

# YOUTH INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT 2022

ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION THIMPHU: BHUTAN June 2022



# **YOUTH INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT 2022**

ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION THIMPHU: BHUTAN June 2022

#### ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION (ACC) BHUTAN

The Anti-Corruption Commission is a constitutional body, mandated to prevent and fight corruption in Bhutan. Established on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2005 by Royal Decree, its mission is to tackle corruption through leading by example, achieving excellence in partnership, and mainstreaming anti-corruption measures in public or private organizations.

Contact Address: ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION (ACC) LHADRO LAM, KAWAJANGSA POST BOX NO. 1113 THIMPHU, 11001, BHUTAN Tel: +975-2-334863/64/66/67/68 Fax: + 975-2-334865 Website: www.acc.org.bt

#### About this Report

The YIA 2022 was carried out with financial support from the Royal Government of Bhutan (RGoB). This research is second of its kind and the first was conducted in 2012. As compared to 2012, the YIA 2022 has adapted the method from the National Integrity Assessment (NIA) 2019, in generating scores. The survey items are mostly adapted from the "Integrity and Value Education in Schools" conducted by ACC, 2012, the "Youth Integrity Survey (YIS) 2019" of Vietnam, and the "Asia Pacific Youth: Integrity in Crisis" 2014 of Transparency International (TI).

Every effort was made to verify the accuracy of the information contained in this report. All information was believed to be correct as of April 2022.

© Anti-Corruption Commission of Bhutan (ACC)

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part and any form for educational purposes without the special permission from the copyright holder provided acknowledgment of the source is made. The publisher would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication that uses this publication as a source.

ISBN: 978-99980-53-76-2

Authors: Kinzang Gyeltshen, Namgay

Contributors: Shacha Wangchuk, Kezang Tshering

Design, Layout and printed @ Kuensel Corporation Limited

Published in Bhutan: Thimphu Publisher: Anti-Corruption Commission of Bhutan (ACC) Date of Publication: June 2022



ารีมา (2007) รายาง (2007) รายาง (2007) รายาง Source (2007) รายาง (2007) รายาง Source (2007) รายาง (2007) รายาง Source (2007) รายาง Source (2007) รายาง Source (2007) รายาง Source (2007) Source (2007) รายาง Source (2007) Sourc



### FOREWORD

Corruption places the very foundations of a democracy in peril by undermining the rule of law, compromising good governance, and eroding public trust. It profits a few but exacts a heavy cost with far-reaching adverse implications on the nation and citizens. In Bhutan, the Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC) is constitutionally and legally charged with the role and responsibility to prevent, educate and ensure strong deterrence in society through strategic, incisive and effective investigations, taking those responsible to task and holding them accountable.

In this, relevant and reliable data is essential and Section 25(e) of the Anti-Corruption Act of Bhutan, 2011 specifically require ACC to "Undertake studies and research to identify the trends, causes, types, pervasiveness and seriousness or impact of corruption." In terms of longitudinal studies, National Integrity Assessments (NIA) are conducted every three years to assess the level of integrity in the public agencies in terms of public service delivery and provide information on vulnerabilities, and guides interventions to promote integrity and mainstream anti-corruption measures in the public sector. The fourth NIA of 2019 covered a total of 272 different services provided by 96 agencies. ACC also undertakes other cross-sectional and specific studies to identify trends, causes, types and impact of corruption in vulnerable sectors.

In due acknowledgement of the importance of the youth and the promise and potential of their role in fighting corruption, representing the very moral fibre of society, the first study related to integrity and values of the Bhutanese youth was conducted in 2012. It is after a decade that a second such assessment has been conducted and the Report on the "Youth Integrity Assessment (YIA) 2022" is being presented herein. ACC believes that this data and information will be of relevance, interest and use to the Ministry of Education and all other institutes and entities, particularly those working with and for the youth. It is of paramount importance that we share and optimise our resources and collaborate meaningfully to ensure a high level of integrity, discipline and values in our young people. His Majesty The King during the Royal Address at the 14<sup>th</sup> RUB Convocation on 24 May 2019 Commanded that:

"...one of the key attributes that will set us apart from others is the value of integrity. We must be a nation of honest, reliable and trustworthy people."

Deki Pema Chairperson

FIGHTING CORRUPTION IS OUR COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY THIMPHU, BHUTAN. Post Box No. 1113, Tel: +975-2-334863/64/66/67/68/69 Fax No. 334865, Website: www.acc.org.bt

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research is the second of its kind conducted by the Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC). The research has been modified and contextualized to best fit and represent the integrity of Bhutanese youth. While carrying out this research, the National Statistics Bureau (NSB) has been very supportive by sharing technical personnel for data collection and analysis.

We are grateful to the Hon'ble Chairperson Deki Pema, Hon'ble Commissioner Jamtsho and Hon'ble Commissioner A Karma Rinzin, for their continued guidance and support. We would like to also show our gratitude to the Research Committee for their valuable guidance and inputs during the conduct of this research. The research committee members are Hon'ble Commissioner Jamtsho, ACC, Director-General Karma Galey, MoE, Director Dr Phangchung, RUB and Offtg. Director of DoPE, ACC.

We would like to express our deep sense of gratitude to Professor Robert Klitgaard, Claremont Graduate University, for thoroughly reviewing the report and informally sharing his valuable comments and feedback which immensely helped to shape this report. Similarly, we would like to thank Ms Tshering Choden, Deputy Chief ICT officer and Mr Cheda Jamtsho, Senior Research Officer, NSB for lending their technical expertise and assisting the research team in the statistical analysis. We are immensely grateful to Mr Tshering Palden, Editor, Kuensel Corporation Limited, Mr Singay, Senior Research Officer, CBS and Ms Tashi Choden, ACC for proofreading the report.

Furthermore, we are indebted to the Ministry of Education (MoE), Bhutan Transparency Initiative (BTI), Trongsa Dzongkhag Administration, Wangdue Phodrang Dzongkhag Administration, and Department of Professional Support (DoPS), ACC, for allowing their staff as supervisors during the data collection. Specifically, we would like to thank Mr Tashi Wangchuk and Ms Kuenzang Choden of MoE, Mr Jigme Wangdi, BTI, Mr Karma Wangdi, Trongsa Dzongkhag Administration, Mr Kelzang Norbu, Wangdue Phodrang Dzongkhag Administration, and Mr Ngawang Tenzin, DoPS, ACC, for successfully leading the teams during data collection.

Lastly, we remain grateful to all the agencies, schools, Institutes and colleges for their support during the process of the research fieldwork. Our extreme appreciation also goes to the 39 enumerators who diligently worked hard to administer the survey questionnaires and also to the respondents who spared their time for the survey.

### CONTENTS

Fore	eword	i
Ackn	nowledgment	ii
Cont	tents	iii
List o	of Figures	v
List o	of Tables	vi
Abbı	reviations	vii
Exec	cutive Summary	ix
Char	pter 1: Introduction. Context and Objectives	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Background of the study	2
1.3	Problem Statement	3
1.4.	Scope, Objectives and Research Question	3
1.5.	YIA in Bhutan and its Concepts	4
Char	nter 2: Methodology	7
2 1	Research Annroach and Methods	7
2.1	Assessment Framework and Weight Distribution	10
2.2	Weight generation for YIA indexes, components and its survey items	13
2.3	Weight generation for YIA indexes, component and its survey items	
2.4	Method for the Calculation of Integrity Scores for YIA	
2.5	Ethical Considerations	
2.6	Limitations	
2.7	Reliability Analysis	
2.8	Score interpretation for YIA 2022	17
Char	oter 3: Findings	
3.1	Demographic Profile	
3.2	Overall Youth Integrity	20
3.3	Index on Integrity Awareness and its survey items	21
3.4	Index on Values and its Components	23
3.5	Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country	
3.6	Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception Towards Youth	34
3.7	Behavior Based Integrity	37
3.8	Experienced Corruption of Youth	41
3.9.	Readiness to Fight Corruption	43
Chap	pter 4: Comparison of YIA Scores	47
4.1	Youth Integrity Score Comparison by sex	47
4.2	Youth Integrity Score Comparison: Class-Wise	48
4.3	Youth Integrity Score Comparison: Youth Type	49
4.4	Youth Integrity Score Comparison: Dzongkhags with Thimphu Thromde	50
4.5	Youth Integrity Score Comparison: Integrity Club School	51
4.6	Youth Integrity Score Comparison: Integrity Club member	52

Chapter 5: Comparison of key Youth Integrity items of 2012 and 2022		
Cha	pter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations	58
6.1	Conclusion	
6.2	Recommendations	61
Refe	erences	70
Ann	exures	72

### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2 Percentage of respondents by sex19Figure 3 Percentage of the current status of youth's education19Figure 4 Percentage of level-wise (and employment status) distribution of20youth respondents20Figure 5 Youth Integrity score with its indexes20Figure 6 Integrity Awareness Index score21Figure 7 Index on Values and its components23Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items24Figure 9 Social influence component with its survey items26Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items30
Figure 3 Percentage of the current status of youth's education.19Figure 4 Percentage of level-wise (and employment status) distribution of20youth respondents20Figure 5 Youth Integrity score with its indexes20Figure 6 Integrity Awareness Index score21Figure 7 Index on Values and its components23Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items24Figure 9 Social influence component with its survey items26Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items30
Figure 4 Percentage of level-wise (and employment status) distribution ofyouth respondents20Figure 5 Youth Integrity score with its indexes20Figure 6 Integrity Awareness Index score21Figure 7 Index on Values and its components23Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items24Figure 9 Social influence component with its survey items26Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items30
youth respondents20Figure 5 Youth Integrity score with its indexes20Figure 6 Integrity Awareness Index score21Figure 7 Index on Values and its components23Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items24Figure 9 Social influence component with its survey items26Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items30
Figure 5 Youth Integrity score with its indexes20Figure 6 Integrity Awareness Index score21Figure 7 Index on Values and its components23Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items24Figure 9 Social influence component with its survey items26Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items30
Figure 6 Integrity Awareness Index score21Figure 7 Index on Values and its components23Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items24Figure 9 Social influence component with its survey items26Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items30
Figure 7 Index on Values and its components23Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items24Figure 9 Social influence component with its survey items26Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items30
Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items
Figure 9 Social influence component with its survey items
Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items
Figure 11 Beliefs Components and its survey items
Figure 12 Index on Youth's Corruption Perception in the Country and its survey items33
Figure 13 Index on Parents & Teachers' Perception towards Youth and its components34
Figure 14 Parents' Perception of youth and its survey items
Figure 15 Teachers' Perception of youth and its survey items
Figure 16 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of extra money
Figure 17 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of a new mobile phone
Figure 18 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of position
Figure 19 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of distribution of sweets/refreshments
Figure 20 Honesty/Integrity: In being accountable
Figure 21 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of passing an exam40
Figure 22 Honesty/Integrity: To get a document40
Figure 23 Honesty/Integrity: To get an admission41
Figure 24 Youth's experiences of corruption
Figure 25 Percentage of youth agreeing that they can play a role in promoting integrity43
Figure 26 Percentage of youth willing to engage in raising awareness activities
Figure 27 Percentage of youth who would commit to reporting corruption:
Country-wise comparison45
Figure 28 Percentage of youth stating reasons for not reporting corruption in Bhutan46
Figure 29 Comparison of youth integrity scores by sex47
Figure 30 Comparison of Integrity Club Schools51
Figure 31 Comparison of Integrity Club Members52
Figure 32 Comparison of the level of sincerity54
Figure 33 Comparison of the youth's behavior55
Figure 34 Comparison of the level of honesty/integrity55
Figure 35 Comparison of the level of sincerity
Figure 36 Comparison of the reporting of unethical acts
Figure 37 Comparison of values and integrity in today's youth57

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Number of students in schools and institutes	7
Table 2 Sample size	8
Table 3 Percentage of respondent distributions in three regions	8
Table 4 Youth Integrity assessment framework and weight distribution	.10
Table 5 Conversion of Likert scale to 100-point score	.15
Table 6 Rule of Thumb to interpret Cronbach's Alpha	.17
Table 7 Cronbach's Alpha value for the three datasets	.17
Table 8 Interpretation of YIA 2022 scores	.18
Table 9 Percentage of youth respondents on general awareness	.22
Table 10 Percentage of youth respondents on the harmfulness of lack of integrity	.22
Table 11 Percentage of youth respondents on the normative definition of integrity	.23
Table 12 Percentage of youth respondents on the values	.25
Table 13 Percentage of youth respondents on their perception towards teachers	.27
Table 14 Percentage of youth respondents on their perception towards	
school/management	. 28
Table 15 Percentage of youth respondents on their perception towards Parents/Friends	.29
Table 16 Percentage of youth respondents reporting wrongdoings	.30
Table 17 Percentage of youth respondents on being responsible during SUPW	.31
Table 18 Percentage of youth respondents on their beliefs	.32
Table 19 Class-wise comparison of integrity scores for students in school	.48
Table 20 Comparison of integrity scores for youth type and their employment status	.49
Table 21 Comparison of Dzongkhags' integrity score with Thimphu Thromde	.50

### **ABBREVIATIONS**

ACAB	Anti-Corruption Act of Bhutan
ACC	Anti-Corruption Commission
ACRC	Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission
BTI	Bhutan Transparency Initiative
CBS	Centre for Bhutan & GNH Studies
CAPI	Computer Assisted Personal interviewing
CS	Central School
DoPE	Department of Prevention and Education, ACC
DoPS	Department of Professional Support, ACC
DoYS	Department of Youth and Sports, MoE
ECCD	Early Childhood Care and Development
EPGI	Education Policy Guidelines and Instructions
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FY	Financial Year
FYP	Five-Year Plans
HSS	Higher Secondary School
ICAC	Independent Commission Against Corruption
ISM	Institute of Science of Mind
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LDC	Least Developed Country
MoE	Ministry of Education
MSS	Middle Secondary School
NIA	National Integrity Assessment
NIACS	National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy
NKRA	National Key Results Areas
NSB	National Statistics Bureau
NYP	National Youth Policy
RBP	Royal Bhutan Police
RGoB	Royal Government of Bhutan
REC	Royal Education Council
RIM	Royal Institute of Management
RUB	Royal University of Bhutan
SUPW	Socially Useful and Productive Work
ТΙ	Transparency International
TI-Korea	Transparency International Korea
TISL	Transparency International Sri Lanka
TT	Towards Transparency
TTI	Technical Training Institutes
TVET	Technical & Vocational Education Training
UNODC	United Nations Organization on Drugs and Crime
YDF	Youth Development Fund
YIA	Youth Integrity Assessment
YIP	Youth Integrity Program
YIS	Youth Integrity Survey

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Bhutan has a young population with youth (15-24 years) constituting nearly 19.76 percent of the country's population (National Statics Bureau, 2018). In recent years, youth has been at the centre of all discussions, particularly in national priorities and policy making.

Youth are identified as one of the important partners in fighting corruption and grooming them to be advocates of integrity. This calls for the meaningful engagement of youth in fighting corruption. Towards this end, there is a need for a better idea of youth's behavior and attitudes regarding integrity, honesty, and corruption. This study provides youth's level of awareness on integrity and corruption, commitment to fight corruption, and their behavior when encountered with corrupt acts.

To examine the level of integrity among the youth, the ACC has conducted the Youth Integrity Assessment (YIA) which is the second such study since 2012. Comprehensive face-to-face interviews were conducted with youth to establish a baseline for integrity in terms of integrity awareness, values, corruption perception, behavior and readiness to fight corruption. To garner a deeper understanding of their integrity, separate interviews were conducted with teachers and parents. Similarly, Focus Group Discussions (FGD) also helped to validate and substantiate the findings.

The YIA 2022 uses the methodology of the National Integrity Assessment (NIA, 2019) in generating integrity scores. Most of the survey items are adapted from the study conducted by the ACC in 2012 (ACC, 2012), the Youth Integrity Survey of Vietnam (YIS, 2019), and the study conducted by Transparency International (TI) for the Asia Pacific in 2014. Using these survey items, three sets of questionnaires were developed for youth, teachers and parents. The survey was conducted in October 2021 and covered 3,558 youth respondents, 580 teachers and 365 parents. To validate the fin dings from the survey, 24 FGDs were conducted in different schools, colleges and institutions across the country.

The first objective of the study is to determine the level of integrity of Bhutanese youth. The overall youth integrity score for the country is calculated at 63.46 which falls in the Good level. The score is mostly contributed by the Index on Integrity Awareness with a score of 70.72. This is followed by the Index on Values with A nation's future will mirror the quality of her youth – a nation cannot fool herself into thinking of a bright future when she has not invested wisely in her children.

> (His Majesty the King Jigme Khesar Namgyel Wangchuck, 2009)

a score of 64.00 and the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country with a score of 60.56. The least score is accorded by the Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception towards youth with a score of 55.04.

In the Index on Integrity Awareness, the score is mostly contributed by youth's awareness of the harmfulness of corruption followed by their understanding of integrity. Ninety percent of youth believe that corruption is harmful to the development of the country. Seventy-one percent of youth believe that a person of integrity means someone who never cheats or lies.

In the Index on Values, the score is contributed by four components, namely i) Values in Youth, ii) Social Influence, iii) Responsibility and iv) Beliefs. The score for Values in Youth Component is 61.77. Further, 52 percent of youth behave well even when no one is watching over them. 58 percent of youth work during SUPW even if their teacher is not watching over them. Fifty percent of youth are ready to lie to their parents/teachers to get out of a difficult situation. Atleast 45 percent of youth are willing to cheat or lie if it is not going to harm others.

The Social Influence Component has scored 64.29. Social influence is assessed in terms of influence made by their teachers, parents, friends, school and community as a whole. The majority of the students believe that their teachers are serious in their work and they are not partial towards students, but 47 percent of youth said that teachers support captain/s even if the captain is wrong. Youth also believe that their parents keep promises made to them. In terms of school, youth have a positive perception towards school management including the use of public resources except in the management of school mess funds.

The score for the Responsibility Component is 58.00. The score is low compared with the overall youth integrity. 83 percent of youth assert that they are responsible and accountable for their actions and that they do not make excuses or blame others. On the contrary, 64 percent of youth are not in a position to report wrongdoings such as cheating in the exam. Similarly, most of the respondents (45%) are not willing to report their teacher to the principal if the teacher does not come to class on time or on a regular basis on the pretext of being busy.

The score for the Beliefs Component is 72.93. It is found that 67 percent of youth believe that people who are ready to lie, cheat, break laws or corrupt have less chance to succeed in life. In the same way, 71 percent believe that an honest person with personal integrity has more chance to succeed in life. But when asked with the term "occasionally", most of the youth (47%) are of the view that they have to lie or cheat occasionally to succeed in life. In other words, almost one in two youth feel that they have to lie or cheat occasionally to succeed in life. This shows that the majority of youth are ready to lie or cheat if it is going to benefit them.

In terms of the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country, the score is 60.56. The score is mostly contributed by the perception that corruption can be curbed in Bhutan (67.03). Similarly, it is depicted that the youth are concerned about corruption and its issues (66.38). In terms of sector-wise perception, youth feel that the level of integrity nowadays in private education (54.81) is lower than that of public education (62.73).

With 55.04, the score for the Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception towards youth is the lowest. The score of Parents' Perception towards youth is 58.46. The score is mostly affected by the low score in the comparison of current youth with the youth of yesteryears with 30.48. The Teachers' score for perception towards youth is 51.61. Similar to parents, teachers are also

of the view that the values and integrity are degenerating in the today's youth as compared with the youth of yesteryears with a score of 24.44. This score is the lowest of all survey items in this study.

In the case of behavior-based integrity, generally, youth seem to display behavior that is in conformity to integrity, but a substantial portion of youth are exposed to corrupt practices and they are willing to cheat or lie to get documents, pass an exam or to get a job or admission. Regarding their readiness to fight corruption, 90 percent of the youth know that it is their duty to report corruption and 75 percent of youth agreed that they can play a role in building integrity or fighting corruption.

The comparison of integrity scores shows that female youth have a higher level of integrity with a score of 63.69 as compared with male (63.23) and it is also significant that female have a higher level of values compared with male youth. Similarly, monastic Institutes have a higher level of integrity with a score of 64.31 with the highest score in the Index of Values (66.32) as compared to schools, colleges, or other institutes. Further, schools with Integrity Club have a higher level of integrity (65.55) than those without Integrity Club (63.64). Importantly, within the same schools where there is Integrity Club, club members have a higher level of integrity (67.03) than non-members (62.85).

Comparing the youth of 2022 with that of 2012, the youth in 2022 are not importantly different from the youth of 2012 in terms of values. However, a welcome trend is that many students report that they know how to report corruption (for instance, 54 percent in 2022 and 24 percent in 2012). It is also found that the youth overwhelmingly would report corruption if they saw it (77%). Even when comparing with the youth of other Asian countires, the Bhutanese youth shows much more integrity and committed to fight corruption.

Therefore, based on the findings, literature review and FGDs, some of the recommendations proposed are as follows:

#### To the Government

- > Develop, fund and invest technical resources to address the youth integrity issues
- > Pursue a specific anti-corruption curriculum in the education systems
- > Develop measures to value student's character certificate and SUPW grade
- > Institute mechanisms to curb the use of office cars to drop children to schools

#### To the Ministry of Education

- Develop and implement guidelines for a value education class
- Enforce strict disciplinary policy
- Boosting up Integrity Club (IC) or programs
- Implement YIP

#### To the Universities, schools and Institutes

- Implement ethics and integrity as a subject at all levels of education
- Reward individuals as models of integrity in schools, colleges or institutes
- Management of the gift culture in schools, colleges and institutes
- Impart values through various programs

#### **To Parents and Teachers**

- Civic duties and responsibilities of parents
- > Develop a framework to strengthen parent-teacher relationship

#### To the Anti-Corruption Commission

- Initiate programs that honor people with integrity to create role models so that youth may emulate them
- Initiate more awareness programs
- > Optimum use of social media and audio-visual productions
- Establish and provide resources to young people for reporting corruption and ensure they are accessible.

#### To the Media

Utilize the media to promote integrity and transparency.

# **CHAPTER 1** INTRODUCTION, CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

#### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

Good governance is an integral part of the system of governance long before Bhutan transited to a Democratic Constitutional Monarchy in 2008. Transparency, accountability and efficiency are the cornerstone of good governance which is also one of the pillars of Gross National Happiness, Bhutan's development philosophy.

Bhutan is expected to graduate from the least developed countries (LDC) group by 2023 (Dolkar, 2022). Good governance has become instrumental in graduating from the LDC status. One of the important components of good governance is to fight corruption and instill values of integrity at all levels. For example, Jennett and Thayenthal, (2014) stated that without personal integrity, organizations, businesses or governments cannot function properly, thus, leading to an unproductive nation. Currently, Bhutan has a Good Level of integrity with a score of 7.97 out of 10 as reported in the National Integrity Assessment (NIA) 2019 (ACC, 2020a).

Integrity is defined differently in different studies (such as NIA, Transparency International [TI] and Oxford Dictionary). This study confined its definition of integrity to the one proposed by TI, (2009) where integrity is defined as "behaviors and actions consistent with a set of moral or ethical principles and standards, embraced by individuals as well as institutions which create a barrier to corruption." Since this study is focused only on youth, UN4Youth (2013) defines "Youth as a period of transition from the dependence of childhood to adulthood's independence." Similarly, the National Youth Policy of Bhutan (MoE, 2011) is directed towards young people in the age group of 13-24 years. However, the United Nations (and UN agencies like UNICEF, UNESCO, UNFPA, and WHO) consider 'youth', as those persons between the ages of 15 to 24 years (2020) and the same is used by the National Statistics Bureau (NSB, 2020) of Bhutan. Therefore, the Youth Integrity Assessment (YIA) is defined as an assessment of whether youth (in the age group of 15-24 years) possess behaviors and actions that are consistent with a set of moral values or ethical principles and standards.

To build a nation of integrity, it is important to instill strong values and personal commitments to integrity among youth.

" The future of our Nation depends on the worth. capabilities and motivation of today's youth. The future is neither unseen nor unknown. It is what we make of it. What work we do with our two hands today will shape the future of our nation.

> (His Majesty the King Jigme Khesar Namgyel Wangchuck, 2009)

Transparency International Sri Lanka (TISL, 2013) considers youth as the lifeline of a nation. Similarly, ACC (2012) believes that the most important platform for imbibing integrity in youth is through parenting culture, schooling system and the environment a child lives in. Most importantly, there is a common belief that education begins at home and is carried on in school where parents and teachers play a critical role in imparting values and shaping the lives of the youth. Therefore, to better understand youth and their values, the first step is to conduct a comprehensive study to establish a baseline for youth perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors towards Integrity and Corruption. This study will adapt the methodology developed by Towards Transparency (TT, 2019) "Youth Integrity Survey of Vietnam" and the indexing methodology of the "National Integrity Assessment of Bhutan" (ACC, 2020a). Similar studies were conducted in Vietnam, South Korea, Mauritius, Indonesia, Fiji and Sri Lanka.

A recent study by Jennett and Thayenthal (2014) found that the nations that foster integrity are investing in the nations' present and future, and youth are the key force in promoting integrity and demanding accountability. Therefore, it is of paramount importance to understand youth's attitudes towards corruption and measure the state of integrity among them. This study determines the integrity levels of Bhutanese youth, and their engagement in acts of integrity violation. The study also gives trends in comparison with global studies and the study conducted in 2012.

#### **1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

Globally, youth encompasses 15.5 percent of the world's population with 1.21 billion which is projected to reach 1.29 billion by 2030. Similarly, the NSB (2020) reported the youth population as 143,701 (15-24 years) in 2020. This constitutes 19.76 percent of the total population. Employment opportunities remain a problem among youth with youth unemployment rate in 2021 at 20.9 percent (NSB, 2021). Since the youth falls under the working-age population, the problem of youth unemployment is a serious threat to economic growth. However, TI (2013) claims that to benefit youth from the economic growth, youth themselves must play a role in the process, and that starts with the commitment to integrity, honesty and engagement in anti-corruption initiatives.

Youth has been at the center of importance on all fronts of development processes and discussion. Every nation that strives for better future centers on youth as its priority. This is evident from the UN which placed youth's needs in all areas of its legislations, policies and programs (Rabgyel, 2018). At the national level, various efforts have been made in terms of policies as well as institutions. The Department of Youths and Sports (DoYS) under the MoE and Youth Development Fund (YDF) are a few institutions that are specifically established for youth development. These institutions are further supported by the adoption of the National Youth Policy (NYP) of Bhutan, 2011 (MoE, 2011) . Currently the NYP is in review process. However, having all these will not suffice if there is no timely check of the youth's integrity.

For the 12<sup>th</sup> Fiver Year plan (FYP), one of the identified National Key Result Areas (NKRA) is to "Reduce Corruption". To meet this goal, one of the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) is to strengthen transparency, accountability and integrity culture. One way to approach this goal is to build a strong coalition/partnership with youth against corruption. The National Integrity and Anti-Corruption Strategy (NIACS) 2019-2023 identifies youth as one of the important partners in fighting corruption and therefore, harness their potential to be advocates of integrity.

Towards realizing the national goal of reducing corruption, the ACC has initiated various programs to engage youth in combating corruption. The Youth Integrity Program (YIP) has been rolled out to all levels of youth in ECCDs, Schools, institutes and other agencies. Similarly, to inculcate the values of ethics and integrity and promote good governance in schools and institutions, 20 integrity clubs have been initiated as of 2021. The ACC also made a collaborative effort in embedding the values of ethics and integrity in the education system like those of Technical & Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Institutes and the postgraduate curriculum in the Royal Institute of Management (RIM). With numerous initiatives, it is equally important to see the level of youth engagement in fighting corruption and examine their level of integrity. The previous study on youth pertaining to corruption was conducted in 2012 that broadly assessed the value of education programs and practices in schools. Therefore, this study will be the second of such kind and provide a comparative analysis of youth's awareness of corruption and their values, beliefs, responsibility, behavior and commitments to fight corruption.

#### 1.3 **PROBLEM STATEMENT**

In the advent of a fast-changing society, the increase in human greed has often led to unethical practices. For instance, ACC (2012) stated that the Bhutanese have a culture of defining a shrewd and manipulative person as 'smart', but honest and ethical as a 'stupid' person. This attributes the risk of inheriting unethical behaviors to the newer generation and the youth are the most vulnerable section leading to the degeneration of values and integrity in youth.

In terms of criminal incidences, there is steady raise in the country since 2015. The year 2019 alone has seen 4,085 records of offenses (NSB, 2020). As per the statistics compiled by Royal Bhutan Police (RBP, 2019), 41.69 percent of the arrested person are in the age range of 15-24 years. It is alarming to see youth engaging in criminal activities. Similarly, Rabgyal (2018) noted that youth coming in conflict with laws would necessitate state investment losing the youthful energy of the state. This ultimately hinders the nation's development progress.

Since 2012, no empirical study on youth integrity has been conducted. Whereas, in other countries, youth integrity surveys are conducted on a longitudinal basis (for example, Vietnam). On other hand, Ura (2009) noted that the impact of value education in Bhutan is not yet evident though the value education is in practice until now.

#### **1.4. SCOPE, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTION**

#### 1.4.1. Scope

This research focuses on youth integrity and issues of corruption as perceived by the youth of Bhutan. It is a nationwide survey and represents all youth within the identified age range (15-24 years, both in schools and out-of-school youth). It has covered 59 schools, eight colleges, 26 monastic institutions and five TVET institutions as reflected in **Annexure 1**. Other than the youth in schools/institutes, the study also covers out-of-school youth such as school dropouts, employed and unemployed youth as reflected in Figure 3 and Figure 4. In total, there were 3,558 youth respondents for this study.

The study also covers 580 teachers and 365 parents to assess their level of perception about the integrity of the present youth. Overall, the study covers 17 Dzongkhag which is divided into three regions and one Thromde as specified in Table 3.

#### 1.4.2. Objectives

This study aims to determine the level of youth integrity in Bhutan. It also examines the changes in various parameters of youth integrity from that of the survey conducted in 2012. Based on the findings, the study will suggest interventions or recommendations for enhancing youth integrity in Bhutan.

#### 1.4.3. Research Questions

The overarching question underpinning this assessment is: *What is the level of youth integrity in Bhutan?* 

The assessment approached this overarching question through the following sub-questions:

- Are integrity violations perceived to be a problem for the youth?
- How will the youth behave if they are encountered with integrity violations and how will they react?
- How willing and available are they to engage in reporting and fighting corruption?
- What role can teachers and parents play in terms of inculcating integrity in youth?
- What could be done to encourage and sustain active youth participation in improving integrity?

#### **1.5. YIA IN BHUTAN AND ITS CONCEPTS**

#### 1.5.1. Indexes of YIA

The YIA encompasses four indexes. These are the Index on Integrity Awareness, Index on Values, Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country, and Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception towards youth. Each of these indexes is discussed hereunder:

#### 1.5.1.1. Index on Integrity Awareness

In order to understand the youth of Bhutan, it is important to assess their level of understanding of the term "Integrity" vis-à-vis "Corruption". This is mainly to build the concept of integrity and corruption from the perspective of youth. This Index assesses the awareness of youth in terms of corruption and its effects. It tries to get the youth's normative definition of integrity. It also sees whether the youth are aware of certain laws, rules, or regulations that are in place in fighting corruption.

#### 1.5.1.2. Index on Values

Values as defined by the ACC, (2012) "...are those principles or standards, which helps to better the quality of life. They form the basis of character and personality development" (p.1). Values are mostly determined by the principles that one lives up to, which are further shaped by their beliefs and the environment one lives in. Therefore, the Index on Values tries to grasp the broad sense of values that Bhutanese youth have. This also tries to assess the social effects on youth which covers parents, teachers, community and school. More importantly, values surround certain beliefs one is associated with. Therefore, some of the key beliefs that are associated with youth are also assessed. To embed the values of ethics and integrity, it all boils down to how responsible one is in inculcating those values and this starts with the level of tolerance towards unethical behaviors and acts. The less level of tolerance for unethical acts spares more space to instill values of ethics and integrity.

#### 1.5.1.3. Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the Country

As reflected in the NIA 2019 report, the perception of corruption is high in Bhutan as indicated by the low score of 6.71 (ACC, 2020a. p.38). It is equally important to assess the perception of corruption from the perspective of young people. Therefore, this index focuses on youth's opinion on the level of integrity in public institutions in which youth have more interaction such as the business sector, health service providers and education sectors. Their opinion about these institutions can have a strong impact on how corruption in the country is perceived. Specifically, this index will try to measure youth's level of corruption perception which ultimately will have an impact in determining their level of integrity as well as in embedding the values of ethics and integrity.

#### 1.5.1.4. Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception towards Youth

Youth spend most of their time at school or home, therefore, more than anyone, parents and teachers will have a better understanding of the youth's behavior, values, beliefs and attitudes. In this regard, it is important to take into consideration the perception of parents and teachers towards youth. In this index, teachers and parents assess youth in terms of their behavior and how they behave in school or at home. They also check the value of youth in comparison to the youth of past years. Since the teachers and parents have dealt with different sections of youth over the years, they will give a better picture of the present youth in terms of their value.

Apart from the four indexes of YIA, Behavioral Based Integrity, Youth's Experenices of Corruption and Readiness to Fight Corruption are also discussed in **Sections 3.7, 3.8** and **3.9.** 

#### 1.5.2. YIA Model

The YIA 2022 model is shown in Figure 1.





# CHAPTER 2 METHODOLOGY

**Chapter 2** presents the methodology adapted for YIA 2022.

#### 2.1 RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODS

The following stages of YIA, as far as possible, ensure the reliability of data collection:

#### Stage 1: Selection of School/Institutes

From the listed Dzongkhags for the enumeration, different schools/institutes are selected as given in **Annexure I**. All schools having Integrity Club were selected and for comparability purposes, the schools that were selected for the "Integrity and Value Education in Schools" study conducted in 2012 are included. Other than the schools, the colleges, monastic institutes and Vocational Training Institutes were also selected based on convenience. The Schools/ institutes selected are listed in **Annexure I**.

#### Stage 2: Population and Sampling

The sampling for YIA was done using various methods based on the categories of the youth. The categories of youth based on their location are youth in school, youth in tertiary education, institutes including TVET institutes, youth in monastic schools, employed youth and unemployed youth.

For this study, the country was divided into three regions based on the National Statistics Bureau's categorization of Dzongkhags. As per the MoE (2020) annual statistics, there are approximately 180,000/- youth (15-24 years) enrolled in various schools and tertiary institutes in the country. As the statistics do not include youth who are employed, out of school and those enrolled in various monastic institutes.

#### Table 1 Number of students in schools and institutes

Category	Total No. of Students
Lower Secondary Schools	24946
Middle Secondary Schools	46033
Higher Secondary Schools	54801
Special Institutes	129
Central Schools	41134
Tertiary Students within Bhutan	12297
Technical/Vocational Institutes	424
Total	179764

#### Stage 3: Sample Size and Response Rate

#### Table 2 Sample size

95% Confidence level

5% margin of error

40 % Non-Response rate

The first stage of sampling involved selecting schools as given below:

- i. At least 4 schools each with an Integrity club and without an integrity club having classes VII-XII were selected from each region.
- ii. One college and TVET Institute from each region.

For the above two categories, the respondents were selected randomly by spreading across classes/courses/gender after getting the list from the school.

The youth who are in the monastic institutes, employed in agencies and unemployed, were selected purposely to spread across categories by gender and location. However, due to the unknown population, convenience and snowball samplings were used to select the respondents.

The details of respondents by region are depicted in Table 3.

Regions	District*	Youth (n=3358)	Parents (n=365)	Teachers (n=580)
	Bumthang	4%	4%	3%
	Dagana	7%	9%	7%
Control	Trongsa	4%	2%	3%
Central	Tsirang	6%	8%	7%
	Zhemgang	3%	6%	6%
	Wangdue Phodrang	2%	2%	3%
	Sub Total	<b>26</b> %	31%	<b>29</b> %
	Lhuentse	3%	5%	4%
	Monggar	9%	7%	4%
Eastern	Pema Gatshel	2%	3%	3%
	Trashigang	7%	5%	4%
	Trashi Yangtse	3%	4%	3%
	Sub Total	<b>24</b> %	24%	18%

#### Table 3 Percentage of respondent distributions in three regions

Regions	District*	Youth (n=3358)	Parents (n=365)	Teachers (n=580)
	Thimphu**	27%	17%	22%
	Chhukha	5%	9%	7%
Mostoria	Gasa	1%	3%	2%
western	Наа	3%	6%	5%
	Paro	7%	8%	7%
	Punakha***	7%	2%	10%
	Sub Total	<b>50</b> %	45%	53%

**Note**. \* Three districts (one from each region, i.e. Samtse, Sarpang and Samdrup Jongkhar) are excluded from the study as it was identified as a red zone due to COVID 19 pandemic and no movements were allowed. \*\*The respondents from Thimphu Thromde are included in the region which is analyzed separately for comparison. \*\*\* The respondents from Phuentsholing Thromde are included in Punakha as some schools of Phuentsholing Thromde were temporarily shifted to Punakha (due to COVID-19).

#### Stage 4: Data collection

Face-to-face interviews were conducted by administering a structured survey questionnaire. Three sets of structured survey questionnaires were developed: one each for youth, parents and teachers. The questionnaires were then pilot tested in four Dzongkhags covering four schools with 12 youth respondents, four parents and seven teachers. The pilot test helped to ensure that the questions or items were appropriate to measure the research objectives and uniform interpretation of the questionnaires by the enumerators. Similarly, it also helped to determine the average time of enumeration for each questionnaire to plan for actual data collection.

Thirty-nine university graduates were recruited as enumerators and they were trained on research ethics, survey procedures and interpretation of the questionnaires. Six supervisors from partnering agencies and researchers from the ACC were deployed to supervise the administration of the survey and ensure the quality of data collection. Two monitoring officers were also deployed to monitor the overall data collection process and carry out Focus Group Discussion (FGD) to garner a deeper understanding of the subject. The field survey was conducted from 7 October 2021 to 22 November 2021 using mobile tablets through the CAPI application.

#### Stage 5: Data Analysis

Before undertaking data analysis, a week-long data cleaning and screening was carried out. The integrity scores were generated based on the formula for each component where different weights were assigned. Stata version 12 was used to clean, screen and generate indexes. The final integrity scores were generated using Microsoft Excel. The literature review was undertaken to substantiate the findings. Furthermore, qualitative data collected through Focus Group Discussions were analaysed using MAXQDA to validate the quantitative data.

#### 2.2 ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK AND WEIGHT DISTRIBUTION

**Table 4** presents the assessment framework for YIA. It broadly consists of the survey items, components and Indexes of YIA. The weights are reflected against each index, component and survey item.

#### Table 4 Youth Integrity assessment framework and weight distribution

Index	Components	Survey item	Weight
		What is your level of understanding of integrity?	0.100
		What is your level of understanding of corruption?	0.100
		A person never cheats or lies	0.100
	Integrity Awareness (1.000)	Never breaks the laws in any case	0.150
Index on		Never gets involved in corruption in any condition	0.150
Integrity Awareness		Lack of integrity (including corruption) is harmful to youth like you	0.100
(0.150)		Lack of integrity (including corruption) is harmful to your family and friends	0.100
		Lack of integrity (including corruption) is harmful to the development of the country	0.100
		I am aware of the rules and regulations to fight and prevent corruption	0.100
	Values in Youth (0.300)	You are generally well behaved only when you are watched over either by parents or teachers/ lecturers.	0.150
		You would lie to either your parents or teachers/ lecturers to get out of a difficult situation	0.150
		You take care of school/institute/agency property in the same way that you handle the home property.	0.150
Index on Values (0.600)		You are willing to cheat or lie if it is going to benefit you.	0.150
(0.000)		During SUPW, you work because the teacher/ lecturer is watching over you and if you don't work, you get low grades.	0.150
		You would try to break the queue to avail yourself the services faster	0.150
		If it was the only way to get admission into a better school/institute/agency, you would be willing to lie/bribe/go to somebody with influence for help.	0.100

Index	Components	Survey item	Weight
		You break school/institute/agency rules because you can't say "no" to your friends.	0.050
		Your friends sometimes bribe/bully to get what they want.	0.050
		You are happy and satisfied with what you have.	0.050
	Social Influence (0.300)	When teachers/lecturers sometimes make mistakes, they accept that they have made a mistake and correct it.	0.100
		The school explains how they have used the money earned from concerts, fete and other contributions to the whole school/institute/agency.	0.100
		Teachers/lecturers/supervisor in this school/ institute/agency take their work very seriously.	0.100
		The school/institute/agency management makes judicious use of the school/institute/agency resources (human, finance and materials).	0.100
Index on		Teachers/Lecturers are partial towards students whose parents are rich and hold important positions.	0.100
(0.600)		If there is a problem between a captain and other students, the teacher/lecturer supports the captain, even if he/she is in the wrong.	0.050
		Student assessments are done with integrity and fairness.	0.150
		Your parents keep their promise. If at all they are not able to keep their promise, they explain to you the reasons as to why they were not able to keep their promise.	0.100
		School/College/Institutes mess in-charges manage funds transparently with integrity.	0.050
		I take responsibility and am accountable for my actions (I don't make excuses or blame others).	0.500
	Responsibility (0.200)	You notice your friend cheating in the exams, you would report to the teachers/lecturers /principal.	0.300
		Your teachers/lecturers do not come to class on a regular basis, always on the pretext of being busy one time or the other. You would report to the principal.	0.200

Index	Components	Survey item	Weight
	Beliefs (0.200)	People who are ready to lie, cheat, break laws and corrupt has more chance to succeed in life.	0.300
		An honest person, with personal integrity, has more chances to succeed in life.	0.300
		Finding ways to increase the family income is the most important and it is acceptable to abuse power to attain this objective.	0.200
		Corruption can be curbed down in Bhutan	0.100
	n Youth's Perception of Corruption (1.000)	Young Bhutanese are concerned about corruption and its Issues	0.200
Index on Youth's		What is your opinion on the level of integrity nowadays in Public education?	0.125
Perception of		What is your opinion on the level of integrity nowadays in Private education?	0.125
Corruption in the		What is your opinion on the level of integrity nowadays in Public Health Services?	0.125
(0.125)		Have you seen or heard the incidences of people engaging in corrupt acts in your community/ school?	0.200
		What is your opinion on the level of integrity nowadays in the business sector?	0.125
	Parents'	My child/children behave well when he/she is at home	0.325
Index on Parents	Perception towards youth	Youth can play a role in integrity-building and in the fight against corruption	0.325
&Teacher's Perception	er's (0.500)	Compared to the youth of yesteryears, values and integrity are degenerating in the present youth.	0.350
towards Youth (0.125)	Teachers' Perception towards youth (0.500)	Youth can play a role in integrity-building and in the fight against corruption	0.450
		Compared to the youth of yesteryears, values and integrity are degenerating in the present youth.	0.550

# 2.3 WEIGHT GENERATION FOR YIA INDEXES, COMPONENTS AND ITS SURVEY ITEMS

To assign weights to indexes, components and survey items, the ratings of the importance of the indexes, components and survey items were used. The mean scores were used to assign weights.

#### 1. Assigning weights to Indexes

The importance rating of the indexes was used to generate the mean score of each index and calculated the weight totaling "1" using the formula given below.

Waight for Inday —	(Index Mean	⊔ <b>1</b>
weight for muex –	\Total Indexes' Mean	* 1

#### 2. Assigning weights to components

Weight for Component = 
$$\left(\frac{\text{Component Mean}}{\text{Total Components'Mean}}\right) * 1$$

#### 3. Assigning weights to survey items

Weight for Survey Item =  $\left(\frac{\text{Mean of Selected Survey Item}}{\text{Total Mean of Selected Survey Items}}\right) * 1$ 

#### 2.4 METHOD FOR THE CALCULATION OF INTEGRITY SCORES FOR YIA

The highest possible score for integrity parameters is 100 points with higher scores having a higher level of integrity and the lowest score is 0, indicating the lowest level of integrity.

Integrity scores are produced by multiplying the scores for each survey item/index by the weights concerned.

The methodologies used to generate integrity score were as follows:

- First, the score for each survey item was multiplied by its weight and the products are added up to derive the component score and then the index score.
- Second, the score for each index was then multiplied by its weight and the products are added up, generating the overall youth Integrity score.

#### The formula for integrity measurement

YI=Ai W (Ai)+Bi W (Bi)+Ci W (Ci)+Di W (Di)

YI=Youth Integrity Score		
Ai=Score for Index on Integrity Awareness	W (Ai)=weight for Index on Integrity Awareness	
Bi=Score for Index on Values	W (Bi)=weight for Index on Values	
Ci=Score for Index on Youth's Perception of	W (Ci)=weight for Index on Youth's	
Corruption	Perception of Corruption	
Di=Score for Index on parents & Teachers	W (Di)=weight for Index on Parents &	
Perception	Teachers Perception	

#### • Formula for score calculation by index

$$n \\ Ci \\ i = 1$$
 (Xi × Wi)

Ci=Index score

Xi=score by survey item

Wi=weight by survey item

n=number of items

#### • Weight of Index and survey items

In assessing the integrity, different weight was assigned to each index or component and survey item. The weight is assigned based on the importance of index or components or survey items in measuring the youth integrity.

#### • Calculation of scores for each survey item

To generate the integrity score, the score for each survey item was calculated first. Different score calculation methods were used for individual respondent assessment and integrated youth, parent and teacher assessment. The score for each survey item using different methods were as follows:

**1. Individual respondent assessment:** It is called individual respondent assessment because scores are produced for individual respondents.

#### Score calculation:

Survey items of the individual respondent assessment were rated on a 5-point scale such as ("Strongly Disagree", "Disagree", "Neutral", "Agree" and "Strongly Agree"), ("Very Often", "Often", "Neutral", "Hardly" and "Never"), ("Very Good", "Good", "Neutral", "Bad" and "Very Bad") and ("Very Harmful", "Harmful", "Neutral", "Not Harmful" and "Not at all Harmful") from which the respondents were asked to choose only one response. The full score for the survey item is 100.

#### ✓ Calculation of scores for individual respondents

First, the scores for individual respondents were generated by converting the scores of each

response from a 5-point scale to a 100-point scale. The formulae to convert a 5-point to 100-point scale are as follows:

#### Formula to convert 5-point scale into 100-point and scores assigned to each scale

#### 100-point score = $(5-point score - 1/4) \times 100$

#### Table 5 Conversion of Likert scale to 100-point score

Response		100-point score conversation	
	Scale	Positive Item	Negative Item
Strongly disagree/Very often/Very Bad/Not at all Harmful	1	0	100
Disagree/Often/Bad/Not Harmful	2	25	75
Neutral	3	50	50
Agree/Hardly/Good/Harmful	4	75	25
Strongly agree/Never/Very Good/Very Harmful	5	100	0

Negative and positive items have been assigned with different scores. For example, on a 5-point scale, for a positive item, if the response is negative for example, "Strongly Disagree" (1-point on a 5-point scale) then the score is 0 and 100 for "Strongly Agree". In the case of a negative item, the score is calculated the other way round.

#### ✓ Calculation of scores for survey item

Survey item A's score for each item is generated after the calculation of scores for each respondent. Scores for each item are generated by averaging the individual respondent's scores for each item.

Score of Survey Item A = sum of scores of Survey Item A respondents/number of Survey Item A respondents

#### 2.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

All the researchers, including supervisors and enumerators, were thoroughly trained on the need to maintain proper codes of research ethics and principles. The principle of voluntary participation was strictly ensured for the respondents. The research was conducted giving due respect to all the participants and successive replacements were done for those respondents who were not comfortable or had declined to take part in the survey interviews.

In every step of the research, confidentiality of the data and anonymity of the respondents were protected. The data collected were stored and backed up securely and it was only used for deriving systemic recommendations. Access to raw data was limited only to the members of the core research team. The enumerators and supervisors were briefed not to disseminate information obtained from the survey with any other unless the report is made public.

#### 2.6 LIMITATIONS

- Direct comparison of integrity scores as well as comparison with the study conducted in 2012 and international studies may not be possible due to the varied scope, sample size and methods used. The comparisons made in this report are for easy comprehension and not to make any distinction.
- Due to the varied category of respondents, it was not possible to confine to a uniform way to determine sample size. Therefore, both probability and non-probability sampling techniques were employed which does not approve of generalizing the whole population but every effort was made to compensate by validating through qualitative methods.
- The study could not cover three districts, i.e. Samdrup Jongkhar, Sarpang and Samtse which were identified as red zones due to COVID 19 pandemic where the accessibility was restricted.
- Since the study is conducted in the financial year 2021-2022, the findings may not hold true hereafter. Therefore, it may entail another study to authenticate and determine the changes.

#### 2.7 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

This study uses three datasets - Youth, Parents and Teachers - to generate integrity scores. Descriptive statistics are used to substantiate the integrity scores. Since most of the questions are multiple-item Likert scale, Cronbach's alpha test was used to measure the reliability, or internal consistency of test items as a composite score. Put simply, Cronbach's alpha measures whether or not a score is reliable. It is computed by correlating the score for each scale item with the total score for each observation and then comparing that to the variance for all individual item scores. If the correlation is high, Cronbach's Alpha is likely to increase and vice versa. The general Rule of Thumb to interpret the Cronbach's Alpha is given in **Table 6**.

Cronbach's Alpha	Internal Consistency
α ≥0 .9	Excellent
$0.9 > \alpha \ge 0.8$	Good
$0.8 > \alpha \ge 0.7$	Acceptable
$0.7 > \alpha \ge 0.6$	Questionable
$0.6 > \alpha \ge 0.5$	Poor
0.5 > α	Unacceptable

Table 6 Rule of Thumb to interpret Cronbach's Alpha

The Cronbach's Alpha is expressed as a number from 0 to 1. The 'Rule of Thumb' requires the Cronbach's Alpha value to be 0.70 or higher for an item score to be considered reliable. If the value is less than 0.70, the correlation between the items is said to be low and the confidence level in the statistical analysis is going to be low as well. As given in **Table 7**, the average Cronbach's Alpha for this study is 0.82. It shows that the results obtained for this study are reliable, valid and acceptable.

#### Table 7 Cronbach's Alpha value for the three datasets

Data Sets	Observations	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Youth	3558	81	0.84
Parents	365	24	0.76
Teachers	580	45	0.87
		Average	0.82

#### 2.8 SCORE INTERPRETATION FOR YIA 2022

As in the case of the NIA 2019, a floating scale is used to categorize the YIA scores into five levels such as Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. The scale is calculated as given below: The first step is to set the middle scale (i.e. Good level)

```
Good (Upper scale) = Average score of four indexes + Standard Deviation of four indexes *0.5
Good (Lower scale) = Average score of four indexes + Standard Deviation of four indexes *-0.5
```

Once the middle scale is set, it uses the same formula to set the scale for "Very Good" where the sum of an average score of four indexes and the standard deviation of four indexes is multiplied by (1.5). This will give an upper scale of level "Very Good" whereas the lower scale will be the upper scale of level "Good" with the next higher decimal. Similarly, for the level "Fair" the sum of an average score of four indexes and the standard deviation of four indexes is multiplied by (-1.5). This will give the lower scale of level "Fair" where the upper scale will be the lower scale of level "Good" with the next lower decimal. The score higher than the level "Very Good" is considered "Excellent" and the score lower than the level "Fair" is considered "Poor." **Table 8** shows the score interpretation of YIA.

#### Table 8 Interpretation of YIA 2022 scores

Level	Score
Excellent	Above 72.42
Very Good	65.87 - 72.42
Good	59.30 - 65.86
Fair	52.74 - 59.29
Poor	Below 52.74

The YIA 2022 uses the index score of 0 to 100, where "zero" represents the lowest level of integrity, transparency and accountability. In other words, "zero" is also considered the highest level of experienced corruption or perceived corruption by the youth, parents, or teachers. On the other hand, "100" represents the highest level of integrity, transparency and accountability indicating the lowest level of experience or perception of corruption. On a positive note, a higher score represents higher integrity and vice-versa. In contrast, a higher score in experience corruption, perceived corruption and perception of teachers and parents towards youth represents less level of perception or experiences of corruption.



# CHAPTER 3 FINDINDS

#### 3.1 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The Youth Integrity Assessment comprises data from three sources namely the youth, parents and teachers.





Note. Source (n=3558 youth, 365 parents, 580 teachers, YIA 2022)

**Figure 2** presents the gender-wise distribution of respondents in each data set. For youth, the representation is 50 percent each. For parents, female have more representation with 66 percent. On the other hand, 57 percent of teacher respondents are male and 43 percent are female.





**Note**. \* Institutes include TVET, TTI or monastic institutes. \*\* "Never attended" or "Attended in past" include either employed or unemployed youth; Source (n-3558 youth, YIA 2022).

In the case of youth, 63.6 percent of respondents are currently in school, 12 percent of youth respondents are in institutes like Technical and Vocational Education Training (TVET), monastic institutes and others as shown in **Figure 3**. 11 percent are in different colleges of Royal University of Bhutan (RUB) and other including private colleges. 13 percent have attended in the past and a 0.4 percent has never attended any of the school, institute or college.





Note. Source (n=3558 youth, YIA 2022)

**Figure 4** presents the current status of youth respondents. Most of the youth are in different classes in school (64 percent), followed by 23 percent in colleges, training institutes and monastic institutes. Nine percent comprises unemployed youth and four percent comprises employed youth.

#### 3.2 OVERALL YOUTH INTEGRITY

The overall youth integrity score for Bhutan is 63.46, which falls in the "Good" level. The score is contributed by four indexes as presented in **Figure 5**.



#### Figure 5 Youth Integrity score with its indexes

**Note.** 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=3558 youth, 365 parents, 580 teachers, YIA 2022)

The Youth Integrity Score is mostly contributed by the Index on Integrity Awareness with a score of 70.72 which is at Very Good level. This may be attributed to the enhanced educational programs initiated by the Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC) in different schools and tertiary institutes. It is followed by a Good level of scores in the Index on Values (64.00) and the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country (60.56). The least is contributed by the Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception towards Youth with a Fair level of score (55.04). This indicates that the parents and teachers feel that the values of present youth have degenerated compared to the youth of yesteryears.

#### 3.3 INDEX ON INTEGRITY AWARENESS AND ITS SURVEY ITEMS

In order to understand the youth of Bhutan, it is important to assess their level of understanding of the term "Integrity" vis-à-vis "Corruption". This is mainly to build the concept of integrity and corruption from the perspective of youth.

This Index assesses the awareness of youth in terms of corruption and its effects. It also sees whether the youth are aware of certain laws, rules or regulations that are in place in fighting corruption.



#### Figure 6 Integrity Awareness Index score

Note. 0 = lowest level of awareness and 100 = highest level of awareness; Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

As can be seen from **Figure 6**, the Integrity score for the Index on Integrity Awareness is 70.72 indicating a Very Good level. This is contributed by nine survey items. The youth have a better level of understanding of the term "corruption" with a score of 67.41 than the term "integrity" with a score of 61.35. Similarly, when asked about the definition, most youth consider a person of integrity means someone who never cheats or lies with a score of 70.31 rather than someone who never breaks the law in any case (67.48) and someone who never gets involved in corruption in any case (66.31). Most of the youth are aware that the lack of integrity (or corruption) is harmful to the development of the country, for oneself, family and friends with a score of 84.27, 80.94 and 79.52 respectively. But the youth's level of awareness of the rules and regulations to fight and prevent corruption is quite low with a score of 62.69 when compared to other survey items except for the level of understanding of the term "integrity". This is further discussed in **Tables 9, 10 and 11**.
General Awareness									
Level of understanding on	Very Good	No Idea	Total						
Integrity	15	45	21	6	13	100			
Corruption	18	49	22	5	6	100			
Awareness on rules/ regulations	15	46	20	13	6	100			

#### Table 9 Percentage of youth respondents on general awareness

From Figure 6, it is depicted that the youth's level of understanding of the terms integrity and awareness of rules and regulations have scored low compared to other survey items. Similarly, **Table 9** shows that most of the youth have a good level of understanding of corruption (67%) followed by an awareness of rules and regulations (61%) and then integrity (60%). The level of awareness could be attributed to the presence of integrity clubs in schools as indicated in **Figures 30 & 31** where more difference is seen in the score of the Integrity Awareness Index. There is also a substantial number of youth who have fair/poor/no idea about integrity, corruption and its related rules and regulations (more than 30%). This could be due to the absence of an anti-corruption curriculum in schools where the youth are less exposed to corruption and anti-corruption learnings.

Harmfulness of Corruption/Lack of Integrity									
Lack of integrity is harmful	Very Harmful	Harmful	Neutral	Not Harmful	Not Very Harmful	Total			
For a youth	41	47	8	3	1	100			
For family and friends	35	53	7	4	1	100			
For development of the country	51	39	6	3	1	100			

### Table 10 Percentage of youth respondents on the harmfulness of lack of integrity

The value of integrity in youth is an important factor in promoting positive social change and **Table 10** explores whether the youth perceive the lack of integrity (including corruption) to be harmful to (i) the youth themselves, (ii) their family and friends, (iii) the development of the country. The result shows that a majority of youth (88%) believe that lack of integrity is harmful to youth like themselves and their family and friends. In addition, 90 percent believe that lack of integrity is even more harmful to the development of the country. This clearly indicates that Bhutanese youth are aware that integrity is important and the lack of integrity is harmful to their personal lives, families and friends and the country as a whole.

A normative definition of Integrity									
A person of Integrity means who	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total			
Never cheat or lies	22	49	19	9	1	100			
Never lies or cheat except when it can resolve difficult situations	5	35	22	31	7	100			
Never breaks the law/rules	19	49	16	15	1	100			
Never breaks the law/rules except to support family/friends	4	29	20	38	9	100			
Never get involve in corruption in any case	20	44	18	16	2	100			

#### **Table 11** Percentage of youth respondents on the normative definition of integrity

As depicted in **Table 10**, the Bhutanese youth know that lack of integrity (or corruption) is harmful and to deepen the understanding of integrity, five normative definitions were provided to see their agreement as reflected in **Table 11**. The Bhutanese youth are more likely to view cheating and lying as violations of integrity than breaking the law/s or being involved in corruption. 71 percent of youth agreed that a person of integrity means someone who never cheats or lies followed by 68 percent who said a person of integrity means someone who never breaks the law/rules in any case and never gets involved in corruption in any condition with 64 percent. Further, there is at least a certain percentage of youth (10%, 16% & 18%) who feel that cheating/lying, breaking laws/rules and involvement in corruption are not violations of integrity which should be a matter of concern. But it is encouraging to note that the majority of the youth feel that someone who cheats/lies to resolve difficulties (38%) and someone who breaks the laws/rules to support family/friends (47%) are not a person of integrity.

# 3.4 INDEX ON VALUES AND ITS COMPONENTS

The values are those principles or standards that help to shape the quality of life and tend to influence the attitude and behavior of a person (ACC, 2012). The Index on Values tries to see how the youth reacts to different situations in terms of values, social influence, responsibility and beliefs.





*Note*. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

The score for the Index on Values is 64.00 indicating a Good level. It has four components as presented in **Figure 7**. The score is mostly contributed by the component "Beliefs" with the score of 72.93, followed by Social Influence (64.29) and Values in Youth (61.77). The least is contributed by the component "Responsibility" with a score of 58.00.

# 3.4.1 Values in Youth Component and Its Survey Items

Values are those principles or standards which help to improve the quality of life. They form the basis of character and personality development. Such values can be love, compassion, sympathy, empathy, tolerance, etc. and it lays the foundation for the external practiced values like integrity, honesty, discipline, punctuality and loyalty. Values tend to influence attitude and behavior and it helps to solve common human problems, the results of which provide answers to questions as to why people do what they do and in what order they choose to do them (ACC 2012). Participant 8 (FGD 3, Pos. 59-6) shared that "everybody in our country thinks that values should be taught by Dzongkha teachers of the school and we need to do away with this notion. I feel every teacher should teach values." To instill values in youth, all are equally responsible, be it teachers of any subjects, parents, friends, elders and at large, the nation as a whole to groom a quality youth for the future.



Figure 8 Values in Youth Component with its survey items

Note. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

**Figure 8** presents the Values in Youth Component with a score of 61.77 falling in the Good level. The scores of survey items show that the youth equally take care of the public property like that of private property as depicted by the Excellent level of score with 74.91 and they also do not break the queue while availing of any services (70.89). But the youth are willing to lie/ cheat to get out of the difficult situation as depicted by the score of 46.00, which falls in the Poor level and it is the lowest of all the scores compared to other survey items. It is followed by a Fair level of score (56.49) where the youth feel that they only behave well when they are watched by either their parents or teachers. Similarly, the youth only work during SUPW when they are watched over by the teachers and if they do not work, they fear getting low grades (59.16).

Survey items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Well behaved only when watched	7	26	14	38	14	100
Willing to cheat or lie if it is going to benefit you	4	22	20	37	17	100
Willing to lie to parents/ teachers to get out of difficult situation	8	42	18	25	8	100
Willing to cheat or lie if it is not going to harm others	8	37	17	28	10	100
Take care of school property like that of home property	28	52	12	7	1	100
Willing to Break the queue to avail service faster	2	13	12	45	28	100

## Table 12 Percentage of youth respondents on the values

The basic foundation for youth to mature and grow wiser to be a person of incorruptibility is to have certain values of being true to oneself/others in any condition. This is described based on how one behaves under supervision or when watched and the same in absence. As shown in **Table 12**, at least 52 percent believe that they behave well even when no one is watching opposing to 33 percent who said they are not. Similarly, 54 percent of youth said that they will not cheat or lie if it is going to benefit them. But it is quite alarming to note that 50 percent of youth are ready to lie to their parents/teachers to get out of a difficult situation. This is further substantiated when most of the youth (45%) are willing to cheat or lie if it is not going to harm others. This indicates that Bhutanese youth are willing to cheat or lie if it is going to benefit them and such behavior in the long run will give birth to corrupt behavior and ultimately contribute to becoming a corrupt society.

Imbibing the sense of belongingness into the youth is crucial. This starts with the value of taking care of public properties. In the case of Bhutan, services such as health and education are provided free of cost to all citizens, including structure, furniture, stationeries and other facilities. When everything is provided free of cost, people tend to lavishly use it as it does not concern them directly. Therefore, to optimize the use and minimize the waste, youth who are mostly in schools should take care of school property as their own. As depicted in **Table 12**, it is heartening to note that 80 percent of youth agreed that they do take care of school property like their home property. Similarly, 73 percent said that they will not break the queue to get the service faster like in the case of health services where people have to wait in a queue to get medical attention.

### 3.4.2 Social influence Components and Its Survey Items

Social influence has positive as well as negative effects on the youth's behavior and mentality and also on imparting/imbibing values. Individuals should imbibe values that will enable them to stand against social or peer pressure and refrain from indulging in unethical acts (ACC,

2012). The social influence component tries to determine the type of environment the youth live in such as the community, schools and people (parents, teachers and friends) they are surrounded with.



Figure 9 Social influence component and its survey items

**Note**. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

As presented in **Figure 9**, the Social Influence Component scored 64.29. It is contributed by 12 survey items. The highest score was accorded in the survey items where teachers take up their work very seriously (72.35) and also admit their mistakes and rectify it (72.15). Similarly, parents keep promises to their children and also explains if they are not able to keep their promises as depicted by the score of 72.12. The least is accorded where teachers support captains even when he/she is wrong (45.97). This is followed by the youth whether they are satisfied with what they have (48.34). The score also depicts that parents do keep their promises to their children as the score is 70.12. However, sometimes they break rules and are not able to say "no" to their friends indicating peer pressure or bad influence/company (55.64).

As a youth, most of their time is spent with their parents, friends and in schools/colleges/ institutes. As reflected in **Figure 3**, more than 86 percent are currently in schools, colleges or institutes. Other than their parents and community, school is one of the places where they spend most of their time to grow and learn. At the same time, the environment they live in also determines the person they become. Therefore, parents, teachers, friends and types of school management have certain roles in embedding values in Youth.

Teachers										
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total				
Teachers accept mistakes and correct it	25	53	11	8	4	100				
Teachers take their work very seriously	23	52	18	6	2	100				
Teachers are punctual for all activities	16	47	22	12	2	100				
Teachers are attentive to students who perform well in their studies	16	40	15	20	9	100				
Teachers are partial towards students whose parents are rich/hold important positions	6	18	18	39	19	100				
Teachers support captain even if he/she is wrong	16	31	18	25	11	100				

#### Table 13 Percentage of youth respondents on their perception towards teachers

As shown in **Table 13**, generally, the youth agreed that teachers accept mistakes and correct them (78%), teachers take their work very seriously (75%) and teachers are punctual in all activities (63%). These resemble a good example to their students. On the other hand, 56 percent of the youth agreed that teachers are attentive to students who perform well in their studies. Similarly, 47 percent of youth said that teachers support captain/s even if the captain is wrong. Such practices in schools will give room for accepting unethical practices and stunt the growth of being truthful and fair. But 58 percent of youth believe that their teachers are not partial towards the students whose parents are rich or hold important positions.

Participant 1, (FGD 3, Pos. 59-64) shared that "We [parents & teachers] do not need to teach values to our students, students are watching us not just in school but at home too. They are learning through our behavior and therefore, we need to show our best behavior all the time."

This shows the importance of exhibiting good behavior rather than giving theoretical values. It is also noted that "the students should be learning the fundamental things in the lower classes. Whatever values and character they need to learn, they should have learned it from the lower classes because there will be developmental progress" (Participant 4, FGD 4, Pos. 26-28). The foundation of the personnel development should be strong to accommodate good values and behavior as they grow. This all starts either in school or at home and community

Table 14 Percentage of youth respondents on their perception towards school/management

School									
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total			
The school collects unnecessary contributions in cash/things.	3	11	16	47	23	100			
The school makes judicious use of school resources	17	52	22	7	1	100			
Student assessments (CA) are done with integrity and fairness	20	46	19	12	3	100			
School explains how they have used the money earned from concerts, fete, etc.	21	44	15	14	7	100			
School mess-in charge manage funds transparently with integrity	12	36	36	12	5	100			
Seen or heard the incidences of people engaging in corrupt acts in the community/ school?	5	14	45	15	21	100			

As students, they may not be able to know everything happening in and around the schools but they will have their level of perception towards school or the management. Based on how the school performs its duty, students will have their judgment over the results which would have a definite impact on the students. The youth have shared their perception based on the use of resources, funds from collections as well as mess management and students' assessments. Generally, 70 percent believed that school does not make unnecessary contributions in cash/ things, 69 percent agreed that school makes judicious use of school resources, 66 percent agreed that student assessments are done with fairness and 65 percent believed that schools explain how they used the money earned from concerts, fete, etc.

Regarding the transparent management of mess funds by the school mess in charge, youth have some reservations as only 48 percent agreed to the statement and 36 percent remained neutral. This indicates that mess management is not up to the expectation of the students. In terms of incidences of corruption, the majority has remained neutral with 45 percent and 36 percent have not seen or heard of any incidences of people engaging in corrupt acts in their community or school. However, 19 percent of youth have seen or heard the incidences of people engaging in corrupt acts in their community/school. This shows the existence of corruption in school or community which is not a good precedent and even worse would be youth getting exposed to such activities.

Parents/friends									
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total			
Government officials use office resources for private purposes	10	35	18	28	9	100			
Government officials use office vehicles to drop/pick their children to/from schools	14	34	14	29	10	100			
You break school rules because you can't say "no" to your friends.	5	31	15	34	15	100			
Your friends sometimes bribe/ bully to get what they want	6	27	14	36	17	100			
Your parents keep their promise	23	51	12	10	4	100			

**Table 15** Percentage of youth respondents on their perception towards Parents/Friends/Government Officials

As presented in **Table 15**, 45 percent of the youth are of the view that government officials whom they know use office resources such as printing, files, notepads, Xerox copy, etc. for private purposes. In the same vein, 48 percent have seen government officials using government vehicles (other than school buses) to drop/pick up their children to/from schools. If such practice continues, there is every chance that youth may inherit as they enter jobs.

While assessing the company the youth are surrounded with, it is encouraging to note that the majority are surrounded by the good company as 53 percent do not bully/bribe to get what they want and 49 percent do not break rules under the influence of their friends. But one cannot neglect the fact that there is a substantial portion of youth (36%) who said that they break rules because he/she can not say "no" to their friends. Similarly, 33 percent agreed that their friends sometimes bribe/bully to get what they want. Compared to parents, teachers, or elders, friends have enormous capability to either groom or doom the ethical potential that one possesses. If not checked now, it will have multiple effects over the years.

Regarding the parents, 74 percent of youth agreed that their parents keep their promises and if they are not able to keep their promises, parents explain the reasons for not being able to keep the promises. This indicates that parents keep their words or walk the talk, which the youth can look up to. But every child has his/her own struggle corresponding to his/her family background which could be attributed to 14 percent of youth who disagreed with the statement.

## 3.4.3. Responsibility Component and its survey items

The level of responsibility that one shoulder reveals the height of maturity. This component measures the responsibility of self, which means the youth being accountable for their own actions or not involved in the so-called "blame game". The responsibility also means taking lead in reporting unethical behaviors which in turn allows one to be accountable for one's actions.

### Figure 10 Responsibility Component and its survey items



*Note*. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

The highest score in the Responsibility component is accorded to being responsible and accountable for one's actions (76.26) which is in an Excellent level as shown in **Figure 10**. However, reporting to the teacher/principal when encountering friends cheating in exams (34.38) and also reporting to the principal if the teacher does not come to class on a regular basis on the pretext of being busy (47.78) have scored comparatively low falling in Poor level. The overall score for the Responsibility component also falls in the Fair level with a score of 58.00.

Responsibility in reporting wrongdoings								
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total		
Responsible and accountable for ones actions	29	54	11	5	1	100		
Report cheating in exam to teacher/principal	5	14	17	44	20	100		
Report teacher for not coming to class on time or on a regular basis on the pretext of being busy	10	29	17	32	13	100		

### **Table 16** Percentage of youth respondents reporting wrongdoings

Responsibility usually accounts what you do and what others do. One should be accountable for what you do and equally, one should be in a position to fix the accountability of others. As depicted in **Table 16**, 83 percent of youth assert that they are responsible and accountable for their actions and do not make any excuse or blame others. On the contrary, 64 percent of youth are not in a position to report wrongdoings such as cheating in the exam. Similarly, most of the respondents (45%) are not willing to report to the principal if their teachers do not come to class on time or on the regular basis on the pretext of being busy. It depicts how complacent

and tolerant the youth are of unethical behavior. Therefore, this indicates that youth are not responsible enough to report wrongdoings which may lead to a serious breach of norms. Being considerate of such behavior may pose a serious risk of getting it normalized. But this is solely dependent on schools, to encourage and provide avenues for reporting.

ACC, (2012) stated that Socially Useful and Productive Work (SUPW) wherever utilized effectively can provide ample platform for so many values to be learned and practiced such as the value of team spirit, sense of belonging, the dignity of labor, contributing to greater goodness and self-discipline. **Table 17** shows how youth take up SUPW in schools.

Responsibility in Socially Useful and Productive Work (SUPW)									
	Strongly AgreeAgreeNeutralDisagreeStrongly Disagree								
SUPW is natural responsibility for students	44	48	4	3	1	100			
During SUPW, you work because your teacher is watching over you	9	23	11	38	20	100			
Friends take up SUPW seriously	10	35	25	23	7	100			

## **Table 17** Percentage of youth respondents on being responsible during SUPW

SUPW is an activity that has the potential to make oneself responsible, take initiative, be sincere in all activities and promote a sense of natural responsibility. 92 percent of the youth agreed that SUPW is a natural responsibility for them as shown in **Table 17.** When it comes to value (also **see Figure 8**), 58 percent work during SUPW even if their teacher is not watching over them and 32 percent agreed that they work during SUPW only because their teacher is watching over them and if they don't work, they will get low grades. Similarly, 45 percent of youth stated that most of their friends are not taking up their SUPW seriously. The intended purpose of SUPW is less likely to be achieved as most of the students do not take SUPW seriously and even those who work are mostly to obtain a good grade.

## 3.4.4. Beliefs Component and its survey items

Beliefs are bound to be different for different individuals yet can be unique and common as well. Beliefs are guided by the community we live in, the religion we follow, the family background we come from, the values we subscribe to and many more. It is also different towards certain understanding and circumstances. In the case of YIA, Beliefs are measured in terms of one's attitude towards measuring success. Figure 11 Beliefs Component and its survey items



Note. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

**Figure 11** presents scores of the Beliefs component and its survey items. Generally, youth feel that an honest person with personal integrity has more chances to succeed in life with a score of 78.61. This is further substantiated by the other two survey items with a score of 67.86 and 67.13. The higher scores indicate that people who are ready to lie, cheat, break laws and corrupt will not succeed in life and also it is not acceptable to abuse power even at the cost of finding ways to increase family income. Overall, the youth have an Excellent level of score in the Belief Component with a score of 72.93.

## Table 18 Percentage of youth respondents on their beliefs

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
People who are ready to lie, cheat, break laws and corrupt has more chance to succeed in life	5	15	12	37	30	100
An honest person, with personal integrity, has more chances to succeed in life.	42	39	11	6	1	100
Finding ways to increase the family income is the most important and it is acceptable to abuse power to attain this objective	3	15	17	41	24	100
Being rich is the most important and it is acceptable to lie or cheat to attain this objective	1	6	8	49	35	100

As mentioned in **Table 11**, the majority of Bhutanese youth understand integrity violations or corruption as cheating or lying over breaking the laws/rules. **Table 18** shows the beliefs of youth attached to their definition of integrity and success. Bhutanese youth hold a strong belief where 67 percent believe that people who are ready to lie, cheat, break laws and corrupt have less chance to succeed in life. In the same way, 71 percent believe that an honest person with personal integrity has more chances to succeed in life.

But when asked about the term "occasionally", the majority of the youth (47%) are of the view that they have to lie or cheat occasionally to succeed in life (**see Figure 35**). This clearly shows that youth have the capability to differentiate between good and bad but they are influenced by the environment they live in indicating a minimal presence of strong integrity role models in the lives of young people. There is a call for the need for strong role models from the highest levels of politics, civil organizations, business, education sector to the entertainment world and social life.

On the other hand, it is promising to note that 84 percent of youth disagreed with the statement that being rich is the most important and it is acceptable to lie or cheat to attain this objective. Similarly, 65 percent disagreed with the statement that finding ways to increase the family income is the most important and it is acceptable to abuse power to attain this objective. This indicates that Bhutanese youth know that integrity is the most important over wealth and being rich.

# 3.5 INDEX ON YOUTH'S PERCEPTION OF CORRUPTION IN THE COUNTRY

This Index tries to measure the exposure of youth to corruption and their reaction to corruption when coming into contact with public and private institutions in their daily lives. To understand where and when corruption might take place in the life of a young person, youth were asked how they percieve corruption in different scenarios or sectors. Similarly, it also tries to measure the level of corruption in different public sectors from the perspective of youth.



Figure 12 Index on Youth's Corruption Perception in the Country and its survey items

**Note**. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

The Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country scored 60.56 which is in Good level indicating low corruption perception. It is contributed by seven survey items as shown in **Figure 12**. The score is mostly contributed by the perception that corruption can be curbed in Bhutan (67.03). Similarly, it is depicted that the youth of today are concerned about corruption and its issues (66.38). In terms of sector-wise perception, youth feel that the level of integrity nowadays in private education (54.81) is lower than that of public education (62.73). The perception of integrity in public health is 65.18 and the lowest score of all survey items is the level of integrity nowadays in the business sector (49.05) which falls in the Poor level indicating a higher perception of corruption by the youth in the business sector. It is encouraging to note that youth are concerned about the corruption issues in the country and they know that corruption can be curbed in Bhutan. It only requires collective efforts to curb corruption and youth can play a critical role in fighting corruption.

# 3.6 INDEX ON PARENTS AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTION TOWARDS YOUTH

More than anybody, teachers and parents know the youth best. Therefore, parents and teachers play a pivotal role in inculcating integrity and other values in the youth, which will ultimately facilitate refraining and restraining from being involved in corrupt acts and also learning more about corruption. This component measures the parents and teachers' perception towards youth.



# Figure 13 Index on Parents & Teachers' Perception towards Youth and its components

**Note**. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=365 parents, 580 teachers, YIA 2022)

**Figure 13** depicts the parents and teachers' perception of youth. It is shown that parents and teachers have a Fair level of perception of integrity in the current youth with a score of 55.04. Compared to parents, teachers have scored in Poor level indicating youth of today have low integrity. Parents' score of perception towards youth is in Fair level.

## 3.6.1 Parents' Perception of youth

The role of a parent is immortal in shaping the life of a child. Exchange Family Centre, (2021) shares "Healthy parents lead to healthy families. Not just physical health but emotional health too." Rabgyal (2018) also supports that family interventions are crucial especially in the early years of childhood as a child undergoes significant mental formation. Therefore, parents have a critical role in shaping the actions and behavior of one's children. He further states that "Family, as a naturally evolved institution within human society, plays an important role in child development" (p.91).

Participant 3, (FGD 3, Pos. 44-58) feels that "Values should be taught at home and not just at school. If the children are having anti-social behavior and if there is no bonding between parents and their children, it is due to the parenting styles and they [parents] are responsible for it. The values should be taught at home." **Figure 14** gives the perception of parents relating to youth's behavior, values and role.



# Figure 14 Parents component and its survey items

*Note*. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=365, YIA 2022)

As can be seen from **Figure 14**, the score of Parents' Perception of youth is 58.46 which is in the Fair level. The score is mostly affected by the Poor level of score in the comparison of current youth with the youth of yesteryears. The score of 30.48 shows that the values and integrity are degenerating in the current youth as compared to the youth of yesteryears. On the other hand, parents feel that their child/children behave well when they are at home (76.03) and parents also know that youth can play a role in fighting corruption (71.03).

# 3.6.2 Teachers' Perception of youth

Teachers are even considered the second parents and role models to students (ACC, 2012). Parents or teachers are not solely responsible for the development of a child. As cited in Exchange Family Center, (2021), "it takes a village to raise a child" which calls for a shared responsibility in raising a child. It is also stated that nowadays a child is raised through nurture, creative and safe ways. Therefore, teachers have a greater role than anybody to nurture

children's growth and specifically in embedding values. Therefore, **Figure 15** shows the perception of teachers towards current youth in terms of their value and the role youth can play in fighting corruption.



### Figure 15 Teachers' Perception of youth and its survey items

*Note*. 0 = lowest level of integrity and 100 = highest level of integrity; Source (n=580 teachers, YIA 2022)

As shown in **Figure 15**, the Teachers' Perception score is 51.61 falling in the Poor level. Teachers genuinely feel that the youth of today can play a role in integrity-building and the fight against corruption with an Excellent level score (84.83). The score is the highest of all survey items of this study. On the other hand, teachers are of the view that the values and integrity are degenerating in the present youth as compared to the youth of yesteryears with a Poor level of the score (24.44). This score is the lowest of all survey items of this study. This clearly shows that the youth have the potential to fight corruption and make a difference at large. It is time for the government, sectors and community to come together and harness the true potential of the youth. However, it is worrisome to note that the youth's values are degenerating over the years.

On the other hand, the teachers acknowledged that the current youth are sharp, bold, confident, technological friendly, open and innovative compared to the youth of yesteryears. Participant 1, (FGD 5) expressed that "Compared to the past, today, the youth are more open. In the olden days, youth were inhibited and they could not express whatever they wanted. But the youth of today are very open to everyone and they can easily express everything. They are very quick in decision-making, straightforward, creative and fast in learning." Almost in all FGDs, the same was shared by the participants.

The FGD participants also shared some weaknesses or room for improvement in present youth. Most participants opined that today's youth need to have the value of *"Tha Damtse"* and *"Ley Judrey."* Similarly, in all FGDs, the problem of discipline with the current youth has been expressed. For example, Participant 2, (FGD 13, Pos.30) opinioned that the current "Youth think that discipline itself is a punishment and whenever the teacher or school administration talks about discipline, they think it as a punishment. Actually, discipline is rather an act that changes people's behavior than punishment for them." To add further, it all boils down to the conduct and attitude of the youth.

The Participants expressed a few reasons associated with the discipline issues amongst the youth such as protection from the parents relating to unethical behaviors, weak discipline policy at the school and national levels, family background and others. Participant 3, (FGD 22, Pos.26-33) indicated that "youth's integrity fully depends upon the hands of policymakers because a policy such as positive disciplining seems inappropriate and less helpful." The same opinion was raised in all FGDs.

# 3.7 BEHAVIOR BASED INTEGRITY

Behavioral-based integrity tries to find out how youth's moral and behavior conforms to the standards of integrity or how the youth's behavior is associated with the concept of integrity. The assessment is done by giving them hypothetical situations and seeing how they would react to the situation exemplified. Their level of integrity will be determined by the levels of their behavior or responses. The questions under this section will also help to touch on the youth's conscience when faced with similar situations in the future and determine their actions in the long run.

## Figure 16 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of extra money



Note. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

As depicted in **Figure 16**, 83 percent of the youth admitted that they will immediately return the extra money but almost 16 percent of the youth responded that they will not return it. As compared to the 2012 study, there is an improvement in their responses. In 2012, 25.2 of the youth said they will quickly pocket it or walk out (ACC, 2012).

## Figure 17 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of a new mobile phone



Note. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

As represented in **Figure 17**, 45 percent of the youth stated that they would hand it over to the relevant authorities and 41 percent would enquire about the owner. Whereas 7 percent would give it to their parent or friend and 6.8 percent would immediately switch it off and take it home. The remaining 0.2 percent would not even dare to pick as stated in others.

### Figure 18 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of position



Note. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

**Figure 18** shows the level of integrity in terms of getting higher positions. Most of the respondents (85 percent) would confess the mistake and take the second prize but 8 percent of the youth would remain silent to get the first prize. The remaining 7 percent would only confess if it's their close friend who is in the first position.



Figure 19 Honesty/Integrity: In the case of distribution of sweets/refreshments

Note. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

**Figure 19** presents the level of integrity in terms of the distribution of sweets/refreshments and their reaction to the leftovers. 53 percent stated that they will redistribute the leftovers to all or 27 percent said they will return the leftovers to whoever was concerned. Whereas, 14 percent stated they will keep most for their friends or 6 percent will keep most for themselves.

# Figure 20 Honesty/Integrity: In being accountable



Note. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

As depicted in **Figure 20**, 40 percent of the youth stated that they will return the balance amount to their parents and explain how they have spent it. On the other hand, 12 percent stated that they will return/explain only if they are asked to. Otherwise, 27 percent of the youth will keep the balance amount for themselves and 21 percent will only keep the amount if it is small. In 2012, 77.9 percent said that they will explain and return the balance and only 17.5 percent said they will not return. This indicates that youth are in a position to be involved in unethical acts if it is pertaining to their parents. This further presents that the parents have become more tolerant and complacent with the unethical behavior of their children.





Note. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

In the case of passing an exam, the majority of the youth (87 percent) said that they will do their best without cheating even if they may fail as depicted in **Figure 21**. Twelve percent of the youth will try to seek help from their friends to pass the exam and 1 percent will do anything to pass the exam.

## Figure 22 Honesty/Integrity: To get a document



*Note*. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

**Figure 22** depicts the behavior of youth when encountering difficult situations to get a document. 46 percent of youth will wait for time to get their documents and 38 percent will enquire about the process and seek reasons for taking time. On the other hand, 15 percent said that they will seek their friends/relatives' support to get the job done and 1 percent will pay unofficial payments to speed things up.



Note. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

When it comes to getting admission into a better school/university/company without having to pass the selection process, 40 percent stated that they will deny the offer and not involve in such practice as presented in **Figure 23**. On the same, 23 percent stated that they would feel uncomfortable with such practice but agree as everybody does the same. 20 percent of the youth said they will accept the offer right away and similarly, 17 percent said that they will refuse but make an excuse for not accepting the practice.

# 3.8 EXPERIENCED CORRUPTION OF YOUTH

The YIA also tries to assess youth's experiences of corruption apart from seeking to understand youth's perception of integrity. Youth were asked if they had been confronted with corruption over the past 12 months i) to get a document; ii) to pass an exam; iii) to get health services; iv) to avoid a problem with the police and v) to get a job. For each scenario they were given three options such as i) they had faced corruption; ii) they had not faced corruption and iii) they had no contact with the service mentioned in the past 12 months. **Figure 24** shows the percentage of youth who have been confronted with corruption in the past 12 months.



#### Figure 24 Youth's experiences of corruption

As depicted in **Figure 24**, Bhutanese youth have a minimal confrontation with corrupt behaviors. Only 6-13 percent have experienced corruption in the last 12 months before the survey period. Compared to the Asia pacific region, more than 25 percent had experienced corruption.

In the Asia Pacific, most cases of corruption were encountered when dealing with the police. It is reported that more than one in five young people across Fiji, South Korea and Sri Lanka has experienced corruption with the police. The highest was noted in Indonesia with 57 percent.

#### In the case of Bhutan,

- one in 16 youth (6%) have experienced corruption when dealing with the police;
- one in 14 has (8%) experienced corruption while availing services related to getting documents such as Transfer Certificate, Permits, Medical Certificate, etc.;
- one in 10 (10%) has experienced corruption in the past 12 months to pass an exam or be accepted into a program or get a higher grade.
- One in 8 has experienced corruption to get better medicine or medical attention for you or your family in a health sector; and
- One in 13 has experienced corruption related to job recruitment or selection.

The experiences of corruption by the youth in Bhutan are comparatively low as compared to other countries. However, considering the smallness of the country and the size of the population, it should be a matter of concern as corruption is also like a deadly disease that starts from a minor symptom.

# **3.9. READINESS TO FIGHT CORRUPTION**

Youth have a key role to play in fighting corruption and making a clean society to live in (Jennett & Thayenthal, 2014). This starts with oneself upholding the values of integrity and then reporting any acts of integrity violations. To see how youth are ready to take this role further, it is important to assess their readiness in terms of reporting corruption, their knowledge of how to report corruption and tolerance of corruption.

Participant 3, (FGD 8, Pos. 42-57) shared that "Corruption free society should be started from school and a corrupt nation can never prosper in terms of economic, social and political development. ...youth can become ambassadors and role model themselves [and] create awareness and instill that positivity and knowledge to the illiterate sections of the population."



Figure 25 Percentage of youth agreeing that they can play a role in promoting integrity

**Figure 25** represents the youth's knowledge and readiness to report the acts of corruption. In 2012, 90 percent of the youth stated that they must report the acts of corruption and similarly, in 2022, 90 percent of the youth agreed with the same. Whereas, 76 percent of the youth said that they do not know where to report corruption in 2012. In 2022, at least 54 percent of youth have agreed that they know where to report corruption indicating an improved level of their knowledge in reporting corruption.

In the same vein, Participant 8 (FGD 6, Pos. 40-41) also expressed that one way to fight corruption by youth is to "...raise their voice in fighting corruption. It will be helpful if the youth can take responsibility to report corruption to the concerned authority. Another thing is that youth can use ICT to report corrupt acts." Therefore, in terms of values, youth in 2022 are not importantly different from youth in 2012 (See Chapter 5). A welcome trend is that many more youth report that they know how to report corruption (54 percent in 2022 vs. only 24 percent

in 2012). Of course, this means that 46 percent still do not know how to report corruption if they encounter it. We can and must do better.





**Figure 26** shows the youth's commitment to fight corruption and readiness to engage themselves in promoting the values of integrity. Almost 75 percent of youth agreed that they can play a role in building integrity or fighting corruption and a few sections (12%) disagreed with the statement and 13 percent remained neutral. In terms of youth's role in changing the issue of favoritism as normal ways of life, 35 percent agreed that youth can change but 40 percent disagreed with the statement. 57 percent of youth agreed that they will pledge to fight against cheating in school/institutes and similarly, 61 percent stated that they will commit to spreading the word about the problem of corruption or promote integrity on social media.

Participant 8 (FGD 2, Pos. 84-91) stated that "Youth of the present generation can speak up their views and opinions without any hesitation. So, it may help in the future to curb corruption." Similarly, Participant 5, (FGD 5, Pos. 32-33) stressed that "Youth should be provided with an awareness program on law and sensitization on corruption and its consequences. Moreover, it would be much better if the topic of corruption could be included in the syllabus of classes nine and above. Otherwise, the school should have counseling on corruption to impart some knowledge in youth about corruption." It clearly shows the strength of the youth in the fight against corruption and gives way to mobilizing their strength.



Figure 27 Percentage of youth who would commit to reporting corruption: Country-wise comparison

**Figure 27** shows the comparison of youth's commitment to report corruption with the study carried out by Transparency International (TI) in the Asia Pacific region in 2014 and the Vietnam Youth Integrity Survey of 2019. Most of the youth in all countries surveyed report corruption. Bhutan has the highest proportion of youth who would report (or has reported) at 83 percent. It is followed by Fiji at 75 percent and Sri Lanka at the lowest at 39 percent. In Vietnam, Indonesia and South Korea, 49, 54 and 59 percent of youth would report corruption (or have done so). With regard to the work of fighting corruption, Bhutan's youth shows far better level of integrity and bravery in their answers than the young people in five other Asian countries.

Participant 3, (FGD 17, Pos. 39-53) suggests that "There should be a platform [such as suggestion box] to report corrupt acts and youth should learn to say "No" to corruption. On top of that, school/institution/agency should create awareness or advocate on unethical acts guided by strict rules against corrupt acts." It is reported that to engage youth in fighting corruption is by reporting unethical acts. To report such, the presence of reporting platforms or avenues is important. Further, Participant 1, (FGD 22, Pos. 89-94) also expressed that "We know that corruption is happening but we fail to report it instantly. Corruption is thriving because of our failure to report." Just having an avenue to report unethical acts will not suffice if there is lack of encouragement and accountability in reporting corruption.



Figure 28 Percentage of youth stating reasons for not reporting corruption in Bhutan

There were at least 17 percent who said they will not report corruption or only report depending on cases as presented in **Figure 27.** Similarly, they were asked about reasons for not reporting corruption as depicted in **Figure 28.** "Afraid of not having protection" was the most cited reason with 37 percent followed by "none of my business" with 25 percent. 18 percent of the youth said they will not report corruption as reporting will not lead to any actions or consideration. Lack of knowledge of denunciation procedures is also one of the reasons for not reporting corruption (16 percent).

# CHAPTER 4 COMPARISON OF YIA SCORES

This chapter presents the comparison of YIA scores. The comparisons are made by sex, class, types of youth and between Thromde and Dzongkhags. Further, to get a better understanding of the Integrity Club in schools, comparisons are made at the school level as well as at the member level.

# 4.1 YOUTH INTEGRITY SCORE COMPARISON BY SEX



### Figure 29 Comparison of youth integrity scores by sex

**Note**. n= male (1778 youth, 123 parents, 329 teachers) & female (1780 youth, 242 teachers, 251 teachers)

**Figure 29** represents the comparison of youth integrity scores by sex. The integrity score for the female is 63.67, which is higher by 0.41 as compared to the male integrity score of 63.26. Both scores fall in the 'Good level' category. Male youth scored high in three indexes which are the Index on Integrity Awareness (70.79), the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption (60.76) and the Index on Parents and Teachers' perception towards youth (55.46). On the other hand, female youth have scored high on values with a score of 64.49, indicating a Good level of values for females than that of male youth.

In addition to the scores, an independent t-test was run specifically for the 3558 youth in three indexes such as "Index on Integrity Awareness", "Index on Values" and "Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country." The test was carried out in two groups of randomly selected 1778 male and 1780 female youth. In terms of the mean score for value index, the female youth have scored higher than their male counterparts and the difference is statistically

significant<sup>1</sup> (See Annexure 3). However, the effect size or the magnitude of the difference is small, which is indicated by Cohen's *estimate*<sup>2</sup>. In terms of the gender-wise mean score comparison on integrity awareness and the youth's perception of corruption, the result shows that the difference is not statistically significant<sup>3</sup> (Also see Annexures 2 and 4).

# 4.2 YOUTH INTEGRITY SCORE COMPARISON: CLASS-WISE

Classes*	Overall Integrity Score	Index on Integrity Awareness	Index on Values	Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the Country	Index on Parents & Teachers' Per- ception towards Youth
Class VII (n=72)	61.65	58.63	62.67	66.94	55.04
Class VIII (n=139)	65.29	64.79	67.04	67.74	55.04
Class IX (n=448)	64.22	67.14	65.30	64.67	55.04
<b>Class X</b> (n=543)	64.07	69.58	64.77	63.06	55.04
<b>Class XI</b> (n=459)	63.34	71.02	63.72	60.60	55.04
Class XII (n=598)	63.87	74.26	64.03	59.48	55.04

 Table 19 Class-wise comparison of integrity scores for students in school

Note. \* Includes the students currently in school; Source (n=2259, YIA 2022)

**Table 19** presents the comparison of integrity scores at different levels from class VII-XII. All have scored in 'Good level' except Class VII which falls in 'Fair level'. The highest score is accorded by Class VIII with 65.29 and the least is scored by Class VII with 61.65. For the Index on integrity awareness, the highest is accorded by Class XII with 74.26 and the score has gradually increased with a rise in higher levels of grade. In terms of the Index on Values, Class VII has scored the highest with 67.04. Looking at the youth's perception of corruption, Class VIII has recorded the highest score of 67.74. The score decreases as they ascend to higher grades indicating the increase in corruption perception as they grow. This could be due to the exposure to more incidences of corruption as they grow. The score for the parents' and teachers' perception index has been kept the same for all levels.

One-way ANOVA was run to examine the differences in integrity scores of three indexes of youth as "Index on Integrity Awareness," "Index on Values" and "Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption." There were 2259 youth who are currently in school and they are classified into six groups (i.e. Classes VII, VIII, IX, X, XI & XII). Looking at the "Index on Integrity Awareness", there is a statistically significant difference in the mean integrity awareness score among the six groups of the classes with a p-value of 0.001, which is below 0.05 (See Annexure 5). Further, to determine which classes are significantly different or similar from each other, a Tukey post-hoc

<sup>1</sup> The t-test statistics shows p-value to be 0.003, which is less than 0.05. The null hypothesis of H0: Pdiff = 0 is rejected. That means, there is a difference in mean score of the Index on Values between male and female youth.

<sup>2</sup> Cohen's d showed a small size effect (d=-0.1). This is as per the general rules of thumb where d of 0.2 or smaller is considered to be a small effect size, d of 0.5 is considered to be a medium effect size and d of 0.8 or larger is considered to be a large effect size (Zack, 2020).

<sup>3</sup> There is no statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis (mean score in the Index on Integrity Awareness and the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption for male and female is same) of H0: Pdiff = 0 versus the two-sided alternative Ha: Pdiff ≠0 at the 5% significance level. For the Index on Integrity Awareness, the p-value = 0.7532 > 0.05; and for the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption, the p-value is 0.3535 > 0.05.

test was conducted. The result revealed that the higher class has a significantly higher level of awareness in terms of corruption and integrity compared to the lower class except for 'Class IX over VIII' and 'Class XI over X' as presented in **Annexure 6**.

Similarly, in terms of the "Index on Values", the difference between the classes is statistically significant at p=0.002<0.05) (See Annexure 7). In addition, the Tukey post-hoc test shows that there were no differences between most of the classes. However, there is a statistically significant difference in values between "Class 8 – Class 7" (p=0.030), "Class 11 – Class 8" (p=0.007) and the "Class 12 – Class 8" (p=0.016) (See Annexure 8). This shows that values in students are high in Class VIII, IX and X.

Furthermore, there is a statistically significant difference in the "Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption" mean score (p=0.001) between the six different levels of education (**See Annexure 9**). With the decrease in score depicts a higher level of perception of corruption in the country. The post-hoc test results reveal that higher classes have a higher level of perception of corruption. Looking at the p-value, there is statistically significant (p<0.001) difference in youth's perception of corruption between the "Class 11 – Class 7" (p=0.000), "Class 12 – Class 7" (p=0.000), "Class 10 – Class 8" (p=0.000), "Class 11 – Class 8" (p=0.000), "Class 12 – Class 8" (p=0.000), "Class 11 – Class 9" (p=0.000), "Class 11 – Class 9" (p=0.000), "Class 11 – Class 9" (p=0.000), "Class 12 – Class 10" (p=0.013) and "Class 12 – Class 10" (p=0.000) (**See Annexure 10**). This shows that the students' level of perception of corruption in the country increases as they ascend to a higher level in schools.

Туре	Overall Integrity Score	Index on Integrity Awareness	Index on Values	Index on Youth's Per- ception of Corruption in the Country	*Index on Par- ents & Teach- ers' Perception towards Youth
Schools (n=2259)	63.90	69.99	64.55	62.34	55.04
Monasteries (n=276)	66.32	64.47	69.32	65.38	55.04
Colleges (n=390)	61.86	76.18	61.70	52.25	55.04
Institutes (n=159)	62.46	69.86	62.46	61.00	55.04
Employed (n=147)	60.18	73.07	58.78	56.61	55.04
Unemployed (n=327)	61.29	73.07	60.84	55.62	55.04

# 4.3 YOUTH INTEGRITY SCORE COMPARISON: YOUTH TYPE

**Table 20** Comparison of integrity scores for youth type and their employment status

**Note**. \* The score for parents and teachers' perceptions have been kept the same for all types of youth as the data segregation was not feasible. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

**Table 20** shows the comparison of integrity scores between the youth who are in schools, monasteries, colleges and institutes. The comparison is also made with the employed and unemployed youth. The youth in monastic education have shown a higher level of integrity with a score of 66.32 which is in "Very Good Level". The employed youth had the least score

of 60.18, followed by the unemployed youth (61.29). In the case of knowledge on integrity and corruption, youth in colleges have a higher level of understanding with a score of 76.18, followed by employed and unemployed youth, each scoring 73.07. The table also shows that youth in monasteries have better values compared to other youth. This could be attributed to the curriculum which is solely based on Buddhist values and strict disciplinary policy in monastic education. Similarly, the youth in monasteries have a higher score in their perception of corruption indicating a lesser level of perception of corruption. On the other hand, youth in colleges have a low score (52.25) indicating a higher level of perception of corruption.

To deepen the analysis, a one-way ANOVA was carried out to determine the differences in integrity scores of three indexes (Index on Integrity Awareness, Index on Values and Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption) for those youth (n=3,558) who were employed, unemployed, those who are in schools, colleges, institutes and monasteries. The result shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the groups (F(5,3552) = 33.43, p<0.001) as shown in **Annexure 11**. A Tukey post-hoc test revealed that monastic education has a significantly lower level of awareness in terms of corruption and integrity compared to other groups as presented in **Annexure 12**. This could be due to the minimal effort made for the conduct of education and awareness programs unlike other institutes such as schools, colleges and TVET institutes.

However, in terms of the "Index on Values," the youth in monastic education have a statistically higher level of values compared to all other groups with a p<0.001 (See Annexures 13 & 14). Similarly, the youth in schools have also a higher level of value compared to unemployed and unemployed youth and youth in colleges with a p<0.001. For the other groups, the score differences are not statistically significant. Furthermore, the score for the youth in monasteries also depicts a significant difference compared to other groups indicating the perception of less corruption in the country (See Annexures 15 & 16). Similarly, youth in school also depict significant differences compared to other youths except for the youth in monasteries. Of all, youths in colleges depict the perception of a higher level of corruption in the country.

# 4.4 YOUTH INTEGRITY SCORE COMPARISON: DZONGKHAGS WITH THIMPHU THROMDE

Regions & Thromde	Overall Integrity Score	Index on Integrity Awareness	Index on Values	Index on Youth's Per- ception of Corruption in the Country	Index on Parents & Teachers' Perception towards youth
Dzongkhags (n=2866)	63.87	70.74	64.46	61.53	55.14
Thimphu Throm- de <i>(n=692)</i>	61.70	70.64	62.10	56.52	54.25

## Table 21 Comparison of Dzongkhags' integrity score with Thimphu Thromde

Note. Source (n=3558, YIA 2022)

**Table 21** gives the comparison of scores for the youth in Thimphu Thromde with the youth of 17 Dzongkhags. The overall integrity score for the youth in Dzongkhags is 63.87 which is higher than the youth in Thimphu Thromde (61.70). The score is higher by 2.17. The highest score

difference was noted in the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country where Dzongkhags scored 61.53 and Thimphu Thromde scored 56.52. There is a difference of 5.01. The higher level of score in the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption depicts less level of corruption in the country and vice versa. Therefore, the score indicates that the youth in Thimphu Thromde perceived there is a high level of corruption in the country compared to the youth of other Dzongkhags. The youth in Dzongkhags have scored high in all the indexes as compared to the youth of Thimphu Thromde.

To examine the significance of score differences, an independent t-test was run for the 3558 youth in three indexes of youth scores such as "Index on Integrity Awareness", "Index on Values" and "Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country." The test was carried out in two groups of randomly selected 2886 youth of 17 Dzongkhags and 692 youth of Thimphu Thromde. In terms of the mean score for the Index on Integrity Awareness, the result shows that the difference is not statistically significant <sup>4</sup>(See Annexure 17). In terms of the Index on Values, the Dzongkhags have scored higher than the Thimphu Thromde and the difference is statistically significant at p<0.001 (See Annexure 19). Therefore, the results indicate that the youth in other Dzongkhags have higher level of integrity and values compared to the youth of Thimphu Thromde.

# 4.5 YOUTH INTEGRITY SCORE COMPARISON: INTEGRITY CLUB SCHOOL



#### Figure 30 Comparison of Integrity Club Schools

As depicted in **Figure 30**, schools with Integrity Club have scored slightly higher with a score of 65.55 as compared to schools without Integrity Club (63.64). They both fall on a "Good level". The score is higher by 1.91. The score for all indexes of schools with Integrity clubs has scored higher as compared to the schools without integrity clubs. Schools with Integrity Clubs have specifically scored higher in the "Index on Integrity Awareness" with a score difference

<sup>4</sup> There is no statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis (mean score in the Index on Integrity Awareness for the Dz-ongkhags and Thimphu Thromde is same) of H0: Pdiff = 0 versus the two-sided alternative Ha: Pdiff <sup>10</sup> at the 5% significance level. For the Index on Integrity Awareness, the p-value = 0.8683 > 0.05.

<sup>5</sup> The t-test statistics shows p-value to be 0.001, which is less than 0.05. The null hypothesis of H0: Pdiff = 0 is rejected. That means, there is a difference in mean score of the Index on Values between the youth in Dzongkhags and the youth in Thimphu Thromde.

of 2.77. This may be attributed to the awareness and activities on integrity and corruption issues by the club coordinator and the ACC. However, the higher score may not be solely due to the presence of the integrity club as the integrity clubs were instituted only a year before the data collection where most of the schools could not carry out the planned activities. The other factors which contributed to a high score could be the ethical culture in school, good disciplinary measures and other value-oriented mechanisms.

Similarly, an independent t-test for the 3558 youth also depicts significant differences in three indexes such as "Index on Integrity Awareness", "Index on Values" and "Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country." The groups comprise 3,232 youth who are in schools where integrity club is not instituted and the 326 youth in schools where the integrity club is instituted. As reflected in **Annexure 20**, in terms of the "Index on Integrity Awareness", the difference in mean score is statistically significant<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, it also indicates that the youth in schools where an integrity club is not instituted have a significantly lower level of awareness compared to the youth where there is an integrity club (p=0.007). Cohen's *d* showed a small size effect (*d*=-0.14). Further, youth in school where there is an integrity club showed a better level of values (t(3556)= -4.32, p<0.001) compared to the youth where there is no integrity club showed a better level of values (t(3556)= -4.32, p<0.001) compared to the youth where there is no integrity club showed in schools where the Integrity Club is not instituted have a higher level of corruption perception in the country, youth in schools where the Integrity Club is not instituted have a higher level of corruption perception in the country (t(3556)= -4.29, p<0.001) (See Annexure 22).

Importantly, Participant 2, (FGD 8, Pos. 42-57) also shared that "it is very important to institute the integrity club if possible, in all the schools across the country because instituting such a noble club can help children to uphold the values, especially integrity. Since the inception of the integrity club, I feel there is a promotion of integrity, especially in some youth."

# 4.6 YOUTH INTEGRITY SCORE COMPARISON: INTEGRITY CLUB MEMBER



## Figure 31 Comparison of Integrity Club Members

<sup>6</sup> The t-test shows a p-value is 0.02. Since the p-value is less than alpha = 0.05, there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis that the mean score of the Index on Integrity Awareness between schools with integrity club and without integrity club is equal.

**Figure 31** shows the comparison of scores for the members and non-members of the integrity club. The comparison is made only within the schools where there are Integrity Clubs. The Integrity Club members have a score of 67.03 which is higher by 4.18 when compared to non-members. Generally, the scores for all indexes for Integrity Club members have scored higher than the non-members. The score for the Integrity Club member falls in the Very Good level and the score for non-members falls in the "Good level". The score for Parents and Teachers' Perception has been kept the same for both members and non-members. The higher score may be attributed to the activities carried out by the club members related to ethics and integrity. However, the effectiveness of the integrity clubs in schools are yet to be ascertained as it is only a recent initiative of the ACC.

More importantly, an independent t-test for the 694 youth also depicts significant differences in terms of the "Index on Integrity Awareness" and "Index on Values." The test was carried out for 130 Integrity Club members and 564 non-Integrity Club members. As shown in **Annexure 23**, the "Index on Integrity Awareness", the score is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (t(692)= 2.52, p=0.01). Further, it also indicates that the Integrity Club members have a significantly higher level of awareness compared to the non-Integrity Club members (p=0.006). Similarly, as represented in **Annexure 24**, the "Index on Values", there is a statistically significant difference in mean score at the 0.05 level (t(692)=5.42, p=0.000). It also indicates that the integrity club members have a significantly higher level of integrity values compared to the non-integrity club members (p=0.000).

# CHAPTER 5 COMPARISON OF KEY YOUTH INTEGRITY ITEMS OF 2012 AND 2022

## Figure 32 Comparison of the level of sincerity



SUPW is the time when a student gets to contribute in his/her little ways to help develop the school. Through involvement in SUPW, one develops values of team spirit, a sense of belonging, the dignity of labor, contributing to greater goodness, self-discipline, etc. What one usually observes during SUPW is that most students have to be made to work, being responsible, taking initiative and doing the work to the best of their ability. Almost 50 percent of the youth agree that they work during SUPW only because the teacher/lecturer is watching over them in 2012. Whereas only 31 percent agreed to the same in 2022. On the other hand, 58 percent disagreed with the statement in 2022 and 48 percent in 2012.

Participant 3, (FGD 13, Pos.83-86) also opined that "If there is no teacher supervising them, they [student] do not work at all even if there is a captain. They do not even pick up the papers in their area but if there is a teacher supervising them, they work." Most of the participants also shared similar opinions that teachers need to supervise them and also take regular attendance to make students work during SUPW.





Integrity is also determined by our actions in the absence of supervision. It is doing the right thing even under extreme temptation and opportunity. In 2012, 64 percent of the respondents asserted that they are generally well behaved even in the absence of supervision. The percentage has reduced to 52 in 2022 whereas the agreed percentage has almost remained the same as that of 2012 with 32 percent and 33 percent in 2022.





Honesty is a core quality that plays a vital role in shaping the character of any person. The students were tested on the level of honesty by stating that they would lie to their parents and teachers to get out of a difficult situation. It is found that 49 percent of students would lie to their parents and teachers to get out of a difficult situation in 2012 and it has increased to 50 percent in 2022. Similarly, 43 percent of respondents in 2012 would not lie under such

circumstances. The percentage has reduced to 33 percent in 2022. The result shows that one in two youths are not very honest and they would lie to fix up their problems. These tendencies can be risk factors for inclination towards corrupt thoughts and actions in the latter part of their lives as one might fix problems illegitimately.



Figure 35 Comparison of the level of sincerity

**Figure 35** shows the youth's mindset in defining success from the means of lying and cheating occasionally to succeed in life. Many are of the view that they must lie or cheat to do well in life. 47 percent agreed to the statement in 2022. However, there is a decrease of seven percent as compared to 54 percent in 2012. On the other hand, the percentage of respondents who disagreed with the statement has slightly increased by 38 percent in 2022 as compared to 37 percent in 2012. 15 percent has remained neutral in 2022 and 9 percent responded "Don't Know" in 2012.

## Figure 36 Comparison of the reporting of unethical acts



As stated in the Constitution (Article 8 (9), every person has a fundamental duty to uphold justice and to act against corruption. Reporting corruption is also an act of fighting corruption. Most acts of corruption go unreported because both the parties would have benefitted at the cost of public harmony and most people who report are only the victims or when they want to settle a past grudge/grievance. This is further accompanied by complacency and a forgiving attitude which act as the greatest weaknesses in fighting corruption. In other words, the attitude of 'it does not matter until it causes harm to me' undermines the effort of fighting corruption (ACC, 2012). Similar is the case with the youth where 51 percent agree that they would not report cheating in exams to their teacher/lecturer/principal in 2012. The percentage has increased to 64 percent in 2022. Similarly, the percentage of respondents who said they will report has decreased from 34 percent in 2012 to 19 percent in 2022. This shows the risk of normalizing unethical practices which will pave way for the greater risk of engaging in corrupt acts.



# Figure 37 Comparison of values and integrity in today's youth

**Figure 37** depicts the perception of teachers and parents towards the youth. The teachers and parents were asked for their opinion on the values and integrity displayed by the present youth as compared to the youth of yesteryears. 91 percent of the teachers agreed that values and integrity in the present youth are degenerating in 2012 and 80 percent in 2022. Similarly, 75 percent of parents believe the same in 2022. This may be attributed to the pressure of keeping up to high expectations, peer pressure, westernization, societal change and the problems they are experiencing. The degeneration of values in youth also depends on their upbringing and the models they look up to. Therefore, the results depict serious issues with the youth as shared by the parents and teachers.
# CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 6.1 CONCLUSION

The Youth Integrity Assessment (YIA) 2022 covers 3558 youth that encompasses youth in schools, colleges, institutes and out-of-school youth or school dropouts, who are employed and unemployed youth. The parents and teachers' perceptions are also assessed to provide a better picture of the current youth. The YIA was conducted to determine the youth's level of integrity, their behavior and values, beliefs and readiness to fight corruption.

The overall youth integrity score is 63.46. The score is at the Good Level. This score will serve as a baseline to see the changes over time. To see the changes in the level of youth's integrity, a similar study at the next level is recommended. In this study, the integrity scores are calculated based on the four indexes such as Index on Integrity Awareness, Index on Values, Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the Country and Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception towards youth. The score is further compared between different parameters of the study. Other than the four indexes, descriptive analyses are also made to substantiate the integrity scores. More importantly, youth's readiness to fight corruption and youth's behavior-based integrity are also assessed by using descriptive statistics.

## 6.1.1. Index on Integrity Awareness

Index on Integrity Awareness has scored 70.72. The score is mostly contributed by youth's awareness of the harmfulness of corruption followed by their understanding of integrity. This shows that youth are aware of the ill effects of corruption, especially for the development of the country where 90 percent of youth believe that corruption is harmful to the development of the country. But youth's definition of integrity is confined to someone who never cheats or lies as 71 percent of youth believe that a person of integrity means someone who never cheats or lies.

## 6.1.2. Index on Values

The score for the Index on Values is 64.00. The score is contributed

" While the school system plays an important role in nurturing our citizens. we cannot rely on this alone. We must not lose sight of the large number of people who are not in schools and educational institutes... We must realize that knowledge and skills, if not renewed, will soon become obsolete. We must inculcate in us a culture of life-long learning.

> (His Majesty the King Jigme Khesar Namgyel Wangchuck, 2021)

by four components such as i) Values in Youth, ii) Social Influence, iii) Responsibility, and iv) Beliefs.

- i. The score for Values in Youth Component is 61.77. The score is further validated when 52 percent of youth said that they behave well even when no one is watching over them. Similarly, 58 percent of youth work during SUPW even if their teacher is not watching over them and 32 percent agreed that they work during SUPW only because their teacher is watching over them with the fear of getting low grades. 50 percent of youth are ready to lie to their parents/teachers to get out of a difficult situation. Similarly, 45 percent of youth are willing to cheat or lie if it is not going to harm others. This indicates that Bhutanese youth are willing to cheat or lie if it is going to benefit them and such behavior will, in the long run, give birth to corrupt behavior and ultimately contribute to becoming a corrupt society.
- ii. The Social Influence Component has scored 64.29. Social influences mostly encompass their parents, teachers and friends who are in school or community. Youth believe that their teachers are serious about work and teachers make a fair assessment. More importantly, schools make judicious use of resources and funds collected through contributions. But 47 percent of youth said that teachers support captain/s even if the captain is wrong. Similarly, a majority of youth believe that there is no transparent management of mess funds by the school mess-in-charge. Further, 19 percent of the youth have seen or heard people involved in corrupt practices and also a majority of the youth have seen government officials using office resources for private gain. This shows that there is a risk of societal influence involved in unethical practices and a lack of role models both from elders and youth themselves.
- iii. The score for the Responsibility component is 58.00. The score is at Fair Level. However, it is encouraging to note that 83 percent of youth are responsible and accountable for their actions and they do not make any excuses or blame others. On the contrary, 64 percent of youth are not in a position to take responsibility for reporting wrongdoings such as cheating in the exam. Similarly, most of the respondents (45%) are not willing to report their teacher to the principal if the teacher does not come to class on time or on a regular basis on the pretext of being busy. Even during SUPW, 45 percent of youth agreed that most of their friends are not taking up their SUPW seriously. This shows that the youth are less concerned about the unethical acts happening around them unless it has direct effects. This also shows the complacency of youth when encountering unethical behavior.
- iv. The score for the Beliefs component is 72.93. Generally, 67 percent of youth believe that people who are ready to lie, cheat, break laws and corrupt have less chances to succeed in life. In the same way, 71 percent believe that an honest person, with personal integrity, has more chances to succeed in life. But would they lie or cheat occasionally to succeed in life? The majority of the youth (47%) are of the view that they have to lie or cheat occasionally to succeed in life. This shows that the youth can differentiate what is good and bad but more so, they are influenced by the environment they live in. This also means that there is minimal presence of integrity role models in their lives.

#### 6.1.3. Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the Country

The score for the Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption in the country is 60.56. The score is mostly contributed by the perception that corruption can be curbed in Bhutan (67.03). Similarly, it is depicted that the youth of today are concerned about corruption and its issues (66.38). In terms of sector-wise perception, youth feel that the level of integrity nowadays in private education (54.81) is lower than that of public education (62.73). The perception of integrity in public health is 65.18 and the lowest score of all survey items is the level of integrity in the business sector (49.05).

#### 6.1.4. Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception towards Youth

The score for the Index on Parents and Teachers' Perception towards Youth scored the least with 55.04. The score of Parents Perception is 58.46. The score is mostly affected by the low score in the comparison of current youth with the youth in the past with 30.48. On the other hand, parents feel that their child/children behave well when they are at home (76.03). The Teacher's perception scored 51.61. Teachers genuinely feel that the youth of today can play a role in integrity-building and fighting corruption as depicted by the score of 84.83. On the other hand, teachers are of the view that the values and integrity are degenerating in the present youth as compared with the youth in the past with a score of 24.44. This score is the lowest of all the survey items of this study. Both parents and teachers feel that the values in current youth have degenerated.

#### 6.1.5. Behaviour Based Integrity

Behavior-based integrity assesses how youth will react when encountering certain situations. Generally, youth display good behavior which conforms to the values and norms. On the other hand, there are few sections of youth who are ready to cheat, lie, bribe or seek favors. Youth are more ready to seek favor or offer a bribe if it is related to obtaining an important document or getting through an exam. Atleast 43 percent of youth who are ready to accept a job/ admission without having to undergo a selection process but through favoritism or support from an influential person. This shows that it has become a normal practice to involve in such activity. Similarly, youth are in a position to compensate for integrity if it is related to their parents, indicating that the parents are being tolerant of unethical behaviors.

#### 6.1.6. Readiness to Fight Corruption

Fighting corruption requires collective responsibility. This study reveals that 90 percent of the youth know that it is their duty as a citizen to report corruption and 75 percent of youth agreed that they can play a role in building integrity or combating corruption. In terms of youth's role in changing the issue of favouritism as normal ways of life, 35 percent agreed that youth can change, but 40 percent disagreed with the statement. This calls for the active involvement of youth agreed that they will pledge to stand against cheating in schools/institutes. In the case of youth's commitment to reporting corruption, 84 percent would report (or have reported) an act of corruption.

## 6.1.7. Comparison of Youth Integrity Scores

This study also gives the comparative youth integrity scores. In terms of youth by sex, female youth have a higher level of integrity with a score of 63.69 compared with male youth (63.23). Further, in terms of integrity awareness and their perception, there are no significant differences, but in terms of value, female youth scored higher which is statistically significant. The level of integrity is higher among youth in monastic Institutes compared with youth in schools, colleges and institutes. The high score is noted in the Index of Values (69.32) which is statistically significant. This could be attributed to the education system were the monastic education has a curriculum associated with values compared to school/college education in Bhutan. When compared among classes, Class VIII, IX and X have higher scores with 65.29, 64.22, and 64.07 respectively. This shows the values in youth diminish as they grow.

The youth in Thimphu Thromde shows a statistically low level of values as compared with the Dzongkhags. The presence of the Integrity Club in school also shows a higher level of integrity (65.55) than in schools without Integrity Club (63.64). Within the same schools where there is Integrity Club, club members show a higher level of integrity (67.03) compared with non-members (62.85). In both comparisons at the school and member levels, the score is statistically significant and shows that the presence of the Integrity Club has helped to create awareness as well as improve values in youth. However, the effectiveness of the Integrity Club in the schools are yet to be ascertained as it is only a recent initiative of the ACC.

Comparing the youth of 2022 with that of 2012, the youth in 2022 are not importantly different from the youth of 2012 in terms of values. However, a welcome trend is that many more students report that they know how to report corruption (54 percent in 2022 vs, only 24 percent in 2012). This indicates that 46 percent still do not know how to report corruption if they encounter it. It is also found that the youth would report corruption if they saw it (77%). This indicates that Bhutanese youth shows much more integrity and bravery in their answers than the youth of other Asian countries.

## 6.2 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations are based on the results of this study, focus group discussion, and literature referred. For each sector concerned, recommendations are outlined and followed by brief descriptions of suggestions for how integrity can be achieved. These recommendations are suggested to promote greater responsibility, transparency and integrity for youth in the country.

#### 6.2.1. To the Government

The future of youth is shaped by government plans, policies and actions. It is in the hands of the government to frame plans and policies that best help the youth and ultimately drive towards the need of the country. The drive and support from the government determines the success of the actions and interventions made by related agencies or organizations. The current youth integrity score is 63.46 which is a Good Level. This provides room for further improvement and scope to ascend to Very Good or Excellent levels. To have a better youth integrity score, support and interventions from the top are pivotal.

#### 6.2.1.1. Develop, fund and invest technical resources to address youth integrity issues

There are many agencies like ministries, anti-corruption agencies, the business sector, media and civil society that come up with several actions, plans and programs for youth development and engagement. All government agencies should be in a position to collaborate and support each other during the development and implementation of plans and programs.

#### 6.2.1.2. Pursue a specific anti-corruption curriculum in the education systems

The ACC in collaboration with various agencies has initiated a discussion and included ethics and integrity in the curriculum of various forms of education. For example, the ethics and integrity module for post-graduate students of RIM, TTI, Institute of Zorig Chusum and TVET institutions. It is of utmost importance to instill values of ethics and integrity in the youth. Their values determine the person they ought to become. Therefore, the Anti-Corruption Act of Bhutan [ACAB] (2011), Chapter three, Section 41 (1, C) also mandates the ACC to "Ensure that training and educational institutions have legal and ethical subjects in their curriculum, teach and educate their trainees or students about social harm and dangers of corruption and actions needed to prevent it, and instill in [their] intolerance for corruption" (Cited in ACC, 2020b).

Furthermore, the TI-Korea (2012) emphasized that learning integrity and anti-corruption concepts should be instituted at all levels of the education system which will further help to strengthen the sense of integrity in youth that will enable them to resist the temptation when confronted with corrupt acts. Similarly, ICAC (2019) stated that the inclusion of an anti-corruption curriculum "... will provide regular incremental information to the young generation making them more resistant to corruption and other malpractices." (p. 51). This study shows that youth are aware of the ill effects of corruption but not so much of the integrity, relevant laws, rules and regulations as shown in **Figure 6**. Making aware of the integrity and its laws will not suffice if it is not put into practice. This study also shows that youth are ready to lie or cheat to get them out of difficult situations. Therefore, this study calls for government support to include an anti-corruption curriculum in schools to educate and instills values that will build a corruption-free society.

## 6.2.1.3. Develop measures to value student's character certificate and SUPW grade

The government should develop measures that would value the character certificate and SUPW grade in different opportunities. In terms of responsibility, youth has scored at Fair Level. It is found that youth are being considerate of unethical behavior within themselves as shown in **Figure 10**. Schools do have programs and activities to promote values in youth but it has not gained the interest of both the youth and concerned agencies. One such activity to learn and practice the value of team spirit, sense of belonging, the dignity of labour, voluntarism and self-discipline is the SUPW. It is found that SUPW is not taken seriously **(See Table 17)**.

Similarly, the current norm does not accord importance to students' character certificate and their SUPW grades. The importance is more driven by their academic performance and other activities. Therefore, their character and SUPW grade has gained the least concern from the youth. It is also noted that students' characters are not reflected in their truest sense and most often, it is graded on a "mercy" ground to get easy admission to other schools as they transfer or graduate. The FGD also found that the student with the same disciplinary issues in one

school tends to carry the same issue to the other school. Therefore, this study recommends the government to value the character certificate and SUPW grade and also professionally grade the character certificate.

#### 6.2.1.4. Institute mechanisms to curb the use of office cars to drop children to schools

As the youth develop values from what they see and are modeled in the society, using office cars to drop and pick up children at schools poses a high risk of developing acceptance and tolerance of such practices in children. While it may be argued that such practices are negligible in terms of economic cost by some, the cost, in the long run, could be very high as the future leaders (school children) could develop acceptance and tolerance of such acts. It is seen from **Table 15** that at least 48 percent of the youth have noticed government officials using office vehicles to drop and pick up their children. While some schools have taken initiatives to discourage parents from dropping and picking up children in government cars (for example Druk School in Thimphu), there is a need to mainstream such measures through collaboration among key agencies such as the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance and the Royal Civil Service Commission.

#### 6.2.2. To Ministry of Education

#### 6.2.2.1. Develop and implement guidelines for a value education class

TI-Korea (2012) stresses the need for youth to learn many concepts and principles about integrity in school premises to arm themselves from unethical approaches. In Bhutan, schools have value education classes but their effectiveness and contents are neither validated nor assessed. Mostly, it is left up to the schools and teachers on how to go about it. More importantly, the MoE should explore ways to teach values and integrity concepts with real-life examples and concrete issues happening in the country. There is also a need for the MoE to come up with the guidelines for value education classes subjected to regular review, evaluation and monitoring. Thus, it would entail a concerted effort between the government and the MoE. The study revealed that **(See Table 19)** the score for the overall youth integrity decreases as the youth ascends from class VIII until they graduate from university or institutes. Even in terms of the Index on Values, the score decreases as the youth ascends to higher classes. This indicates that youth are not receiving crucial education on values in the school education system. Therefore, schools and teachers can be effective partners in the process of development and implementation of value education in schools by providing the necessary materials and training, ultimately empowering youth in the fight against corruption.

## 6.2.2.2. Develop and enforce strict disciplinary policy and code of conduct

The Ministry of Education has developed a Guideline for School Disciplinary Policy, reflected in Annexure 2 of the 30<sup>th</sup> Education Policy Guidelines and Instructions (EPGI 2012, p.17). Accordingly, many schools have developed their own disciplinary policy. In the consecutive review of EPGI, there is no reflection of Disciplinary Policy or code of conduct (32<sup>nd</sup>, 33<sup>rd</sup> & 34<sup>th</sup> EPGI of 2018, 2019 & 2020 respectively). It is important for the ministry to develop a model code of conduct for both teachers and students and also provide a guideline for school discipline policy. This will provide an opportunity for schools to have a uniform implementation of discipline policy as well as a code of conduct.

## 6.2.2.3. Boost up Integrity Club (IC) or Integrity programs

The ACC has initiated Integrity Club (IC) in schools in three different phases. As of April 2022, there are 20 schools with IC. This study has included most schools having IC and a comparative study is made with the school where IC is not initiated. The results depict a better level of integrity compared to schools where there is no IC initiated **(See Figure 30).** Similarly, at the member level, IC members have a better level of integrity awareness as well as values compared to the non-IC members in the same school where there is IC **(See Figure 31).** Therefore, this study recommends MoE to:

- Initiate Integrity Club or integrity programs in other schools, starting from the schools under Thimphu Thromde. As reflected in **Table 21**, the youth in Thimphu Thromde has a statistically low value as compared to other regions of the country;
- Organize regular training for IC coordinators and develop a manual for the coordinators similar to that of Education for Justice (E4J) and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in collaboration with the ACC;
- Assess its impact and effectiveness for both members/coordinators and the school; and
- Support/initiate activities and programs for IC in schools.

Since the Integrity Club is meant for only the club members, it is further recommended to include as a program where whole students will have equal level of participation in the programs rather than confining to only certain members.

## 6.2.2.4. Implement Youth Integrity Program (YIP)

The ACC has developed YIP in 2020 intending to eliminate corruption in the country and realize the national vision of the country that adheres to the highest standards of integrity and discipline. The program is planned to reach from ECCD to tertiary education complemented by out-of-school programs directed to both employed and unemployed youth. The YIP is intended to strengthen the national education system by imparting Integrity Education and empowering youth with greater space to contribute to improved governance. Therefore, this study recommends the MoE in collaboration with the ACC to fully implement the YIP as planned in Annexures 1 and 2 of the YIP document (ACC, 2020b).

## 6.2.3. To the schools, colleges, and institutes

## 6.2.3.1. Implement ethics and integrity as a subject at all levels of education

Colleges and universities should require all students to take integrity education (and anticorruption) subjects regardless of their major courses. Include ethics education programs and projects within the curriculum at all levels of educational establishments from primary school to university. Develop a syllabus for teaching integrity and anti-corruption that is interactive and participatory and that utilizes new communication technologies. The design of new syllabi should be undertaken in full collaboration with youth representatives.

## 6.2.3.2. Reward individuals as models of integrity in schools, colleges, or institutes

TI-Korea (2012) stated "...rewarding youth and younger groups, especially children, is that positive ethical imprinting is more effective and lasting in young minds. In addition, young

children easily emulate what their peers and friends are doing" (p.27). Rewarding individuals with integrity should not be limited to adults but should be extended to youth who may have done exemplary deeds. The recipient must be introduced in the mass and encourage other youth to do the same. For example, the Royal Bhutan Police sharing post on their page applauding those who returned the lost items/cash. Similarly, sharing of posts related to students who returned cash to the owner was covered by a news channel. Such honest and brave acts should be promoted and publicized through various means like social media so that other youth can see and emulate them. To extend the rewards further, the schools and institutions could organize activities or programs that promote integrity such as competitions for writing essays, composing songs or poems, creating visual art, and presenting dramas.

## 6.2.3.3. Management of gift culture in schools, colleges and institutes

Giving and receiving a gift is common practice in Bhutanese culture. Over the years, such culture may become a norm that has a detrimental impact on performing one's duty. Therefore, the ACC enacted Gift Rule 2017 which most agencies have implemented. For fair assessment and smooth conduct of school activities and programs, schools should implement gift rules. TI-Korea (2012) stated that giving presents during special events by students or parents to teachers must be discouraged as this becomes a channel for bribery and unethical behavior by both parties. Both parties can refuse all forms of gift offering or acceptance. The schools, universities, or Institutions can implement gift rules to effectively manage and promote integrity. It is encouraging to note that there is 58 percent of youth who stated that their teachers are not partial but there are also at least 24 percent who said their teachers are partial as reflected in **Table 13**. One of the factors attributed could be due to the culture of gift-giving in schools. Therefore, this study recommends schools to discourage the culture of gift-giving between teachers, students and also parents.

## 6.2.3.4. Impart values through various programs

## • Religious discourse (Choeshed Layrim)

ACC, (2012) found out that the school programs such as 'Choeshed Leyrim' are instituted to refine the thinking of youth and cultivate good thoughts which would ultimately guide their decision and be better human beings. Similarly, Youth Integrity Program (YIP) also encourages the Royal Education Council (REC) and Institute of Science of Mind (ISM) to conduct joint research to strengthen Value Education and expand student engagement in Dharma activities or the Choeshed Layrim (ACC, 2020b). This study also found that monastic education has a higher integrity score (See Table 20) compared to any other schools, colleges, or institutes. Similarly, the values in monastic institutions have also scored higher than other schools, colleges, or institutes and expand student engagement, the schools, colleges, and institutes are encouraged to organize and conduct Choeshed Layrim on a timely basis.

#### Guest Speakers

To take a break from the routine classroom learning, it is recommended to have a session on values either in the class or as a whole school/college/institutes approach to infuse values into the youth. The speaker can be within or outside the schools, colleges, or institutes. The speaker can be profound personnel or from renowned institutions so that the youth can look up to them as a model.

#### • Mechanism to record student conduct

The school/college/institutes have a mandate to rate students' character and their SUPW grades. This rating should be done in the truest sense rather than doing it by a lone teacher or principal. The parameter and basis of ratings should be clearly defined. The core objectives of the rating should be the infusion of values and the management of students' character/behavior. This can be done even beyond the classroom like in the playfield, gardening, homework, volunteering and SUPW. There should be a mechanism to record students' conduct whether it is in the classroom or in any field to give a better picture of students' character.

## 6.2.3.5. Encourage and provide avenues for reporting unethical acts in schools, colleges and institutes

This study has shown that most schools lack a proper channel for reporting corruption or any acts of integrity violations. In the case of reporting unethical acts, youth are reluctant to report and if there are no timely interventions, such acts would escalate into bigger crimes in the future. The youth has scored low in Responsibility Component, specifically in reporting wrongdoings as shown in **Figure 10.** Furthermore, 75 percent of the youth believe that they can play a role in building integrity/fight against corruption (**See Figure 26**). Similarly, 90 percent of the youth agreed that they must report acts of corruption as reflected in **Figure 25**. Therefore, this study strongly recommends schools/colleges/institutes in collaboration with the ACC should provide students with effective and secure whistleblowing systems where they can report on corruption and unethical behavior. This should encourage and ensure young people to report any acts of corruption or unethical behavior. Further, the schools/colleges/ institutes should ensure proper protection and anonymity to the whistleblower.

## 6.2.4. Parents and Teachers

## 6.2.4.1. Civic duties and responsibilities of parents

ICAC (2013) believed that the key role of parents could be accentuated as transmitters of societal values to children. Parents are the first teachers and models for their children. TI-Korea (2012) stated that young minds are very susceptible to absorbing and even understanding new ideas and values. Therefore, whatever parents display and do will have an immense contribution to a child's growth. It is also considered that schools and homes are fertile ground to sow the seeds of integrity for growing children and students. Parents have a greater role to play in the sensitive years of children's growth. This requires parents to develop themselves and learn to show ethical values in their daily affairs. Parents must prepare their children at home to relate to the world and their immediate environment outside the home.

#### 6.2.4.2. Develop a framework to strengthen a teacher-parent relationship

Instilling values in children is not only the sole responsibility of teachers but teachers have a crucial role in the development of children to be better human beings. The school is responsible for providing education and instilling values and discipline among youth for positive change. Nonetheless, if parents are lenient and tolerant of the unethical behaviors of their children, teachers alone cannot bring change. Therefore, teachers and parents should work collaboratively and support one another in disciplining and instilling values in children. As said by Ziang Zemin, "It takes two hands to clap" (Cited in Brainy Quote, 2022), one cannot shape the lives of children without the support of another. Moreover, the magnitude of teachers' role in instilling values and bringing positive change in children is dependent on parents' support and cooperation. More often, teachers noted that parents are more protective of their children's unethical behavior.

#### 6.2.5. To the Anti-Corruption Commission

## 6.2.5.1. Initiate programs that honor people with integrity to create role models so that youth may emulate them

This study shows that there is a lack of adequate role models for youth. In the view of the social influence, there are cases where teachers support a captain even if he or she is wrong, youth coming into conflict with rules with influence from their friends, friends bullying the innocents, improper management of school mess fund **(See Figure 9)**, youth being exposed to incidences of corruption, and government officials misusing government properties for personal gains show that there is lack of role modeling from the society at large **(See Tables 13, 14 & 15).** 

Having programs to honor people with integrity will help youth in particular and society at large to emulate and encourage them to act in standards of ethics and integrity. TISL, (2013) presents an annual Integrity Award that highlights a person of true integrity from the business, government, and entertainment sectors. More importantly, they also have a program of one-on-one mentoring from TISL staff to empower youth with knowledge and guidance on anti-corruption. The same has been recommended by ICAC, (2019) to the Republic of Mauritius. These are some of the best practices around the world that sought to sensitize the youth to fight against corruption and remain role models for the rest. To make it more symbolic and prestigious, the recognition can be made by, for example, the Prime Minister's Office or the Office of the Anti-Corruption Day or the Foundation Day of ACC. Such recognition will also help to identify anti-corruption ambassadors at the national level and promote integrity.

In a similar line, the Education Division, ACC has drafted a proposal for Anti-Corruption Champion Award with the objective to honor individuals who have demonstrated exceptional courage and outstanding leadership/support in fighting corruption through the practice of ethics and integrity; to encourage positive behavioral change that would promote personal and professional accountability, transparency and integrity so as to deter corruption; and encourage awareness and practice of integrity in the public institutions and workplaces. The proposal also encompasses the guideline for nomination, eligibility, selection and award specificity. Therefore, this study recommends the ACC vitalize such awards at the national level and also support other agencies and institutions including schools and colleges to come up with a similar initiative.

#### 6.2.5.2. Initiate more awareness program

The ACC has covered rounds of awareness programs for the general public and still, a number of thematic sessions are carried out for different groups of public officials. Similarly, a series of awareness programs are carried out in different schools. Since there is no separate subject on corruption and anti-corruption in the school education system, the ACC should rigorously conduct educational activities targeting youth. This study recommends the ACC to:

- Conduct more face-to-face interactions with the students and teachers with the distribution of relevant materials;
- The awareness program should also include monastic education as their level of awareness on integrity and corruption is low as compared to schools, colleges and other institutes (See Table 20);
- Broadcast TV and radio programs or rebroadcast existing anti-corruption clips/videos at regular intervals;
- Provide more opportunities for youth to participate on a regular basis in edutainment activities such as wall paintings, on-spot drawing, role plays, sketches and artistic expressions, competitions such as video clips/ short films, or even documentaries.

## 6.2.5.3. Optimize the use of social media to promote values of integrity

With the advancement of technology and the school education system going "text-bookless", most schools are opting for digital platforms as their medium of information sharing. Further, the COVID pandemic has induced the education system to go online where most of the students were handed smartphones with accessible internet facilities. This provides the right platform for the ACC to optimize the use of social media platforms to promote values of integrity. TISL, (2013) also target media platforms such as smartphones and radio to reach youth with strong messages on integrity. TI-Korea, (2012) also shared that "...the use of social media among youth in the fight against corruption might not always reap the outcomes expected unless it is done in an aggressive and structured manner for example, via boosted/ sponsored posts on the Facebook page." As Bhutanese youth are fond of using social media such as Facebook, Telegram, Instagram, Wechat, Tiktok and Watsapp, the ACC and related agencies should come up with readily available resources, programs, activities, and plans on such platforms. This will help to deepen the understanding of integrity and imbibe values not only to youth but also the adults.

## 6.2.6. To the Media

## 6.2.6.1. Utilize the media to promote integrity and transparency

Media plays an important role in sharing information and capturing a vast number of audiences. In the digital era of computer and smartphone users, it further eases to widen the coverage. It is of a plethora of importance that the media fraternity come up with content encompassing values and messages related to integrity and corruption. Sharing of anti-corruption messages should not be left alone to the ACC. Media can act as a medium of social transformation. The coverage of news and stories related to corruption and anti-corruption on TV, reports, news and other programs will greatly help the youth to enhance their level of awareness of the corruption issues and anti-corruption measures.

#### 6.2.7. Others

The other agencies associated with the youth-related programs and activities should also stress the importance of ethics and integrity in all the programs or activities organized. The Ministry of Labour and Human Resources (MoLHR) has already included ethics and integrity in the TVET institutes' curriculum. The MoLHR should further explore and include ethics and integrity in the Skill Development Plans specifically targeting the out-of-school youth such as unemployed youth. For the employed youth, the Royal Civil Service Commission (RCSC) and other corporate and private agencies should thoroughly induct them on the importance of ethics and integrity. Similarly, the Royal University of Bhutan (RUB) should also develop and implement the ethics and integrity subject in their constituent colleges. Other than the schools, colleges and institutes, the youth are spread across all sectors. Therefore, all agencies must come together to instill values in youth and let the young people of Bhutan know that "Corruption is high risk with low benefits."

## REFERENCES

- Anti-Corruption Commission. (2012). *Report on "Integrity and value education in schools"* 2012. ACC, Thimphu: Bhutan
- Anti-Corruption Commission. (2020a). *National Integrity Assessment 2019.* ACC. Thimphu: Bhutan
- Anti-Corruption Commission. (2020b). Youth Integrity Program. ACC. Thimphu: Bhutan
- Brainy Quote, (2022). *Jiang Zemin quotes*. Retrieved from https://www.brainyquote.com authors/jiang-zemin-quotes
- Dolkar, D. (2022, April 11). Bhutan on path to graduate from LDC. *Kuensel.* p.1-2.
- Exchange Family Center, (2021). It Takes a Village to Raise a Child: How communities can help raise kids. Retrieved from https://www.exchangefamilycenter.org/exchange-family-center-blog/2021/2/4/it-take-a-village-to-raise-a-child-how-communities-can-help-raise-kids
- Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., Neve, J. E. D., Aknin, L. B., and Wang, S. (2021). *World Happiness Report 2021*. New York: Sustainable Development Solutions Network.
- Independent Commission Against Corruption [ICAC]. (2019). *Barriers to youth engagement in the fight against corruption in Mauritius.* Author
- Jennett, V, and Thayenthal, A. (2014). *Asia Pacific youth: Integrity in Crisis*. Transparency International (TI).
- Kulkarni, A. (2016). Adolescents and youths in south Asia: A force to reckon with. Youths matters. *The Druk Journal*, 2(2), 5-10
- Laerd Statistics, (2020). *Independent t-test using Stata*. Retrieved on 21 April 2022 from https:// statistics.laerd.com/stata-tutorials/independent-t-test-using-stata.php
- Ministry of Education., (2011). National Youth Policy. MoE, Thimphu; Bhutan
- Ministry of Education., (2012). 30<sup>th</sup> Education policy guideline and instructions EPGI 2012.MoE, Thimphu; Bhutan
- Ministry of Education., (2019). 33<sup>th</sup> Education policy guideline and instructions 2019. MoE, Thimphu; Bhutan

Ministry of Education., (2020). Annual Education Statistics 2020. MoE, Thimphu; Bhutan

- National Statistics Bureau. (2018). 2017 Population & housing census of Bhutan. Thimphu: Bhutan
- National Statistics Bureau. (2021). 2021 Labour Force Survey Report: Bhutan. Thimphu: Bhutan
- Rabgyal, D. (2018). Youth civic engagement. Sherubtse College, Trashigang: Bhutan
- Transparency International [TI]. (2021). *Corruption Perception Index*. Retrieved from https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2020/index/nzl
- Transparency International-Korea [TI-Korea]. (2012). *Integrity and corruption in South Korea: What do young people think?* TI-Korea: South Korea
- Transparency International Sri Lanka [TISL]. (2013). *Integrity and corruption in Sri Lanka: What do young people think?* TISL: Sri Lanka
- Towards Transparency [TT]. (2019). 2019 Vietnam Youth Integrity Survey (YIS 2019). Hong Duc Publishing House: Vietnam
- UN4Youth. (2013). *Definition of youth.* Retrieved on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2021 from https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/youth/fact-sheets/youth-definition.pdf
- United Nations. (2020). World youth report: Youth Social Entrepreneurship and the 2030 Agenda. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/development/desa/youth/wpcontent uploads/sites /21/2020/07/2020-World-Youth-Report-FULL-FINAL.pdf
- Ura, K. (2009). A proposal for GNH value education in schools. GNHC, Thimphu: Bhutan
- Zack, (2020). *Effect Size: What It Is and Why It Matters*. Retrieved on 21 April 2022 from https://www.statology.org/effect-size/

## ANNEXURES

## Annexure 1 List of schools/institutes in different Dzongkhag

Dzongkhag/ Thromde	Selected School	College	Monastic Institute	Institute	Total Re- spondents*	
Bumthang	Jakar HSS Chume MSS Sonamkuenphen		Kharchu Shedra	VTI Chume	126	
	HSS					
Chukha	Chukha HSS	Gedu College of Business Studies	Chhukha Rabdey		192	
	Darla MSS					
	Tshangkha MSS		Daga Trashi Yangtse Rabdey			
Dagana	Gesarling HSS		Dagapela Tashichol- ing Dratshang		252	
U	Daga HSS					
	Dagapela MSS					
	Tashiding LSS					
Gasa	Bjishong MSS		Gasa Rabdey		40	
Наа	Gongzim Ugyen Dorji HSS		Haa Rabdey		117	
	Tshaphel LSS					
Lhuontso	Lhuentse HSS				101	
Lindentse	Autsho MSS				101	
	Yadi CS	GCST, Gyel- poshing	Mongar Rabdey			
	Mongar HSS		Kidhekhar Buddhist Institute			
Mongar	Gyelposhing MSS		Losel Yangchenling Nunnery		302	
	Kidheykhar MSS					
	Drametse HSS					
	Khangkhu MSS	Norbuling Rigter Col- lege	Tenchencholing Nunnery		2.1	
Paro	Shari HSS		Ugyen Padma Yoe- serling Zangdopelri		241	
	Rigzom Academy					

Dzongkhag/ Thromde	Selected School	College	Monastic Institute	Institute	Total Re- spondents*	
	Nangkor CS		Pemagatshel Rabdey			
Pemagatshel	Pemagatshel MSS				86	
Phuntsholing Thromde	Chumigthang MSS					
(Phaduna,	Sonamgang MSS					
Punakha)	Phuntsholing HSS				264	
Dupakha	Dashiding HSS	CNR, Lobesa	Chorten Nyingpo Goenzin dratshang	Khuruthang VTI	204	
Pullakila	Punakha CS					
	Kabesa MSS					
	Genekha LSS		Shechen Orgyen Chodzong Nunnery			
	Wangbama CS					
Thimphu	Kuzhuchen MSS					
Dzongkhag	Yangchen Gat- shel MSS					
	Khasadrapchu MSS					
	Desi HSS	JSWS		Thimphu TTI		
	Yangchenphu HSS					
	Babesa HSS			Zorigchusum Institute	959	
	Dechencholing HSS	RTC	Dechenphodrang Monastery			
Thimphu Thromde	Druk School		Lhadzong Sherab- choling nunnery			
	Kelki HSS					
	Loseling MSS					
	Lungtenzampa MSS					
	Changzamtok MSS					
		Sherubtse College	Kanglung Thubten Chhokhorling Shedra	Rangjung VTI		
Trashigang	Rangjung HSS		Trashigang Rabdhey		233	
	Jampeling HSS		Thekcho Kuenzang Choden Nunnery			
Trashiyang-	Tsenkharla CS		Yangtse Rabdey	Zorigchusum Institute	115	
tse	Bayling HSS					

Dzongkhag/ Thromde	Selected School	College	Monastic Institute	Institute	Total Re- spondents*
Tropper	Tshangkha HSS	CLCS, Taktse	Samdrup Choling Dratshang		120
Irongsa	Taktse HSS	Faktse HSS			128
	Tsirangtoe CS		Tsirang Namgaychol- ing Rabdey		
	Damphu HSS				202
Isirang	Mendrelgang MSS				208
	Damphu MSS				
Wangdue	Phobjikha CS		Gangteng Sanga Choling Dratshang		87
Phodrang	Bajo HSS				
	Zhemgang CS		Zhemgang Dechen Yangtse Drasthang		107
Zhemgang	Zhemgang LSS				107
	Buli MSS				

**Note**. \*The "Total respondent" represents the number of respondents covered from that particular District/Thromde and does not necessarily mean from the school/institutes listed. Source (n=3588, YIA 2022)

#### Annexure 2 Two-sample t-test for Index on Integrity Awareness by sex

Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Male Female	1,778 1,780	70.7874 70.64817	.3088526 .3171803	13.02318 13.38185	70.18165 70.02609	71.39315 71.27026
combined	3,558	70.71775	.2213309	13.20216	70.2838	71.1517
diff		.1392274	.442718		7287794	1.007234
diff = Ho: diff =	= mean(Male) = O	- mean(Fer	nale)	degrees	t : of freedom :	= 0.3145 = 3556
Ha: d Pr(T < t	iff < 0 ) = 0.6234	Pr(	Ha: diff !=  T  >  t ) = (	0 D.7532	Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.3766

Two-sample	e t test wi	th equal var	iances			
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Male Female	1,778 1,780	63.4787 64.52402	.2532528 .2427718	10.67874 10.24256	62.98199 64.04787	63.9754 65.00016
combined	3,558	64.00165	.1756004	10.47438	63.65736	64.34594
diff		-1.045319	.3508125		-1.733133	357505
diff = mean(Male) - mean(Female) t = -2 Ho: diff = 0 degrees of freedom =					= -2.9797 = 3556	
Ha: d: Pr(T < t)	iff < 0 ) = 0.0015	Pr(	Ha: diff != T  >  t ) =	0 0.0029	Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.9985

#### Annexure 3 Two-sample t-test for Index on Values and its effect size by sex

	on	mean comparis	Effect size based on
	per group:	Obs	
1,778	Male =		
1,780	Female =		
Interval]	[95% Conf.	Estimate	Effect Size
0341435	1656587	0999081	Cohen's d

## Annexure 4 Two-sample t-test for Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption by sex

Two-sample	e t test wit	h equal var	riances			
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Male Female	1,778 1,780	60.75576 60.35639	.3025525 .3060422	12.75753 12.91194	60.16237 59.75615	61.34916 60.95663
combined	3,558	60.55597	.2151715	12.83476	60.13409	60.97784
diff		.3993745	.4303515		4443861	1.243135
diff = Ho: diff =	= mean(Male) = O	- mean(Fem	nale)	degrees	t of freedom	= 0.9280 = 3556
Ha: d: Pr(T < t)	iff < 0 = 0.8233	Pr(	Ha: diff != T  >  t ) = (	0 ).3535	Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.1767

. oneway B1_i	index educatio	n, tabulate			
grade attending or attended	Summ Mean	ary of B1_ir Std. Dev.	ndex Freq.		
Class 7 Class 8	58.628472 64.793165	13.214042	72 139		
Class 9	67.140067	12.902883	448		
Class 12	71.023965	12.478419	459		
Total	69.98506	12.910034	2,259		
0	An	alysis of Va	ariance	_	
Source	55	dī	MS	£'	Prob > F
Between group Within group	os 28183 os 348155	.387 5 .171 2253	5636.6774 154.529592	36.48	0.0000
Total	376338	.558 2258	166.668981		
Bartlett's te	est for equal	variances:	chi2(5) = 12	.2027 Prob	o>chi2 = 0.032

#### Annexure 5 Class wise one way ANOVA test for Index on Integrity Awareness

## Annexure 6 Class wise comparisons of means for Index on integrity awareness

						<u> </u>
			Tul	key	Tuk	ey
B1_index	Contrast	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
education						
Class 8 vs Class 7	6.164693	1.804984	3.42	0.008	1.016581	11.31281
Class 9 vs Class 7	8.511595	1.578346	5.39	0.000	4.009892	13.0133
Class 10 vs Class 7	10.95026	1.559112	7.02	0.000	6.503414	15.3971
Class 11 vs Class 7	12.39549	1.575725	7.87	0.000	7.901265	16.88972
Class 12 vs Class 7	15.63365	1.550695	10.08	0.000	11.21081	20.05649
Class 9 vs Class 8	2.346901	1.20692	1.94	0.375	-1.095433	5.789236
Class 10 vs Class 8	4.785564	1.181655	4.05	0.001	1.415289	8.155838
Class 11 vs Class 8	6.2308	1.203491	5.18	0.000	2.798247	9.663353
Class 12 vs Class 8	9.468958	1.170527	8.09	0.000	6.130421	12.8075
Class 10 vs Class 9	2.438662	.7934211	3.07	0.026	.1756948	4.70163
Class 11 vs Class 9	3.883898	.8255894	4.70	0.000	1.529181	6.238615
Class 12 vs Class 9	7.122057	.7767514	9.17	0.000	4.906634	9.33748
Class 11 vs Class 10	1.445236	.7881946	1.83	0.444	8028248	3.693296
Class 12 vs Class 10	4.683394	.7368823	6.36	0.000	2.581685	6.785104
Class 12 vs Class 11	3.238159	.771412	4.20	0.000	1.037965	5.438353

grade attending	Summary	of VI i	ndex	overall		
or attended	Mean	Std.	Dev.	Freq.		
Class 7	62.673611	9.457	0367	72		
Class 8	67.038669	10.54	7231	139		
Class 9	65 317522	9 892	8849	448		
	61 782689	0 683	27001	5/3		
Class IU	04.702009	9.000	07994	J43 450		
Class II	63.720588	9.788	3626	459		
Class 12	64.029682	10.13	6224	598		
Total	64.545208	9.946	2801	2,259		
	A	nalysis	of Va	ariance		
Source	S	S	df	MS	F	Prob > F
Between group	bs 1885.	30781	5	377.061561	3.84	0.0018
Within group	os 22149	5.216	2253	98.3112365		
Total	22338	0.524	2258	98.928487		
Bartlett's te	est for equal	varianc	es:	chi2(5) = 2	2.7406 Pro	ob>chi2 = 0.740

## Annexure 7 Class wise one way ANOVA test for Index on Values

## Annexure 8 Class wise comparisons of means for Index on Values

			Tul	key	Tuk	ey
VI_index_overall	Contrast	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
education						
Class 8 vs Class 7	4.365058	1.439691	3.03	0.030	.2588235	8.471292
Class 9 vs Class 7	2.643911	1.25892	2.10	0.287	9467347	6.234557
Class 10 vs Class 7	2.109078	1.243578	1.70	0.535	-1.437811	5.655966
Class 11 vs Class 7	1.046977	1.256829	0.83	0.961	-2.537707	4.631661
Class 12 vs Class 7	1.356071	1.236865	1.10	0.883	-2.17167	4.883812
Class 9 vs Class 8	-1.721147	.9626629	-1.79	0.474	-4.46682	1.024526
Class 10 vs Class 8	-2.25598	.9425111	-2.39	0.159	-4.944177	.4322164
Class 11 vs Class 8	-3.318081	.9599275	-3.46	0.007	-6.055952	5802096
Class 12 vs Class 8	-3.008987	.9336354	-3.22	0.016	-5.671869	3461048
Class 10 vs Class 9	5348336	.6328481	-0.85	0.959	-2.339821	1.270153
Class 11 vs Class 9	-1.596934	.6585062	-2.43	0.148	-3.475102	.281234
Class 12 vs Class 9	-1.28784	.6195521	-2.08	0.299	-3.054905	.4792245
Class 11 vs Class 10	-1.062101	.6286793	-1.69	0.539	-2.855197	.7309964
Class 12 vs Class 10	7530065	.5877517	-1.28	0.795	-2.429371	.9233581
Class 12 vs Class 11	.309094	.6152932	0.50	0.996	-1.445824	2.064012

Annexure 9 Class wise one way	ANOVA test	for Index on	Youth I	Perception	of Corru	otion
				0.0000.0		

	1	Analysis	of Va	ariance			
Source	5	SS	df	MS	F	Prob > F	
Between group Within group	os 14586 os 31288	14586.9124 312887.365		2917.38248 138.875883	21.01	0.0000	-
Total	3274	4.277	2258	145.028466			-
Bartlett's te	est for equal	. varian	ces:	chi2(5) = 1	.9.9839 Pro	ob>chi2 = 0.	001
. oneway YPC	_index_overa	all educ	ation,	tabulate			
grade	Cummo mu	of VDCT	indo				
or attended	Summary Mear	n Std.	Dev.	Freq.			
Class 7	66.935764	l 11.1	52334	72			
Class 8	67.742800	5 10.2	49246	139			
Class 9	64.669364	11.1	84701	448			
Class 10	63.058242	. 11.1	53614	543			
Class 11	60.595044	12.7	51193	459			
Class 12	59.477425	5 12.3	96819	598			
Total	62.341193	. 12.0	42777	2,259			

## Annexure 10 Class wise comparisons of means for Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption

			Tukey		Tuk	cey
YPCI_index_overall	Contrast	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
education						
Class 8 vs Class 7	.8070419	1.711122	0.47	0.997	-4.07336	5.687444
Class 9 vs Class 7	-2.2664	1.49627	-1.51	0.655	-6.534007	2.001207
Class 10 vs Class 7	-3.877523	1.478035	-2.62	0.092	-8.093123	.3380774
Class 11 vs Class 7	-6.34072	1.493785	-4.24	0.000	-10.60124	-2.0802
Class 12 vs Class 7	-7.458339	1.470056	-5.07	0.000	-11.65118	-3.265496
Class 9 vs Class 8	-3.073442	1.144158	-2.69	0.078	-6.336769	.1898855
Class 10 vs Class 8	-4.684565	1.120207	-4.18	0.000	-7.879579	-1.48955
Class 11 vs Class 8	-7.147762	1.140907	-6.26	0.000	-10.40182	-3.893707
Class 12 vs Class 8	-8.265381	1.109658	-7.45	0.000	-11.43031	-5.100454
Class 10 vs Class 9	-1.611123	.7521619	-2.14	0.266	-3.756412	.5341669
Class 11 vs Class 9	-4.07432	.7826574	-5.21	0.000	-6.306588	-1.842052
Class 12 vs Class 9	-5.191939	.7363591	-7.05	0.000	-7.292156	-3.091722
Class 11 vs Class 10	-2.463198	.7472072	-3.30	0.013	-4.594355	3320399
Class 12 vs Class 10	-3.580817	.6985632	-5.13	0.000	-5.573234	-1.588399
Class 12 vs Class 11	-1.117619	.7312973	-1.53	0.646	-3.203399	.9681615

edu_emp_typ	Summa	ary of B1_in	Idex		
е е	Mean	sta. Dev.	rreq.		
Schools	69.98506	12.910034	2,259		
Monasteri	64.470109	14.958921	276		
Colleges	76.182692	11.091585	390		
Institute	69.858491	13.983193	159		
Employed	73.069728	12.580419	147		
Unemploye	73.89526	12.675453	327		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u></u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Total	70.717749	13.202164	3,558		
	Ana	alysis of Va	riance		
Source	SS	df	MS	F	Prob > F
Delassa	07065			22.42	0.000
Between group	ps 27865.3	529 5	55/3.1105/	33.43	0.0000
Within group	ps 592109	.309 3552	166.697441		
	610074	0.00 2557	174 207122		
TOTAL	619974	.862 3557	1/4.29/122		
Bartlett's te	est for equal v	variances:	chi2(5) = 31	.9314 Prob	b>chi2 = 0.000

Annexure 11 Youth type - One way ANOVA test for Index on Integrity Awareness

## Annexure 12 Youth type comparisons of means for Index on Integrity awareness

			Tukey		Tul	key
B1_index	Contrast	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf	. Interval]
edu emp tupe						
edu_emp_cype			c = 0			
Monasteries vs Schools	-5.514951	.8232672	-6.70	0.000	-7.862304	-3.167598
Colleges vs Schools	6.197633	.7079703	8.75	0.000	4.179022	8.216243
Institutes vs Schools	1265692	1.059341	-0.12	1.000	-3.147032	2.893894
Employed vs Schools	3.084668	1.098994	2.81	0.057	0488563	6.218193
Unemployed vs Schools	3.9102	.763918	5.12	0.000	1.732068	6.088333
Colleges vs Monasteries	11.71258	1.015581	11.53	0.000	8.816892	14.60828
Institutes vs Monasteries	5.388382	1.285452	4.19	0.000	1.723216	9.053547
Employed vs Monasteries	8.599619	1.318322	6.52	0.000	4.840734	12.3585
Unemployed vs Monasteries	9.425151	1.055346	8.93	0.000	6.416081	12.43422
Institutes vs Colleges	-6.324202	1.214842	-5.21	0.000	-9.788038	-2.860365
Employed vs Colleges	-3.112964	1.24957	-2.49	0.127	-6.67582	.4498912
Unemployed vs Colleges	-2.287432	.9680947	-2.36	0.170	-5.047727	.4728623
Employed vs Institutes	3.211237	1.477297	2.17	0.250	-1.000929	7.423404
Unemployed vs Institutes	4.036769	1.248275	3.23	0.016	.4776075	7.595931
Unemployed vs Employed	.825532	1.282098	0.64	0.988	-2.830068	4.481132

edu_emp_typ	Summary of	of VI_	overall			
e	Mean	Std. Dev.		Freq.		
Schools	64.545208	9.92	162801	2.259		
Monasteri	69.324275	10.5	527401	276		
Colleges	61.698718	10.7	79128	390		
Institute	62.459906	9.6	540331	159		
Employed	60.846088	10.9	37518	147		
Unemploye	60.66896	11.4	186736	327		
Total	64.001651	10.4	174381	3,558		
	Ana	Analysis of Varia		riance		
Source	SS	SS df		MS	F	Prob > F
Between group	s 16028.0	5034	5	3205.72067	30.43	0.0000
Within group	s 374219	9.34	3552	105.354544		
Total	390247	.943	3557	109.712663		

## Annexure 13 Youth type - One way ANOVA test for Index on Values

## Annexure 14 Youth type comparisons of means for Index on Values

VI_index_overall         Tukey         Tukey         Tukey           edu_emp_type         Contrast         Std. Err.         t         P> t          [95% Conf. Interv           Monasteries vs Schools         4.779067         .6544899         7.30         0.000         2.912943         6.6455           Colleges vs Schools         -2.84649         .5628299         -5.06         0.000         -4.451267         -1.241           Institutes vs Schools         -2.085302         .8421668         -2.48         0.131         -4.486543         .3159           Employed vs Schools         -3.69912         .8736906         -4.23         0.000         -6.190243         -1.207           Unemployed vs Schools         -3.876248         .6073079         -6.38         0.000         -9.927606         -5.323           Institutes vs Monasteries         -6.86437         1.021923         -6.72         0.000         -9.778143         -3.950           Unemployed vs Monasteries         -8.478187         1.048054         -8.09         0.000         -11.046647         -5.489           Unemployed vs Monasteries         -8.655315         .8389902         -10.32         0.000         -11.0475         -6.2633           Institutes vs Colleges         .7611877	
VI_index_overall         Contrast         Std. Err.         t         P> t          [95% Conf. Interv           edu_emp_type	
edu_emp_type         Monasteries vs Schools       4.779067       .6544899       7.30       0.000       2.912943       6.645         Colleges vs Schools       -2.84649       .5628299       -5.06       0.000       -4.451267       -1.241         Institutes vs Schools       -2.085302       .8421668       -2.48       0.131       -4.486543       .3159         Employed vs Schools       -3.69912       .8736906       -4.23       0.000       -6.190243       -1.207         Unemployed vs Schools       -3.876248       .6073079       -6.38       0.000       -5.607843       -2.144         Colleges vs Monasteries       -7.625557       .807378       -9.44       0.000       -9.927606       -5.323         Institutes vs Monasteries       -6.86437       1.021923       -6.72       0.000       -11.46647       -5.489         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.478187       1.048054       -8.09       0.000       -11.46647       -5.489         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.655315       .8389902       -10.32       0.000       -11.0475       -6.263         Institutes vs Colleges       .7611877       .9657883       0.790       -1992531       3.514 <td>val]</td>	val]
Monasteries         4.779067         .6544899         7.30         0.000         2.912943         6.645           Colleges vs Schools         -2.84649         .5628299         -5.06         0.000         -4.451267         -1.241           Institutes vs Schools         -2.085302         .8421668         -2.48         0.131         -4.486543         .3159           Employed vs Schools         -3.69912         .8736906         -4.23         0.000         -6.190243         -1.207           Unemployed vs Schools         -3.876248         .6073079         -6.38         0.000         -5.607843         -2.144           Colleges vs Monasteries         -7.625557         .807378         -9.44         0.000         -9.927606         -5.323           Institutes vs Monasteries         -6.86437         1.021923         -6.72         0.000         -11.46647         -5.489           Unemployed vs Monasteries         -8.478187         1.048054         -8.09         0.000         -11.46647         -5.489           Unemployed vs Monasteries         -8.655315         .8389902         -10.32         0.000         -11.0475         -6.263           Institutes vs Colleges         .7611877         .9657883         0.79         0.970         -1.992531	
Monuscripts vs Schools       -2.84649       .0044059       -1.30       0.000       -2.912345       0.004         Institutes vs Schools       -2.84649       .5628299       -5.06       0.000       -4.451267       -1.241         Institutes vs Schools       -2.085302       .8421668       -2.48       0.131       -4.486543       .3159         Employed vs Schools       -3.69912       .8736906       -4.23       0.000       -6.190243       -1.207         Unemployed vs Schools       -3.876248       .6073079       -6.38       0.000       -5.607843       -2.144         Colleges vs Monasteries       -7.625557       .807378       -9.44       0.000       -9.927606       -5.323         Institutes vs Monasteries       -6.86437       1.021923       -6.72       0.000       -9.778143       -3.950         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.478187       1.048054       -8.09       0.000       -11.46647       -5.489         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.655315       .8389902       -10.32       0.000       -11.92531       3.514         Employed vs Colleges       .7611877       .9657883       0.79       0.970       -1.992531       3.514	15192
Institutes vs Schools       -2.085302       .8421668       -2.48       0.131       -4.486543       .3159         Institutes vs Schools       -3.69912       .8736906       -4.23       0.000       -6.190243       -1.207         Unemployed vs Schools       -3.876248       .6073079       -6.38       0.000       -5.607843       -2.144         Colleges vs Monasteries       -7.625557       .807378       -9.44       0.000       -9.927606       -5.323         Institutes vs Monasteries       -6.86437       1.021923       -6.72       0.000       -9.778143       -3.950         Employed vs Monasteries       -8.478187       1.048054       -8.09       0.000       -11.46647       -5.489         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.655315       .8389902       -10.32       0.000       -11.0475       -6.263         Institutes vs Colleges       .7611877       .965783       0.79       0.970       -1.992531       3.514	11713
Institutes vs Schools       -2.003302       .0421003       -2.40       0.131       -4.400343       .1313         Employed vs Schools       -3.69912       .8736906       -4.23       0.000       -6.190243       -1.207         Unemployed vs Schools       -3.876248       .6073079       -6.38       0.000       -5.607843       -2.144         Colleges vs Monasteries       -7.625557       .807378       -9.44       0.000       -9.927606       -5.323         Institutes vs Monasteries       -6.86437       1.021923       -6.72       0.000       -9.778143       -3.950         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.478187       1.048054       -8.09       0.000       -11.46647       -5.489         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.655315       .8389902       -10.32       0.000       -11.92531       3.514         Employed vs Colleges       .7611877       .9657883       0.79       0.970       -1.992531       3.514	11112
Limployed vs Schools       -3.8736912       .8736966       -4.23       0.000       -6.190243       -1.207         Unemployed vs Schools       -3.876248       .6073079       -6.38       0.000       -5.607843       -2.144         Colleges vs Monasteries       -7.625557       .807378       -9.44       0.000       -9.927606       -5.323         Institutes vs Monasteries       -6.86437       1.021923       -6.72       0.000       -9.778143       -3.950         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.478187       1.048054       -8.09       0.000       -11.46647       -5.489         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.655315       .8389902       -10.32       0.000       -11.992531       3.514         Employed vs Colleges       .7611877       .9657883       0.79       0.970       -1.992531       3.514	19303
-3.876248         .6073079         -6.38         0.000         -5.607843         -2.144           Colleges vs Monasteries         -7.625557         .807378         -9.44         0.000         -9.927606         -5.323           Institutes vs Monasteries         -6.86437         1.021923         -6.72         0.000         -9.778143         -3.950           Employed vs Monasteries         -8.478187         1.048054         -8.09         0.000         -11.46647         -5.489           Unemployed vs Monasteries         -8.655315         .8389902         -10.32         0.000         -11.0475         -6.263           Institutes vs Colleges         .7611877         .9657883         0.79         0.970         -1.992531         3.514	1/990
Colleges vs Monasteries       -7.625557       .807378       -9.44       0.000       -9.927606       -5.323         Institutes vs Monasteries       -6.86437       1.021923       -6.72       0.000       -9.778143       -3.950         Employed vs Monasteries       -8.478187       1.048054       -8.09       0.000       -11.46647       -5.489         Unemployed vs Monasteries       -8.655315       .8389902       -10.32       0.000       -11.0475       -6.263         Institutes vs Colleges       .7611877       .9657883       0.79       0.970       -1.992531       3.514	4652
Institutes vs Monasteries         -6.86437         1.021923         -6.72         0.000         -9.778143         -3.950           Employed vs Monasteries         -8.478187         1.048054         -8.09         0.000         -11.46647         -5.489           Unemployed vs Monasteries         -8.655315         .8389902         -10.32         0.000         -11.0475         -6.263           Institutes vs Colleges         .7611877         .9657883         0.79         0.970         -1.992531         3.514	23509
Employed vs Monasteries         -8.478187         1.048054         -8.09         0.000         -11.46647         -5.489           Unemployed vs Monasteries         -8.655315         .8389902         -10.32         0.000         -11.0475         -6.263           Institutes vs Colleges         .7611877         .9657883         0.79         0.970         -1.992531         3.514           Employed vs Colleges         .8526295         .0032060         0.966         0.956         2.655067         1.970	0596
Unemployed vs Monasteries         -8.655315         .8389902         -10.32         0.000         -11.0475         -6.263           Institutes vs Colleges         .7611877         .9657883         0.79         0.970         -1.992531         3.514           Employed vs Colleges         .8526205         .0023060         0.96         0.956         2.685067         1.970	39908
Institutes vs Colleges .7611877 .9657883 0.79 0.970 -1.992531 3.514	53132
Employed the Calleren 0526205 0022060 0.96 0.056 2.695067 1.070	4906
FUNDIONED AS COTTEMES 103707233 .3333303 -0.00 0.330 -3.00300/ 1.3/3	79808
Unemployed vs Colleges -1.029758 .7696265 -1.34 0.764 -3.224167 1.164	54652
Employed vs Institutes -1 613817 1 174438 -1 37 0 743 -4 962451 1 734	34817
Inemployed vs Institutes 1 70045 002367 -1 80 0.463 -4.62047 1.038	28556
Unemployed vs institutes 1.7555 . 59257 -1.00 0.405 -4.02047 1.050	00041
Unemproyed VS Emproyed1//1282 1.019256 -0.1/ 1.000 -3.08329/ 2./29	9041

edu_emp_typ	Summary o	f YPCI_index	_overall		
e	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq.		
Schools	62.341191	12.042777	2,259		
Monasteri	65.382699	10.571424	276		
Colleges	52.25	12.848281	390		
Institute	60.998428	13.076145	159		
Employed	56.607143	12.51818	147		
Unemploye	55.615443	13.878414	327		
<u> </u>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Total	60.555965	12.834759	3,558		
	λņ	alveis of Va	riance		
Source	Alla	arysis or va df	MG	F	Prob > F
				E	1100 × F
Between group	bs 50840.2	2972 5	10168.0594	67.49	0.0000
Within group	os 535107	.981 3552	150.649769		
Total	585948	.278 3557	164.731031		
Bartlett's te	est for equal v	variances:	chi2(5) = 26	5.5146 Prol	b>chi2 = 0.00

Annexure 15 Youth type - One way ANOVA test for Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption

## Annexure 16 Youth type comparisons of means for Index on youth's perception of corruption

			Tukey		Tuk	ey
YPCI_index_overall	Contrast	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
edu emp type						
Monasteries vs Schools	3.041508	.7826373	3.89	0.001	.810002	5.273015
Colleges vs Schools	-10.09119	.6730306	-14.99	0.000	-12.01018	-8.172202
Institutes vs Schools	-1.342763	1.007061	-1.33	0.766	-4.21416	1.528634
Employed vs Schools	-5.734048	1.044757	-5.49	0.000	-8.712927	-2.755169
Unemployed vs Schools	-6.725747	.7262172	-9.26	0.000	-8.796385	-4.65511
Colleges vs Monasteries	-13.1327	.9654605	-13.60	0.000	-15.88548	-10.37992
Institutes vs Monasteries	-4.384272	1.222013	-3.59	0.005	-7.868554	8999892
Employed vs Monasteries	-8.775556	1.25326	-7.00	0.000	-12.34893	-5.20218
Unemployed vs Monasteries	-9.767256	1.003262	-9.74	0.000	-12.62782	-6.906689
Institutes vs Colleges	8.748428	1.154887	7.58	0.000	5.455538	12.04132
Employed vs Colleges	4.357143	1.187901	3.67	0.003	.9701211	7.744165
Unemployed vs Colleges	3.365443	.9203174	3.66	0.004	.7413746	5.989512
Employed vs Institutes	-4.391285	1.40439	-3.13	0.022	-8.395573	3869968
Unemployed vs Institutes	-5.382984	1.18667	-4.54	0.000	-8.766495	-1.999474
Unemployed vs Employed	9916994	1.218824	-0.81	0.965	-4.466889	2.48349

Two-sample t test with equal variances							
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]	
Dzongkha Thimphu	2,866 692	70.73578 70.64306	.2413411 .5443889	12.92021 14.32064	70.26256 69.57421	71.209 71.71192	
combined	3,558	70.71775	.2213309	13.20216	70.2838	71.1517	
diff		.092718	.092718 .5592633			1.189227	
diff = mean(Dzongkha) - mean(Thimphu)t = 0.1658Ho: diff = 0degrees of freedom = 3556							
Ha: diff < 0 Pr(T < t) = 0.5658 Ha: diff != 0 Pr( T  >  t ) = 0.8683					Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.4342	

## Annexure 17 Two-sample t-test for Dzongkhag-Thromde Index on Integrity Awareness

## Annexure 18 Two-sample t-test for Dzongkhag-Thromde Index on Values and effect size

Two-sample t test with equal variances								
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]		
Dzongkha Thimphu	2,866 692	64.46123 62.09827	.1942935 .4017212	10.40151 10.56763	64.08026 61.30953	64.8422 62.88701		
combined	3,558	64.00165	.1756004	10.47438	63.65736	64.34594		
diff		2.362961	.4419392		1.496481	3.22944		
diff = mean(Dzongkha) - mean(Thimphu)t =5.3468Ho: diff = 0degrees of freedom =3556								
Ha: d: Pr(T < t)	iff < 0 ) = 1.0000	Pr(	Ha: diff != T  >  t ) =	0 0.0000	Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.0000		

Effect size based on mean comparison								
Obs per group:								
Dzongkhags = 2,866								
	Thimphu Thromde = 692							
Effect Size	Estimate	[95% Conf.	Interval]					
Cohen's d	.2264675	.1432693	.3096339					
POINC-BISEIIAI I	.0093047	.0300321	.1210/95					

**Annexure 19** Two-sample t-test for Dzongkhag-Thromde Index on Youth's Perception of Corruption and effect size

Two-sample t test with equal variances							
Group Obs		Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]	
Dzongkha Thimphu	2,866 692	61.52935 56.52457	.2327404 .5157792	12.45977 13.56803	61.073 55.51188	61.98571 57.53725	
combined	3 <b>,</b> 558	60.55597	.2151715	12.83476	60.13409	60.97784	
diff		5.004786	.5371849		3.951565	6.058008	
diff = mean(Dzongkha) - mean(Thimphu) Ho: diff = 0 degrees of free						= 9.3167 = 3556	
Ha: di Pr(T < t)	iff < 0 = 1.0000	Pr(	Ha: diff != T  >  t ) =	Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.0000		

Effect size based on	mean compariso	n			
Obs per group: Dzongkhags = 2,866					
Effect Size	Thimpr Estimate	14 Thromde = [95% Conf.	692 Interval]		
Cohen's <i>d</i> Point-Biserial r	.394615 .1543633	.3110669	.4781083		

**Annexure 20** Two-sample t-test for Integrity Club Schools for Index on Integrity Awareness and effect size

Two-sample t test with equal variances						
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Schools Schools	3,232 326	70.54804 72.40031	.2336977 .6775613	13.28588 12.23369	70.08982 71.06735	71.00625 73.73327
combined	3,558	70.71775	.2213309	13.20216	70.2838	71.1517
diff		-1.852271	.7666701		-3.355429	3491141
diff = mean(Schools) - mean(Schools) $t = -2.4160$ Ho: diff = 0 degrees of freedom = 3556						
Ha: diff < 0 Pr(T < t) = 0.0079 Ha: diff != 0 Pr( T  >  t ) = 0.0157			Ha: d Pr(T > t	liff > 0 .) = 0.9921		

Effect size based on	mean compariso	on	
	Obs	per group:	
Schools	without Interc	rity Club =	3,232
56110015	wrenoue incerg	griey crub	37232
Scho	ols with Interg	grity Club =	326
<del></del>			<del> </del>
Effect Size	Estimate	[95% Conf.	Interval]
<u></u>			<u></u>
Cohen's d	140396	2543283	0264439
			· · · · · · · · · · · ·

## Annexure 21 Two-sample t-test for Integrity Club Schools for Index on values and effect size

Two-sample t test with equal variances						
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Schools Schools	3,232 326	63.76153 66.38229	.1837186 .5808828	10.44453 10.48811	63.40131 65.23952	64.12174 67.52505
combined	3,558	64.00165	.1756004	10.47438	63.65736	64.34594
diff		-2.62076	.6071741		-3.811204	-1.430315
diff = mean(Schools) - mean(Schools) Ho: diff = 0						
Ha: diff < 0Ha: diff != 0Ha: diff > 0Pr(T < t) = 0.0000				iff > 0 ) = 1.0000		

Effect size based on mean comparison					
	Obs	per group:			
Schools	without Inter	grity Club =	3,232		
Schoo	ols with Inter	grity Club =	326		
Effect Size	Estimate	[95% Conf.	Interval]		
Cohen's d	250826	364853	1367638		

**Annexure 22** Two-sample t-test for Integrity Club Schools for Index on youth's perception of corruption and effect size

Two-sample t test with equal variances						
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Schools Schools	3,232 326	60.26377 63.45284	.2272062 .6434205	12.91683 11.61726	59.81829 62.18704	60.70925 64.71863
combined	3,558	60.55597	.2151715	12.83476	60.13409	60.97784
diff		-3.189069	.7440263		-4.64783	-1.730308
diff = mean(Schools) - mean(Schools) Ho: diff = 0						
Ha: diff < 0 Pr(T < t) = 0.0000 Ha: diff != 0 Pr( T  >  t ) = 0.0000			Ha: d Pr(T > t	liff > 0 2) = 1.0000		

Effect size based on	mean compariso	on	
	Obs	per group:	
Schools	without Interg	grity Club =	3,232
Schoo	ols with Interg	grity Club =	326
Effect Size	Estimate	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Cohen's d	2490773	3631023	1350173

Annexure 23 Two-sample t-test for Integrity Club members for Integrity awareness and effect size

Two-sample t test with equal variances							
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]	
Yes No	130 564	76.13462 73.17154	.8152228 .5318702	9.29497 12.63122	74.52168 72.12685	77.74755 74.21623	
combined	694	73.72659	.4602954	12.12597	72.82284	74.63033	
diff		2.963073	1.175202		.6556827	5.270463	
diff = mean(Yes) - mean(No)t = 2.5213Ho: diff = 0degrees of freedom = 692							
Ha: d: Pr(T < t)	Ha: diff < 0 Pr(T < t) = 0.9940 Ha: diff != 0 Pr( T  >  t ) = 0.0119			Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.0060		

Effect size based on mean comparison							
Obs per group:							
		Yes =	130				
		No =	564				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·····					
Effect Size	Estimate	[95% Conf.	Interval]				
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Cohen's d	.2453003	.0540898	.4363344				

## Annexure 24 Two-sample t-test for Integrity Club members for index on values and effect size

Two-sample t test with equal variances						
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Yes No	130 564	68.47885 62.72496	.928442 .462171	10.58587 10.97595	66.6419 61.81717	70.31579 63.63275
combined	694	63.80277	.4223225	11.12561	62.97359	64.63196
diff		5.75389	1.060879		3.670962	7.836819
$diff = mean(Yes) - mean(No) \qquad t = 5.4237$ Ho: diff = 0 degrees of freedom = 692						= 5.4237 = 692
Ha: d: Pr(T < t)	Ha: diff < 0			Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.0000	

Effect size based on mean comparison						
Obs per group:						
		Yes =	130			
		No =	564			
Effect Size	Estimate	[95% Conf.	Interval]			
Cohen's d	.527672	.3347851	.7201853			

**Annexure 25** Two-sample t-test for Integrity Club members for index on youth's corruption perception and effect size

Two-sample t test with equal variances						
Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Yes No	130 564	60.16827 57.93994	1.123807 .5639488	12.81337 13.39304	57.94479 56.83224	62.39175 59.04764
combined	694	58.35735	.5050807	13.30579	57.36568	59.34902
diff		2.228331	1.292683		3097206	4.766383
diff = mean(Yes) - mean(No)t = 1.723Ho: diff = 0degrees of freedom = 69					= 1.7238 = 692	
Ha: d: Pr(T < t)	iff < 0 ) = 0.9574	Pr(	Ha: diff != T  >  t ) =	0 0.0852	Ha: d Pr(T > t	iff > 0 ) = 0.0426

Effect size based on mean comparison Obs per group: Yes = 130 No = 564 Effect Size Estimate [95% Conf. Interval] Cohen's d .1677089 -.0232411 .358538

Published in Bhutan: Thimphu Publisher: Anti-Corruption Commission Date of Publication: June 2022 ISBN 978-99980-53-76-2