



LEXICAL CHOICES IN POLICE VETTING EXERCISE IN KENYA: HOW FRAMING IS USED TO ACCOUNT FOR THE LEXICAL CHOICES MADE BY POLICE OFFICERS DURING THE VETTING EXERCISE

By Author(s):

Pascalyn Kimaiyo
Moi University, Kenya

Abstract

This paper applies frame analysis approach to interrogate the lexical choices in suspected corrupt practices during the police vetting exercise in Kenya in 2014-2016. The framing theory was used in interpreting what was going on in the police conduct as investigated by the vetting panel. The main focus of this paper was to explain how framing theory informs the lexical choices made by some police officers as they answered to allegations of corruption. The study carried out an in-depth analysis on how Goffman's frame analysis can be used to appropriately interpret police conduct as brought out during the vetting exercise. The researcher used secondary data from online sources and recorded video clips. The study purposively selected fifteen vetting interviews that were felt to be containing the lexical items that answer to the objectives of the study. These interviews were mainly concerned with financial probity of the various police officers especially in regard to their mobile money transfers. The results of the study revealed that word choices play a crucial role in strategically communicating what the intentions of the speaker. The appropriate interpretation of these lexical items is arrived at by applying primary frameworks which act as the lens through which the listeners can appropriate meaning to what is happening in every day's social activities.

Keywords

Framing, primary frameworks, vetting, corruption.

How to cite: Kimaiyo, P. (2025). LEXICAL CHOICES IN POLICE VETTING EXERCISE IN KENYA: HOW FRAMING IS USED TO ACCOUNT FOR THE LEXICAL CHOICES MADE BY POLICE OFFICERS DURING THE VETTING EXERCISE. *GPH-International Journal of Business Management*, 8(10), 130-151. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17767801>



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Introduction

Framing concerns itself with the interpretation of situations or words based on already known patterns of behavior or discourse thus suitable in accounting for the lexical choices as used by police officer during the police vetting exercise in Kenya. A study on police vetting can neatly be placed under the sub-field of forensic linguistics .

A couple of studies have been done in forensic linguistics especially with regard to how language is used in the legal setting but few studies have been done on police interviews. Heydon (2005) as quoted in Haworth (2009) opines that police interviews are still under researched and that ‘only a book-length’ study exist. Nevertheless, police suspect interviews are not a new development in the field of Forensic linguistics as there are a number of scholars who have explored the field. Most of the studies on police interviews have been done outside the Kenyan linguistic environment e.g. Sweden (Johnson & Linell, 1991), Holland (Komter, 2002), Australia(Heydon, 2003,2004,2005), the USA(Watson, 1983,1990; Shuy, 1998). The only literature available to the best of my knowledge on police interviews are those that deal with police officers interviewing suspects, statements made at the police stations during the time of reporting crimes and statements made by police officers at crime scenes (Satia, 2014).

In all the studies cited above, the police officers are key players in giving evidence in legal proceedings .Although there are studies on various aspects of police involvement in interviews, interrogations etc no work has explored the unusual situation where police officers themselves are subjects of interrogation creating a unique scenario where, metaphorically, the hunter becomes the hunted and therefore the present study hopes to fill this gap.

The main purpose of this study was to investigate how frame analysis can be used to give an appropriate interpretation of some of the lexical choices made by police officers in explaining their activities that were suggestive of corruption. Frame analysis was used to investigate how positive activities given as reasons for police officers’ mobile money transactions tend to reduce the negative import carried in bribery allegations. Framing acknowledges the fact that words and situations are not meaningful in themselves unless they are anchored on actual occurrences and utterances. The next part of the study follows a discussion of the principal tenets of the theoretical framework.

2.1 THE FRAMING THEORY.

Framing theory by Goffman (1974) suggests that individuals make meanings of situations based on principles of organization that control events. Frames are mental structures that enable us to make sense of the world around us (Lakoff 2004). These frames are cognitive in nature and are triggered when we encounter a new situation that needs to be interpreted. The main assumption in frame analysis is language use in everyday sense has the capacity to trigger various interpretations as intended by their users. Frames can be thought of as “metaphorical containers” (wine 2008), structures of expectations (Bateson 2000, Goffman

1974, Tannen 1995) and as “opinion shapers or thought manipulators” (Lakoff 2004) as quoted in Wine (2008:1). Thinking of a frame as a kind of metaphorical container implies that the interpretation of a situation is approached by considering many possible expectations of outcomes. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) note “the very strength of metaphors is in their ability to express what is hard to pin down in more reductionist ways” (Wine 2008:1). A frame can be called up by contextualization cues perceived by the participants in a conversation (Gumperz 1982). Goffman suggests that whenever individuals are faced with any situation they will interpret it in terms of a primary framework.

2.1 Primary frameworks

According to Goffman (1974) individuals interpret particular events using a “schemata of interpretation” called primary framework. The schema is Primary in the sense that it is not hinged to any ‘prior or original interpretation’. The primary framework enables the user to give a definition of what is going on in an interaction, without which no utterance (or movement or gesture) could be interpreted” (Goffman 1974). The primary framework is the ‘first concept’ that is needed in any interpretation of a situation. Mwai, (2016:61) argues that “individuals can only apprehend events and issues in their lives through their primary frameworks and without them they will be in continuous struggle to interpret and make sense of everything around them in this universe”. Therefore in order for us to comprehend the police conduct as reflected in their financial engagements, there is need to focus more on the lexical choices as the cues that signal the intended meanings that serve as the primary frameworks.

Goffman (1974) considers frames to be primarily social and situational (Gordon 2009:255). He defines frames as the means by which people define situations in an interaction (Goffman 1974:10). To Goffman situations are never static but are constantly aligning to the direction taken by the discourse. Therefore, participants in an interaction are in control of the direction taken up by their discourse. Closely related to framing is the notion of footing. (Goffman 1981) as quoted in (Gordon 2009:255) argues that “a change in footing implies a change in the alignments we take up to ourselves and others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance”. People continually create and recreate frames depending on the footing and alignments they take up in any social interactions. Footing encompasses both alignments between speakers and alignments of speakers to utterances. Alignments of speakers to utterances are concerned with the format of production (Gordon 2009:256).

As a means to understand how framing operates, this study presents certain key tenets which include; key and keying, designs and fabrications.

2.1.1 Keys and keying

Actions and utterances in the society are not inherently meaningful but need to be subjected to particular primary frameworks for them to be meaningful. Bateson’s observation of the otters’ behavior illustrates how the primary framework operates. Goffman (1974:38) says “the tail biting activity is closely patterned after something that already has a meaning in its

own terms- in this case fighting''. The primary framework for the otters' behavior is that of a fight but upon a closer observation, the behavior deviates from the normal expectation of a fight which can result into bodily harm or injuries. This deviation confirms a "transformation or a transcription of a "strip of fighting into a strip of a play". The animals in the activity seemed to appreciate and interpret the meaning of their biting behavior as that of a play rather than a serious 'aggressive behavior' (Gordon: 2009). Goffman, (1974) points out that the central concept in frame analysis is the key. He defines key as "a set of conventions by which a given activity, one already meaningful in terms of some primary framework is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by participants to be something quite else" (Goffman 1974:44).

To sustain Bateson's discussion on animal behavior, Goffman (1974) highlights the procedure to be followed in the transformation of a "serious real action into something playful". This study identifies the first four steps that are very significant to the objectives of the paper.

- (a) The playful act is so performed that its ordinary function is not realized. The participants' actions are compromised both in strength and competence so as to accommodate each other.
 - (b) There is exaggeration of the expansiveness of some acts.
 - (c) The sequence of activity that serves as a pattern is neither followed faithfully nor completely but occurs erratically.
 - (d) A great deal of repetitiveness occurs.
- (Goffman 1974:41-42).

This process of transcription is known as keying (Goffman 1974:44). Bateson argues that the transcription process is not restricted to monkeys alone but can be mapped onto other areas of human life such as 'threat, deceit and ritual' and that "in all the three cases what appears to be something isn't quite that being merely modeled onto it"(Goffman: 1974:45). The implication we get of transcriptions is that more cognitive effort is needed to unearth exactly what is going on. The interpretation of situations should not be taken at their face value but critical evaluation based on our lived experiences, stories and folklore should be utilized. A further interpretation of a situation is needed to set a part the differences between a literal and a figurative use of language.

Consequently, individuals make sense of a new situation based on some known circumstances around them which at times can yield a misinterpretation of facts especially when a wrong schema is applied. To put it in Goffman's words "when attention is turned to man, many different kinds of monkey business can be found, keys abound". This implies that interpretation of a situation should go deeper and wider when keying (doing a transformation) of human experience from the action modeled on it e.g. irony, satire and metaphorical expressions.

Goffman (1974:45) gives a full definition of keying as,

- (a) A systematic transformation that is involved across materials already meaningful in accordance with a schema of interpretation and without which keying would be meaningless.
- (Goffman 1974: 45)

Going back to the monkey behavior for illustration, the schema of interpretation is the fight while the transformation of the activity is that of a play. The monkeys' tail biting activity does not result in any injury that characterizes a usual aggression among a fighting group. In order for a successful keying to take place, the participants should be privy to the 'alterations' involved using the conventional cues that are known to them.

A similar approach is applicable to the present study that seeks to use the tenets of keys and keying to relate form and meaning of linguistic forms. These forms are the lexical items used by the vetted police officers during the vetting exercise. Lexical choices made by the vetted police officers will form the schemata of interpretation to be used to give meaning to their actions. The explanations advanced by the officers will form the frames of already understood activities to be used to work out the meanings of the new situations. These known primary frames include; tea and lunch, contributions, merry-go-rounds, proceeds from rental houses etc. whose meanings will form the patterns of activities in the transformation process.

2.1.2 Designs and fabrications

Keying provides the means by which a 'script of activity can be transformed – serve as an item-by-item model for something else' (Goffman 1974:83). The transformation or the keying process can yield an appropriate interpretation - model of 'what is it that is going on' or a 'fabrication'. Significant in the present study is the fact that words are taken as forms of transcription of what they refer to. Words uttered are some kinds of transformations of the meaning they stand for. A description of an event say a "merry-go-round" or a "contribution" as part of explanations given by the vetted police officers, form a model, a foundation to be followed in interpreting the mobile money transfers in their mobile phones.

The understood patterns of the activities and features of contributions and merry-go-rounds will be juxtaposed to the actual cash transactions made by the affected officers. This whole process forms a kind of transformation that can result in an appropriate interpretation or a fabrication. Goffman (1974) defines fabrication as "the intentional effort of one or more individuals to manage activity so that a party of one or more others will be induced to have a false belief about what is it that is going on". In the vetting exercise the vetted police officers intended their actions revealed in their lifestyle audit reports, mobile money transfers, direct deposits and savings to be interpreted as ordinary instances of social activities such as contributions, merry-go-rounds, savings, proceeds from rental houses, lunch money, tea, tokens of appreciation etc. These explanations are valid for as long as the participants are in the know and agree that 'a systematic alteration' is involved and will eventually lead to the appropriate meaning of situations at hand.

Fabrications are intended to mislead a party and make them to believe a wrong interpretation meant to serve certain communicative ends. According to Goffman (1974), those who perpetuate a fabrication are called the operatives, fabricators, and deceivers while those who fall prey to the fabrication are called the dupes, marks, pigeons, suckers, butts, victims and

gulls. Individuals who cooperate in presenting deception can be categorically said to be engaging in “collusive communication”.

Just like keying, fabrications require the use of a model, the use of something already meaningful in terms of a primary framework(s) (Goffman 1974:84). If we take the example of a merry-go-round as one of the explanations given in the police vetting exercise as a model for analysis, the features of a merry-go-round will be considered to ascertain whether the interpretation of the money transfers could sufficiently fit in. The known pattern of a merry-go-round is the regular transfer of fixed amounts of money at fixed time frames but going to different people. Any transaction that meets these criteria will be interpreted as an appropriate keying of that situation and vice versa.

Since keying leads to the correct interpretation of ‘what is it that is going on’, many participants are likely to have the same version of interpretation. On the other hand, a fabrication requires the differences for instances irony and satire. Goffman posits that “those in on deception, what is going on is a fabrication, for those contained what is going on is what is being fabricated” (Goffman: 1974:84).

Fabrications are bound to be discredited, challenged and destroyed especially when the truth is discovered by the ‘contained’ party. On the other hand keying yields a much agreed upon interpretation among the participants and will likely be taken as the reality of the situation in question. Deceptions or fabrications will result in “untransformed” activity which is considered “straight”, plain and literal.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The data for the study was collected from audio- visual recordings and newspaper reports of the police vetting exercise in Kenya between 2014 and 2016. The audio-visual recordings of the vetting exercise retrieved from the media composed of about 8400 words. These vetting interviews were streamed live on the local TV stations such as Nation, Citizen among others making it easier for the data to be accessed. The storage of the data was mainly in flash disks and MP3 formats thus facilitating easy accessibility and retrieval of the data any time it was needed. The audio-visual tapes can be listened over and over for clarity of focus. Audio-visual recorded material provided a ‘more accurate rendition of the interview than any other method’ (Juan and Ong’ondo:2011:74) as quoted in Satia (2014:93).

The study was qualitative and descriptive in nature as it entailed a detailed description of the data collected. The present study described in detail the selected responses of the police officers during the vetting exercise of 2014-2016 with the aim of finding out how framing analysis is applied in giving the appropriate interpretation to lexical choices that alluded to suspected acts of corruption. The research delved into analyzing the way ordinary words are used to mask suspected acts of corruption with the aim of regularizing such vices. Descriptive research reports facts as they are and also makes recommendations that are geared toward solving an existing problem. Kerlinger (1969) as quoted in Kombo and Tromp (2006) says descriptive studies are not only restricted to fact finding but may also result in the

formulation of important knowledge principles and solution to significant problems. This method was appropriate for studying selected issues, cases and events deeply and in detail (Orodho and Kombo, 2002).

The study purposively selected responses from fifteen police officers who underwent the vetting process. The logic and power of purposive sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for in-depth study (Patton, 2015:9). Therefore, purposive sampling was justifiable for the present study because most of the questions asked by the National Police Service Commission and the vetting panel were similar, the allegations made against the police officers were similar and the respondents used the same lexical terms to refer to similar ideas. This study therefore selected those responses that answered to the research questions; to explain how words associated with suspected corrupt practices were re-lexicalized by police officers during the police vetting exercise in Kenya and to describe how framing informs these choices.

Getting primary data from police sources proved to be very hard on account of security implications hence the present study contented with the use of secondary data. These utterances were in audio-visual recordings retrieved from media houses and their websites. The audio-visual recordings accorded the researcher the advantage of playing them over and over for clarification when need arose. The analyzable data for the study were the lexical choices bordering on bribery allegations. These lexical items were found in the responses or oral utterances of the interviewed police officers.

The various audio- visual interviews were watched and listened to. There followed a selection of the relevant videos which were carefully observed and transcribed by the researcher. Those sections that were not in English were translated using the free translation method. The choice for the free translation method is motivated by the need to maintain the original meaning of the utterances. The written excerpts were then examined to highlight those salient lexical items that were relevant to the objectives of the study. Names of police officers and places found in the recordings were anonymized as a way of protecting their rights and privacy. The responses were transcribed using an adaptation of Jefferson Gail that was less elaborate in detail so as to facilitate ease of understanding of the exchanges.

I had to translate the segments that were in Kiswahili into English using the ‘original and parallel free translation format’ as proposed by Duranti(1997: 156). Original and parallel free translation format involves the placing of two versions of text side by side so as to maintain a ‘horizontal parallelism’ (Duranti: 1997:156) in (Satia, 2014)

The researcher being proficient in Kiswahili did not have much difficulty in doing the translations. However, as a means of corroborating my own translations I sought clarification from a proficient teacher of Kiswahili.

The vetting process and especially police discourse being a highly sensitive matter called for ethical considerations in matters of transcription and concealing the identity of the affected officers. Therefore, as a way of protecting the concerned officers ‘privacy and identification the researcher anonymized names of police officers and places by giving them pseudo names. Therefore, the various police officers were identified with the letters of the alphabet

such as Officer A, B etc. The transcripts were attached as appendages at the end of the study while the videos were reserved by the researcher to be produced when need arose.

The next part of the study is a discussion of the theoretical frameworks together with their principal tenets.

4.0 ANALYSES AND DISCUSSIONS

The discussion that followed evaluated how framing informs the lexical choices made by police officers during the vetting exercise.

4.1 keys and keying process

The process of keying entails “a systematic transformation” of a known material as a “schema of interpretation” applied to a new situation to yield an appropriate interpretation. In framing we look at how new situations can be interpreted on the basis of an already understood situation.

4.1 lexical choices associated with basic needs such as tea, lunch and token of appreciation.

A police officer who is given money in the name of tea, lunch or token of appreciation seems to be operating on a frame change. The frame changes from a suggestive wrong doing or bribery to something that is of necessity and legitimate. The police officers seem to have taken up a totally different footing towards corruption and begin to treat it as acceptable and necessary. This way an officer is no longer viewed as being bribed but as a diligent officer whose hard work is being appreciated. The gifts offered to them is a testimonial to the good work well done. The monetary benefits extended to the officers is christened using food items such as lunch, meat and tea with the view of lessening the impact that such gestures have on the conduct of the police officers.

In the following exchange a senior police officer who received a colossal amount of money confidently told the vetting panel those motorists were sending him lunch money.

VETTING PANEL: Upon receipt of money in your phone from that person that you did not know, couldn't bother to ask why they sent you money?

OFFICER B: Yes, almost on all occasions. If you receive money on your phone and first of all the name is strange, the ideal thing to do is to call back and you end up with a name..... most of them are used, they use thesewhat do we call them... alias names. Oh ni wa Kimani(not the real name) amekutumia ni **lunch** yako[it is the son of Kimani who has sent you. It's your **lunch**]. So once and it's African Mr. chairman, when someone tells you nimekutumia [I've sent you] **lunch** in good faith and you didn't ask for it, it is unkind to return. I thought so.

4.2. Lexical choices bordering on social activities like merry go round, welfare and contributions as primary frameworks.

The discussion that follows highlights the use of the words merry go round, welfare and contributions as lexical terms chosen by some police officers in giving meaning to their actions that are suspected to be acts of bribery.

The term **merry go round** as a reason for the several money transfers was used much to the chagrin of the chairman of KPSC. He was quick to appreciate officer B who didn't use the term; he said "there's one thing that you've done which we must appreciate. You haven't come here and told us about the hypothetical, the old, the tired tales of merry go round...."

In looking at merry go round as a story line in the frame analysis for the several money transfers, we first identify the features of a real merry go round which will then be juxtaposed with the patterns followed by the cash flows. The features of an ideal merry go round include; fixed amounts of money given out at affixed time frame whether monthly or weekly, change of recipients and documented membership with clear records kept. Therefore, the schemata of interpretation in the keying process should be in tandem with the new situation of cash transfers so as to yield an appropriate interpretation of what was going on. The keying process yields an appropriate interpretation that is as plausible as possible to be believed by all the parties involved. The reverse is also true if "the script of one activity" is not successfully mapped onto the "the schemata of interpretation" (Goffman 1974) which in turn leads to a fabrication of what is going on. Fabrications are subject to doubts and disbelief among the contained group who feel unconvinced.

The following discussion serve to illustrate how the vetting panel seems to have felt duped by some of the police officers' explanations on their cash flows.

VETTING PANEL: Do we really have merry go rounds?

OFFICER B: Some are real, some are imaginary Mr. Chairman

VETTING PANEL: Any other feature of a merry go round? How would you know who had, whose turn it was... wouldn't you keep some kind of records?

OFFICER B: Yes. There is normally.... they give numbers you are number one, you are number two..... VETTING PANEL: Could you remember the members if you were a member of a merry go round?

OFFICER B: Oh yes Mr. Chairman. They are your associates.

VETTING PANEL: Those are your associates. So you haven't told us of all those hypothetical merry go round.

From the discussions above the salient lexical item is merry go round. Merry go rounds are 'self-help organizations which mobilize their own resources mainly from members periodical savings, cover their costs and finance their growth using the profits arising from credit to members' (Adede, A. 2007:16). These organizations are started with the purpose of pooling resources together as a means of improving the economic status of their members.

In an ideal merry go round money should be seen circulating among its members. Secondly, there are records kept to enable the members to keep track of their contributions. However this was not the case with some of the police officers' transactions which had no documentation as proof of their dealings. In addition the officers could not readily give the names of their associates in the merry go round. Their mobile money transactions indicated instances where police officers received or sent money to one person or few people a number of times.

The other word which featured significantly during the vetting exercise is welfare. Several officers cited the purposes of the money transacted in their mobile phones as for welfare. The officers explained that they usually have a welfare kitty that is meant to assist fellow officers in times of need. The exchange below will serve to illustrate how this welfare organization operated among the police officers.

VETTING PANEL: So...xyz is a police officer. He has sent you money 12 times.

OFFICER A: Yes sir

VETTING PANEL: What is this money for?

OFFICER A: Welfare.

When officer A is asked the purpose of the money she received from another officer (presumably her junior) the response was welfare money. Similarly officer C offers a similar explanation for money she sent seventy times to her senior who is the base commandant.

VETTING PANEL ... in fact we are even wondering with your salary and your OCS not the OCS but the traffic commandant who is your boss and who earns a lot more money you are sending him large sums of money. You sent the OCS, your base commander 70 times, an amount totaling to 131425. It means you are sending him in small bits. What were you paying him for?

OFFICER C: Sir, si eti nilikuwa namlipa but ilikuwa kama mtu ako na shida wanasema tuangalie. So ilikuwa kama sisi ni... tulikuwa watu five ...(interrupted)[it's not that I was paying him but if somebody has a problem they could say we look into it so it was like us, we were five people]

Though OFFICER C does not use the exact word welfare, the explanations given as assisting a fellow officer in need implies the same.

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines welfare as the general health, happiness and safety of a person or an animal or a group. Therefore, the department of welfare in any organization functions for the wellbeing of its members whether in happiness or sadness. Therefore the word welfare becomes our primary framework used to interpret what it is that is going on (Goffman 1974). In order to arrive at the appropriate interpretation, the features of a functional welfare should match those witnessed in the money transfers. As a starting point, a welfare department is tasked to assist all the members irrespective of their status in times of need. All members of a welfare group should be contributors so as to benefit from it when their time comes and the members who benefit from the arrangement change. It is not the case that one person in a group goes through problems all the time unless in cases that are extremely exceptional.

Therefore, if it is the case that the two officers indicated above are in charge of welfare, then we expect that they received contributions from all the other members. Their mobile money transactions should reflect the names of the members who have benefited from the welfare kitty. The contributions should come from all the members but it cannot be the case for instance that only two members out of thirteen members are the main contributors and that the money collected is sent to one person several times.

From the exchange below the vetting panel seemed to question the workings of the given police welfare which received money on several occasions from only two members.

The vetting panel asked, “so the only ones who were sending you money in support of colleagues and for welfare were only two officers? On her part Officer A responded, “Yah.”

Officer A told the panel that out of all the members of the welfare group, only two officers were the main contributors to the welfare kitty. The given explanations may not match well the operations of a good welfare arrangement. A similar observation can be made on Officer C who sent money for welfare to a senior officer but never received any money from him.

VETTING PANEL....I mean you never had problems for the base commander to send you

OFFICER C: There is a time I had a problem and the base commander sent me six thousand

VETTING PANEL: By what means?

OFFICER C: M-pesa.

VETTING PANEL: It is not reflected anywhere. We have analyzed thoroughly. He is not anywhere unless you show us.

Footnote; M-pesa is Mobile banking platform that enables its users to send and receive money via their mobile phones.

A typical example of a good welfare should not benefit only the senior officers who receive financial assistance from their juniors. Officer C above sent money several times to her boss but there are no records showing that she ever received money from the boss for welfare purposes. Therefore if the features of the primary framework (welfare) do not match those features of the money transfers then the appropriate interpretation will not be arrived at. It cannot be the case that only the senior officers get welfare money from their juniors. Therefore when we apply the term welfare as schemata for interpreting what was happening in the officers’ mobile money transfers we cannot get a transformation but a fabrication. This explains the reason behind the vetting panel’s doubts on the explanations given by the vetted police officers.

Another word that serves as a primary frame work is the lexical term contributions. According to the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary contribution is “ a sum of money given to a person or an organization in order to help pay for something” Contributions as used by the officers refer to money collected from various officers with a view to help another officer. In one instance an officer admitted to having collected money from his junior officers and sent the same to a senior officer who had asked for financial assistance from him. The officers A, C, D and G explain their receipt of money via their mobile phones as contributions.

OFFICER A: we normally have a welfare where members contribute some money and I being the senior LCO, I keep the money.

OFFICER C: Sir I cannot say is a problem because kama mtu atakuwa na shida Rakon ama Raum (not real names) as a whole tulikuwa tunamtolea ile kiroho yako vile inakuambia. So tulikuwa tunamchangia kidogo especially kama mimi mama walikuwa wananiambia Rachael (not the real name) we ndio utatuma, naweka M-pesa namtumia[it was if somebody will have a problem in Rakon or Raum as a whole we were contributing what your heart directs

you to. So we were contributing little especially me as a mother they were telling me Rachael you are the one to send. So I deposit in M-pesa and sent it to him/her]

OFFICER D:The base commander directs to me “kindly talk to your officers a senior officer wants assistance”. So you sit down talk to your officers and the under the request of the base commander you sit down and see how much can each contribute. That now after putting the money together you are being told now you can send.....

OFFICER G:sir, When you tell me like that I just sit down as a commander I tell my officers Mr. OCPD told us he has ABCD so what are we going to do with him? We discuss, the officers tell me “madam let us contribute this and this” and we give him sir.

In saying that the cash flows in their mobile phones were for contributions from the members in their base, the officers wished to convince the vetting panel that their actions are noble and are not linked to the graft allegations. These explanations are further backed up by citing instances when specific police officers actually had problems and needed assistance.

When we take the lexical item contribution as our primary framework for interpreting the cash flows, we pattern it with the features that characterize ideal contributions for instance contributions are made voluntarily in varying amounts depending on an individual’s ability and willingness. It is possible that the money is put together and one person acting as a treasurer or a custodian sends the money to the beneficiary at one go or as the money is received. In most instances just like in welfare, the beneficiaries vary as per the purpose of the contribution.

In one of the responses given by an officer, the names given as beneficiaries in the contribution were not reflected in the sender’s mobile money statement. In fact the greatest beneficiary of the contributions endeavor was her boss. In one instance officer C seemed to be facing a difficulty in justifying the seventy times she had sent money to her base commander. Also contributions are not made for only one person over a number of times. It raises a lot of questions when the beneficiary of those contributions is an officer of a higher rank who supposedly earns more money than his/her juniors.

VETTING PANEL: So it means the traffic commandant always would tell you when he has problems but you never told the traffic commandant when you have problems because we are not seeing any money from the traffic commandant to you.

Goffman (1974) says keying yields the appropriate interpretation of a situation whereas fabrications are meant to mislead a party. In the three explanations given above as merry go round, welfare and contribution, there appears to be no transformation of the three activities to yield an appropriate interpretation. When these words are subjected to the test of transformation they fail to meet the threshold of the features of the activities cited consequently orienting the analysis to view them as suggestive of fabrications that are meant to give a misleading interpretation. Goffman (1974) argues that fabrications are bound to be discredited, challenged and destroyed once the truth is unveiled. On the contrary if the money transfers were to be modeled along the panel’s story line of bribery possibly a plausible transformation would take place and the figurative use of language would be revealed. From the foregone discussion above, this paper arrived at a possible interpretation that the word contribution could be a coded word that is used among senior officers to ask for money from

their juniors. The senior officer directs his/her junior officers to send him/her some contributions which may not be given out by the directed officers from their hard earned salaries but from bribes collected from members of the public. By asking for contributions from their junior officers, the senior officers are indirectly sending these officers to the members of the public especially road users to collect bribes from them. Once the collection is done the money is sent to that particular officer who has financial needs.

4.1.2 Rental incomes and sales from farming activities.

The sources of income that featured significantly during the interviews were proceeds from rental houses, sale of farm produce and animal products. Many police officers admitted to owning properties that generated huge sums of money. As proof of the same, the officers gave elaborate explanations on how their money was collected and how it finally reached their accounts. However, when the responses of the interviewing panel are critically considered they are suggestive of feelings of being duped, unconvinced because the figures dealt seemed not to be adding up. The explanations given as primary frameworks seemed to fail in giving a transformation of one activity that matches the features of the new encounter in this case the sources of money deposited in the officers' accounts. For illustration we take these cases of police officers who declared their rental incomes that seemed not to match with the amounts of money they had transacted.

VETTING PANEL: "He sent you rent 21 times in 2012-2013"

VETTING PANEL: In the year 2013... Your account was credited to the tune of 800 thousand..... What is the source?

OFFICER A: The money from the rental, from milk proceeds and the maize and the eggs...

VETTING PANEL: So this 180,210, coz we can see you have been doing cash deposits. So whatever your late wife was doing could give you that kind of money not once in a month several times. I think we can look at it and show. So we just want to know the source because it is in cash....

OFFICER H: Those are rentals and are deposited by the agents.

VETTING PANEL: From which properties?

OFFICER H: Just houses which are not many. They are just single houses. They are about ten.

The sources of income cited by the officers seemed not to match with the amounts of money deposited into their bank accounts and those amounts transacted via the mobile phones. The police officers above received and deposited money into their accounts that could not carefully fit in the explanations given. Rental incomes undisputedly come in at fixed amounts and at regular intervals whose patterns can easily be followed up and backed with clear records. However in the exchanges above there were many questions raised on the amounts dealt and the frequencies taken.

4.1.3 Savings and other business ventures as sources of huge deposits in bank accounts.

Some of the vetted police officers attributed their accumulating amounts of money in their bank accounts to accrued savings and proceeds of successful businesses. These activities are capable of generating large sums of money and successfully form a primary framework to

ascertain the appropriateness of these explanations. However from the reactions of the vetting panel, there is need for the researcher to look deeper into the matching features of the known activities vis-à-vis the new encounters. The panel that seemed to be privy to all the officers' financial status appeared to be unconvinced by the story lines as given by the interviewed police officers as shown by the exchange below.

VETTING PANEL: ... the figures don't add up. We are not arguing. We are just telling you that there is another source you have not disclosed to us because we are not satisfied the sources you have given us are....have adequately covered the large sum of money we see".

The study further noted that the sources of the numerous cash deposits and huge sums of money given as proceeds from rental houses, sale of farm produce, animal products savings and business ventures appeared to be instances of fabrications. These cited sources are profitable ventures capable of generating large sums of money but from the questions tabled by the panel before the police officers there emerged a disconnect between what was transacted and the said sources presented.

The story lines that the interviewed officers presented as explanations for the sources of money they transacted clashed with the story lines of the vetting panel in the form of gathered evidence. It is very possible for individuals to save money in their accounts but it may not be possible for them to save every cent they earn unless they have other sources of income to enable them to meet the daily needs. This magical excessive saving is what the vetting panel doubts as legitimate but suspects it to be instances of corrupt dealings for instance the example below as cited by the panel

VETTING PANEL....So it's this source that makes us to be doubtful of your, your being able to convince us, that I mean doubtful, you are not convincing us that you are not involved in any corruption. It's justsee the money it is flowing in....

From the foregoing discussion it can be said that police officers positioned themselves as hard working entrepreneurs engaged in legitimate income generating activities. The interview panel suspected the huge deposits into the officers' bank accounts as proceeds of graft but the officers on the other hand wanted the panel to believe that they have genuinely earned their money. Gordon (2009: 332) argues that positioning is jointly produced where by participants position themselves and others.

VETTING PANEL: In 2012-2113 you dealt with..... You received deposits of 2.4million shillings.....

VETTING PANEL: Let us look at the 230 thousand. Who deposited this money and what is the source?

OFFICER A: I think I deposited the money from the money from the rental, er from the milk and the maize and the eggs at my house.

In the exchange above Officer A positions herself as an astute entrepreneur who deals in serious business of rental houses and profitable farming. This positioning contradicts the way the vetting panel viewed the numerous cash transactions into the officer's bank accounts.

In the same vein officer C has a similar case of positioning herself. She explains her sources of huge amounts of money she dealt in as proceeds from businesses dealing with farm produce.

VETTING PANNEL... The difference is 5.3 million that is money floating because you did not tell us graphically how much you were deriving from wheat, mboga[vegetables] and er.. bananas..... and tell us where this 5.3million was coming from. If you tell us you may have collected some money through the M-pesa tills from matatu owners and matatu operators

OFFICER C: Sir, wakati nilikuwa nanunua marag..... mahindi na ngano nilikuwa nanunua pesa kidogo na yenye nauza juu kidogo. So nilikuwa napata profit.[Sir, the time I was buying bea... maize and wheat I was buying at a low price and that I sold was a little higher. So I was getting a profit].

Officer C attributes her millions to businesses that involve the sale of farm produce. In the next exchange Officer N cannot account for several cash and cheque deposits that he made in his account.

VETTING PANEL: Four cheque deposits of four hundred, five hundred, five hundred, five hundred (thousands) and they were deposited on 10th October 2012..... (Interrupted)

OFFICER N: Chair, my bank statement is here (wielding a piece of paper) There's no day I deposited same day that amount of money. That analysis is wrong.

Officer N had to object to the presented evidence because the reality of the matter seemed to be bordering on embarrassment and implausibility.

CONCLUSION

This study found glaring discrepancies between what ideally takes place in merry go rounds, welfare money, contributions, proceeds from rental houses and sale of farm produce and savings and other business ventures and the patterns of cash flows in the officers' bank accounts and mobile phones. To begin with the first three activities are done in an orderly manner with records as prove well kept. The beneficiaries in these arrangements vary according to the number of members. It is very unlikely that one person benefits alone several times. The amount involved in merry go rounds is fixed and is given out at a regular time. Contributions on the other hand are not fixed but all the members are involved in contributing the money. Welfare money benefits all the members whenever they are in need. This is contrary to what was witnessed when a police officer who had sent money to her senior seventy times claimed that the purpose for the money sent was for welfare. Lastly savings and proceeds from business ventures are legitimate economic activities that are capable of generating a lot of money. These activities have undoubtedly clear and systematic records that can be followed when need arises. However the story lines that some of the police officers gave did not seem to convince the panel and listeners alike in terms of consistencies that characterize the known activities.

REFERENCES

- Coulthard, M. and Johnson, A (2007) *An introduction to Forensic linguistics: Language in Evidence*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Coulthard, M(1996) 'The Official Version: Audience Manipulation in Police records of interview with suspects' in Caldas-Coulthard & M, Coulthard, *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London : Routledge (166-78)
- Bernard, H.R (2002) *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative methods*, (3rd ed. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Tannen , D, Hamilton , E and Schiffrin, D (2015) *The handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd Ed: Framing and positioning: Gordon, C (2009)
- Gentles,S.J, Charles,C., Ploeg,J, & Mckibbon, K. (2015). Sampling in Qualitative Research: Insights from an Overview of the methods of Literatutre. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(11), 1772-1789. Retrieved from HYPERLINK "<https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss11/5>"
- Goffman, E (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Northeastern University Press. New York: Harper and Row.
- Gumperz, J.J (1982) Contextualization cues in Gumperz, J.J(ed) . *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heydon, G (2005) *The Language of Police Interviewing: A Critical Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Ralarala,M. and Rodrigues, T. (2019) Incarcerated, incriminated or vindicated? An investigation into socio-pragmatic elements of police interviewing. in Ralarala, M. etal eds (2019) *New Frontiers in Forensic Linguistics: Themes and Perspectives in language and Law in Africa and beyond*. Sun Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating Theory and Practice* (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Republic of Kenya. (2010).*The constitution of Kenya, 2010*. Nairobi: Kenya National Law Reporting. HYPERLINK "<http://www.kenyalaw.org>" www.kenyalaw.org HYPERLINK "<http://www.kenyanews.go.ke>" www.kenyanews.go.ke. Kenya News Agency Information for development. KNA 16th October, 2019.

4.2.1 Merry go rounds

The denotative meaning of **merry go round** according to Cambridge dictionary, is a large machine at a fair or amusement park that turns round and has a wooden or plastic animals or vehicles on which children ride. The term merry go round has been expanded to include financial engagements where individuals contribute money to each other at a regular period of time in fixed amounts. These contributions are done over and again until all the members of the group have benefited. In simulating what goes on in the carousels, these contributions form a cycle that can go on and on for as long as the members agree. The use of the term merry go round can be considered as a case of semantic broadening.

Semantic broadening is the process by which a lexical item is used to convey a more general meaning above the encoded one. Lexical broadening consists of approximation and

metaphorical extension (Muyuku: 2009) as quoted in (Koech, S 2014). In semantic broadening the meaning of a word is expanded so as to include other more meanings of words. Semantic broadening is a type of semantic change by which the meaning of a word becomes broader or more inclusive than its earlier meaning (Kaburise. P& Klu. E. (2014). They further observe that “Broadened or connotative-rich words and expressions have the potential to create misinterpretation and localizing one’s utterances” (pg. 1)

Merry go rounds when used in the Kenyan context eliminates all the semantic properties of a play in an amusement park but retains the features of an activity that is done in a cycle. This is a typical case of localizing ones ideas and interpretation.

The semantic changes that the word merry go round has gone through is a case of semantic broadening or generalization of words to become more inclusive in meaning. That is to say the word has its denotative meaning of a Ferris wheel and also the connotative meaning of a special kind of contributions among members of a welfare group. This meaning is the connotative meaning that is generally associated with merry go rounds in Kenya. However the same connotative meaning has been further expanded by respondents during the police vetting exercise in Kenya.

When police officers were asked to explain the several mobile money transactions that were moving among officers of various ranks and especially money transfers from junior officers to the seniors, their response was that they were engaged in a merry go rounds. The panel felt that the many cash flows were not fulfilling all the features of merry go rounds as understood in the Kenyan context. Therefore this study concludes that the original meaning of a merry go round has been expanded over and over to include all kinds of activities that are done repeatedly irrespective of the cyclic movements.

PANEL 10: To OCPD Ramunga (not the real name) whom you sent fifteen times...

OFFICER J: We sat and tried to find a solution to er....get....you know...to uplift our standards. Soer....we decided to do a merry go round within us.

The officer above attributes the several money transfers from his mobile phone to another officer’s phone to a merry go round among various officers.

4.2.2 Tea

The other word whose meaning has been expanded is the word **tea**. The denotative meaning of the term is a beverage drink that is usually taken preferable while hot. The word tea when used among acquaintances headed for a restaurant or tea rooms will just have the denotative meaning. However when used in the context where some undue favors are to be extended to one of the participant(s) then the word acquires a connotative meaning. The present study observes that the word tea has undergone a process of semantic broadening where it has acquired an inclusive meaning of anything material or monetary that is given out from one person to the other in exchange for a favour.

In the police context any form of bribery is re-lexicalized as tea so that the degree of the corrupt practice is mitigated. The semantic properties of the term tea: easy to cook, costs little, taken all the time, a show of good will, an icebreaker, taken by almost everybody in

Kenya etc. are transferred to the act of bribery and made to sound normal and acceptable in the eyes of the recipient and the giver.

VETTING PANEL: Tell us finally sergeant Bravo, as an officer working in a base and of course a very senior officer for that matter in terms of years served. Have you been bought **tea** by a matatu driver, matatu owners, bodaboda riders, their owners so that **you smoothen things for them**, even without you soliciting?

OFFICER A: No

PANEL 1: Now, look at commissioner XYZ straight into the face and tell her that you've never **received any monies to influence how you serve as a traffic officer**.

OFFICER A: (Hesitatingly) What I can say... sometimes you are.... You are just doing your...er... checkups on the road, somebody can just stop his Prado, car and says "can I buy you **tea**?" just good heartedly but not from matatus, No. "Nikununulie **lunch, ni kristmas**"[can I buy you lunch? It is Christmas].As we are heading for Christmas, somebody will just stop over and says "let me buy you lunch" without even demanding from the.

In the exchange above, the vetting panel chooses to use the word 'tea' which is a case of accommodation at the lexical level. The panel's lexical choice was motivated by the need to accommodate the police officer thus adapting to the language of police context. According to Accommodation theory by (Giles 1979) as cited in Satia(2014:45) 'when individuals speak they tend to adjust their speech style to the speech style of their interlocutors'. The vetting panel utilized the convergence type of accommodation to make the police officer feel somewhat at ease.

When asked whether she has been bought tea by matatu operators with the aim of "smoothening things for them", the officer was quick to decline. However when probed further about her receiving any monies in exchange of favours, the officer responded that sometimes while on duty she can be bought tea. In choosing the term tea as opposed to a bribe, the police officer seems to suggest that the gesture is a positive one that causes no harm after all it was given out of a good will.

OFFICER A says ".....somebody can just stop his Prado, car and says "can I buy you tea?"nikununulie lunch ni krismas"[can I buy you lunch? It is christmass]. When the word tea is used in this context we don't expect the benefactor to take the officers to a restaurant or a tea room to buy tea. Rather the benefactor will give out some amount of money to the officers which will be taken and contextually understood as tea.

4.2.3 Lunch or lunch money

The other lexical item that featured during the police vetting exercise in Kenya and is commonly used within police discourse is the notion of **lunch**. This exchange serves to illustrate.

PANEL2: Upon receipt of money in your phone from that person that you did not know, couldn't you bother to ask him why they sent you the money?

OFFICER B:the ideal thing is to call back and you end up with a name. Most of them use ...they use these... what do we call them...alias names. Oh ni wa Kimani (not his real name) amekutumia ni lunch yako. [Oh it is son of Kimani who has sent. It's your lunch].

Officer B described the numerous amounts of money he received from motorists as lunch money. He claimed that he never bothered to send the money back because it was sent to him without soliciting for it. Similarly officer A above talks about people who offer to buy her and other police officers lunch without them asking for the same. This lunch as understood in this context does not refer to the usual meal that is taken in the middle of the day but monetary favours extended to police officers.

I think the word lunch is an improvement of tea on account of the amount of money involved in the transaction. With a small amount of money one can buy another person tea but lunch requires a higher amount of money. Lunch unlike tea is taken in the middle of the day, almost every person takes a meal during lunch time thus implying a necessity to the human species and the police officers are no exception. In a sense the meaning of the word like that of tea has been expanded to include monetary gains by police officers from members of the public such as motorists, business owners etc. The term lunch is used to re-lexicalize bribery making it less abhorrent since it is a necessity.

4.2.4 Token of appreciation

Another expression that is worth mentioning in semantic broadening is the phrase “**token of appreciation**”. Consider the exchanges below:

PANEL5: So when he pays you this money, he pays you for escort duties?

OFFICER E: No. it’s an appreciation, they appreciate our work.

PANEL6: kindly face the panel and tell them that you have never taken a bribe

OFFICER F: I cannot say I have never taken a bribe but sir you know a bribe, the specification of a bribe in ... according to..... I am forgetting. OK If I have ever taken a bribe sir..... May be an **appreciation**.

The responses from the officers are typical cases of re-lexicalization. These are attempts made by the officers to run away from the more incriminating words like bribery. Officer F tried to define the term “bribe” and being aware of the dangerous position she was placing herself in, decided to re-lexicalize the term as an appreciation. An appreciation unlike a bribe is positive and affirming good work done worth a reward. In using the term “token of appreciation” the officer seems to suggest that there is nothing wrong with her receiving gifts from the members of the public so long as her work is being appreciated. The dictionary definition of the term Token of appreciation is something you do for someone or that you give them as a way thanking them. Appreciation is given out after a good work well done. The meaning of the word appreciation has been expanded to include even money that is given out so as to influence or compromise someone in doing their duty well.

To use appreciation in place of a bribe is an understatement of the overall effect the vice of corruption has to the community. But all in all the concerned officers being aware of the consequences of bribery allegations in the end did face repairs of themselves via strategic choice of words.

4.2.5 Welfare money

Another word that has been used broadly in the vetting exercise is the term **welfare**. According to Cambridge English dictionary, the term welfare is help (financial) given especially by the state or an organization to people who need it especially because they do not have enough money, are poor or unemployed for a long time.

The use of the word welfare money among police officers is a case of semantic broadening. The original meaning of welfare as help given by the state has been expanded to include any financial assistance that individuals give one another in times of need be it on happy or sad occasions. Initially the help given in welfare was restricted to the unemployed, the poor and the needy while in the present study welfare is extended even to people who are employed such as police officers. The semantic properties of the word welfare as help accorded to the needy, the poor and the unemployed is eliminated in this context and assigned new meanings as financial assistance given to an individual in a happy or sad situation. In one of the responses during the vetting exercise an officer claimed that the money she sent to her senior was welfare money that was meant to assist the officer's family while on training. The interpretation of such responses will be done in framing of the officers in the later parts of this paper. Consider these exchanges:

PANEL 1: Alberto Noninin Wacera(not the real name) he deposited two hundred....sorry 22350. This was not.....er... a lump sum of money. He made deposits eleven times totaling this money. You say he was a colleague in the traffic.....would you recall what was the purpose of the money?

OFFICER A:A welfare. Tuko na[we have]a welfare and we had one of our officers whose child had....er.....alikuwa na ugonjwa wa roho.....[had a heart disease]

PANEL 1: You sent him money 10650. What was the purposed?

Officer A: Again it was for welfare. He was attending a course at the Kenya Police Training so we collected money then gave him so that he can help his family.....

4.2.6 Contributions

Closely related to welfare is the lexical item **contribution**. Longman dictionary defines contribution as something that you give or do in order to help something to be successful. It can be explained as an amount of money that people give in order to assist in the payment of something. Contributions in the Kenyan context, is a common means of pooling resources together in order to help someone. Contributions are normally done to assist bereaved families to meet funeral expenses for their loved ones. Contributions have also been done as a means of facilitating activities such as building churches, doing weddings, paying school fees among other activities. The vetted officers wanted their mobile money transfers to be interpreted as a form of contributions. The money sent from one officer to the other especially from juniors to seniors was explained as contributions that were collected from other officers.

PANEL 3: Hold on before you talk about five, am talking about you. I am not talking about any five. Your base commander had problems seventy times?

OFFICER C: Sir, I cannot say is a problem because kama mtu atakuwa na shida mahali within Rakon ama Raum(not the real names) as a whole tulikuwa tunamtolea ire kiroho yako vile inakuambia. So tulikuwa tunamchangia kidogo[if somebody had a problem in a place

within Rakon or Raum as a whole we were contributing that which your heart tells you. So we were **contributing** for him something small]

OFFICER D: You sit down, talk to your officers and then under the request of the base commander you sit down and see how much can each **contribute**. That now after putting the money together you are being told that now you can send that money to him.

PANEL 14: The reports indicated that you have sent a lot of money on several occasions to your seniors via mobile money transfer. Explain to the commission.

OFFICER P: It was **contribution** towards ...er...there was an officer who was sick and there was also a first aid competition and it was when he asked for a contribution from us.

4.3.1 Merry go rounds

The word merry go round was offered as an explanation to the pattern followed by the money transfers in the officers' mobile phones. The usage of this word is derived through the process of analogy. The cyclic movement in the amusement park is analogized with the turns taken by membership contributions in a group. The Blevins (2009:1) argue that "the human mind is continuously searching for any patterns. Once the patterns are found are classified, related to other patterns and used to predict yet further patterns and correlations." When individuals talk of merry go rounds in the Kenyan context, it is not the case that they are referring to a circus but a self-help group. Adede A(2007:16) defines merry go round as " a self-help organization which mobilize their own resources mainly from members periodical savings, cover their costs and finance their growth using profits arising from credit to members". The respondents during the vetting exercise wanted the interviewing panel to interpret their financial transactions as instances of a merry go round which is a lawful venture and open to any group of individuals.

4.3.2 Contributions and welfare money

One of the explanations given by some of the police officers who underwent the vetting process wanted their money transfers via their mobile phones to be taken as contributions from members that were meant for welfare. Ideally the welfare department of any organization is concerned with assisting members of their group in times of need. The contributions can be made, directed to the treasurer who has a record of the members' contributions. The treasurer can sent or give the money to the designated member. The explanations as given by the officers are compared to the dealings of a good welfare. In giving this explanation the officers intended their actions to be treated as legitimate. However from the manner in which the money flowed many doubts abound. Consider the responses below for illustration

PANEL 1: He is an officer

OFFICER A: Yes he is a colleague. Yah working with me at Narosamu (not the real name)

PANEL 1: He sent you 5410. The same transaction was done over a number of times precisely 7 times. You remember what was the purpose of these deposits?

OFFICER A: For welfare.

PANEL 1: How many officers do you have?

OFFICER A: We were about....er... I think we were about 13 but some went on transfer, we were left about 7 but now we are again 13.

PANEL 1: So the only ones who were sending you money in support of colleagues and for welfare were only 2 officers?

OFFICER A: Yah.

PANEL 1: Tell us if you know Moses Angaza(not his real name)?

OFFICER A: Is in Nyukani (not the real name) traffic base.....

PANEL 1: You sent him money 10650. What was the purpose?

OFFICER A: Again it was for welfare. He was attending a course at the Kenya Police college.....

OFFICER C:tulikuwa tunamtote ile kiroho yako vile inakuambia so tulikuwa tunamchangia kidogo.....naweka mpesa namtumia.

PANEL 3: So it means the traffic commandant always would tell you when he has problems but you never told the traffic commandant when you have problems.....

The first interview between PANEL 1 and OFFICER A reveal interesting views on how their welfare operated. Out of thirteen police officers in the base only two members are the main contributors to the welfare kitty. The same contributors are sending money to the officer in charge of welfare numerous number of times implying that their members had issues on the same number of times. Such a coincidence made the vetting panel to doubt the veracity of truth in the officer's explanations.

In the second exchange above between PANEL 3 and OFFICER C who is in charge of welfare in her base, we witness instances when she sent welfare contributions to her boss seventy times. It is expected that welfare contributions would go to different people at different times as the need arises.