 2001 by scoring 2.2 points in 3 surveys, but ranked 12th with 2.7 points in 4 surveys in the year 2002 CPI in which 102 countries were involved (www.transparency.de). In the year 2010, Tanzania scored 2.7 points similar to what scored in 2001. However, there was a slight improvement in 2013 survey in which it scored 3.3 points. In this survey, 175 countries were included. The sobering position of Tanzania in the annual surveys is vivid evidence that corruption is still a menace in the country.

Various efforts have been made to address corruption in Tanzania since colonial time. During the colonial era, particularly from 1930 - 1958, giving or receiving bribes was regarded a shameful deed and a criminal offence, and most corruption incidents involved lower and middle officers. This is clear in Shaaban Robert's letters to his brother Ulenge Mwalimu Yusufu, warning him from getting a train ticket through dubious means (Mulokozi, 2002:72 -73). Shaaban Robert, who was a prominent Swahili writer, stood firm to reject bribery and corruption committed by few officers during colonial times (Mulokozi, 2002:132 -133). According to the law for the Prevention of Corruption Cap. No.400 of 1958, which was known later as the Anti-Corruption Law of 1958, receiving presents and commissions were listed as corruption offences. The new Government then inherited the law after independence. The law however, was adequate, and the integrity was the cornerstone of public service, with presents and commissions being non-existent (Warioba Report, 1996:67). The Warioba Report (1996:59) discloses that the situation started changing in the late 1960s due to a big expansion of public services and the state of economy in the country as a result of the nationalisation of private companies and properties. Integrity also began to disappear, as did discipline, and cheating and bribery spread rapidly everywhere.

1.2. Measures taken to stem corruption in the first 3 decades after independence

To address this rapid growth in corruption, the Government enacted a law in 1971 to prevent corruption, in addition to improving the provisions of the 1958 law. The Warioba Report (1996:67-68) maintains that, in order to strengthen the law of 1971, President Mwalimu Nyerere established the Anti-corruption squad in 1975 to deal with the problem of corruption. It is a fact that the Anti-corruption squad made some impact in the 1970s, and many people were arrested. But the impact soon waned, and the wave of corruption continued to mount into the 1980s when it became a threat to the peace and stability of the country. Maliyamkono and Bagachwa (1990) observe that corruption was increasing, as was evident from corruption cases recorded in Tanzania, in the years 1980-1983. For example, in 1980 there were 149 cases of corruption involving 174 individuals. By 1981 the number of corruption cases had increased and 184 individuals were arrested. State organs were not respected any more. In its attempt to fight corruption this time, especially in 1983, the Government decided to mount a campaign against what came to be known as “economic saboteurs“ (Warioba Report, 1996:68). The report says that many people were arrested and detained. A lot of property was seized, but all in vain. The whole exercise did not bring the intended results. Many who were charged were released. Many whose property had been confiscated by the government eventually had to be compensated (Warioba Report, 1996:68). The report continues to reveal that a number of officers of state organs, which were empowered to deal with the problem, used their positions to accumulate wealth. All the Government efforts came to naught and the country had a shortage of consumer goods as well as essential needs (Warioba Report, 1996:68). This was a result of the fact that the campaign focused on events and not on the root cause of the problem.

In order to overcome the weakness of 1984, the Government decided to allow people to import consumer goods, to address the shortages, and hence reduce corruption caused by shortages of

consumer goods. Thus, the liberalisation of imports managed to some extent to reduce a type of corruption, which could not be removed by using the law. But trade liberalisation also created a new type of corruption in our community. A greater part of the imports of goods did not pay customs duty and other taxes. Side by side with these changes, corruption began to creep into the rungs of the leadership class, establishing a high-level form of corruption.

In 1996, President Mkapa formed a Presidential commission of inquiry against corruption known as the 'Warioba Commission'. The commission was entrusted with the task of carrying out a diagnosis of corruption problems in the country, to gain an understanding of its extent and to recommend appropriate reforms and strategies to combat it. The commission submitted a report to the President in November 1996. The judiciary, the police, and the health sectors were found by the commission to be the most infected by corruption in Tanzania (Warioba Report, 1996).

In reviewing measures taken by the government so far, such as the adoption of the 'leadership code' in 1967, followed by the establishment of the Anti-Corruption Squad in 1975, the Code of Ethics Act No. 13 of 1995 and the recently established National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan which focus on institutional reforms and raising public awareness (The Guardian, 12th April 2001:3), the Warioba Report (1996), the work of Shivji (1975) and Hoseah (1997:98,99), it seems that government attempts to eradicate corruption faced with difficulties. The 'leadership code' was aimed at preventing leaders from acquiring assets through corrupt means (Shivji, 1975:79) while the constitution was intended to ensure that forms of injustice, intimidation, discrimination, corruption, and favoritism were eradicated (United Republic of Tanzania, 1998:13).

Education Avenue as the solution

It seems that all the state's campaigns and attempts have been aimed at events, and not at the root cause of the problem. That is to say, no systematic programme has been initiated to address corruption since Tanzania's independence. It seems also that the commitment of the leaders at the top, which is a precondition for any reform, is

lacking. This concurs with the European Union observation that the Tanzanian government is not tackling the country's corruption problems with sufficient zest. The Union has threatened to withdraw humanitarian aid to Tanzania if it does not address the problem seriously and take urgent corrective measures (Daily Mail & Guardian, 23rd May 2000). Bureaucracy and delaying tactics perpetrated by some government officials are stumbling blocks in the anti-corruption drive. Stiffer penalties for corruption enacted by the government had proved a failure.

Education, the author argues, can be an effective added tool to state institutions in addressing corruption. This study therefore provides another avenue in line with state's endeavour to address corruption, this time through education. The study suggests working with Civics teachers and teachers of religion collaboratively and to participate with them to lay a foundation for learning positive values at schools with a history of educating leaders of the country and, later, at all schools, to teach values with a lasting effect on the nation.

Profile of corruption internationally and in Tanzania

2.1 Corruption internationally

From 1998 to 2003, and 2010 to 2013 Transparency International [TI] surveys have demonstrated that Tanzania is amongst the most corrupt countries in the world, being ranked from being the fourth to the twelfth then the seventieth most corrupt country internationally. The literature on corruption internationally, including annual surveys conducted by TI, indicates that there is corruption in all countries, that it has particularly dire consequences for the well being of people who most need assistance, and that it compromises the economies of these countries, most of which are underdeveloped countries (TI, 1998, 2013). Broadly speaking, TI annual surveys indicate that developed western countries, such as Scandinavian countries, and countries in Western Europe and North America, with strong economies and under-girding social security networks are least corrupt, with the exception of countries in the isthmus region linking the America. The TI surveys also indicate that the most corrupt countries tend to be the newly emerging democracies of Eastern Europe and under-developed

countries in Asia, South America and Africa, specifically sub-Saharan Africa, which includes Tanzania. This profile of corrupt countries is discussed for the years 2001, 2010 and 2013.

2.2. Definition of Corruption

TI Chapters spread across the globe, in conjunction with governments and companies in the private sector across the world have been struggling to define corruption, emphasizing principles like 'position of power' and 'the absence of accountability' as indicators of corruption. These two principles are central to the many forms of corruption found in countries referred to in this article. Drawing on Robert Klitgaard, Githongo (2000:2) claims that corruption occurs when a person with responsibility has a monopoly over goods or services and the discretion to decide who receives it, and how much of it, but lacks accountability. Corruption, according to this view, is linked to power and comes into play in the determination of who benefits from a person in a position of power who dispenses goods and services without being accountable for the manner in which this is done. TI's (www.transparency.de) notion of corruption corroborates Githongo's view, defining it as the "misuse of public power for private benefit." These definitions of corruption capture its meaning in this article where corruption refers to the use, by a person in power, of his/her public position to benefit him/herself in decisions he/she makes in the dispensing of goods and services.

2.3. Range of corrupt countries internationally

The TI international ranking of countries in terms of corrupt practices, established through its annual survey in 2001, 2010 and 2013, has generated a profile of corruption internationally in which developed countries seem least and underdeveloped countries most corrupt, with a range of countries ranked somewhere between these two extremes, as seen in Tables 1(a), 1(b) and 1 (c).

As Tables 1(a) and 1(b) indicate, Scandinavian countries like Finland and Denmark are ranked as the least corrupt countries in the world, and other developed western countries and countries tied to the west are ranked following these. Two further Scandinavian countries are ranked in the category, 'least corrupt countries' as are two from

Australasia, New Zealand (ranked third), six from Western Europe (including Iceland), two from the Far East with strong ties to the West (including Hong Kong), two from North America, and one from the Middle East (Israel), also with strong leanings to Western Europe and the USA.

Table 1(a)

TI Profile internationally – least to most corrupt countries in 2001

Rank	Country	CPI Score	
1	Finland	9.9	Least N=17
2	Denmark	9.5	
3	New Zealand	9.4	
4	Iceland	9.2	
	Singapore	9.2	
6	Sweden	9.0	
7	Canada	8.9	
8	Netherlands	8.8	
9	Luxembourg	8.7	
10	Norway	8.6	
11	Australia	8.5	
12	Switzerland	8.4	
13	United Kingdom	8.3	
14	Hong Kong	7.9	
15	Austria	7.8	
16	Israel	7.6	
	United States	7.6	
34	Slovenia	5.2	Between least and most N=7
35	Uruguay	5.1	
36	Malaysia	5.0	
37	Jordan	4.9	
38	Lithuania	4.8	
	South Africa	4.8	

40	Costa Rica	4.5	
65	Guatemala	2.9	Most N=27
	Philippines	2.9	
	Senegal	2.9	
	Zimbabwe	2.9	
69	Romania	2.8	
	Venezuela	2.8	
71	Honduras	2.7	
	India	2.7	
	Kazakhstan	2.7	
	Uzbekistan	2.7	
75	Vietnam	2.6	
	Zambia	2.6	
77	Cote d'Ivoire	2.4	
	Nicaragua	2.4	
79	Ecuador	2.3	
	Pakistan	2.3	
	Russia	2.3	
82	Tanzania	2.2	
83	Ukraine	2.1	
84	Azerbaijan	2.0	
	Bolivia	2.0	
	Cameroon	2.0	
	Kenya	2.0	
88	Indonesia	1.9	
	Uganda	1.9	
90	Nigeria	1.0	N=91
91	Bangladesh	0.4	[total]

Source: Transparency International, CPI 2001 Report

It is interesting to note that four Scandinavian countries were ranked in the top ten least corrupt countries internationally in 2001, with Finland notably being identified as the least corrupt country in

the world. Three West European countries follow, and thereafter one each from Australasia, the Far East and North America. Interestingly, the United Kingdom and USA are not ranked in the top ten least corrupt countries in the world, being ranked 13th and 16th respectively, the latter ranking being shared with Israel. It is also interesting to note that small countries like New Zealand, Iceland, Luxembourg and Israel are ranked 3rd, 4th, 9th, and 16th in the world, and that smaller states still, like Singapore and Hong Kong are ranked 4th and 14th.

To summarize, the least corrupt countries in the world, as illustrated in Table 1a, tend to be Scandinavian and small, rather than European or North American and large. Moreover, most corrupt countries, generally speaking, and by a significant margin [10 countries], seem to be African, followed by underdeveloped emerging countries of the former Soviet Union, emerging democracies [5 countries] being amongst them, followed by South American countries and countries around the Philippines [3 countries each], countries from the Indian sub-continent, countries in the American isthmus [2 countries each], and one newly developed East European country. By and large, all these countries seem to be underdeveloped, independent or newly independent, developing countries, with the exception of India [71st] perhaps. Many, including India, the Philippines and Zimbabwe [65th], Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan [71st], Cote d'Ivoire [77th], Pakistan [79th], Ukraine [83rd], Uganda [88th], and Nigeria [90th], seem to have unsettled national disputes. Several, such as India and Nigeria, have very large populations, and most of them seem fairly large in geographical area in comparison with the least corrupt countries discussed above. Others, such as countries of Eastern Europe like Romania [69th], and countries of the former Soviet Union such as Russia [79th], Ukraine [83rd], Azerbaijan [84th], Uzbekistan [71st], and Kazakhstan [also 71st] seem to have recently undergone massive transformation. Yet others, such as Zimbabwe [65th], seem to be imploding due to disastrous state policies, whilst yet others seem to have an insecure economy and currency - such as Tanzania [82nd], Zambia [75th], Cote d'Ivoire [77th], Cameroon and

Kenya [both 84th], Uganda [88th], and Nigeria [90th]. Ranked the most corrupt country in 2001 is Bangladesh, ranked at 91st that year.

In comparison with the least corrupt countries discussed above, most corrupt countries ranked by TI seem to be in Africa, Asia and states of the former Soviet Union, the South American and isthmus regions. In addition, they seem, in the main, to be large countries in terms of geographic area, under-developed and with unstable economies and currencies. There are, however, several notable exceptions, such as India.

Between the countries ranked least and most corrupt by TI in 2001 are a number of countries - ranked 34th to 40th - where corruption seems less than in countries categorized 'most', but more than in countries ranked 'least' corrupt internationally. Two of these countries are in Eastern Europe [Slovenia and Lithuania], and one each is in South America [Uruguay], the Far East [Malaysia], Middle East [Jordan], Africa [South Africa] and the Gulf of Mexico [Costa Rica]. Generally speaking these countries may not be considered either developed or underdeveloped, and include two countries which serve as stabilizing influences in their otherwise predominantly underdeveloped regions, given their strong economies respectively, Malaysia and South Africa.

It is interesting to note that South Africa – the Europe of Africa, has been ranked 39th and 54th country internationally, is more or less in the middle of countries ranked by TI in 2001 and 2010. It is thus ranked in-between, being neither the least nor the most corrupt country, and is flanked by Finland and Denmark, and Bangladesh and Somalia on either side as the least and most corrupt countries in these two surveys.

It is interesting to note, too, that the two Eastern Europe countries, Slovenia and Lithuania, included in this group, are in close proximity to the developed countries of Western Europe and hence susceptible to their influence. In contrast, countries in South America [Uruguay], the Far and Middle East [Malaysia and Jordan], Africa [South Africa] and the Mexican Gulf [Costa Rica] are far from developed countries and, consequently, from their influence by proximity. Geographically,

none of these countries is likely to be considered very small, like some countries ranked 'least' corrupt, with several exceptions, like Malaysia and Costa Rica, and none is likely to be considered large on the scale of many countries ranked most corrupt by TI, such as India, Nigeria, Bangladesh.

3. A profile of corruption in Sub-Saharan Africa countries and internationally

The literature on corruption internationally, including annual surveys conducted by TI, indicates that there is corruption in all countries, that it has particularly dire consequences for the well being of people who most need assistance, and that it compromises the economies of these countries, most of which are underdeveloped countries (TI, 1998; 2003; 2010). Broadly speaking, TI annual surveys indicate that developed western countries, such as Scandinavian countries, and countries in Western Europe and North America, with strong economies and under-girding social security networks are either clean or least corrupt, with the exception of countries in the isthmus region linking the America. The TI surveys also indicate that the most corrupt countries tend to be the newly emerging democracies of under-developed countries in Asia, South America and Africa, specifically sub-Saharan Africa.

3.1. Range of corrupt countries internationally

The TI international ranking of countries in terms of corrupt practices, established through its annual survey in 2010, has generated a profile of corruption internationally in which developed countries seem least and underdeveloped countries most corrupt, with a range of countries ranked somewhere between these two extremes, as seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1: TI Profile internationally – least to most corrupt countries in 2010

Rank	Country	CPI Score	Remarks
	Denmark	9.3	Almost free of corruption
	New Zealand	9.3	
	Singapore	9.3	
	Finland	9.2	
	Sweden	9.2	
	Canada	8.9	Least Corrupt Countries n=27
	Netherland	8.8	
	Australia	8.7	
	Switzerland	8.7	
0	Norway	8.6	
1	Iceland	8.5	
	Luxembourg	8.5	
2	Portugal	6	Between least and most n = 33
3	Botswana	5.8	
4	South Africa	4.5	
6	Malaysia	4.4	
	Namibia	4.4	
	Turkey	4.4	
	Tunisia	4.3	
67	Italy	3.9	Most Corrupt countries
78	China	3.5	
	Lesotho	3.5	
85	Malawi	3.4	
	Morocco	3.4	
91	Djibouti	3.2	
	Swaziland	3.2	
101	Zambia	3	
116	Mozambique	2.7	
	Tanzania	2.7	
123	Madagascar	2.6	
127	Uganda	2.5	
134	Bangladesh	2.4	
	Nigeria	2.4	
154	Zimbabwe	2.4	
	Comoros	2.1	
	Congo Brazzaville	2.1	
	Kenya	2.1	

9						
2	Ghana	4.1		164	DRC	2
6	Rwanda	4		168	Angola	1.9
				170	Burundi	1.8
				178	Somalia	1.1

Source: Transparency International, CPI 2010 Report

As Table 1 indicates, it is interesting to note that Scandinavian countries are ranked in the top ten least corrupt countries internationally in 2010, with Denmark notably being identified as the least corrupt country in the world. Interestingly, the United Kingdom and USA are not ranked in the top ten least corrupt countries in the world; they are ranked 20th and 22nd respectively, the latter ranking being shared with Belgium.

Most corrupt countries, generally speaking, and by a significant margin [19 countries], are all African, with exception of Bangladesh. By large, all these countries seem to be under-developed, independent or newly independent, developing countries, with the exception of perhaps India [87th]. Countries such as Somalia [178th], the most corrupt country ever on earth seem to be imploding due to disastrous state policies and war

Between the countries ranked least and most corrupt by TI in 2010 are a number of countries - ranked between 33rd and 66th - where corruption seems less than in countries categorized 'most', but more than in countries ranked 'least' corrupt internationally. 6 of these countries are African countries in which 4 are in Sub-Saharan Africa [Botswana 33rd, South Africa 54th, Namibia 56th, Rwanda 66th]. Generally speaking these countries may be considered under developing, and include two countries which serve as stabilizing influences in their otherwise predominantly underdeveloped regions, given their strong economies respectively, Botswana and South Africa.

3.2. Range of corrupt countries internationally in 2013

The TI international ranking of countries in terms of corrupt practices, established through its annual survey in 2013, has generated a profile of corruption internationally in which developed countries seem least and underdeveloped countries most corrupt, with a range of countries ranked somewhere between these two extremes, as seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1: TI Profile internationally – least to most corrupt countries in 2013

Rank	Country	CPI Score	Remarks	
1	Denmark	9.1	Almost free of corruption	
	New Zealand	9.1		
3	Finland	8.9		
5	Singapore	8.6		
	Norway	8.6		
6	Sweden	8.9		
7	Netherlands	8.3		
	Switzerland	8.5		
9	Australia	8.1		
	Canada	8.1		
11	Luxembourg	8.0	Least Corrupt Countries n=27	
12	Iceland	7.8		
13	Botswana	6.4		
14	Portugal	6.2		
15	Rwanda	5.3		Between
72	South Africa	4.2		Most Corrupt countries
77	Tunisia	4.1		
80	China	4.0		
82	Swaziland	3.9		
83	Zambia	3.8		
		3		
85	Malawi	.7		
91	Morocco	3.7		
94	Djibouti	3.6		
111	Tanzania	3.3		
119	Mozambique	3.0		
	Madagascar	2.8		
127	Comoros	2.8		
	Bangladesh	2.7		
136	Kenya	2.7		
	Uganda	2.6		

Rank	Country	Score	Least and most corrupt countries (n = 33)
8			
5	Malaysia	5.0	least and most corrupt countries (n = 33)
3	Turkey	5.0	
5	Lesotho	4.9	
5	Namibia	4.8	
7			
6	Ghana	4.6	
3			
6	Italy	4.3	
9			
144	Nigeria	2.5	
154	Congo Brazzaville	2.2	
	DRC	2.2	
157	Zimbabwe	2.1	
	Burundi	2.1	
160	Eritrea	2.0	
163	Chad	1.9	
168	Angola	2.3	
172	Libya	1.5	
173	South Sudan	1.4	
174	Sudan	1.1	
175	Somalia	0.8	
	Korea North	0.8	
	Afghanistan	0.8	

Source: Transparency International, CPI 2013 Report

As Table 1 indicates, it is interesting to note that Scandinavian countries are ranked in the top ten least corrupt countries internationally in 2013, with Denmark notably being identified as the least corrupt country in the world. Interestingly, the United Kingdom and USA are not ranked in the top ten least corrupt countries in the world; they are ranked 20th and 22nd respectively, the latter ranking being shared with Belgium.

Most corrupt countries, generally speaking, and by a significant margin [19 countries], are all African, with exception of Bangladesh. By large, all these countries seem to be under-developed, independent or newly independent, developing countries, with the exception of perhaps India [87th]. Countries such as Somalia [178th], the most corrupt country ever on earth seem to be imploding due to disastrous state policies and war

Between the countries ranked least and most corrupt by TI in 2013 are a number of countries - ranked between 33rd and 66th - where corruption seems less than in countries categorized 'most', but more than in countries ranked 'least' corrupt internationally. 6 of these countries are African countries in which 4 are in Sub-Saharan Africa [Botswana 33rd, South Africa 54th, Namibia 56th, Rwanda 66th]. Generally speaking these countries may be considered under developing, and include two countries which serve as stabilizing influences in their otherwise predominantly underdeveloped regions, given their strong economies respectively, Botswana and South Africa.

By eyeballing the three CPI reports in Tables 1 (a), 1 (b) and 1(c) above, it is quite clear that corruption is still a menace in many under developing countries. There is a very minor change if any, in the CPI records of these countries since 2001 survey to the latest survey of 2010. Tanzania has been dwindling between CPI scores of 2.2 - 2.7 for more than 10 years now. Surprisingly, it is yet ahead of all East African countries.

4. Generic forms of corruption internationally and in Tanzania

Being ranked 82nd in the profile of corrupt countries internationally by TI in 2001, Tanzania is clearly located amongst countries identified to be most, rather than least, corrupt in the world. It is underdeveloped, far from developed countries like Western Europe and North America, has an economy massively underpinned by foreign aid and dependent on it, is weak, has a sagging state infrastructure, and there is a strong sense that corruption is all pervasive in government and in instruments of the state. Paradoxically, with independence, President Mwalimu Nyerere ushered in a new beginning for the newly independent nation in 1961, and linked national transformation to the ideology of 'self reliance' and 'ujamaa values', receiving massive support for his thinking from developed countries in Western Europe, and the United Kingdom in particular.

As shown in the profile, Tanzania clearly differs from least corrupt countries like Finland, Denmark, New Zealand, Iceland and Singapore in terms of its level of corruption and it has a particular

location amongst the most corrupt countries, being ranked in the top third of countries ranked 79th –91st internationally. It is also likely to differ from both these groups of countries in the profile in terms of the forms of corruption identified by TI, which is the purpose of this discussion. To this end the 2001 survey will be discussed further.

Unlike other ‘least’ corrupt countries, Tanzania has a Corruption Perception Index rating [CPI] of 2.2, as opposed to 9.9 - 9.2, and was ranked 82nd in 2001, as opposed to 1st - 4th. In addition, Tanzania is ranked in Table 1 at approximately the mid-point of the CPI rating and rankings between 1998 and 2003 internationally, a CPI of 2.2 when ranked 82nd in 2001, in a range bounded by a CPI of 1.9 and ranked 81st in 1998 when ‘most corrupt’, and a CPI of 2.7 and ranked 71st in 2002 - its highest ranking ever, but still amongst the ‘most’ corrupt countries in the world. Furthermore, Tanzania was ranked 10th of the bottom 13 [of 27] ‘most’ corrupt countries internationally in 2001, below countries like Ecuador in South American, Pakistan in the Indian sub-continent, and Russia as a former Soviet Union country, but above other countries in the former Soviet Union [Ukraine and Azerbaijan], South America [Bolivia], Africa [Cameroon, Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria], a country in the Far East [Indonesia] and the Indian sub-continent [Bangladesh].

Table 2, showing the generic form of corruption TI identified in a selection of ‘least’ and ‘most corrupt countries, gives insight into differences between corruption in these two groups of countries, as well as insights into the generic forms of corruption found in Tanzania and in countries ranked ‘most’ corrupt, yet close to it in TI ranking. A small group of five countries ranked 1 to 4 [two ranked 4th] was selected to contrast the generic form of corruption found in ‘least’ corrupt countries with 13 countries ranked as the 79th - 91st ‘most’ corrupt countries internationally. The latter group included Tanzania, to contrast corruption in it with corruption in the former group of countries ranked ‘least’ and ‘most’ corrupt. Also, the selection was made to make the study manageable.

Generally speaking, Table 2 indicates overwhelmingly that African countries have the greatest number of generic forms of

corruption compared to other countries ranked 'least' and 'most' corrupt by TI internationally in 2001, and that Tanzania has fewer forms of this kind of corruption than other African countries ranked 'most' corrupt internationally. Table 2 indicates moreover, that the main form of corruption found in 'least' corrupt countries was a range of scams in international taxation, for example, in New Zealand. In contrast, the misuse of public funds was wide spread in countries ranked 'most' corrupt and was found internationally in all 13 countries listed in the table but not in 'least' corrupt countries. The second type of corruption most prevalent in all 13 these countries was bribery in the civil service. The forms corruption takes is discussed next with particular reference to Tanzania.

As indicated in Table 2 below, of the 46 generic forms identified, Africa is the continent that engages in the greatest number of generic forms of corruption, identified in 5 African countries, followed by the Indian sub-continent, with 14 forms in 2 countries, the Far East, with 5 forms in 1 country, former Soviet Union countries, with 8 forms in 3 countries, and South America, with 5 forms in 2 countries. At 46, the number of generic forms of corruption found in Africa notably exceeds generic forms found in the 5 countries ranked 'least', with fewer than 5 generic forms of corruption found in total for these countries. Amongst the 46 generic forms of corruption in Africa, Tanzania was found to have 7 forms in 2001, in comparison with other African states, with 11 forms identified in Kenya and Nigeria respectively, 9 in Cameroon, and 8 in Uganda. Tanzania, thus, seems to have the smallest number of generic forms of corruption in comparison to the African countries mentioned.

Table 2
Generic forms of corruption found in countries ranked
'least' and 'most' corrupt internationally in 2001

Rank	Country	Forms of corruption found
1	Finland	~ International tax scam
2	Denmark	
3	New Zealand	~ International tax scam
4	Iceland	
	Singapore	
79	Ecuador	~ Misuse of Public fund ~ Bribery in the civil services
	Pakistan	~ Misuse of Public funds~ Bribery in the civil services ~ Embezzlement ~ Political corruption
	Russia	~ Misuse of Public funds~ Bribery in the civil services
82	Tanzania	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~Subverting judicial procedures ~ Kickbacks in government procurement ~ Approving State tenders ~ Tax evasion ~ Corruption in the Police
83	Ukraine	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~ Political corruption
84	Azerbaijan	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in civil services ~ Political corruption
	Bolivia	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~ Embezzlement
	Cameroon	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~ Embezzlement ~ Political corruption ~Subverting judicial procedures ~ Kickbacks in government procurement ~ Approving State tenders ~ Tax evasion ~ Corruption in the Police

	Kenya	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~ Embezzlement ~ Political corruption ~Subverting judicial procedures ~ Kickbacks in government procurement ~ Approving State tenders ~ Tax evasion ~ Corruption in the Police ~ Paying speed money ~ Gold scam
88	Indonesia	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~ Embezzlement ~ Political corruption
	Uganda	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~ Embezzlement~Subverting judicial procedures ~ Kickbacks in government procurement ~ Approving State tenders ~ Tax evasion ~ Paying speed money
90	Nigeria	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~ Embezzlement ~ Political corruption ~Subverting judicial procedures ~ Kickbacks in government procurement ~ Approving State tenders ~ Tax evasion ~ Corruption in the Police ~ Paying speed money ~ Oil scam
91	Bangladesh	~ Misuse of Public funds ~ Bribery in the civil services ~Embezzlement ~Subverting judicial procedures ~ Kickbacks in government procurement ~ Approving State tenders ~ Tax evasion ~ Corruption in the Police~ Paying speed money

TI (1998 - 2013)

In countries ranked 'least corrupt' by TI, the only form of corruption found was scams in international tax evasion. In contrast, 'misuse of public funds' is a generic form of corruption found in the 7 'most' corrupt countries with international tax scams as a form of corruption is found only in one 'least' corrupt country. Also, unlike 'least' corrupt countries, where no political corruption was found,

politicians in 8 countries ranked by TI in 2001 as 'most' corrupt use a generic form of political corruption to buy votes and hence bring corrupt leaders into power.

Generally, Table 2 indicates that the 'misuse of public funds' and 'bribery in the civil service' are the main generic forms of corruption in countries ranked 'most' corrupt, rather than 'international tax scams' in countries where corruption was found by TI to be minimal, or 'least'.

More specifically, two generic forms of corruption, namely the varied use of state funds for personal gain, and a range of bribes civil servants require for their services, were found in all 13 countries ranked 'most' corrupt. Following these, secondly, another two generic forms, namely 'embezzlement', referring to theft of state money in secret bank accounts and the like, and 'political corruption' referring a number of ways in which politicians win influence by, for example, buying votes, are found in 8 countries each, the first in Pakistan, Bolivia, Cameroon, Kenya, Indonesia, Uganda, Nigeria, Bangladesh, the second in Pakistan, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Cameroon, Kenya, Indonesia, Uganda, and Bangladesh.

'Subverting judicial procedures' comes third, with specific reference to various ways in which the law is bent for personal gain, 'kick-backs in government procurement' – with specific reference to the soliciting of commissions for procurement contracts, 'state tenders being given to friends', forms of nepotism, 'tax evasion', not paying taxes at all, and the like. This form of corruption is found mainly in 6 countries: Tanzania, Cameroon, Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, Bangladesh.

Following the subversion of judicial procedures is a fourth generic form of corruption, namely 'corruption in the police', which was identified in 5 countries - Tanzania, Cameroon, Kenya, Nigeria, Bangladesh. The fifth generic form of corruption is what TI calls 'paying speedy money', that is, money exchanging hands to speed up services, and found in 4 countries - Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, Bangladesh. The sixth, and final, generic form corruption takes in these countries is 'gold scams', including the smuggling of gold. This generic form of corruption was found in 1 country only, Kenya, with

'oil scams' - different forms smuggling oil - found in 1 country, Nigeria, only.

With specific reference to Tanzania, the TI found that, as is the case in all 13 the 'most' corrupt countries listed in Table 2, the 'misuse of public funds' and 'bribery in the civil service' also manifest as generic forms of corruption in Tanzania. Tanzania shares with 4 African countries and 1 country in the Indian sub-continent five further generic forms of corruption, namely 'subverting judicial procedures', 'kick-backs in government procurement', 'approving state tenders to friends', 'corruption in the police' and 'tax evasion'. Interesting to note from the review of this literature, is that 'embezzlement' and 'political corruption, the second largest generic form of corruption identified by TI was not mentioned with regard to Tanzania. Perhaps surprisingly too, 'paying speed money', the fifth ranked generic form of corruption, is not found in Tanzania either. And not unexpectedly, 'scams' with respect to gold and oil are not found in this country.

Summarizing, indications are that there are, generally speaking, 12 generic forms of corruption in the 13 'most' countries listed in Table 2, in contrast with one generic form manifesting in 'least' corrupt countries. 'Misuse of public fund' for personal benefits and 'bribery in the civil service', the forms of corruption found in all 13 'most' corrupt countries, interestingly enough, seem to be non-existent in 'least corrupt countries as are the other 10 generic forms found in the 13 countries mentioned, with the exception, that is, of corruption relating to 'taxes', where it takes the form of international scams as opposed to individuals failing to pay their taxes. In Tanzania, corruption was found to be most evident in the 'misuse of public funds' and in 'bribery in the civil service', as was the case in the other countries mentioned. Moreover, Tanzania was found to be guilty of 'subverting judicial procedures', 'kick-backs in government procurement', 'state tenders being given to friends', 'tax evasion' and 'corruption in the police', generic forms of corruption also found in 6 other countries ranked 'most' corrupt. Seemingly not found in

Tanzania were ‘embezzlement’ and ‘political corruption’, ‘paying speed money’, and ‘scams’ in gold and oil.

4.1. Variation in the ranking of Tanzania 1998-2003

Being ranked 82nd in the TI corruption profile of in 2001, Tanzania is ranked amongst the ‘most’ corrupt countries internationally, with the ‘least’ corrupt countries like Finland, Denmark, New Zealand, Iceland and Singapore ranked 1st to 4th. However, Tanzania’s ranking varied between 1998 and 2003, with the specific form that corruption took reflected in Tables 3 and 4. During this period President Mkapa claimed that significant inroads had been made to curb corruption by the Tanzanian government during his term of office. The TI ranking for the period 1998-2013 seems to confirm this claim since Tanzania’s ranking improved slightly, to its highest ranking as yet, namely 71st [CPI of 2.7] internationally in 2002, as opposed to 81st [CPI of 1.9] in 1998 and 1999. Little is known, however, about the range of specific practices found in the country. These are discussed next.

Broadly speaking, TI variously ranked Tanzania amongst the ten ‘most’ corrupt countries internationally between 199 and 2013 but, as Table 3 illustrates and, as both Presidents; Mr. Mkapa and Mr. Kikwete have claimed, there were indications of improvement as well as regression in Tanzania’s rankings during this time.

Table3:Variation in the ranking of Tanzania internationally 1998-2013

Year	Tanzania Ranking by Year	CPI score [10 represents the highest, and 0 the lowest ranking]
1998	81 st n = 88	1.9
1999	93 rd n = 99	1.9
2000	76 th n = 90	2.5

2001	82 nd n = 91	2.2
2002	71 st n = 102	2.7
2003	92 nd n = 133	2.5
2010	116 th n = 178	2.7
2013	111 th n = 175	3.3

Source: TI (1998 – 2013)

Table 3 illustrates the variation in Tanzania's ranking between 1998 and 2013 to be at its lowest - 81st of 88 countries - in 1998, less corrupt than the 3 'most' corrupt countries ranked internationally in that year. In 1999 it was ranked 93rd [of 99 countries: CPI 1.9], and less corrupt than the 6 'most' corrupt countries. In 2000 when ranked 76th [of 90 countries: 2.5] and less corrupt than the 13 'most' corrupt countries it lies approximately in the middle of its range of variations in terms of its TI ranking because after this it first went down to 82nd [of 91 countries: CPI 2.2] 2001, less corrupt than 9 countries, and then up again to reach its highest position at 71st [of 102 countries: CPI 2.7] in 2002, placing it above the 27 'most' corrupt countries. In 2003 it was ranked lower again, 92nd [of 133 countries: CPI 2.5] but higher than the 34 'most' corrupt countries. Interestingly, Tanzania's CPI score was less than 2.0 for two years running [1998 and 1999], and higher than 2.2 for four consecutive years [2000-2003]. These variations suggest slight, but unstable improvement, as its ranking has dropped by as much as approximately 1 CPI point in 4 years.

4.2. Specific forms of corruption in Tanzania

Table 4 illustrate the specific forms that corruption takes in Tanzania, adding 14 specific forms to the 7 generic forms of corruption discussed above.

Table 4: Specific forms of corruption found in Tanzania

Kickbacks in Government procurement	Misuse of public fund	Approving State tenders	Corruption in the Police	Bribery in the civil service	Tax evasion	Subverting Judicial procedures
~forging documents ~soliciting commissions ~'Takrima' receiving gifts ~procure below-standard goods ~theft n = 5	~forging document ~ghost employees ~corruption in the projects ~cheating in getting loans n = 4	~forging documents ~soliciting commissions ~'Takrima' receiving gifts n = 3	~forging documents ~bribing officials in drug trafficking ~bribing traffic polices n = 3	~forging documents ~bribery to get basic needs and services n = 2	forging documents bribing TRA officials n = 2	~bribing judicial officials and court clerks n = 1

Warioba Report (1996), TI (1998-2013)

An analysis of the specific forms of corruption, listed under the generic form in Table 4, indicates that one specific form - 'forging documents' - was found in six (6) of the seven (7) generic forms; a second, -'bribery'- was found in four (4) generic forms, and two specific forms of corruption - 'soliciting commissions' and 'takrima'- were evident in two (2) of the generic forms of corruption identified by TI in Tanzania. Five specific forms were unique to two (2) generic forms of corruption, namely: 'kickbacks in government procurement, and 'misuse of public funds'.

'Forging documents' or copying receipts, cheques, official letterheads and the like, was a form of corruption in all generic categories, with one exception. Different kinds of bribery were found in four (4) generic corruption categories: 'bribing officials in drug trafficking' and 'bribing traffic police' in the generic category, 'corruption in the police', and 'bribing to get basic needs and services', for example to get into hospital, get water and electricity, in the generic category, 'bribery in the civil service'. The specific form of corruption, 'bribing the Tanzanian revenue authority' [TRA], was regarded as a component of the generic category, 'tax evasion', and 'bribing judicial officials and court clerks', as part of the generic

category ‘subverting judicial procedures’. ‘Soliciting commissions’, with approximately “10%” or officials frequently taking kick-backs for favours, such as approving contracts and awarding tenders in contracts, and ‘Takrima’ or receiving gifts as favours to gain advantage were linked to two (2) generic forms namely, ‘kick-backs in government procurement’ and ‘approving State tenders’. The remaining specific forms of corruption are unique to the identified generic form.

‘Procuring below the price of standard goods’, a terms used to refer to officials who allow another to take the difference between the low and stated price as a favour for personal gain, for example, is one of two specific forms of corruption categorised as ‘kick-backs in government procurement’. ‘Ghost employees’, referring to fictitious employees on the government payroll, was one of three specific forms of corruption defined as ‘misuse of public funds’. No specific forms of corruption were found regarding the category, ‘approving state tenders’.

Research findings by Sulayman (2007) seem to indicate that ‘Forging documents’, is most prevalent in Tanzania, followed by different kinds of bribes, then ‘soliciting commissions’ and ‘Takrima’, and then other forms particular to the generic forms noted above. The term, ‘Takrima’, originally signified the virtue of generosity and hospitality for others, but currently used in the Tanzanian context to refer to a specific form of corruption. Research findings also suggest that some officials entrusted to serve the nation use their position of power to enrich themselves at the State’s expense through the state tendering process for government procurements by favouring certain companies over others. And perhaps quite widespread and involving companies as well as individuals may be scams with respect to taxation. These forms of corruption, according to the Warioba Report (1996:5), seem predominant among high-level leaders and public officials such as decision-makers, chief executive officers, politicians and members of parliament, suggesting that, in this country, perhaps in contrast to countries ranked ‘least’ corrupt, is

that its people may have to resort to bribes to get what are their rights as citizens, to speed-up bureaucratic systems, or to bend the law.

1. Kick-backs in Government procurement

At least 5 specific forms of corruption were mentioned under the generic form/category, 'Kickbacks in Government procurement'. The first was 'forging documents', which was common to five more generic forms of corruption. The second was 'soliciting commissions' and 'Takrima', which were regarded as similar in terms of the generic form of corruption to which it belonged. The two specific forms of corruption particular to the generic form of corruption, 'Kickbacks in Government procurement', were 'procure below-standard goods' (referring to cheating by officials for personal gain), and 'theft' (referring to officials committing fraud for personal gain). This generic form of corruption, 'kickbacks in government procurement', was regarded as most serious/widespread, having the greatest number of specific forms of corruption found in Tanzania if compared to the other six generic categories/forms. The literature reflects the spread of these forms. The Guardian newspaper of 23rd November 1999 quotes the Auditor General of Tanzania saying that the Government had, in 1998 alone, lost [5bn Tsh] - equivalent to [6.25m\$] - through fraud and theft, and that the Medical Stores Department alone spent 453,691,572 Tsh. [567,000\$] to buy expired and broken drugs. Also, through government procurement, officials bought what was believed to be a passenger ship that was below standard - 'M.V. Bukoba' - which killed over 1000 people when it sank in Lake Victoria in 1996 - all because of the greed of officials in the government procurement department.

In addition, the media in Tanzania has quoted the Minister of Finance saying that the Government lost over 72.8bn/- through theft, and negligence between 1999 and 2002 (The Guardian, 8th August 2003). The Minister told the House that 16bn/- had disappeared through theft and loss of Government equipment and goods, while another 45bn/- were lost as a result of failure to return revenue collections and privatisation, and some 10bn/- were unaccounted for. A loss of that magnitude was too big to ignore for a country in which

over 45 per cent of the budget is foreign donor dependent. Such losses indicate that government officials were not responsible, were negligent and were now punishing Tanzanian taxpayers for their – the officials’ - lack of responsibility.

2. Misuse of public funds

This generic form of corruption manifests as four (4) specific forms of corruption. One specific form, ‘forging documents’, is common to five generic forms of corruption. Three of the four (4) specific forms of corruption particular to the generic form ‘misuse of public fund’, have to do with the specific form of corruption, ‘ghost employees’, a form of corruption that literature reveals has inflated operating costs in the Government of Tanzania for years, with top-heavy ‘ghost employees’ being paid \$5m annually by the Government. This was discovered when a new payroll system was introduced in Tanzania in 2000. The new system exposed almost 8000 ‘ghost’ employees (Posthumus, 2000:69).

The second form of corruption in the generic category, ‘misuse of public funds’, is ‘corruption in the projects’. This specific form of corruption refers to the spending of funds located for projects on things not allocated for, in order to justify expenditure and channel some funds to individuals’ pockets. The third specific form of ‘misuse of public fund’ is ‘bribing in getting loans’, that is, bribing official of the National Security Funds [NSSF] and National Banks to allocate soft loans without consideration of the rules by offering them money or using individual influence. While these forms of corruption have enriched corrupt individuals they have left the economy of the country in desperate straits.

3. Approving State tenders

‘Forging documents’, ‘soliciting commissions’ and ‘Takrima’ are three specific forms of corruption classified generically as corruption in ‘approving State tenders’, but they also manifest in the generic form of corruption, ‘kickbacks in government procurement’. Highlighting the wide spread of these forms of corruption in Tanzania, the Warioba Report (1996:210-80) indicates that there are administrative and managerial corruption as regards investments,

tenders and contracts. The Report also reveals that it is almost impossible to get a trade license without giving a bribe or being a person of influence, and that sometimes corrupt officials use middlemen and fake proforma invoices. Meagher (1997:4) suggests that it may well be that the major cause of these forms of corruption is the existence of a bungling bureaucratic monopoly at each stage of the investment and tender approval processes, which are compounded by lack of transparency, oversight, effective penalties, and incentives for honest behaviour.

4. Corruption in the police

At least 3 specific forms of corruption fall under the generic form 'corruption in the police', namely 'forging documents' (referring to official letterheads, passports and alike), 'bribing officials in drug trafficking', and 'bribing traffic police' (referring to bribes offered officials to protect drug dealers and bribes offered to police to get offenders off a traffic offence). The literature indicates that Tanzania has been identified as a transit point for drug trafficking to Southern Africa, Europe and America (Warioba Report, 1996:23). It also indicates that its traffic police receive bribes from drivers who break traffic regulations, and that this is a widespread occurrence in the country. In addition, the Report indicates that police receive bribes by powerful individuals who want an innocent person arrested and take them to court on framed charges and that immigration officials receive bribes to issue passports and permits illegally, bypassing the normal procedures (Warioba Report, 1996:2).

'Corruption in the police' is widespread in Tanzania. The Guardian (8th August 2003) quoted an MP who said that members of the police collaborate with criminals to hide their files from prosecutors. One case, in the Tanzanian Revenue Authority, that he cited as an example was that of a policeman from the Regional Police Commander's office who escaped prosecution when his file for a charge of US\$102,340 [TS8m/-] was 'lost' in 1996. A second file theft incident took place in Ilala District when a US\$690.000 [Ts69m/-] case was dismissed because the police failed to produce the file for this case, claiming that it had been 'lost'.

5. Bribery in the civil service

One of the two specific forms of corruption falling under 'bribery in the civil service' and 'bribing to get basic needs and service' is the paying of bribes to state officials to get basic needs and services [like light and water]. Written literature makes the point that this practice is widespread in Tanzania, but specifically in municipal services like Health, Education, and Land Affairs. It's a specific form of corruption that touches all people, both rich and poor, but harms the poor more than it does the rich. More pertinently, it coerces citizen to buy what it is their right to have (TI 1998, 2001; Warioba Report, 1996; TCCIA, 1995; Hoseah, 1997, 1998, 1999; Meagher, 1997).

6. Tax evasion

'Bribing TRA officials' during tax assessments so that they will bend the law is one of two specific forms of corruption referred to as 'tax evasion'. Literature reveals that sometimes corrupt officials in TRA use middlemen and fake proforma invoices, for taxing motor vehicles and other goods (Warioba Report, 1996:281-83).

7. Subverting judicial procedures

Only one specific form of corruption, 'bribing judicial officers and court clerks', refers to money given to judicial and court clerks to bend the law or destroy important documents was found in the generic form of corruption, 'subverting judicial procedures'. Literature reveals that this form of corruption is widespread in Tanzania and that it takes place in judicial proceedings, starting with the court clerks, personal secretaries and typists to the magistrates and prosecutors. All these personnel take bribes for specific assignments (Warioba Report, 1996:2, Meagher, 1997:2).

General speaking, corruption in Tanzania takes fourteen specific forms under seven [7] generic forms of corruption namely, 'kickbacks in government procurement' 'misuse of public fund', 'approving State tenders', 'corruption in the police', 'bribery in the civil service', 'tax evasion', and 'subverting judicial procedures'. The fourteen specific and substantive forms of corruption are prevalent amongst high-level leaders, public officials and civil servants and include corrupt transactions, forgery of documents, receipts and cheques, in

most cases; official letters intended to mislead or deceive higher authorities in public offices. Other forms of corruption have to do with receiving commissions, 'Takrima', favour, or loans from any national institution without consideration of regulations, receiving bribes from persons seeking basic needs and services, possession of properties through dubious means, theft and fraud.

But what could be causing corruption in Tanzania and elsewhere is a question worth answering.

5. Causes of corruption in Tanzania

The causes of corruption in Tanzania and other underdeveloped countries are very similar. Slight differences between them reflect differences in the nature of the peoples of each country. Indications are that moral decay, bad governance and hardship have been the major causes of corruption in all underdeveloped countries thus far, with all other causes seemingly related to these. The consequences of corrupt practices like these over time has caused an escalation of poverty, undermined government legitimacy, the rule of law and constitution, enhanced incompetence, and led to a lack of transparency and accountability in the country.

Moral decay is cited as the core cause of corruption (Warioba Report 1996; Mcgeary & Michaels, 1998:43; Meagher 1997:1; Carasciuc's, 2000:1). The 'TI Bangladesh' (1999) survey reveals that people's perception of the causes of corruption is as follows: 76% view the desire to get rich overnight as the main cause, followed by moral degradation (58%), lack of accountability (51%) and meagre or inadequate salary (32%). Hoseah (1997) regards human greed as very often being the main contributing factor to corruption, and he lists extortion, influence peddling, nepotism, fraud, and theft to be the major facets of corruption. He asserts that leaders, not having values of 'honesty, sobriety, self-restraint, transparency and probity', constitute the major source of corruption in Tanzania (Hoseah, 1999).

Bad governance and lack of transparency that in most cases have resulted in grafts, frauds and theft in different national institutions, are responsible for the spread of corruption in Tanzania. The Prevention of Corruption Bureau ('PCB') report recorded graft allegations of 20

government institutions and departments (The Guardian, October 3rd 2003), indicating that government officials were irresponsible, and mooted that such incidents constitute vivid evidence that increased immorality among Government officials, including accountants and auditors was behind the increased loss of Government property and corruption. The report suggests that most leaders have no internal or external fear as public servants; instead they have used their position and concomitant responsibilities as a means of justifying their personal interests. The Warioba Commission indicated that other reasons leading to corruption and closer to bad governance were closeness between businessmen and leaders, lack of transparency in the economy, appointment of corrupt leaders, erosion of the integrity of leaders, emergence of competition in conspicuous consumption, and changes in the country's democratic structure (Warioba Report, 1996).

Also, Government officials displayed a lack of understanding regarding the meaning of the meaning of concepts like democracy, good governance and rule of law and this ignorance has contributed much to the inadequate application of leadership qualities and a deviation from the national leadership Code of Ethics Act. In addition, many people being ignorant, have no knowledge of democracy, good governance and rule of law and this makes it difficult for them to demand their rights, as vested in the constitution, once these have been taken away or even to demand an explanation on various issues from leaders. This was revealed by one of the participants in the 2003 Two-Day Social Watch Country Forum (Sunday Observer, 7th September 2003). Because of this many people believe that bad governance and perhaps ignorance are the major causes of corruption in Tanzania and elsewhere in the world.

Contrarily, literature on corruption in Tanzania cites hardship of life to be one of the main causes of increased corruption (Warioba Report, 1996). The minimum pension paid by the government to a pensioner for instance, is Tsh20, 077 [less than USD20] per month (The Guardian, 2nd July 2004).

6. Attempts by Tanzanian Government to curb corruption

Tanzania has been attempting to address corruption since the first government led by Mwalimu Nyerere hitherto. The constitution of Tanzania is meant to ensure the eradication of injustice, intimidation, discrimination, corruption, and favouritism (United Republic of Tanzania, 1998:13). However, while preventative measures have been put in place by the government since the first decade of independence, with a view to addressing corruption, using the media and sometimes pledges, 'TI' statistics show that this phenomenon is still a menace to Tanzanian society.

Amongst the measures taken by the Government to address corruption in the country, were the adoption of the 'leadership code' in 1967, followed by the establishment of the Anti-Corruption Squad in 1975, and the Code of Ethics Act No. 13 of 1995 (Warioba Report, 1996). However, all those created additional causes rather than solutions, because the Code led to officials bending the law (Shivji, 1975). The government then established the National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan in 2000, with the focus on institutional reforms and the raising of public awareness (The Guardian, 12th April 2001:3).

In order to implement the 'Code of Ethics Act' that became operational on 1st of July 1995, the Warioba Report (1996:10) recommended the declaration of officials' assets at leadership level as one of the measures to prevent corruption. Following this recommendation, which collided with the ruling party's stance after the 1995 elections, President Mkapa declared his assets and liability to the public, followed by the Vice President as a demonstration of the current Government's commitment to fight corruption. However, most of the officials did not adhere to the recommendation. In his observation, Hoseah (1999:1) maintains that the Act is unsatisfactory because it lacks an effective mechanism for ascertaining the declared assets, properties and liabilities of leaders. He suggests, therefore, that the law be overhauled to reflect its intentions to curb impropriety and conflict of interest. Perhaps changes are necessary to accept privatization policies, something that President Mkapa has frequently

suggested as a solution to abate problems associated with corruption in Tanzania. The key issue here in our view, as elsewhere, is not ownership, but the systems of governance and accountability in place within different State institutions.

Reviews of the Warioba Report (1996), the work of Shivji (1975) and Hoseah (1997,1998,1999), seem to indicate that government attempts to eradicate corruption have failed because all its campaigns have been aimed at events rather than at the root cause of the problem. It seems also that commitment from the top leaders, which is a precondition for any reform, is lacking. These conclusions reflect observations by the European Union that the Tanzanian government is not tackling the country's corruption problem with sufficient zest. Following this observation, the Union threatened to withdraw humanitarian aid to Tanzania in 2000 unless it seriously addressed the problem and took urgent corrective measures (Daily Mail & Guardian, 23rd May 2000). The matter is thus crucial, especially when it is realized that, in the interest of democracy and market economy, the international community insists on government accountability and transparency (Mogear & Michaels, 1998).

7. Corruption in Tanzania in relation to other countries

Commentaries on corruption in Tanzania show that corruption here is similar to that in other countries in the region, like Uganda, DRC, as well as in other countries in the Indian sub-continent, like Bangladesh and India. Broadly speaking, corruption in all these countries include generic forms such as 'kickbacks in government procurement', 'misuse of public fund', 'approving State tenders', 'corruption in the police', 'bribery in the civil service', 'tax evasion', and 'subverting judicial procedures'.

In Tanzania, Health, Education, Police, Land, Municipal Services [Water Supply, Electricity, Holding Tax], and Public Transport Sectors are cited as the areas most affected by corruption (Warioba Report, 1996; TCCIA, 1995; Hoseah, 1997,1998,1999; Meagher, 1997). A newspaper (The Guardian, 6th August 2003) reported, for example, that a local Government chairman in Dar es Salaam was

charged with forgery when presenting false documents as value for house rent.

Leakage of Standard seven examination papers in 1999 is another vivid example of the corruption prevalent in Tanzanian society. In this incident, some teachers were allowed to escape after being caught with some pupils who were in possession of marking scheme papers (The Guardian, 6th October 1999, Daily News, 9th October 1999). Also, there was a big leakage of the Form Four National Exams in 1998 and 2003. The Government had to intervene to cancel and reschedule the National Exams (Sunday Observer, 14th March 1999). Commenting on the incident, while addressing the nation in the new Millennium, Tanzanian President, Mr. Mkapa, admitted that this incident had revealed the country's moral decay and irresponsibility. He questioned the kind of a nation we were trying to build if would be doctors, engineers and other academicians we to attain their qualifications through dubious means? (Daily News, 4th January 1999).

At the same time, while the Tanzanian government established an institution namely, Prevention Corruption Bureau 'PCB' to address corruption in the country, it is an open secret that this same organisation has been spending billions of Tanzanian shillings unworthily (The Guardian, 15th September 2003). The 'PCB' report of 2003 indicates that its budget had increased from Tsh 2.1.bn [US\$2.2M] to 5bn/- [US\$5.5M] without a corresponding increase in the number of people convicted of corruption. A PCB official revealed this whilst presenting the report to the Third Annual General Meeting of the Southern African Forum Against Corruption (SAFAC) on the 7th of August 2003 in Dar es Salaam. He said that between 1999/2000 and 2003/2004, the PCB budget had increased from 2.1bn/- to 5.3bn/, an increment that is contrary to the figures of prosecuted cases – the director said only 31 persons had been convicted, including a former Permanent Secretary currently serving a three-year jail term. The newspaper disclosed, moreover, that:

The PCB figures on convicted persons in brackets, according to Hoseah, included in 1999 (9 persons), in 2000 (6

persons), in 2001 (nil), in 2002 (12 persons), and in 2003 (4 persons). He said the low number of convicted persons underscored the fact that investigations had failed to establish cases and substantial evidence (The Guardian, August 8th 2003)

This is but one example among many instances where national resources and fund are being misused.

In Uganda, top leaders of the country also misuse public funds. A South African newspaper (Sunday Times, 12th October 2003) reported on page 12 that the president of Uganda, a country ravaged by poverty, war and the HIV/AIDS pandemic, spent at least USD34, 290 [R240, 000] from state coffers to fly his daughter, Natasha Museveni, to Europe in his presidential jet so that she could have a baby in a Western hospital, claiming that “when it comes to medical care for myself and my family there is no compromise”! Sources in Uganda said the round trip for Museveni’s daughter cost R850, 000 [USD 121,428], contrary to the figure of around R240, 000 [\$27,000] disclosed by the President (The Guardian, 16th October 2003). The Newspaper sadly states that it would take a Ugandan, on average, a national wage of 85 years to earn such an amount! Tanzanian media aired the same story.

Generic forms of corruption in Bangladesh have much in common with generic forms of corruption in Tanzania. A survey undertook by the TI Bangladesh chapter in 1999 as well as another, more recent, survey reveal that the protection of life and property and the dispensation of justice are missing in Bangladesh due to the rampant corruption in all Government organs and civil services. As is the case in Tanzania, the TI Bangladesh Survey (1997:5) reveals that it is almost impossible to get a trade license without paying a bribe, being a person of influence or, at least, paying speedy money.

Corruption in the DRC, previously known as Zaire, has reached a situation where wrong-doing has become the norm and the standard accepted behaviour necessary to accomplish organizational goals; notions of public responsibility and trust have become the exception, not the rule. The situation is still as it was during the era of the late

Zairian President Mobutu, except that Mobutu not only admitted that administrative corruption was the rule but actually encouraged it (TCCIA, 1996).

In India corruption has become an accepted way of life, a country of 1.1 billion people, more than half of who remain mired in poverty 57 years after independence from the British. Forms of corruption are to be found widely amongst police and in local government where officials demand money or sexual favours, according to Ms Shilpa Gupta, a successful young restaurateur, cited in 'The Straits Times' (TI Daily Corruption News, 28th June 2004). The TI also uncovered that India's 'underground economy' - transactions involving corrupt practices such as under invoicing, smuggling, profiteering and the black market - exceeds US\$200 billion annually, or nearly a third of the country's gross domestic product. This means that the Indian treasury is being deprived of revenues through taxation.

The TI daily news report on corruption reveals that there are societies in the world that legalise corrupt practices as part and parcel of their way of life, and that their governments operate without checks on the counter-effect, hence building corrupt nations (TI Daily Corruption News, 2nd July 2004). Indications are that top leaders in these countries, even if they pretend to fight corruption, are not taking the threat of graft very seriously. They are even struggling to get successors who will always feel favoured by them and consequently not dig into their files. It is only when they are defeated by their rivals or deceased that we start hearing their scandals and felons the TI source reveals.

The TI daily news report on corruption cites the former president of Zambia, Mr. Chiluba, the former Kenyan president, Mr. Moi, Mr. Moussa Traore of Mali, Mrs. Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan, Suharto of Indonesia, Milosovic of Czechoslovakia, Charles Taylor of Liberia, Mabutu Seseseko of Zaire, now the DRC, and Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines as examples, their names appearing in the media every day in connection with corruption. According to the TI, a corruption watchdog, the only heads of state to steal more money than Mobutu were Suharto and Marcos. In some other countries there are

indications of ‘top-secret’ efforts to spare big shots who stole from national banks and then burned them, sold them and even killed those who would be ready to reveal the truth (TI Daily Corruption News, 2nd July 2004).

In general, corruption is blamed for affecting the social and economic fabric of society and intensifying poverty. Some reviewed literature concludes that corruption is so entrenched that eliminating it completely will be very difficult because one of the causes of corruption, which cannot not be easily eradicated, is unethical behaviour among the people. This implies that, not until authorities think clearly on moral and poverty issues, corruption will remain a menace in underdeveloped nations. Many people in these countries are forced to pay bribes in order to get services they need and, hence, resort to bribery as a shortcut. Unlike ‘least’ TI ranked corrupt countries, in which corruption is found in international tax scams practiced by international business companies, government organs in TI countries ranked as ‘most corrupt’ in 2001 lead corruption. In these countries corruption ranges from petty to grand corruption in local government [City Councils, Transport and telecommunications, Provincial Administrations, Electricity], the Police Force, the judicial system, and in some cases amongst top leaders. Officials in these countries misappropriate and misuse public funds to satisfy their greed, desires and needs while, at grassroots level, people are forced to bribe civil servants to speed up services and get their rights on time.

In conclusion, corrupt practices in Tanzania are similar to those in other comparable countries in Africa and on the Indian sub-continent. All of these are under-developed countries where the social welfare of the people is not regarded as seriously as in Western countries, and where people’s basic needs are seldom met. Also, TI ranked all these countries as most corrupt countries internationally. Different forms of corruption found under the generic forms of corruption in these countries, and in Tanzania in particular, impedes the national efforts of social-economic transformation and the building of a self-reliant nation. Values education, this study argues, provides a permanent

solution to corruption, by providing students who are the adults of tomorrow, with a foundation of moral values, both secular and religious, that will guide their choices in life and ensure that their decisions are informed by the values intrinsic to this foundation.

8. Integration of Moral values as a Solution

Most of the measures taken by governments to stem corruption have proven failure, particularly in Tanzania. The author argues for addressing corruption through education by integrating moral values in school curriculum. Moral values per se –as suggested in the moral integrated process models- are not taught as a course in the traditional sense. It is rather a multi-faceted programme that includes a variety of activities embracing enrichment, personal development, community service, recreation and nurturing as learning within the existing programme. In this way, moral values education cannot be seen as a stand-alone programme in the school programmes. It has to be integrated in the education policy as well as in all academic disciplines. This provides opportunities for young people to receive training and skills which are essential for their self-development, self-discipline and provides a foundation in moral values as alternatives for them to consider in their lives. This may impact their decisions and build their self-determination to resist immoral practices including corruption while still at school and college to play a leadership role in their own situations and contexts as students and later in life as adults and leaders to serve their respective society.

In South Africa, hosting its first Anti-Corruption Forum in March 2005, concluding that education could be used to stem corruption early by attempting to predispose future leaders while they are still in their formative years, to resist temptation and actively stand against corruption for the common good (Sulayman, 2007:1).

Sulayman (2007:18) argues that the curricula contribute greatly to preparing young people for their future membership of society and their active participation in the country's development. To make this clear and worthy, Mwalimu Nyerere changed the content of Civics curriculum to build a socialist state based on self-reliance values and anti-corrupt nation. He emphasises:

9. Conclusion

Unlike the 'least' corrupt countries, where taxation scams internationally seems to predominate, generic forms corruption found in 'most' corrupt countries in 2001 include 'misuse of public fund', 'bribery in the civil services', 'subverting judicial procedures', 'kickbacks in government procurement', 'political corruption', 'paying speedy money', 'embezzlement', 'corruption in the police', 'tax evasion', and 'scams' in gold and oil. These are found in African nations, countries of the former Soviet Union, on the Indian sub-continent, in South America, and in a country in the Far East.

In Tanzania corruption manifests as 14 specific forms, grouped under 7 broad or generic forms, and include 'forgery of documents - found in all but one generic form - followed by 'soliciting commissions' and 'takrima', found in two generic forms. All other specific forms of corruption in Tanzania, such as 'ghost employees', are specific to the generic form where found.

References

1. Al-Shawkani Mohammad Ali Adab al-Talab wa-Muntaha al-Arab
2. www.librarything.com/author/alimammohammadibnali
3. Anderson L W, D R. Krathwohl, Peter W. Airasian, Kathleen A. Cruikshank, Richard E. Mayer, Paul R. Pintrich, James Raths, and Merlin C. Wittrock (eds) (2000). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Allyn and Bacon
4. Arthur W. Foshay (2000). The Curriculum. Teachers College, Columbia University
5. Beane, J A (1977). Curriculum Integration: Designing the Core of Democratic Education. New York: Teachers College Press, http://www.archeworks.org/projects/tcsp/ic_guide_p6.html
6. Brophy, J & Alleman J (2011).
7. http://www.archeworks.org/projects/tcsp/ic_guide_p6.html
8. Caine, Renate Nummela and Geoffrey Caine. Making Connections: Teaching and the Human Brain. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1992. Source: http://www.archeworks.org/projects/tcsp/ic_guide_p6.html
9. Fetterman D M (2001). Foundations of Empowerment Evaluation. California: Sage Publications Inc. Thousand Oaks.
10. Fisher, R (1994). Moral education and philosophy in schools. NAVET Papers Vol X
11. Foshay Arthur W. (2000). The Curriculum. Teachers College, Columbia University.
12. George Bishop (1994). Curriculum Development. A textbook for students. Mc Millan
13. Halstead J M & Taylor M J (1996). Values in Education and Education in Values. Falmer Press.
14. Halstead J M (2000). Developing a Values Framework for Sex Education in a Pluralist Society. In Mal Leicester, Celia Modgil & Sohan Modgil. Education, Culture and Values Volume IV. Moral Education and Pluralism (pp. 85-96). London: Falmer Press.
15. Ibn Khaldun, Muqaddimah, vol. 3, (Translation: Zahir Kadiri, 1988, p. 145) Istanbul: UGAn
16. Kohlberg I (1980). Moral Reasoning of Students. American Journal of Education, 88: 3.
17. Khosrow Bagheri (2001). Islamic Education. Alhoda, Tehran
18. Linda C Scренко (1997). Values and character education implementation guide Georgia department of education office of policy and communications. [Online] Available url: <File:///G1/VALUESandCHARACTEREDUCATION.htm>. August 1997.

19. Lipman, M (1987). Ethical reasoning and the craft of moral practice. *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol 16, No 2
20. MacNeil, Cheryl (2002). Evaluator as Steward of Citizen Deliberation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23: 1 (pp 45-54). American Evaluation Association: Elsevier Science Inc
21. National Institute of Corrections (2000) Nuts and Bolts of the Curriculum Development Process, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Office of Justice
22. Powney, J., Cullen, M-A., Schlapp, U., Johnstone, M. & Munn, P. (1995). Understanding values education in the primary school. York: Reports Express. p.vii
23. Programs, of Justice, 2000
24. <http://www.nttac.org/pdfFiles/curriculumdevelopment.pdf>
25. Ralph W. Tyler (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum & Instruction*. University of Chicago Press
26. Rowe, D & Newton, J (1994). *You, me, us! Social and moral responsibility for primary schools*. Citizenship Foundation, London
27. Saleh Mohaqmmmed. Q-cip: Quran-Curriculum Integration Project <http://muslimed.webwindow.ca/> (2008) Aldeen Foundation 2008,ISNA Educational Forum
28. Sharp, A M (1964). Philosophical teaching of moral education. *Journal of Moral Education*. Vol 13, No.1
29. Sulayman H I (2007). *Building Values in 3 Schools of Tanzania: A Participatory, Colaboratory and Empowerment Evaluation Approach*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, WITS, JHB
30. Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: theory and practice*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.
31. Taylor I, M (Ed.), *Values education in Europe: a comparative overview of a survey of 26 countries in 1993* (pp.1-66). Dundee: Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum- Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.
32. Wiggins, R. (2001). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Music educator concerns. *Music Educators Journal*, 87, 5 40-44.