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Commissioner’s foreword

The integrity of an organisation is framed by the attitude of its staff. Indeed, organisational culture is a key driver of integrity. An organisation which operates in an environment of lax adherence to process, an unwillingness to call out impropriety and a perception that action will not be taken in response to improper conduct is at high risk of corruption, misconduct and maladministration.

The maintenance of integrity in public institutions requires constant vigilance. Organisations must continuously assess risks, listen to their staff and measure the effectiveness of their processes.

In April 2018 my office released a survey which sought to better understand attitudes and experiences in public administration around issues of integrity. The survey was made available to public officers in both state and local government.

The purpose of the survey was two-fold. First, the survey would offer a contemporary understanding of public officers’ attitudes to reporting, experiences of corruption or inappropriate conduct and perceptions of risk. Secondly, it would provide information that would assist agencies to identify key areas for improvement.

The survey remained open for four weeks. More than 12,500 responses were received, although some responses were incomplete. I thank all those public officers who contributed to the survey.

This is the first of two reports to be published in respect of the survey. It deals with an analysis of the quantitative survey data. Early next year a second report will be published. That report will address the qualitative data.

This report highlights a range of issues, all of which should act as a catalyst for agencies to review their operations.
Before commenting upon some of the more salient findings I should offer a few words of caution. The report relies exclusively upon the survey responses received. They are based upon the perceptions of those who have responded. It is not possible to assert that the survey findings accurately depict the true state of affairs in an agency or across public administration. No survey could achieve such an outcome. Instead, these survey results should be seen as a sign post for agencies to explore identified issues in greater detail in order to assess the extent to which action is required.

The survey identified widespread and significant concern amongst public officers about reporting impropriety, both internally and to an outside agency. The results indicated widespread anxiety amongst public officers about making a report and high levels of dissatisfaction with the manner in which their organisation dealt with their report and communicated with the reporter.

There is little doubt that for many public officers the decision to make a report about impropriety is a difficult one. As this survey report reveals, public officers often experience anxiety, including fearing for their own employment, when making a report. Even in the face of a mandatory reporting obligation, it would be naïve to assume that emotional factors do not play a role in determining whether a public officer will report.

Confidence in the process was also low. Only 40% of participants agreed that they were confident their organisation would take action in respect of a report and only 25% agreed that their organisation had adequate protections in place for those who report.

It is incumbent upon every organisation to best ensure an environment where a willingness to report improper conduct is valued rather than discouraged and where a reporter can feel safe and supported to make a report.

Interestingly, 14% of participants agreed that their agency discourages such reporting. A further 32.5% did not know or were unsure. Only 53.5% actively disagreed with the notion. Each organisation should reflect upon that finding.
I am hopeful that the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2018* will, when it commences, have a positive impact in respect of reporting.

A high proportion of participants reported encountering particular forms of corruption or inappropriate conduct over the last five years. The most prevalent were bullying and harassment, and nepotism and favouritism.

Similarly, a high proportion of participants identified their agency as being highly or extremely vulnerable to a range of corruption or inappropriate conduct risks. Again, bullying and harassment and nepotism and favouritism figured prominently.

I hope that this report assists those engaged in public administration to better understand contemporary perceptions about integrity in public institutions and acts as a catalyst for further discussion, evaluation and action to address the issues identified.

Listening to staff is fundamental.

Staff attitudes drive culture and culture drives integrity.
Participants

The purpose of the ICAC Public Integrity Survey 2018 was to better understand state and local government employee’s attitudes and perceptions towards corruption and inappropriate conduct.

The survey was ‘live’ from 4 April - 4 May 2018 and received 12,656 responses. No questions were mandatory and not all responses were complete.

The survey questions are shown in Appendix one. Rounding has been used in respect of statistical results. Accordingly not all tables and figures total 100%.

In order to permit comparisons, participants were asked to self-identify which agency they worked for from a list of seventeen agencies or agency groups. Smaller agencies were typically excluded to ensure the privacy of participants. Subsequent machinery of government changes have resulted in title and composition changes to some agencies. The original title of the agency is shown in brackets in the following table.

Agency breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%¹</th>
<th>% OF AGENCY²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA Health (Department for Health and Ageing or Local Health Networks)</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Human Services (Department for Communities and Social Inclusion)</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Police</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Education (Department for Education and Child Development)</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Child Protection</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Correctional Services</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney-General’s Department</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1. PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% of Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department for Environment and Water (Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources)</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Primary Industries and Regions</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Industry and Skills (Department of State Development)</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services (excluding SA Police)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Treasury and Finance</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts Administration Authority</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government - Other</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Percentages based on all survey participants, including those not identifying their workplace.
2: Percentages based on the total agency head count of relevant categories in the Workforce Information Report 2016-17.
3: Includes Local Health Networks and the retitled Department for Health and Wellbeing.
Demographics of participants

### TABLE 2. DEMOGRAPHICS OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N¹</th>
<th>%²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,040</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other¹</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years and under³</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-34 years</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years and above</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>9,193</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-term</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Gender pie chart](image)
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### TABLE 2. DEMOGRAPHICS OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected members^3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management or Executive (‘Senior’)</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level staff (‘Middle’)</td>
<td>6,058</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff (‘Other’)</td>
<td>4,374</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time with organisation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ROLE**

- **ELECTED MEMBERS** 0.3%
- **‘SENIOR’** 9.4%
- **‘MIDDLE’** 52.4%
- **‘OTHER’** 37.9%

**TIME WITH ORGANISATION**

- **LESS THAN ONE YEAR** 9.8%
- **1-5 YEARS** 25.7%
- **6-10 YEARS** 21.9%
- **11-20 YEARS** 25.1%
- **MORE THAN 20 YEARS** 17.6%
TABLE 2. DEMOGRAPHICS OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in public administration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>3,597</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: As questions were not mandatory, the number of participants in specific demographic categories is smaller than the total of all responses.
2: Percentages are calculated on the total number of participants who responded to that particular question.
3: For the purpose of statistical analyses this category was excluded.

The survey sample was representative of the SA government workforce, as described in the Workforce Information Report 2016-17, although there is a greater proportion of permanent staff.
AWARENESS AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE ICAC AND THE OPI
Awareness & perceptions of the ICAC & the OPI

Awareness

The survey commenced with references to the ICAC and the OPI. Participants were subsequently asked whether they had heard of the ICAC or the OPI prior to receiving the survey. Therefore, it is possible that the following figures are overestimations of genuine awareness.

Four out of five participants were aware of ICAC. Fewer participants were aware of the OPI.

**STATISTICAL FINDINGS**

**Aware of the ICAC**

- Women were less likely and men were more likely to agree to having heard of the ICAC (75.4% and 86.4%).
- Those aged 21-34 were less likely and those aged 55+ were more likely to agree (68.5% and 84.9%).
- ‘Other’ staff were less likely and ‘Middle’ and ‘Senior’ staff were more likely to agree (72.2%, 82.4% and 94.2%).
- Casual staff were less likely and permanent staff were more likely to agree (58.6% and 80.9%).
- Those who had been in the organisation for less than a year were less likely and those who had been there for more than 20 years were more likely to agree (70.0% and 84.2%).
- Those who had been in public administration for less than a year and from 1-5 years were less likely and those who had been there for more than 20 years were more likely to agree (59.0%, 70.7% and 85.7%).

There is steadily increasing awareness of ICAC the longer a person has worked in an organisation, in public administration, by age and increasing power or status. Casual staff had particularly low levels of awareness.
Eleven percent less women than men were aware of ICAC. This may reflect lower female representation in groups that were more aware of the ICAC, more than 20 years in either the organisation or public administration, ‘Senior’, and permanent roles.

Awareness of the ICAC was asked in a survey performed by McGregor Tan Research on behalf of ICAC in 2015. The 2015 survey also commenced with references to the ICAC and the OPI but did not ask for participants’ awareness prior to receiving the survey. Compared to the 2015 survey, awareness of the OPI has been stable (59%). Awareness of ICAC had apparently decreased from 91% to 80%, a drop of 11%. Considering increased ICAC related media, for example the Oakden: A Shameful Chapter in South Australia’s History report, it is unlikely those previously aware of ICAC had subsequently forgotten. It also seems unlikely that there had been significant transition of staff out of public administration who may be more likely to be aware of ICAC. This difference may be attributable to the change in question wording.

Perceptions

Participants who were aware of the ICAC were asked for their level of agreement or disagreement with a series of questions in respect of their perceptions of the ICAC and its role.
A high percentage of participants agreed that it was important to have an ICAC (93.4%) and for ICAC to have the power to address high level corruption and inappropriate conduct (96.0%).

Perceptions of the manner in which the ICAC conducts its activities varied. Fewer participants agreed that ICAC decisions were free from interference (54.4%), that it is trustworthy (61.5%) and treats people fairly (48.6%). Only 51.4% of participants expressed confidence that action would be taken if a report was made to the ICAC / OPI. Post hoc* analysis exploring the perceptions of ICAC from those who had contact with the organisation and also the lower levels of actual disagreement suggest that lower than desired agreement likely reflects a lack of personal experience and contact with ICAC / OPI.

Nine out of ten participants agreed that the ICAC should assist in establishing anti-corruption measures. More than three in four participants agreed that the ICAC should share more about ‘what was going on’ in the public sector and local government. Disagree and ‘neither agree nor disagree’ responses to whether ICAC should share more information may potentially reflect awareness that some confidentiality is needed for operational reasons.

*Post Hoc in this context is used to describe additional exploration of the data that was not part of the initially planned series of statistical tests exploring demographic differences. For the sake of brevity the specific data from these further breakdowns of responses are not included in the report.
REPORTING CORRUPTION AND INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT
Reporting corruption & inappropriate conduct

Reporting to the ICAC & the OPI

Public officers have an obligation under the Commissioner’s Directions and Guidelines (https://icac.sa.gov.au/directions-guidelines) to report all reasonable suspicions of corruption and serious or systemic misconduct and maladministration to the OPI. SA Police public officers have slightly different reporting obligations, detailed in the link provided.

Nearly one in three participants were either ambivalent / uncertain regarding reporting or were opposed to reporting.

Four out of five participants agreed that they had reporting obligations. Willingness to report was lower. Nearly one in three participants were either ambivalent / uncertain regarding reporting or were opposed to reporting.

STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Have reporting obligations to the ICAC / OPI

- Women were slightly less likely and men were slightly more likely to agree they had reporting obligations (78.6% and 81.6%).

- ‘Other’ staff were less likely and ‘Senior’ staff were more likely to agree (76.3% and 87.7%).

- Casual staff were less likely and fixed-term staff were more likely to agree (74.2% and 83.3%).

- Those who had been in an organisation for 11-20 years were less likely and those who had been in the organisation for less than one year or 1-5 years were more likely to agree (75.4% and 83.0%, 82.5%).
Willing to report to the ICAC / OPI

- Women were less likely and men were more likely to agree they would report to ICAC (67.6% and 72.1%).\(^1\)
- ‘Other’ staff were less likely and ‘Senior’ staff were more likely to agree (63.7% and 83.0%).\(^4\)
- Casual staff were less likely and fixed-term staff were more likely to agree (61.4% and 76.0%).\(^5\)
- Those who had been in an organisation for 11-20 years were less likely and those who had been in the organisation for less than one year were much more likely to agree (65.4% and 79.0%).\(^6\)
- Those who had been in public administration for less than one year were more likely to agree (79.8%).\(^7\)

One in five participants were not aware of or disagree with having reporting obligations. It is important that all public officers are aware of and comply with their reporting obligations. These survey results suggest that public officers who are employed in less senior roles and casual staff should be specific targets for expanded education about their reporting obligations. Increased awareness amongst newer employees may suggest induction processes are incorporating ICAC awareness training. Lower levels of awareness among longer term employees suggests periodic refresher training is needed.

One in three participants reported being ambivalent / uncertain or opposed to reporting to ICAC / OPI. Lodging a report may be emotionally confronting and agreeing to do so is likely highly contextual to the specifics of the situation. As the question regarding willingness to report was necessarily generic this may have lowered agreement, with participants potentially not feeling they could provide an informed response. However, high proportions not being willing to report to ICAC / OPI is an area for exploration and education.

Demographic differences in willingness to report to the ICAC / OPI reflect those of reporting obligation awareness, with newer staff being more likely and casual and lower level staff being less likely to report. That 4.5% less women agreed they were willing to report to the ICAC / OPI may perhaps be explained by their over representation in ‘Other’ roles, a group which was less likely to agree to report.

It is important that all public officers are aware of and comply with their reporting obligations.
Reporting internally

Participants were asked a series of questions about reporting corruption/inappropriate conduct within their organisation.

There was slightly more agreement that participants would report internally than to ICAC/OPI, but still one in four did not agree they would report internally. Disagreement was also higher, at one in ten.

Fourteen percent of participants agreed that their organisation discouraged reporting, with a further one in three being ambivalent/uncertain. This raises issues as to the reporting culture within organisations that participants experience. Post hoc exploration showed feeling discouraged was more likely amongst participants who disagreed that their organisation had reporting procedures or provided information on reporting.

There was slightly more agreement that participants would report internally than to ICAC/OPI, but still one in four did not agree they would report internally.
It is important that public officers have confidence in their organisation’s willingness to take appropriate action in respect of reports and for reporters to be treated appropriately. The survey results indicate that such confidence is lower than is desirable. Only 40% of participants agreed that they were confident that their organisation would take action and only one in four agreed that their organisation had adequate protections for those who report. A larger proportion (29%) disagreed there were adequate protections.

Every organisation in public administration ought to take note of these survey results and reflect upon what can be done to improve them.

While there was greater agreement that organisations had policies or procedures for reporting, one in three participants disagreed or were ambivalent / uncertain as to their existence. Only 45% of participants agreed that their organisation provided information about reporting. It is important that every agency has in place reporting procedures and that those procedures are effectively communicated to all public officers.

Under a third of participants agreed that they were confused about what to report. Note that this question did not specify whether this was regarding reporting internally or to the ICAC / OPI. It is difficult to provide a definitive list of matters that ought to be reported owing to the varied array of conduct that would trigger a reporting obligation. Public officers need to exercise their judgement and are encouraged to contact the OPI if they are not sure about whether to make a report. If in doubt, it is best to report.

One in five participants agreed that one should consider negative consequences to the organisation before reporting. That is a surprising result. Attempts to hide poor practice or behaviour is misguided loyalty at best and further encourages poor practices, adversely affects an agency’s ability to deliver services to the community and, ultimately, decreases public trust in government institutions. Organisations are encouraged to promote a culture where admitting a mistake is more valued than hiding one. Considering negative consequences prior to reporting was more prominent amongst ‘Other’ staff and less likely in ‘Senior’ staff, though 16% of ‘Senior’ staff still agreed with the proposition.

Organisations are encouraged to promote a culture where admitting a mistake is more valued than hiding one.

Only 40% of participants agreed that they were confident that their organisation would take action and only one in four agreed that their organisation had adequate protections for those who report.
STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Willing to report internally

- Men were slightly less likely and women were slightly more likely to agree that they would report internally (71.5% and 74.5%).
- ‘Other’ staff were less likely and ‘Senior’ staff were more likely to agree (69.4% and 83.8%).
- Fixed-term staff were more likely to agree (76.7%).
- Those who had been in an organisation for 6-10 or 11-20 years were less likely and those who had been there for under a year were more likely to agree (70.4%, 71.2% and 80.7%).
- Those who had been in the public service for 6-10 years were less likely and those who had been there for under a year were more likely to agree (71.2% and 82.2%).

My organisation discourages reporting

- Men were more likely and women were less likely to disagree their organisation discourages reporting (56.9% and 51.5%).
- Those aged 21-34 years old were less likely to agree (10.4%).
- ‘Other’ staff were more likely and ‘Senior’ staff were less likely to agree (16.4% and 8.4%).
- Fixed-term staff were less likely to agree (9.3%).
- Those who had been in an organisation for less than one year and one to five years were less likely and those who had been in an organisation for 11-20 years were more likely to agree (6.3%, 11.9% and 16.9%).
- Those who had been in public administration for less than one year and one to five years were less likely to agree (4.5% and 10.6%).

Confident my organisation would take action

- Men were more likely and women were less likely to agree they were confident their organisation would take action (42.0% and 38.2%).
- Those aged 21-34 were more likely to agree (45.6%).
- ‘Senior’ staff were more likely and ‘Other’ staff were less likely to agree (59.0% and 34.8%).
- Fixed-term staff were more likely to agree (50.1%).
- Those who had been in the organisation for less than one year or 1-5 years were more likely and those who had been there for 6-10 years or 11-20 years were less likely to agree (55.6%, 44.0%, 35.6% and 34.7%).
- Those who had been in public administration for less than one year or 1-5 years were more likely and those who had been there for 11-20 years or more than 20 years were less likely to agree (61.9%, 47.6%, 35.8% and 36.6%).
My organisation has adequate protections for those who report

- Women were less likely and men were more likely to agree there were adequate protections for those who report (22.9% and 28.0%).
- Those aged 21-34 were more likely to agree (29.1%).
- ‘Other’ staff were less likely and ‘Senior’ staff were more likely to agree (21.9% and 40.6%).
- Fixed-term staff were more likely to agree (29.8%).
- Those who had been in the organisation for less than one year were more likely to agree (33.3%).
- Those who had been in public administration for less than one year and from 1-5 years were more likely to agree (40.6% and 28.4%).

Confused about what to report

- Women were more likely and men were less likely to agree to being confused about what to report (31.7% and 25.9%).
- Those who were 21-34 years old were more likely and those who were 55+ were less likely to agree (36.0% and 26.1%).
- ‘Other’ staff were more likely and ‘Senior’ staff were less likely to agree (33.3% and 18.6%).
- ‘Casual’ staff were more likely to agree (37.9%).
- Those who had been in an organisation for less than one year and also more than 20 years were less likely to agree (26.1% and 26.4%).
- Those who had been in the public service for less than one year and more than 20 years were less likely and those who had been in the organisation for 1-5 years or 6-10 years were more likely to agree (24.6%, 26.7%, 32.3% and 33.0%).

A common pattern arose in relation to a number of survey questions. Those public officers who were newer to the organisation or public administration were more likely to report, less likely to think that their organisation discourages reporting and more likely to agree that there are adequate protections in place for reporters. Similarly there is a pattern of those in less senior positions seeing a less positive reporting culture within the organisation.

Those public officers who were newer to the organisation or public administration were more likely to report, less likely to think that their organisation discourages reporting and more likely to agree that there are adequate protections in place for reporters.

Women were less likely to report to the ICAC / OPI but more likely to report internally. This suggests a gendered aspect to reporting, which may be a topic for future exploration.

The gender difference in confidence that a public officer’s organisation would take action may relate to a public officer’s status or role. ‘Other’ staff had lower agreement to this question and this group was disproportionately female.

Whilst demographic differences are important to consider, a greater focus should be on how an organisation can shift perceptions generally to promote a more favourable reporting environment.
Experiences with reporting internally

The survey revealed that 15.7% of participants had previously reported corruption or inappropriate conduct to someone inside their organisation. For the most recent report, 68.9% had reported to a supervisor or manager, 19.0% to the head of their organisation, 23.4% to human resources personnel and 18.5% to an ‘Other’ role. Those who made such reports were asked a number of questions about their experience.

The survey suggests that participants’ experiences with reporting internally are typically not positive. Only one in four was satisfied with the process. It is likely that those who were dissatisfied with the outcome of a report may be more likely to consider the process as being flawed which could have reduced agreement to this question. However, such low satisfaction is still a point for consideration.

Approximately one in three participants agreed that they were informed of the process that would occur. For situations where a public officer had reported anonymously, and therefore could not be informed of the process, participants could choose ‘Not Applicable’. Hence, it seems likely that the low proportion of participants agreeing they were informed of the process is a genuine reflection of public officer’s experiences.

Post hoc exploration showed those who reported not being informed of the process that would occur were more likely to be dissatisfied with the process.

This reinforces the importance of organisations ensuring that those who make a report are properly informed of the process adopted to deal with it.

The survey suggests that participants’ experiences with reporting internally are typically not positive. Only one in four was satisfied with the process.

I WAS SATISFIED WITH THE PROCESS  
59.3% AGREED  
25.3% DISAGREED

MY REPORT WAS LOOKED INTO  
34% AGREED  
49.5% DISAGREED

MY ANONYMITY WAS MAINTAINED  
36.8% AGREED  
30.9% DISAGREED

I WAS INFORMED OF THE PROCESS THAT WOULD OCCUR  
47.5% AGREED  
37.3% DISAGREED

MY ORGANISATION MADE CHANGES AS A RESULT OF MY REPORT  
57.1% AGREED  
21.8% DISAGREED
Half of participants agreed that their report was looked into. This may underestimate an organisation’s response to reports as 1) participants may not be aware of the action taken in response to the report and 2) the information provided in the report may be insufficient to permit further inquiry. Accordingly, this figure alone should not be definitively taken as a negative outcome. Instead the result reinforces the need for organisations to inform those who make reports of the action taken.

Slightly under one in three participants agreed their anonymity was maintained. Slightly over one in three participants disagreed. Whether or not a reporter can maintain his or her anonymity is likely a significant consideration for some reporters. In some circumstances anonymity can be difficult to maintain and it is also difficult to guarantee. However, organisations should ensure they have processes in place to best protect a reporter’s anonymity where sought in order to create an environment where people feel safe to report.

One in five participants agreed that their organisation made changes as a result of their report. The particular wording of the question may have artificially lowered agreement. ‘Made changes’ may have implied a broader, organisation wide response, which may not always be necessary. It may have been more precise to have drafted the question to identify whether an organisation ‘took action as a result of the report’. Of course not every report warrants action. However, with the survey revealing that only one in five participants agreed that action was taken as a result of their report, this may suggest that action is not taken as often as it should.

Taken together these results highlight high dissatisfaction with internal reporting of inappropriate conduct. Staff who are willing to take the often confronting and difficult step of speaking up are critical to an organisation’s integrity. It is incumbent upon public agencies to ensure reports are acknowledged and treated appropriately. Organisations are encouraged to review their reporting procedures and openly and frankly examine how they are responding to reports of inappropriate conduct.

However, organisations should ensure they have processes in place to best protect a reporter’s anonymity where sought in order to create an environment where people feel safe to report.

Staff who are willing to take the often confronting and difficult step of speaking up are critical to an organisation’s integrity.
Attitudes to reporting

Participants were asked a series of questions addressing attitudes to reporting.

Most participants were confident that they knew what was expected under their Code of Conduct. This question does presume that all participants were subject to a Code of Conduct which may not necessarily be the case. However, this should be applicable for the majority of participants. While self-expressed confidence does not denote an actual confirmed understanding, this suggests most of the participants are likely familiar with their Code of Conduct. Those not agreeing were more likely to be younger, casual staff, or had more recently entered employment in public administration.
Survey responses reveal a clear pattern of anxiety about reporting. Slightly over half of all participants responded that they would be worried about their job if they were to report. Forty three percent of participants said that they would feel intimidated to report and nearly one in three felt reporting caused trouble with colleagues. Twenty nine percent of participants knew of others who had experienced negative consequences as a result of reporting. One in three participants agreed that making a report to an external body has negative consequences for the reporter.

Nevertheless, participants’ willingness to report was higher overall than perceptions of anxiety over reporting. This suggests that many participants will still report notwithstanding personal fears.

Pleasingly only few participants agreed that it was not an individual’s responsibility to report or that loyalty to the team was more important than reporting.

STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Worried about their job

- ‘Other’ staff were more likely and ‘Senior’ staff were less likely to agree that if they reported they would be worried about their job (58.1% and 44.6%).

Feel intimidated to report

- Women were more likely and men were less likely to feel intimidated to report (46.1% and 37.4%).
- Those aged 21-34 were more likely and those age 55+ were less likely to agree (51.3% and 37.0%).
- ‘Other’ staff were more likely and ‘Senior’ staff were less likely to agree (48.0% and 26.7%).

Reporting causes trouble with colleagues

- ‘Senior’ staff were less likely to agree that reporting causes trouble with colleagues (23.6%).
- Those who had been in the organisation for less than one year and those who had been there for more than 20 years were less likely to agree (37.2% and 39.4%).
- Those who had been in public administration for less than one year were less likely to agree (36.8%).
Know of others who have experienced negative consequences from reporting

- Those 55+ were more likely and those 21-34 were less likely to agree to having known others who had experienced negative consequences from reporting (32.4% and 20.5%).

- ‘Other’ staff were more likely and ‘Senior’ staff were less likely to agree (32.0% and 24.7%).

- Fixed-term staff were less likely to agree (21.9%).

- Those who had been in the organisation for 11-20 years were more likely and those who had been in the organisation for less than a year or one to five years were less likely to agree (34.0%, 17.5% and 25.8%).

- Those who had been in public administration for 11-20 years and more than 20 years were more likely and those who had been in public administration for less than a year or one to five years were less likely to agree (32.5%, 33.0%, 10.8% and 22.3%).

Reporting externally has negative consequences

- Those aged 21-34 were less likely to agree that reporting externally has negative consequences (32.1%).

- ‘Other’ staff were more likely and ‘Senior’ staff were less likely to agree (38.6% and 28.2%).

- Fixed-term staff are less likely to agree (31.9%).

- Those who had been in the organisation for 6-10 years were more likely and those who had been in the organisation for less than one year were less likely to agree (38.2% and 26.8%).

- Those who had been in public administration for less than one year were less likely to agree (24.7%).

‘Other’ staff had greater feelings of vulnerability and more knew others who had suffered negative consequences from reporting. ‘Senior’ staff experienced a lower sense of personal vulnerability and knew fewer people who had experienced negative consequences. Of course the concept of ‘negative consequences’ is subjective and has not been further explored.

Newer staff, both in the organisation and public administration, experienced a lower level of perceived vulnerability and were less likely to have known others who had experienced negative consequences as a result of reporting. Younger staff were more likely to feel intimidated to report.

‘Other’ staff had greater feelings of vulnerability and more knew others who had suffered negative consequences from reporting.
CORRUPTION AND INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT IN SA PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
Corruption & inappropriate conduct in SA public administration

Corruption / inappropriate conduct encountered in the last five years

Participants were asked if they had personally encountered corruption or inappropriate conduct in the last five years. If a participant had such experience he or she was then able to identify the type of conduct by reference to 14 categories.

A total of 45.5% of participants reported not encountering corruption / inappropriate conduct in the last five years.

For the purpose of the ‘Encountered corruption / inappropriate conduct’ figure on the following page, corruption / inappropriate conduct is shown as proportions of 1) participants who reported encountering corruption / inappropriate conduct in the last five years (‘Encountered’) and 2) all participants who completed the whole survey regardless of if they had encountered corruption / inappropriate conduct. The latter measure gives a more realistic perspective of the actual prevalence of perceived corruption / inappropriate conduct in public administration.

The survey does not assess the frequency, impact or severity of corruption / inappropriate conduct encountered by participants. Additionally, this is participants’ perceptions of corruption / inappropriate conduct. This perception may not necessarily reflect reality. However, this is still a valid and useful assessment of public officer’s concerns and experiences.

Of the categories of conduct identified, interpersonal and human resource issues are most prevalent, with nepotism / favouritism reported by two out of five participants and bullying / harassment by 44% of participants.

Of the categories of conduct identified, interpersonal and human resource issues are most prevalent, with nepotism / favouritism reported by two out of five participants and bullying / harassment by 44% of participants. Conflicts of interest are reported by more than one in four participants. More than one in five participants reported a failure to fulfil duties or the misuse of power. One in ten participants reported encountering financial misconduct, theft or fraud. ‘Financial misconduct’ could be broadly interpreted and may potentially include dissatisfaction with funding allocations.
ENCOUNTERED CORRUPTION / INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT

- Financial Misconduct, Theft, Fraud (Excluding Procurement Issues)
  - % All Participants: 10.2%
  - % Encountered: 21.7%

- Nepotism / Favouritism
  - % All Participants: 41.7%
  - % Encountered: 81.3%

- Falsifying Information (Excluding Financial Misconduct and Procurement Issues)
  - % All Participants: 11.3%
  - % Encountered: 24.2%

- Procurement (Distinct From General Financial Issues)
  - % All Participants: 6.1%
  - % Encountered: 13%

- Inappropriate Access To and / Or Misuse of Confidential Information
  - % All Participants: 16%
  - % Encountered: 33.4%

- Bullying and Harassment
  - % All Participants: 44.1%
  - % Encountered: 84.4%

- Conflict of Interest
  - % All Participants: 27.8%
  - % Encountered: 56.9%

- Bribery / Inappropriate Acceptance of Gifts
  - % All Participants: 5.1%
  - % Encountered: 10.8%

- Perverting the Course of Justice
  - % All Participants: 3.9%
  - % Encountered: 8.3%

- Mismanagement of Those Receiving Care
  - % All Participants: 10.3%
  - % Encountered: 21.8%

- Failure to Fulfil Duties (Excluding Other Categories)
  - % All Participants: 22.5%
  - % Encountered: 46.9%

- Physical Abuse / Assault
  - % All Participants: 4.8%
  - % Encountered: 10.3%

- Misuse of Power (Excluding Other Categories)
  - % All Participants: 22.8%
  - % Encountered: 47.2%

- Other
  - % All Participants: 4.6%
  - % Encountered: 12%

FINANCIAL MISCONDUCT, THEFT, FRAUD (EXCLUDING PROCUREMENT ISSUES)

NEPOTISM / FAVOURITISM

FALSIFYING INFORMATION (EXCLUDING FINANCIAL MISCONDUCT AND PROCUREMENT ISSUES)

PROCUREMENT (DISTINCT FROM GENERAL FINANCIAL ISSUES)

INAPPROPRIATE ACCESS TO AND / OR MISUSE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

BULLYING AND HARASSMENT

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

BRIBERY / INAPPROPRIATE ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS

PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE

MISMANAGEMENT OF THOSE RECEIVING CARE

FAILURE TO FULFIL DUTIES (EXCLUDING OTHER CATEGORIES)

PHYSICAL ABUSE / ASSAULT

MISUSE OF POWER (EXCLUDING OTHER CATEGORIES)

OTHER

ENCOUNTERED CORRUPTION / INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT

FINANCIAL MISCONDUCT, THEFT, FRAUD (EXCLUDING PROCUREMENT ISSUES)

NEPOTISM / FAVOURITISM

FALSIFYING INFORMATION (EXCLUDING FINANCIAL MISCONDUCT AND PROCUREMENT ISSUES)

PROCUREMENT (DISTINCT FROM GENERAL FINANCIAL ISSUES)

INAPPROPRIATE ACCESS TO AND / OR MISUSE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

BULLYING AND HARASSMENT

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

BRIBERY / INAPPROPRIATE ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS

PERVERTING THE COURSE OF JUSTICE

MISMANAGEMENT OF THOSE RECEIVING CARE

FAILURE TO FULFIL DUTIES (EXCLUDING OTHER CATEGORIES)

PHYSICAL ABUSE / ASSAULT

MISUSE OF POWER (EXCLUDING OTHER CATEGORIES)

OTHER
Falsifying information (excluding financial and procurement issues) was encountered by one in ten participants. This raises the question in what other areas in public administration governance are individuals falsifying information and what impact is this having? Sixteen percent of participants reported inappropriate access to and/or misuse of confidential information. This likely contravenes privacy obligations and may undermine trust in government services. One in ten noted the mismanagement of those receiving care. Given this is likely limited to participants working in care settings the actual rate may be higher. Five percent of participants reported bribery and acceptance of gifts and 4% reported having encountered attempts to pervert the course of justice.

Participants were asked whether they had received training on specific corruption risks. They were also asked whether they agreed that their workplace had to ‘bend the rules’ to achieve its goals.

![Training on Specific Corruption Risks](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Unsure</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![My Workplace Has to Bend the Rules](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagreed</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Unsure</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey results suggest that there is more work to do in respect of ensuring more public officers are trained in identifying and dealing with corruption risks. Corruption can occur in any organisation and at any level. It is important that organisations properly train staff to identify risks and the appropriate responses.

Slightly over one in five participants agreed that their workplace was required to bend the rules to achieve its goals. The question did not further explain what was meant by ‘bend the rules’. It is unclear if bend the rules reflects poor adherence to protocol, attempts to achieve personal benefit or protocols seen as ineffective or restrictive.

Agencies should routinely review their policies and procedures to ensure they permit efficiency and effectiveness, and that they are being adhered to.
STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Training on specific corruption risks

- Men were more likely and women were less likely to agree to having received training on specific corruption risks (67.8% and 56.0%).
- ‘Senior’ staff were more likely and ‘Other’ staff were less likely to agree (74.4% and 54.4%).
- Those who had been in the organisation for 6-10 years were less likely to agree (55.4%).
- Those who had been in public administration for less than one year were more likely and those who had been in public administration for 6-10 years were less likely to agree (69.1% and 56.1%).

My workplace has to bend the rules

- Men were more likely and women were less likely to agree their workplace had to bend the rules (25.1% and 20.2%).
- Those aged 21-34 were slightly less likely to agree (19.7%).
- ‘Other’ staff were more likely and ‘Senior’ staff were less likely to agree (25.1% and 15.9%).
- Fixed-term staff were less likely to agree (16.4%).
- Those who had been in the organisation for 6-10 years were more likely and those who had been there for less than one year were less likely to agree (25.1% and 10.7%).
- Those who had been in the public service for less than one year or for one to five years were less likely to agree (8.7% and 19.2%).

Post hoc exploration showed a gender difference in receiving training on corruption risks was likely related to workplaces with higher training rates being more male dominated. Women are also over represented in ‘Other’ staff, which was a group less likely to receive training.

The gender difference in ‘bending the rules’ seems unlikely to strongly relate to the specific workplace, with post hoc exploration showing some organisations with higher agreement also had a higher proportion of female staff. This may instead reflect a gendered reticence either to admit to bending the rules or engage in such behaviour. In a review of responses from participants who identified as belonging to an organisation with a higher proportion of female staff, men were still more likely to agree to bending the rules than their female colleagues, although the women had higher rates of agreement than the average for the whole sample.
Corruption / inappropriate conduct vulnerability

A total of 22.5% of participants did not think their organisation was vulnerable to corruption / inappropriate conduct.

Percentages in the ‘Perceived vulnerability to corruption / inappropriate conduct’ figure overleaf are based upon all participants who were shown the vulnerability questions and not just those participants who thought their organisation was vulnerable.

Reflecting responses to encountered corruption / inappropriate conduct, many participants reported their organisations being highly or extremely vulnerable to nepotism / favouritism (34%) and bullying / harassment (35%). Expanding the results to include perceptions of moderate vulnerability this increases to over half of all participants. Nearly one in four participants think their organisation is highly or extremely vulnerable to inappropriate access to and / or misuse of confidential information, increasing to 41% when perceptions of moderate vulnerability are included. Focussing on perceptions of high or extreme vulnerability, one in four participants were concerned with conflicts of interest, one in five with the misuse of power and slightly under one in five with failure to fulfil duties. One in ten participants were concerned with procurement, bribery / inappropriate acceptance of gifts and physical abuse / assault. Seven percent had concerns regarding financial misconduct, theft and fraud.

These survey results create an opportunity for organisations to talk with their staff, examine their culture and governance systems and to assess their corruption / inappropriate conduct risks and mitigation strategies.
PERCEIVED VULNERABILITY TO CORRUPTION / INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT

FINANCIAL MISCONDUCT, THEFT, FRAUD (EXCLUDING PROCUREMENT ISSUES)
- Somewhat Vulnerable: 7.2%
- Moderately Vulnerable: 14%
- Highly or Extremely Vulnerable: 30.3%

NEPOTISM / FAVOURITISM
- Somewhat Vulnerable: 34.4%
- Moderately Vulnerable: 17.9%
- Highly or Extremely Vulnerable: 18%

FALSIFYING INFORMATION (EXCLUDING FINANCIAL MISCONDUCT AND PROCUREMENT ISSUES)
- Somewhat Vulnerable: 7.3%
- Moderately Vulnerable: 12.3%
- Highly or Extremely Vulnerable: 27.6%

PROCUREMENT (DISTINCT FROM GENERAL FINANCIAL ISSUES)
- Somewhat Vulnerable: 11.2%
- Moderately Vulnerable: 14.4%
- Highly or Extremely Vulnerable: 26.8%

INAPPROPRIATE ACCESS TO AND / OR MISUSE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION
- Somewhat Vulnerable: 22.9%
- Moderately Vulnerable: 17.8%
- Highly or Extremely Vulnerable: 23.6%

BULLYING AND HARASSMENT
- Somewhat Vulnerable: 35%
- Moderately Vulnerable: 19.3%
- Highly or Extremely Vulnerable: 17.9%

CONFLICT OF INTEREST
- Somewhat Vulnerable: 24%
- Moderately Vulnerable: 18.4%
- Highly or Extremely Vulnerable: 23.3%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Somewhat Vulnerable</th>
<th>Moderately Vulnerable</th>
<th>Highly or Extremely Vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bribery / Inappropriate Acceptance of Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perverting the Course of Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismanagement of Those Receiving Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse of Power (Excluding Other Categories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Fulfil Duties (Excluding Other Categories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse / Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived Vulnerability to Corruption / Inappropriate Conduct Cont.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bribery / Inappropriate Acceptance of Gifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misuse of Power (Excluding Other Categories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure to Fulfil Duties (Excluding Other Categories)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Abuse / Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIFIC RISKS OF CORRUPTION AND INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT
Specific risks of corruption & inappropriate conduct

Generic or shared login details

Access to sensitive and confidential information must be properly controlled. Confidential information stored on a system which can be accessed by means of generic or shared login information means access cannot be audited and the risk of misuse is greatly increased.

In this survey, 32.6% of participants reported knowledge of databases / systems storing sensitive information, such as people’s personal details or financial data, which were accessible by generic or shared login details. This is an extraordinary result.

Organisations should examine their electronic systems to determine the extent to which sensitive and confidential information can be accessed by way of generic or shared login information. Where such access is available an assessment ought to be made of the controls in place to prevent misuse.
Recruitment practices

Participants were asked questions about their own recruitment.

A high proportion of participants reported having been the subject of a criminal history check during their recruitment. While previous convictions may not be an automatic barrier to employment in public administration, criminal history checks are a useful tool to ensure an employer has information that may be relevant to an employment decision.

Two out of five participants reported having a criminal association check. This was higher than expected and may be the result of confusion between a criminal history check and criminal association check. Unsurprisingly a higher percentage of SA Police and Department for Correctional Services staff reported having criminal association checks.
Fewer participants than expected reported having their qualifications verified. Participants could select ‘Not Applicable’ to accommodate for having no formal qualifications and 8% did so. Thirty percent of participants did not have their qualifications verified and post hoc exploration showed this was not strongly limited to particular demographic groups.

Where an employee must hold a particular qualification in order to carry out a particular role, that qualification ought to be verified by the employer. A statement in a job application ought not be accepted as the sole basis of proof of the existence of the qualification.

Referees were contacted during the recruitment of nearly nine out of ten participants. Lower rates were recorded in both ‘Other’ and ‘Casual’ roles.
RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS
Research conclusions

A number of points arise from this survey.

Attitudes towards ICAC and the OPI

There is room for continued improvement in awareness of the ICAC and the OPI. Participants were highly supportive of having an ICAC and for the ICAC to have the power to effectively address high level impropriety. Perceptions of ICAC, such as trustworthiness and independence, could be more positive though this likely reflects a lack of participant’s personal experience and contact with the office.

Eighty percent of participants agreed they had reporting obligations to the ICAC / OPI. However, only 70% agreed that they would report to the ICAC / OPI. Given the crucial role reporters play in bringing impropriety to light it is important that public officers understand their reporting obligations and are willing to abide by them. It is hoped that the commencement of the Public Interest Disclosure Act 2018 will assist in improving willingness to make reports.

Corruption and inappropriate conduct

A high proportion of participants had personally encountered corruption / inappropriate conduct in the last five years. Similarly, a high number of participants felt their organisation was highly or extremely vulnerable to a range of corrupt / inappropriate conduct. While the survey did not explore with participants the impact of the conduct encountered, the frequency of encountered misbehaviour, combined with high levels of perceived risk sends a clear message to those in public administration: every agency must strive to foster a culture of integrity, to identify risks of impropriety and ensure those risks are adequately addressed. This should not be a one-off event. Shifting organisational culture, and the underpinning policies and practices, requires time and ongoing commitment.
Reporting

There is scope for increased willingness to report, both internally and to ICAC / OPI. However, the self-described willingness to report captured by the survey necessarily treated reporting in a purely abstract way. Deciding to report can be difficult. Many will experience anxiety and fear. Some will be unsure of what to report and many will question what making a report will mean for them personally. The varied human complexities of reporting are difficult to appropriately explore in a brief survey. Willingness to report in the real world is likely a more challenging activity and it is reasonable to suggest that this increased challenge may result in lower willingness to report than captured in this survey. Organisations should continue to strive to ensure staff can, and feel they can, report safely and that making a report is an accepted and appropriate part of working in the organisation.

Disconnect of views across an organisation

Determining ‘status’ or ‘power’ is difficult given diverse job classification systems and the multiplicity of titles across public administration. The simplistic, three tiered system adopted in this survey has still clearly identified a number of significant differences. There is a disconnect of perceptions and attitudes between ‘Senior’ and ‘Other’ staff. Hence, the leaders of an organisation cannot presume that their typically more positive view of their agency’s openness and responsiveness to reports or the perceived extent of corruption / inappropriate conduct is shared by their staff. ICAC encourages agencies to explore the differing perceptions of the issues raised in this survey across their organisation and better understand the differing needs of staff in understanding the importance of reporting, being able to report and feeling safe in doing so.

Impact of longer term employment

A consistent trend that emerged in this survey is that those newer to an organisation or in public administration have more positive attitudes regarding their organisation and reporting culture. Typically the proportion reporting positive opinions / attitudes steadily declined over time, likely reflecting personal or observed experiences, or the impact of organisational culture. Potentially this may also mean newer staff are exposed to more effective policies and procedures. Newer staff may potentially also be more likely to respond to the survey in ways which they think will be viewed more favourably by others.
For varied responses this gradual decline saw a slight upturn at the final categories of 55+ years old or having been in an organisation for more than 20 years. It was presumed that this may relate to ‘Senior’ staff having typically been in public administration for longer and ‘Senior’ staff having more positive attitudes. However, post hoc exploration demonstrated that this slight upturn was often retained when ‘Senior’ staff were excluded from the data. It is unclear at this time why this slight upturn was observed across multiple questions in the survey.

Contract type

Across varied responses fixed-term staff repeatedly had somewhat higher and casual staff somewhat lower ratings of a positive reporting culture. Casual staff likely feel more vulnerable to repercussions and potentially have less sense of personal connection or loyalty to an organisation. Barring intervention to attempt to address these concerns / attitudes one would expect this to be reflected in casual staff having a somewhat greater disengagement from topics of corruption / inappropriate conduct and reporting.

However the difference between fixed-term and permanent staff was unexpected. One may have expected permanent staff to have a greater sense of loyalty or engagement, reflected in pro-reporting attitudes. Post hoc exploration showed that permanent staff had typically been in an organisation and public administration for longer. This may relate to a more jaded view. Fixed-term and casual staff had typically been in an organisation or public administration for far less time. Likely the differences in fixed-term participant responses reflect initial enthusiasm and more limited exposure to the types of issues raised in this survey. Differences in casual staff responses, which were more commonly in ‘Other’ roles, may reflect uncertainty, vulnerability and potentially lack of exposure to reporting systems/policies.
## Appendices

### Appendix one: Question wording

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION TOPIC</th>
<th>SPECIFIC WORDING</th>
<th>RESPONSE SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>Female; Male; Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>What is your age?</td>
<td>20 years and under; 21-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55 years and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>Where do you work? (Remembering you cannot be identified)</td>
<td>17 options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment type</td>
<td>How would you describe your current employment?</td>
<td>Permanent; Fixed-term; Casual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>How would you describe your current role?</td>
<td>Elected official; Senior Manager or Executive; Middle level staff; Other staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with organisation</td>
<td>How long have you worked with this organisation?</td>
<td>Less than 1 year; 1-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-20 years; More than 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in public administration</td>
<td>How long have you worked in the public sector or local government?</td>
<td>Less than 1 year; 1-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-20 years; More than 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the ICAC and the OPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the ICAC</td>
<td>Had you heard of South Australia’s Independent Commissioner Against Corruption before receiving this survey?</td>
<td>Yes; No; Don’t know / not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of the OPI</td>
<td>Have you heard of the Office for Public Integrity?</td>
<td>Yes; No; Don’t know / not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of the ICAC and the OPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to have ICAC</td>
<td>It is important that South Australia have an ICAC</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for ICAC to have appropriate power</td>
<td>It’s important that ICAC has the power to effectively address high level corruption and inappropriate conduct</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAC decisions are free from interference</td>
<td>ICAC’s decisions are made without interference from any person or agency</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION TOPIC</td>
<td>SPECIFIC WORDING</td>
<td>RESPONSE SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAC is trustworthy</td>
<td>ICAC is trustworthy</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAC treats people fairly</td>
<td>ICAC treats people fairly</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAC should help establish anti-corruption measures</td>
<td>ICAC should help organisations to establish anti-corruption measures</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAC should share more information</td>
<td>ICAC should share more information about what’s going on in the public service and local government</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident action taken if report to ICAC / OPI</td>
<td>If I report to the Office for Public Integrity / Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, I am confident that appropriate action will be taken</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting to the ICAC and the OPI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have reporting obligations to the ICAC / OPI</th>
<th>Anyone working with or for the State or Local Government is required to report corruption or inappropriate conduct to the Office for Public Integrity / Independent Commissioner Against Corruption</th>
<th>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willing to report to the ICAC / OPI</td>
<td>I think I would report corruption or inappropriate conduct to the Office for Public Integrity / Independent Commissioner Against Corruption</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reporting internally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willing to report internally</th>
<th>I think I would report corruption or inappropriate conduct to someone inside my organisation</th>
<th>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organisation discourages reporting</td>
<td>My organisation discourages reporting</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident my organisation would take action</td>
<td>If I make a report in my organisation, I am confident that appropriate action would be taken</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has adequate protections for those who report</td>
<td>I feel there are adequate protection in my organisation for those who’ve reported</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION TOPIC</td>
<td>SPECIFIC WORDING</td>
<td>RESPONSE SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation has policies / procedures for reporting</td>
<td>My organisation has policies and procedures for reporting</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation provides information about reporting</td>
<td>My organisation provides information about reporting</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused about what to report</td>
<td>I’m confused about what conduct would be reported</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider negative consequences to the organisation before reporting externally</td>
<td>It is important to consider the potential negative consequences to your organisation before reporting</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experiences with reporting internally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Have you previously officially reported corruption or inappropriate conduct to someone inside your organisation?</th>
<th>Yes; No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the most recent occasion where you reported corruption or inappropriate conduct who did you report this to?</td>
<td>Supervisor or manager; Head of my organisation; Human resources; Other (please describe in the field below); Not certain / can’t remember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe this most recent report?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was informed of the process that would occur</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My anonymity was maintained</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My report was looked into</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organisation made changes as a result of my report</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was satisfied with the process</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION TOPIC</td>
<td>SPECIFIC WORDING</td>
<td>RESPONSE SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes to reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Code of Conduct requirements</td>
<td>I am confident I know what is required of me under my Code of Conduct</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about their job</td>
<td>If I reported I would be worried about my job</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel intimidated to report</td>
<td>I would feel intimidated to report</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting causes trouble with colleagues</td>
<td>If I reported I would likely be in trouble with my colleagues</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know of others who had experienced negative consequences from reporting</td>
<td>I know of others who have had negative consequences when they have reported</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting externally has negative consequences</td>
<td>Reporting to an external agency generally has negative consequences for the person reporting</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not responsible to report</td>
<td>It's not my responsibility to report</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team loyalty is more important</td>
<td>Loyalty to your team is more important than reporting</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corruption / inappropriate conduct encountered in the last five years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption / inappropriate conduct encountered in the last five years</td>
<td>In your work for the State or Local Government have you personally encountered any of the following corruption or inappropriate conduct, in the last five years?</td>
<td>Yes; No; Not applicable (List of different forms of corruption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on specific corruption risks</td>
<td>My organisation has provided me with information / training on specific corruption risks, eg conflict of interest, procurement risks, information security</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workplace has to bend the rules</td>
<td>My workplace sometimes has to bend the rules to achieve its goals</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION TOPIC</td>
<td>SPECIFIC WORDING</td>
<td>RESPONSE SCALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability to corruption</td>
<td>Considering your current workplace’s practices and policies, how vulnerable do you think your workplace is to the following corruption or inappropriate conduct?</td>
<td>Not at all vulnerable; Somewhat vulnerable; Moderately vulnerable; Highly vulnerable; Extremely vulnerable; Not applicable. (List of different forms of corruption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic or shared login details</td>
<td>Does your workplace have any databases or systems storing sensitive information, such as people’s personal details or financial data, which can be accessed with generic or shared login details?</td>
<td>Yes; No; Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment practices</td>
<td>As part of recruitment for your current job, are you aware of any of the following occurring?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A criminal history check</td>
<td>Yes; No; Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A working with children or a working with vulnerable people check</td>
<td>Yes; No; Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal association check</td>
<td>Yes; No; Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of your qualifications</td>
<td>Yes; No; Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referees were contacted</td>
<td>Yes; No; Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix two: Statistical results

1. All statistical tests in this report are limited to chi-square tests for independence. Response
categories of 'Strongly agree' and 'Agree' were combined to 'Agree' and response
categories of 'Strongly disagree' and 'Disagree' were combined to 'Disagree'. Only results
which were statistically significant are reported. Not all questions were subject to statistical
analysis of demographic differences. As some participant's demographic information is
missing, the percentage agreeing or disagreeing to the question may differ slightly for each
specific demographic test, typically plus or minus 0.1%. Due to the differences being so
minor, for ease of reading the revised percentages of agreement or disagreement to each
question are not shown.

2: \(x^2(2) = 204.9, p<.001, \chi^2 = 1.34\).
3: \(x^2(6) = 234.7, p<.001, \chi^2 = 1.10\).
4: \(x^2(4) = 330.3, p<.001, \chi^2 = 1.20\).
5: \(x^2(4) = 120.7, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.72\).
6: \(x^2(4) = 24.1, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.34\).
7: \(x^2(8) = 350.1, p<.001, \chi^2 = 1.23\).
8: This question was asked at a different
point in the survey. Unlike the other
questions in this section of the report,
participants who were not aware of the
ICAC were able to answer this question.
Those participants who had stated they
were previously unaware of the ICAC
were provided with a brief summary of
the ICAC and the OPI's purpose and
function prior to answering this question.
9: \(x^2(2) = 23.6, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.48\).
10: \(x^2(4) = 83.6, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.64\).
11: \(x^2(4) = 241.4, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.34\).
12: \(x^2(8) = 51.9, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.50\).
13: \(x^2(2) = 30.4, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.56\).
14: \(x^2(4) = 141.6, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.86\).
15: \(x^2(4) = 47.3, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.49\).
16: \(x^2(8) = 77.4, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.63\).
17: \(x^2(8) = 34.2, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.42\).
18: \(x^2(2) = 16.6, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.42\).
19: \(x^2(4) = 84.4, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.67\).
20: \(x^2(4) = 165.9, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.90\).
21: \(x^2(4) = 165.0, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.89\).
22: \(x^2(8) = 127.4, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.78\).
23: \(x^2(4) = 115.3, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.75\).
24: \(x^2(2) = 15.0, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.38\).
25: \(x^2(4) = 48.6, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.48\).
26: \(x^2(4) = 201.3, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.99\).
27: \(x^2(8) = 136.9, p<.001, \chi^2 = 0.81\).
28: \(x^2(2) = 269.8, p<.001, \chi^2 = 1.14\).
29: \(x^2(8) = 229.0, p<.001, \chi^2 = 1.05\).