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Abstract
Corruption has remained one of the major international concerns of the past decade. Cutting across social, cultural and economic dimensions, corruptions is universally perceived as the biggest human induced threat facing humanity at the moment. Currently, there is active debate among scholars on the bases and exact ways in which corruption affects particular societies. Specifically, Accountants and auditors are expected to plan their work with due diligence. And bring their professional competence to bear on their jobs, since their reports may be relied upon by variety of individuals and organizations in investment decision making. We conducted a content analysis on anti-corruption’s quarterly reports from 2003-2013. The methodological approach of content analysis is studying of valid textual data and different textual sources with the purpose of providing knowledge, new insights, a representation of facts and a practical guide to action. We examined 600 cases of allegations against accountants, managers and other finance handlers in their work institutions. The cases were investigated and prepared by anti-corruption commissions as stipulated under section 36 of the anti-corruption and economic crime act, 2003. The paper found out that there is a significant relationship between corruption and accounting Professional scepticisms between 2003 and 2013.The paper concluded that the drivers related to corruption in Kenya is insufficient levels of professional skepticism. This suggest that a need for increased focus on professional skepticism is required, as well as continual reminders during the course of an engagement of the responsibilities for due professional care and maintaining an appropriate level of skepticism, in order to reduce the state of corruptions in Kenya.
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Introduction
Corruption can be visualized to be at ‘stationary state’ in any economy. However, it can be argued that governance is what determines the pendulum of the state. A country with good governance is an essential part of a framework for economic and financial management. Poor governance may result from factors such as incompetence, ignorance, lack of efficient institutions, the pursuit of economically inefficient ideologies, or misguided economic models (Tanzi, 1999; Onuorah & Appah, 2012; Bello, 2001; Egwuonwu, 2007 & Dulleck, et al.,2008).

As corruption permeates the political, economic and social spheres of communities and countries, the stability and security of individual countries and international community are threatened and there can be few prospects for development and prosperity Milke,2011; Shaw & Reitano,2013).Specifically, corruption hinders efforts to achieve the internationally agreed upon Millennium (Ooms et al., 2010), Development Goals (Carmona,2009), undermines democracy and the rule of law leading to human rights violations, distorts markets, erodes quality of life and allows organized crime, terrorism and other threats to human security to flourish (Kumar,2003,2007; Held,2013; Rajagopal,1999 &). Evidence also shows that corruption hurts poor people disproportionately and is a dominant factor driving fragile countries towards state of failure (Opili, 2014; Mazo, 2009 & Savage et al., 2008).

Corruption is not a new phenomenon (Mojanoski & Nikolovski, 1857; Tiedeman, 1900; Nye, 1967; Mackie, 1970; Ali & Isse, 2002; Godinez & Liu, 2015). Centuries ago, Shakespeare gave corruption a prominent role in some of his plays; and the American Constitution made bribery and treason the two explicitly mentioned crimes that could justify the impeachment of a U.S. president (Tanzi, 1999). The degree of attention now paid to corruption leads to natural question of why. Why so much attention now? Is it because there is more corruption than in the past? Or is it because more attention is being paid to a phenomenon that had always existed but had been largely, though not completely, ignored? The answer is not obvious, and there are no reliable statistics that would make possible a definitive answer (Svensson, 2005).

The most popular and simplest definition of corruption is that, it is the abuse of public power for private benefit. This is the definition used by the World Bank. From this definition it should not be concluded that corruption cannot exist within private sector activities. In large private enterprises, corruption clearly does exist, as for example in procurement or even in hiring. It also exists in private activities regulated by the government.
Corruption can be classified in different categories (Mo, 2001; Rumyantseva, 2005; Khan1996 & Anderson, (2015) undoubtedly, but objectively, our paper will emphasize more on corruption connected to finance and accounting orientation practices of, public organisation in Kenya. According to Klitgaard (1998, p. 4), corruption may be represented by the following formula:

\[ C = M + D - R \]

Where corruption = monopoly + discretion - accountability.

According to the paper, corruption will occur when an organization or person has a monopoly over goods or services, and is at discretion to decide who will receive it and how much that person will receive. A corrupt equilibrium is reached when governors, top civil servants, and professionals in the private sector make a gain, but the rest of society makes a loss. Klitgaard considered lack of transparency as a factor that promotes corruption. Bertot et al.,(2010), Kolstad & Wiig (2009), Cokgezen (2004) and Halter et al.,(2009) incredibly supported it. However we hypothesize in this article that, accounting professional skepticism is the tonic of corruption in Kenya.

We conceptualized the concept of accounting professional skepticism and corruption from utilitarian approach, the moral rights approach and Integrative social contract approach: The first approach proposes that actions and plans should be judged by their consequences. People should therefore behave in such a way that will produce the greatest benefit to society with the least harm or lowest cost (Nwachukwu, 2007). The second approach posits that moral decisions are those that best maintain the rights of those people affected by them. Finally, the Integrative social contract approach, based on the integration of two contracts; the general social contract that allows business to operate and defines the acceptable rules among members of a community that addresses acceptable way of behaving (Helin,& Sandström,2007 & Nwagboso,2008)

We can argue that skepticism is a diminutive concept of ethics. Ethics are the moral principles that an individual uses in governing his or her behaviour. It is the personal criteria by which an individual distinguishes “right or wrong” (Victor, & Cullen, 1988). According to Victor, & Cullen (1988) ethics and ethical values, concern things, which we think, say and/or practice that may not necessarily violate the rules of the organization or infringe the law of the land or amount to outright crime or felony, but which borders on our sense of morality, our sense of right and wrong. A study by (Torois et al., 2014; Popescu, 2011 & Constantinescu & Kaptein, 2015) showed that, managers’ ethical decision influences corporate financial performance and they emphasized that managers should comply with their code of conduct for better performances

Studies on Professional ethics from Nigeria perspective (Okoye & Ofoegbu,2006), Kenya (Ojienda & Juma, 2015), UK (Hutton & Massey,2006), Egypt (Wahdan et al.,2006), U.S (Wines,2006) and china (Lu & Enderle,2006) among other intellectuals such as Mathews and Perera (1996), Vizeu (2015), Nortje & Hoffmann (2015) observe that every profession has a built in code of ethics to compel ethical behaviour on its members. The coherency for this is obvious. Individuals from time to time have to face ethical dilemmas and the problem of weakness of will. Accountants are no different. In their working life they encounter numerous situations where they are tempted to do something morally wrong. That is why a feature of accountancy’s claim to professionalism is its commitments to ethical standards. This involves an assurance that the accountancy bodies and their members will not pursue their material self-interests in ways that conflict with their duties to the public interest (Appah, 2010).

Accountants are professionals responsible for the preparation of financial reports and their prerequisite is to adhere to the codes of ethical accounting standards, so as to produce reliable, relevant, timely, accurate, understandable and comprehensive financial reports. According to Akadako & Izedonmi (2013) showed that financial reporting forms the basis for economic decision making. According to Ball (2006) various shareholders need financial reports for decision making on the investment and financial aspect of the organization. For that reason financial reports produced by the accountant should be based on certain fundamental qualities for various
users to understand the content of the report.

The fundamental objective of financial reports is to communicate economic measurements of information about resources and performance of the reporting entity, useful to those having reasonable rights to such information (Alexander & Britton 2000). According to IASB (2008) and the work of Levine the “Finance and growth: theory and evidence” (Levine, 2005) high quality financial reporting information is important because it will positively influence capital providers and other stakeholders in making investment, credit, and similar resource allocation decisions enhancing overall market efficiency.

Accounting is a profession that rests heavily on the need to exhibit a high sense of accountability and stewardship Akadakpo & Izedonmi (2013) therefore, professional code of conduct should not be conceded. And for that reason Aguolu (2006), Jenfa (2000), Okezie (2008), Nwagbosu (2008), Nwanyanwu (2010) and Ogbonna and Appah (2011) provided the fundamental guidelines applicable to all accountants. These guidelines includes;

**Integrity:** This is the quality of being honest and having, strong moral principles. It implies not merely honest but fair dealing and truthfulness. This principle of integrity imposes an obligation on all accountants to be straight forward and honest in professional and business relationships.

**The objectivity:** The principle of objectivity imposes the, obligation on all professional accountants to be fair, intellectually honest and free from conflicts. This principle requires four basic needs of credibility, professionalism, quality of service and confidence.

**Professional competence:** A professional accountant, in agreeing to provide professional services implies that he is competent to perform the services. Accountants should refrain from agreeing to perform professional services which they are not competent to carry out unless competent advice and assistance are obtained.

**The confidentiality:** A professional accountant should respect the confidentiality of information acquired during the course of performing professional services. They should not use or disclose any such information without proper and specific authority.

**Independence:** Independence means having a position to take an unbiased viewpoint in the performance of professional assignments. Accountants must not only maintain an independent attitude in fulfilling their responsibilities, but the users of financial reports must have confidence in that independence.

**Technical standards:** Professional services should be carried out in accordance with the relevant technical and professional standards. The services should conform to the technical and professional standards of relevant accounting bodies and other legislation.

According to the 2005 “Global Economic Survey” produced by Price Waterhouse Coopers, the number of firms reporting fraud is increasing rapidly, and the number of restatements of financial statements increased to 1,195 cases in 2005 (8.5% of U.S. publicly traded companies). In Kenya recently, Losses to fraud in Kenya’s financial institutions rose to Ksh1.6 billion ($18.8 million) for the first nine months of 2013 — nearly triple the Ksh655.6 million ($7.71 million) stolen in the first nine months of 2012 (BFID, 2013 report). Furthermore, Banking Fraud Investigations Department (BFID) in its monthly crime reports, identity theft, electronic funds transfer, bad cheques, credit card fraud, loan fraud, forgery of documents and online fraud as among the ways used to defraud financial institutions, creating accounting unreliability.

Three years ago, the incompetence and betrayal of Professionals skepticism is evidenced in the defence of United States (pentagon). According to the CPI’S sources (www.publicintegrity.org, 2011) they predicted that, Pentagon's accounting shambles may cost an additional $1 billion because of issues such as, poor bookkeeping and financial ledgers. Terming pentagon’s accounting unreliable. There has been a slight improvement over the past decade according to both Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index and the World Bank’s Governance Indicators, but still Kenya scores relatively poorly on both these measurements.

According to Transparency International’s Global Corruption Report 2009, the cost of corruption is a serious deterrent to potential investors and a major impediment for existing and new businesses (Global Corruption Report, 2009). Accordingly, business executives continue to perceive corruption as a major obstacle for business operations, with 21% of the companies interviewed within the framework of the World Economic Forum’s Global Competitiveness report 2011-2012 naming corruption at the top of the list of obstacles for doing business in the country. This is consistent with findings from the World Bank and IFC Enterprise survey 2007, in which 38% of the companies surveyed reported corruption to be a major constraint to their operations.

For example the country scores 49/100 in the 2010 Open Budget Index (compared to 57/100 in 2008), which indicates that the government provides some information to the public, but this is insufficient for citizens to fully hold the government accountable for its management of public resources (International Budget Partnership, 2010).

Furthermore, in the recent Transparency International’s 2014 assessment, Kenya got a woeful score of 25/100 and was positioned 145/177, with -0.912 points of countries surveyed. When equated to African country counterpart, Mauritius. With score of 54/100 and was positioned 47/177, with 0.676 points. Undoubtedly, we can argue that the current state of corruption in Kenya is rapaciously ballooning. To address corruption and provide accountable and transparency governance, a clearer understanding is required on extent and exact cause of
corruption.

Despite the different methodologies and sometimes different sources, we recognise scholars around the globe for credible contributions concerning the effect of corruption on country’s economy. For example (Yao, 2002) argued that corruption in China is generated by the Chinese political system. Cai et al., (2009) investigated the institutional causes of corruptions among Chinese firms with a firm level-level data set. Still there is a lack of more comprehensive economic analysis about the causes of corruptions in China.

Past studies (e.g. Goel and Nelson 1998) investigated the effect of government size on corruption with the American annual state-level data set while (Glaeser & Saks 2006) used a data set of federal corruption convictions in the US to investigate the causes of corruption. Fisman and Gatti (2002b) employ the information of the mismatch between the revenue generation and expenditure in the U.S. state to test the relationship between decentralisation and corruption. Svensson (2003) used the firm-level data set from Uganda to explore the determinants of firm bribery payments.

Furthermore, the Transparency International Organization (TIO) classified corruption into two types, one resulting from the practice of law, and occurs when the legislature establishes laws for the sake of self-interest. Just like what the former Philippine President (Fernandez Marcos) who re-drafted sections of the Philippine Constitution to confer legitimacy on the looting of the people's wealth (Johnston, 1996).

There, in fact, uncounted potential causes of corruption. However, the major studied possible causes are accounting (Sandholtz & Koetzle, 2000), economic (Alam, 1990), demographic (Volkema, 2004), political institutions (Lederman, 2005 & Nye, 1967), judicial (Dakolias & Thachuk, 2000), bureaucratic factors (Van Rijckeghem & Weder, 2001), geographical (Virta, 2010), and cultural (Nichols, et al., 2003) and managerial techniques (Lozeau et al., 2002). The micro factors which include professional skepticism have received limited attention. This is quite unsettling. And therefore it requires more focus.

The organization of the article is as follows: the current section encompasses both the introduction and literature of the study. The subsequent sections cover overview of content analysis, Anti-Corruption’s Quarterly Reports, methodology, model specification, results, implications, and finally conclusions.

2.0 Overview of Anti-Corruption’s Quarterly Reports

The Anti-Corruption and Economic Crimes Act, 2003 was enacted by Parliament to provide a legal framework to guide the fight against corruption and economic crimes in Kenya. The Act provides for a number of strategies to be employed in the fight against corruption. These include investigation, prosecution, prevention, education, and asset recovery and subsequently compile reports about the allegation of corruption. (ACECA Explained, 2013)

The Commission has a legal duty to prepare Quarterly Reports setting out the number of reports made to the Director of Public Prosecutions, and recommendations made for the prosecution of any person for corruption or economic crime. These Reports shall indicate whether the recommendations were accepted or not. The Commission is required to give a copy of each Quarterly report to the Director of Public Prosecutions who shall present it to Parliament. These Quarterly Reports are published by the Commission in the Kenyan Gazette. (ACECA Explained, 2013)

The Director of Public Prosecutions is required to prepare an Annual Report on cases relating to corruption and economic crime. The annual report shall include a summary of the steps taken in each case and the status of each case at the end of the year. It shall also indicate if a recommendation of the Commission to prosecute a person for corruption or economic crime was not accepted and why it was not accepted. The Director of Public Prosecutions shall present each Annual Report to Parliament. (ACECA Explained, 2013)

Below is a sample of a report made pursuant to section 36 of the anti-corruption and economic crimes Act, 2003. The report covers the third quarter of the year 2013 and is for the period commencing 1st July, 2013 to 30th September, 2013
3.0 Overview of Content Analysis and Methodology

This paper concerned on the information content, of the Content analysis of anti-corruption’s quarterly reports 2003-2013. Content analysis is a method of analysing written, verbal or visual communication messages (Cole 1988). It was first used as a method for analysing hymns, newspaper and magazine, articles, advertisements and political speeches in the 19th century (Harwood & Garry 2003). Content analysis has a long history of use in communication, journalism, sociology, psychology and business, and during the last few decades its use has shown steady growth (Neundorf 2002 and Lombard et al., 2002).

Content analysis as a research method is a systematic and objective means of describing and quantifying phenomena (Krippendorff 1980, Downe-Wamboldt 1992, Sandelowski 1995). It is also known as a method of analysing documents. Content analysis allows the researcher to test theoretical issues to enhance understanding of the data. Through content analysis, it is possible to distil words into fewer content related categories. It is assumed that when classified into the same categories, words, phrases and the like share the same meaning (Cavanagh 1997).

Content analysis is a research method for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context, with the purpose of providing knowledge, new insights, a representation of facts and a practical guide to action (Krippendorff 1980). The aim is to attain a condensed and broad description of the phenomenon, and the outcome of the analysis is concepts or categories describing the phenomenon. Usually the purpose of those concepts or categories is to build up a model, conceptual system, conceptual map or categories. The researcher makes a choice between the terms ‘concept’ and category’ and uses one or the other (Kyngas & Vanhanen 1999).

The method may be used with either qualitative or quantitative data. Furthermore, it may be used in an inductive or deductive way. We adopted deductive content analysis since it more often used in cases where the researcher wishes to retest existing data in a new context (Elo, 2014). The model Involve testing categories, concepts, models or hypotheses (Marshall & Rossman 1995; Sim,1998 & Roberts, 2000).

It is argued that if a deductive content analysis is chosen, the next step is to develop a categorization matrix and to code the data according to the categories. In deductive content analysis, either a structured or unconstrained matrix of analysis can be used, depending on the aim of the study (Kyngas & Vanhanen 1999). It is generally based on earlier works such as theories, models, mind maps and literature reviews (Sandelowski 1995, Polit & Beck 2004, Hsieh & Shannon 2005). It has been articulated that successful content analysis requires that, the researcher can analyse and simplify the data and form categories that reflect the subject of study in a reliable manner (Kyngas & Vanhanen 1999; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

The unit of analysis in content analysis involves; Sentence Unit comprising word, proposition, or the sentence (syntactical units) (Fahy et al. 2000, Hillman, 1999). Paragraph unit, slightly larger syntactical units, (Hara et al., 2000 & De Wever et al., 2006.), Message Unit which involves looking at the levels of argumentation and counter argumentation in transcripts, (Marttunen 1997,1998 and 2001 & Garrison et al., 2006), the Thematic Unit (Krippendorff 2012 & Budd, 1967),Illocutionary Unit, Howell-Richardson and Mellar (1996) and Rourke et al., (2001). we espoused on thematic unit of analysis “…a single thought unit or idea unit that conveys a single item
of information extracted from a segment of content” (Budd, 1967 p. 34)

To overcome both the problem of relying on potentially inconsistent judgements in deciding whether or not a set of wordings constitute a single meaning. We performed the hand coding of the thematic (allegation of each case reported by each Anti-Corruption’s Reports). As Krippendorf (1980 p. 64) concedes that, ultimately, the process of unitization "involves considerable compromise" between meaningfulness, productivity, efficiency, and reliability. Once the content of the transcripts had been coded and categorized, we employed SPSS statistical programs for more quantitative analysis.

Model development and variable measurement

After exploring the target contents (cases reported) we explain the variables and how they are measured, and then we present the model which will guide the relationship between the accounting professional skepticism and corruption. These dimensions were assumed to be uni-dimensional but correlating (because the data in each condition come from the same condition and so there could be some constancy in their responses). The components of the accounting professional skepticism and corruption (themes) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Accounting professional skepticism</td>
<td>Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Coding measure</td>
<td>Thematic Coding measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud 5 No of files recommended for prosecution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery 4 No files recommended for administrative or other action</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement / Misappropriation 2 No of file recommended for further investigation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Trust 2 No of file not accepted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others allegation 1 Other actions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of thematic:

**Bribery**

Bribery occurs when a person dishonestly gives or receives a benefit as an inducement or reward for doing or omitting to do what one is already under duty to do or omit to do (Sampford et al., 2006; Gordon & Miyake, 2001 & Bayley, 1966).

**Fraud**

This refers to a situation where a person intentionally makes a false statement or manipulates information in order to confer a benefit to oneself or other person(s) through dishonesty, deceit or trickery (Beasley, 1996; Petersen et al, 1999).

**Embezzlement and Misappropriation**

Embezzlement refers to the dishonest acquisition and conversion of public funds or resources to one’s use. Misappropriation, on the other hand, is the misallocation or wrongful use by a public office of public funds placed under his/her care (Asongu, 2013; Fantaye, 2004 & Coram et al., 2008).

**Breach of Trust**

Authority assigned to a public office must be exercised in a manner that promotes integrity and the best interest of the people. A public officer should do his or her best to discharge these duties in line with the Constitution. When a public officer does anything that is contrary to these expectations, he or she commits a breach of trust (Thompson, 1987 & Martin, 2009).

**The paired-samples t-test Model (Dependent t-test)**

The paired-samples t-test is used when there are two experimental conditions and the same participants took part in both conditions of the experiment. In our own perspective, the two experimental conditions are accounting professional skepticism and corruption taking place under the same conditions of the experiment (Field, 2000, 2009, 2013 & Box et al., 2005). The Anti-Corruption’s Quarterly Reports. Further, the test also provides the Pearson correlation analysis between the two conditions and the two-tailed significance value. By default, SPSS provides only the two-tailed probability, which is the probability when no prediction was made about the direction of group differences. Because we sought to determine whether accounting professional skepticism is an influential factor of corruption, we reported one-tailed probability by dividing the two-tailed probability by 2 (Field, 2013).

We examined 600 cases of allegations against accountants, managers and other finance handlers in their places of institutions. After analysing critically the textual content of the study we found 382 cases of allegations against accounting professional skepticism and corruption in Kenya. In view of that, we ran the following paired-samples t-test model using SPSS software:
\[ t = \frac{D' - \mu_D}{SD/\sqrt{N}} \]

where, \( D' \) = observed difference between sample means.
\( \mu_D \) = expected difference between population means (if null hypothesis is true)
\( SD/\sqrt{N} \) = estimate of the standard error of the difference between two sample means

### 4.0 Analysis and results
The study applied paired-samples t-test analysis to test the study’s proposition. Table 1.0 summarizes the results of the paired-samples t-test analysis

**Table 1.0 the paired-samples t-test analysis on the influence of accounting professional skepticism on corruption in Kenya 2003-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of pair</th>
<th>Themes of the study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>accounting professional skepticism – corruption allegation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-8.06</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>accounting professional skepticism - No of file recommended for further investigation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-6.38</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>accounting professional skepticism - No of file not accepted</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.113*</td>
<td>.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>accounting professional skepticism - Other action</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.0415*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>Others allegations – corruption allegation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Others allegations - Other action</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=383, df=382, n = Number of observations of the sample. S = Sample standard deviation, SE = Std. Error Mean, r = Pearson correlation, (*) = not sig at \( p < .05 \), (**) = sig at \( p < .05 \)

### 4.1 Accounting professional skepticism and on corruption
We computed the allegation of Fraud, Bribery, Embezzlement / Misappropriation and Breach of Trust as accounting professional skepticism and others allegations (e.g. abuse of power) while No. of file recommended for prosecution and No. of files recommended for administrative or other action were computed as corruption allegation. At that juncture, the variables were paired as specified in the table 1.0

Specifically, Fraud, Bribery, Embezzlement / Misappropriation and Breach of Trust (accounting professional skepticism) greatly influence corruption in Kenya pair 1 (\( t = -8.06, p < .05, r = .56 \)) compared to pair 2 (\( t = -6.38, p < .05, r = .59 \)), pair 3 (\( t = 1.21, p > .05, r = .70 \)), pair 4 (\( t = -1.73, p < .05, r = .60 \)), pair 5 (\( t = 3.94, p < .05, r = .57 \)) and pair 6 (\( t = 4.63, p < .05, r = .52 \)) respectively.

From the magnitude of the \( t \)-statistics we can see that Fraud, Bribery, Embezzlement / Misappropriation and Breach of Trust (accounting professional skepticism) greatly influence corruption in Kenya in a negative situation. Furthermore, within the content of the study, the analysis shows that the allegation concerning accounting professional skepticism and the No of file recommended for further investigation is also great but the outcome of the situation is negative. The number of file not accepted and other actions recommended by anti-corruption had very less impact on corruption while others allegations e.g. abuse of power is minimal according to the analysis.

### 5.0 Conclusions
The importance of a concerted national effort to combat and prevent corruption cannot be overemphasized. Using anti-corruption reports as source data this paper, we have examined that accounting Professional skepticism contribute to corruption in Kenya. Therefore, this study confirmed that accounting Professional skepticism is an influential factor of corruption in Kenya. The paper, which narrowed unknown factor of corruption, is comprehensive in reach, provides reliable information on the level of corruption. The state of corruption in Kenya is high and increasing. Therefore this requires the strenuous and profound efforts from professional skepticism outlook from all stakeholders to reverse this trend.
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