

The significance of triangulation in measuring corruption: some general reflections.

Werner Webb

University of Johannesburg

Abstract

This paper attempts to outline the experiences of a researcher attempting to evaluate the success of internal administrative measures to prevent and combat corruption in the South African public service. As part of the project plan, the researcher identified an administrative agency – the Department of Correctional Services – as a case study. The Department has agency units responsible for service delivery geographically dispersed over six regions. It has a range of ethics policies, as well as dedicated ethics implementation units, the investigating and code enforcement directorates based at its head office. For purposes of reliability and validity the researcher has identified a sample from across the six regions to collect data on the effectiveness of the Department's anti-corruption strategy. A number of limitations have been identified with general survey methods used in the project. In this paper these obstacles are identified and possible alternative research methods are considered.

The increase or decline of corrupt acts in public institutions can not be measured by general social science research methods, at least not without careful consideration of the concept of corruption. The measurement of such a phenomenon is complicated by a number of variables including the context within which it takes place. Societies have different conceptions of corruption and it is therefore not unlikely that what is seen as corrupt in one state would not be seen as corrupt in another. We need to take cognisance of the cultural aspects of the society under study. The development phase of a state also impacts on our understanding of what is seen as malfeasance. What we regarded as acceptable behaviour half a century back is today seen as illegal. Furthermore, the researcher has to specify what is meant by corruption. Corruption could be narrowly interpreted as an exchange of favours between two individuals, of which one occupies a position of public authority, or more generally to include the misuse of state property and fraud.

Probably the most problematic of corruption research is the inability to collect empirical evidence – to observe corruption in the work place. Normal research methods such as questionnaires and interviews would not accurately reveal the extent to which corruption is present in a public institution. The number of prosecutions and convictions of alleged perpetrators – including the number and frequency of disciplinary measures - is also not an indication of the success of anti-corruption efforts. Only a relative small percentage of corrupt public officials are internally disciplined and/or criminally prosecuted and convicted. The rate of successful convictions - compared to disciplinary sanctions - is even smaller as prosecutors have to provide evidence that the alleged criminal is guilty of the offence beyond reasonable doubt.

These obstacles threaten the reliability and validity of the data that we collect and therefore the conclusions that we make when researching such a difficult concept such as

corruption. One approach that we can use is that of triangulation, but what is triangulation? **Triangulation** refers to the use of multiple methods which raises the researcher above personal biases that stem from a single methodology. The use of multiple methods in the same study enables the researcher to overcome the deficiencies that flow from the use of one method. In this paper the researcher investigates how triangulation could be applied to research on corruption.

1 Introduction

A major weakness of research into ethics management in the public service has been the absence of research into the implementation of ethics policies (cf chapter 2). Empirical research into implementation has been vague and provides for little indication of how these programmes work in practice. This paper is not concerned with data emanating from empirical research *per se*, but rather with the research approaches and methods that are useful in collecting such data. Corruption is a phenomenon that defies standard measurement practices by social researchers. Whereas empirical research is generally concerned with *observing* a phenomenon and describing the *experiences* of a researcher in respect of that phenomenon, corruption requires the researcher to devise a unique research approach.

In this paper the various research approaches and techniques that could be used in measuring corrupting within an institution will be discussed. Corruption in most societies is an illegal activity. That makes it a covert activity thus creates difficulty in observing and measuring it. It could be assumed that respondents who have engaged in corruption would not accurately and truthfully report it. Furthermore, as corruption is an act of calculation (Klitgaard, Maclean-Abaroa & Lindsey Parris, 2000: 27) perpetrators would most probably sidestep attempts to observe and measure it. In a sense, researchers are required to design measurement techniques that would bypass these attributes of the phenomenon. Considering this attribute of corruption, a perceived weakness of most measurement tools is that it attempts to measure the level of corruption by asking respondents whether they have engaged in corrupt activities (cf UN Anti-Corruption Tool Kit, 2004: 72-75).

In this paper, the researcher engages similar research techniques to that of the UN Anti-Corruption Toolkit. However, in this study qualitative and quantitative research approaches and methods are combined to provide for a generic measurement instrument that can be used in the public service. This instrument takes the form of an Index premised on the fact that corruption is a covert activity, thus not visible and consequently not explicitly measurable. This Index is composed of a number of indicators that aims to measure the opportunities for corrupt activity within a public institution.

This Index differs from other measurement tools such as the *Corruption Perception Index* or the *Bribe Payers' Index* of Transparency International, as well as the measurement tool provided for in the UN Anti-Corruption Toolkit, 2004, in that the unit of analysis is a single public institution and not the general population. These surveys make use of *inter alia* national surveys to test the perceptions of society in respect of corruption as well as performance indicators such as the press freedom and independence of the judiciary (cf UN Anti-Corruption Toolkit, 2004: 479). This Index intends to measure the existence and compliance of institutional mechanisms to prevent corrupt activities. This study attempts to fill void in research on the implementation of ethics policies.

2 Obstacles to measuring corruption

The measurement of corruption is complicated by a number of factors. The social researcher has to observe a phenomenon that is generally not visible. As corruption is illegal in most societies it occurs as a *covert activity*. Perpetrators try to hide their intentions to extort money or gifts from citizens. Citizens bribe public officials to gain an unjust advantage over other citizens, and when a competitive tender is to be selected for the provision of public services, over other competing companies. Naturally, when such malfeasance is exposed both parties risk the possibility of losing not only their unjust advantage, but also their upward career prospects – in the case of public officials, and their business reputations and future contractual dealings with the public service – in the case of business owners. The state is prohibited from considering a tender submitted by individuals appearing on a Register for Convicted Corrupt Offenders. Additionally, criminal prosecution possibly resulting in a conviction accompanied by a criminal record

and a fine serves as a further deterrent (*Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act*, 2004 (Act 12 of 2004), sections 26 and 28).

A further obstacle to measuring corruption *per se* is the *varied interpretations of the concept*. In Kurer's (2005:222-239) view any research effort dealing with corruption is influenced by how the phenomenon is defined. To date, researchers on corruption have accepted Heidenheimer's three distinctive and competing definitions of corruption: its public opinion, public interest and public office centred definitions (cf chapter 2). These definitions have been subjected to severe criticism. For example, when the attributes defining corruption is decided upon society, a number of obstacles arise. Firstly, it is unlikely that there would be agreement in public opinion on what constitutes a corrupt act. And, when this disagreement arises, who decides which view to adopt?

A more objective definition of corruption is the public office centred definition. When a public official violates some public rule and is motivated by personal gain, such conduct is corrupt. This type of definition is also subject to various criticisms. Firstly, it is criticized for being culture specific; bureaucratic rules and norms might be supported by the values and conventions in one society, but not necessarily in others. The basic argument is that rules and norms in one society can not be imposed on another. Secondly, when an act is not illegal it is not corrupt. Therefore, a particular act can be legal in one society, whilst being illegal in another.

Public interest centred definition extends the scope of corruption by stating that such conduct must do damage to the public and its interests. Again, who decides what is in the public interest? Johnston's attempt to provide for a new definition of corruption; the neo-classical approach determines that corruption is the abuse of a public role, according to legal or social standards, for private benefit. In Kurer's view, this simply amounts to a combination of public office and public opinion definitions.

A number of indices, that aims to do an international comparison by measuring the level of corruption in different societies, could be criticized. Such indices, such as Transparency International's *Bribe Payers' Index* and the *Corruption Perception Index*,

make use of surveys that measure the perception of society in respect of corruption. Furthermore, these indices premise their evaluation on a number of uniform standards irrespective of the subjective perceptions of the inhabitants of the sampled societies. Kurer (2005: 235-236) refers to the problem of cultural relativism; where surveys asks a number of general questions on the corrupt practices - ignoring the local traditions and customs of societies.

The *Country Assessments* as commissioned by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime provide a comprehensive overview of corruption in a country and describes the measures to combat and prevent it. These reports are based upon a number of surveys reflecting the perceived levels of corruption and the actual experience thereof. These assessments provide *inter alia* for an indication of the level, type and costs of corruption, its causes and consequences, and could serve as a point of departure for a country's effort to prevent and combat malfeasance. The Country Assessment Report for South Africa interestingly revealed high level perceptions of corruption as compared to much lower levels of actual experiences of it. These reports are subject to the same obstacles in measuring corruption: its covert and illegal nature, as well as an inability to make comparisons between societies because of cultural relativism. Perceptions of corruption will be different, not only between societies, but also in time.

Confronted by these obstacles, this researcher has decided to steer away from measuring corruption *per se*. The study focus is on a number of indicators – opportunities for corruption within the public institution. Whereas corruption is covert, these indicators are observable and measurable. Furthermore, the unit of analysis for this study is a single public institution, not society as a whole. In most cases public institutions have formal ethics policies reflecting standard ethical conduct required from its employees. Such ethics policies are to a lesser extent subject to the evolutionary nature of societal values. Comparison between institutions can only be undertaken when institutions subscribe to similar ethical standards and practices.

Research into the opportunities for corruption within a public institution requires the researcher to combine the qualitative and quantitative research approach. Whereas quantitative structured techniques such as surveys and experiments provide for a greater measure of reliability – thus ensuring the same findings when measurements are repeated, qualitative research provides for much greater variation and richness in observing a phenomenon, consequently greater validity (Babbie & Mouton, 2007:124-125). The researcher has to creatively combine these approaches to obtain an appropriate balance between validity and reliability. In the following sections these approaches are explained.

3 Qualitative research approach

The qualitative researcher studies human action in its natural setting through the eyes of the actor being the subject of the study. She makes a deliberate attempt to put themselves in the shoes of the subjects they observe and try to understand their actions, decisions, behaviour, practices, and rituals. In contrast with the quantitative researcher which uses somewhat artificial settings of experiments and surveys, the qualitative researcher describes the phenomenon in detail and tries to understand human behaviour within the appropriate context. When conducting qualitative research, the researcher uses an inductive approach, in other words, the researcher begins within the natural setting, describing events, developing hypotheses and eventually ends with a theory (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 269).

The qualitative researcher is seen as the main instrument in the research and tries to observe events and actions as they occur without any interference or intervention. In fact, most qualitative researchers aim to blend in and become participant observers of the events they investigate. These researchers tend to focus on the *process* as they occur, rather than reconstruct them afterwards. Furthermore, these researchers tend to couch their descriptions and explanations in everyday language, rather than use abstract, theoretical constructs.

The qualitative researcher follows an idiographic strategy by examining a single event or case and its structural coherence with the larger context (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 272). Typical examples of qualitative research include ethnographic studies, case studies and life histories. Contrary to the quantitative approach, the qualitative researcher is not concerned with the generalisation of research results. Rather, the transferability of the research findings rests with the reader of the study (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 277).

Among these three methods we will shortly elaborate on the case study method. The case study method has been rejected for being the one shot case study having no scientific value. Babbie and Mouton regards the case study as an intensive investigation of a single unit within its context. Case studies take multiple perspectives into account and attempt to understand the effect of multi level social systems on a subject's perspectives and behaviours. The defining characteristic, in their view, is its emphasis on the individual unit (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 280-283).

Furthermore, case studies use multiple sources of data and multiple methods including interview and observation and the use of variety informants. Of particular importance in case studies is the use of multiple sources of data, what is generally called *replication* and *convergence*. Replication refers to the amount of times a phenomenon repeats itself, thus increasing the confidence the researcher has that the finding is reliable. Convergence refers to multiple sources of evidence having a bearing on a variable using different methods such as interviewing and participant observation, or even by interviewing subjects in different ways on different occasions. Using multiple sources of evidence, sometimes called triangulation, represents aspects of thick description and increases the reliability of findings (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 282-283).

4 Qualitative research methods

Methods by which data is collected within the qualitative research design includes basic individual interviewing, depth individual interviews, focus group interviews, observation and participant observation, and the use of personal documents (Babbie & Mouton, 2007:

288-303). Field observation often provides data which surveys are unable to provide for example, when this researcher observed the light hearted response by a suspended public official when he approached by a colleague at the departmental premises. However, such techniques are often very time consuming and expensive (UN Toolkit, 2003: 74-75).

Individual interviewing, in the qualitative approach, differs from other interviewing techniques. Rather than being confronted with a battery of predetermined questions, the object of study is allowed to speak for herself. Although the interviewer has a general plan of inquiry, no set questions that should be asked in a specific order exist. In this case the interview is much like a conversation where the respondent does most of the talking. The researcher, who does not understand even the most basic elements of the study and thus needs to be taught, requires good listening skills probing the respondent with questions. Interviewing ends with transcribing the conversation, analysing the meaning of the gathered material, verifying the material (its reliability and validity) and reporting the research findings (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 290).

With regard to sampling in the qualitative research design, three matters seem appropriate to consider: enculturation, current involvement and adequate time. It makes little sense to interview a new recruit when we are interested in determining whether the correctional centre management are committed to fighting malfeasance, or the marketing officer is we are interested in determining how many disciplinary enquiries have been held over the past year. Sometimes we might identify respondents that are crucial for our research purposes, however they are simply too busy to interview properly. In situations like these it could be advisable to request the respondents to refer you to other worthy individuals (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 288).

Using depth individual interviews, the researcher is not interested in the ‘what’ of the respondent, but rather the ‘why’. For example, when the respondent states that she does not believe that management is firm on their intention to prevent corruption, the interviewer would ask why the respondent has this belief. Thus the interviewer is more concerned with process by which the respondent has developed this ‘belief’. Focus group

interviews allow the researcher to select a group of between eight and twelve respondents allowing each individual to speak. Although this method saves time and money, it most often compromises the quality of your data. Ideally the researcher should identify between three and five groups to provide adequate insights.

In respect of simple observation, the researcher remains an outside observer. Where the researcher is simultaneous a member of the group and a researcher, she is a participant observer. The participant observer has the added responsibility to determine whether the research will be conducted in an overt (transparent) or covert (secret) fashion. This decision will have an effect on the findings of the research.

Studying corrupt activities in a covert fashion poses certain ethical dilemmas. Firstly, it places the responsibility on the researcher to report such illegal behaviour to the authorities once he/she becomes aware of such conduct. Secondly, the researcher exposes him/herself to risks especially when accused public officials decide to 'pay back' the researcher for exposing the alleged transgression.

Finally, the qualitative researcher can make use of personal documents. Such documents include autobiographies, letters, diaries, memorandums, photos and videos. One thing that these documents have in common is the fact that the reader of the document can get to know something of the personal characteristics of the author of the document.

Qualitative research methods often provide various advantages as compared to quantitative research methods such as surveys. For example, field visits could often lead to the collection of documentary evidence and observations that provide important insights into the working of a department. This researcher has collected significant documentary evidence and made important observations directly related to the subject of study. Collecting documents *id est* Resolution 1 of 2006 and a Table of Disciplinary Inquiries, observing the work of a single ethics officer responsible for investigating the conduct of 1600 public officials, or insights during an in depth interview that institution-

cultural changes could have contributed to greater malfeasance would not have been produced by a survey.

5 Why triangulate?

Triangulation is one of the best ways to enhance validity and reliability in qualitative research. Qualitative researchers are particularly subjected to personal biases and deficiencies that flow from single methodologies. Qualitative research design – including case studies - could benefit greatly from triangulation: combining different methods and investigators in a single study. We can also triangulate by paradigm, methodology, methods and researchers. Other methods used to enhance validity and reliability in social science research – in particular qualitative research – include member checks, peer review, extensive field notes, and audit trial (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 275-276).

Triangulation enhances the credibility of qualitative research: ensuring compatibility between the constructed reality of respondents and the attributes assigned to them by the researcher. It enables us to strive to be objective and do justice to our object of study. To elicit various and divergent constructions of reality within the context of a study, triangulation means to collect information about different events and relationships from different points of view. This means asking different questions, seeking different sources and using different methods (Babbie & Mouton, 2007:277).

6 Quantitative research approach

As the study population is too large to observe, this researcher has decided to make use of a survey. Surveys, together with experiments, are generally regarded as part of the quantitative research approach. Quantitative researcher usually aims to analyse variables and the relationship between them in isolation from the context or setting with the aim to increase generalizability. Quantitative research follows a nomothetic strategy by searching for empirical regularities of laws of human behaviour with the view of

generalizing their results (from a sample) to larger populations or even other settings (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 232, 270-272).

Surveys require the researcher to select a sample of respondents from the study population and to administer a questionnaire to them. However, in drafting such a questionnaire, the researcher is required to conceptualise and operationalise the research concept. In the following paragraphs, this process is explained.

7 Conceptualisation for the measurement of corruption

Social science concepts are not easily measurable. Consider for example measuring prejudice, racism, or even standard of living. Not only to individuals disagree what these concepts mean to them, societies and cultures within that society often disagree. Often in literature on unethical conduct in the public service, authors refer to theft, corruption and fraud interchangeably. For example would arriving late at work or leaving early be regarded as being corrupt? What about using the work phone for private calls?

It could be argued that fraud involves the misrepresentation of something to gain some sort of unfair advantage. Conversely, corruption refers to the misuse of public office to gain some form of personal advantage. The difference between the two concepts revolves around the fact that corruption requires two parties, one being a public official, whilst fraud can be committed by one self. Nonetheless, many readers might disagree with this conceptualisation.

For this reason it seems necessary to conceptualize what is meant by the concept of corruption. Babbie and Mouton (2007:111) refers to conceptualization as the process through which we specify what we will mean when we use a particular concept, some sort of a working agreement. Importantly, we need not agree on what the best specification of such a concept is – we simply need a working agreement on the matter, so that we can work on the concept.

The product of this conceptualisation process is the specification of one or more indicators of the concept. For the purposes of studying the concept of corruption, we might choose a number of indicators: the number of disciplinary inquiries that have been conducted over the past 5 years, the number of criminal convictions against public officials, or even the number of qualified audit opinions that a department has received during the same period. These indicators will indicate to us the presence or absence of the concept. It could even be determined whether a department has a high or low level of malfeasance.

In studying corruption within a public institution, we might want to distinguish between opportunities for corruption and actual corrupt acts committed. Whereas the above indicators are applicable to the latter dimension, indicators for opportunities for corruption could include: the commitment of an institution's management to prevent and combat corruption; the capacity of investigators to investigate malfeasance, or the extent to which ethics policies are communicated through an institution.

The precision of our measurement instrument is also of importance, specifically its reliability and validity. Reliability refers to the extent that the measurement instrument will provide for the same description of the phenomenon if that measurement is repeated. Validity refers to the extent to which a specific measurement provides data that relates to commonly accepted meanings of the concept. One such criterion is face validity: is fidelity an indicator of marital satisfaction, or is the number of grievances an indicator of motivated employees?

Although this conceptualization process is a continual process, and is likely to continue even when a final report is written up, it should ideally commence at the beginning of any study (Babbie & Mouton, 2007:113). Once agreement is achieved on the meaning for a concept, we have assigned a nominal definition to it. However, we are still not ready to measure it. We need to develop an operational definition. Such a definition spells out precisely how the concept will be measured.

8 Operationalisation for the measurement of corruption

Many social science concepts have complex and varied meanings. Corruption - as a social science concept – defies such measurement as it can not be observed by social scientists. Its illegal nature makes it impossible to observe, interview participants or collect documentary evidence, thus collecting empirical evidence is impossible. Just as social scientist attempt to measure invisible things such as love, jealousy and prejudice, so too can we attempt to measure corruption. This involves the identification of a *number of indicators* that would point to the likelihood that corruption is present in a public institution. Although we might not agree on whether these indicators are ultimately always valid measurements, we could agree that such indicators are likely to indicate the manifestation of malfeasance.

In our endeavour to measure a particular concept, we could decide to develop an index or a scale into which the identified indicators would be placed. Indexes and scales are efficient devices for data analysis. Let us first define the *usefulness of utilising an index* in measuring variables. An index is used to rank-order the units of analysis, for example a specific department, in terms of specific variables. Indexes are composite measures of variables. Measuring the age or gender of a respondent is not difficult, we only need to ask one question: What is your age, or what is your gender? However, a concept like corruption, or the presence of corrupt opportunities in a public institution is complex and requires the researcher to make use of multiple indicators. Using a survey we attempt to collect various pieces of data to develop a composite measure of the indicators.

The survey will take the form of a questionnaire where respondents are required to respond to a number of questionnaire items. Each of these items will provide the researcher with attributes of the various indicators. The survey aims to score a respondent in terms of responses to several questionnaire items, each of which provides an indication of the nature of the variable. An index is constructed through the simple accumulation of scores assigned to individual attributes.

Scales slightly differs from indexes. Whereas indexes measure a number of indicators without taking into consideration their relative weight in relation to the variable, scales recognises this feature. The researcher might believe that a particular indicator should carry a greater weight than other indicators in the scale. So, for example, the existence and implementation of disciplinary measures in a department would carry a greater weight than the existence training and workshops for officials on ethics policies. For the purpose of this study we will only make use of indexes for measuring the prevalence of corruption in public institutions. Let us turn to the steps required in designing an index for this study (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 136-139).

You might *disagree on whether a particular item in the index* is valid and represent on face value the variable of corruption, but rough agreement seems to be adequate. Simply because concepts are complex and thus difficult to measure, that should not deter us from measuring it. Measuring the manifestation of corrupt opportunities using an index as a measurement technique, could be altered and refined during the research process to provide for a growing measure of validity. This index would simply serve as a point of departure for further deliberation.

The purpose of this study is to determine to what extent ethics policies have been designed and are implemented to prevent corrupt opportunities within a state department. We further know from empirical evaluation (cf chapter 4) that a number statutory and policy measures have been put in place to prevent corruption from occurring in the first place. However, are these measures implemented, and if so, are they effective. Earlier in this paper, I argued that *corruption per se* and its decline or increase can not explicitly be measured. One can not approach a respondent and ask whether he or she has engaged in extortion over the past year, or whether he or she has accepted a bribe. Such data would simply not be reliable.

Therefore, it was decided that developing an index to measure the existence and implementation of ethics policies within a state department. Such an index would provide an indication of the extent to which corruption is prevalent within that

department. Similar to evaluating a patient's psychological well being without having observable and tangible features to observe, we will attempt to do the same with the well being of public institutions, *vis-a-vis* the manifestation of corruption.

The first step in designing such an index requires the *identification of questionnaire items* to which respondents must reply. Such items must of course comply with the criterion of face validity, put differently, these questionnaire items must on face value relate with the variable that is being measured. This researcher has identified a number of indicators that would point to the prevalence of corruption. Let us take a closer look at these indicators.

The following *indicators* have been indentified for this study. The effective management of ethics; including the number of reported misconduct through the whistle blowing mechanism of the relevant department, the number of disciplinary cases initiated within the department, the number of convictions in disciplinary cases, the capacity of a department to implement ethics policies, the commitment of public managers in implementing these ethics policies, the number of cases referred to the South African Police Service for further criminal proceedings, and the frequency and thoroughness of ethics training within the department. The questionnaire would elicit responses from respondents to each of these data items.

The second indicator of malfeasance within a department would include the audit opinions of the Auditor General; including the number of qualified audit opinions received by the relevant department during the past 5 years, the number of cases of irregular and unauthorised cases of expenditure identified by the Auditor-General, or any other designated auditing institution, and the outcome of performance audits and forensic audits conducted.

A third indicator of opportunities for corruption in a department is the extent to which the department has embraced management reform; including the years of public service, training and qualifications of top public officials to determine the application of a merit

system, the extent to which supervisors are given ‘freedom’ to management, the extent to which subordinates are supervised through direct observation, checking and reporting measures (thus measuring the existence of an internal control structure within the department); compliance with departmental policies and procedures, and the extent to which top officials subscribe to business values and norms as compared to public service values and norms.

Few would disagree with the indicators as identified within dimension 1. These indicators are observable and quantifiable. Furthermore, it could be argued that this indicator – its face validity – is beyond questioning as disciplinary processes are amongst the few measures available to supervisors to address various forms of misconduct. Dimension 2 indicators are less obvious, but still a relative accurate pointer to possible malfeasance. The audit reports of the Auditor-General, or its authorised auditing institution, constitute the indicator for the second dimension.

Whereas the traditional financial audits executed by the Auditor-General, or other auditing institutions, could point to irregular, wasteful or unauthorised expenditure, and thus identify *inter alia* expenditure not budgeted for, expenditure incurred without the necessary authorisation, or simply not following the necessary policies and procedures, it is rather performance audits that are a greater indicator of possible malfeasance. Performance audits evaluate a department’s management measures to determine whether resources have been procured economically and finances been spent effectively and efficiently. When performance audits point to weaknesses of a department’s management control measures, the likelihood of corruption or fraud being committed increases. It is at this point that forensic investigations could be undertaken to determine the existence of criminal activity in a department. Furthermore, when audit reports identify cases of fraud or corruption in a department, such information must be included in a department’s year report that, together with the audited financial statements and the audit report, is submitted to the relevant legislature. These reports in turn have to be scrutinised by the relevant public accounts committee. The performance audits are also central to the ability of the public service to enforce compliance with ethics policies as such

information is forwarded to the Public Service Commission for further action (Interview, 2007: Specialised Audit Services, Office of the Auditor-General).

The dimension 3 indicators are the least obvious of all to point towards corrupt opportunities. In this paper it is argued that management reform, specifically those associated with the New Public Management (NPM) initiatives, creates opportunities for public servants to extort bribes, favour relatives and friends, and impose conditions on the bureaucracy that creates incentives for citizens to act illegally. Corruption is more likely to increase where internal control measures are absent. Management Reforms including trends to decentralisation decision making authority - freeing managers to manage, creating flexible organisations, focusing on outputs rather than compliance with policies and procedures are likely to increase opportunities for corruption. Furthermore, appointing public managers with an inclination towards business values and norms, rather than public service values and norms contributes greatly to opportunities for unethical conduct. The use of this indicator does not imply that that all of NPM is bad, many improvements in the processes and structures of the public service have been brought about. Rather, it is an acknowledgement that NPM has on the balance not improved much. Whilst creating a more effective, economical and efficient public service, opportunities for corruption and fraud have been created (cf Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004; Frederickson, 1997: 157-182; Heath, 1999:53-54).

It is argued that the above indicators will provide an indication of the extent to which corrupt opportunities are present within a specific department. A survey will be conducted by posing these questionnaire items to a sample of respondents (see annexure A, B and C). Based on their responses to each data item, *each department will be assigned a score* which will reflect to extent of corruption prevalence within the department.

9 Sampling for data collection

As social science researchers are unable to observe everything around them, sampling provides a method by which the researcher can identify exactly what he or she is interested in observing. Two different types of sampling methods are available: non-probability- and probability sampling. Non-probability sampling is often used within the qualitative research approach and includes the purposive or judgemental-, snowball-, quota- and reliance on available subjects sampling methods. For this study, a short discussion of these is appropriate (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 166-168, 288).

The purposive or judgemental sampling method requires the researcher to use her own judgement in identifying those respondents that would be useful for the study. Such a judgement should be informed by the researcher's knowledge of the population (subject of study), its elements and the nature of the research aims. With the snowball sampling method the researcher identifies a number of respondents, interviews them and asks them for the names of other useful data sources. The researcher then proceeds to interview those respondents as identified by the initial respondents. This method refers to the process of accumulation as each located subject suggests other subjects.

The quota sampling method requires the researcher to identify those elements within a particular study population. This sampling method requires the researcher to describe the characteristics of the study population. For example, a correctional centre might consist of 800 staff members, of which two hundred officials work at the prison for juvenile offenders, 150 officials work at the prison for female offenders, and 250 at the prison for male offenders convicted for serious offences. The remaining two hundred officials might be staffing the back office, *id est* the human resource, public relations and finance departments. The researcher might also be interested in knowing that of the two hundred officials, only 10 actively works with misconduct and disciplinary cases. In summary, the quota sampling method would require the researcher to identify these different elements and collect data from them all. These different elements are then weighted in

accordance with their portion of the total population. The overall data would then be representative of the total population.

The reliance on available subject method requires the researcher to collect data from respondents as they pass a specific sampling point. For example, this researcher might want to observe (and perhaps speak) to officials who frequent the office of the official responsible for disciplinary cases at the correctional centre. Naturally this sampling method is risky as findings can not be generalized to the total population.

If all members of a population were identical, in terms of their behaviour, expectations and attitudes, it would be unnecessary to undertake a carefully constructed sampling procedure. In such a case any sample would be sufficient as any group of respondents would be representative of the total population. Of course, this is not the case, as no study population is entirely homogeneous. It is therefore necessary to scientifically sample a group of elements (individuals, correctional centres or departments) that are representative of the total population, and thus share the same attributes, or even share the same variations.

When identifying a sample, researchers are often subject to conscious and unconscious bias. For example, a researcher might purposefully select correctional centres that are convenient to visit for survey purposes. It is easier to interview or administer a questionnaire in correctional centres that are located near the researcher's residence, close to urban areas, or even in safe residential areas. This bias would result in a sample that is not representative of the study population and would ultimately distort the research findings. This imperative requires us to look at the necessity of applying probability sampling. Simply put, probability sampling refers to identifying a sample of respondents that will be representative of the population from which it is selected, if all members of the population have an equal chance of being selected. Various sampling methods exist including simple random-, systematic- and stratified sampling (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 189-193).

Simple random sampling requires the researcher to establish a sampling frame – a list of the study population, in this case a list of the officials working for the Department of Correctional Services. A number is assigned to each element (each staff member) in the list. Thereafter, a table of random numbers is used to select elements from the sampling frame. For example, the sampling frame could contain a list of 100 officials, with each official given a number from 1 to 100. If the researcher wants a sample of 10 respondents, 10 numbers are selected from the random list of numbers exempli gratia 67, 24, 33... and so forth. Using the numbered sampling frame, ten official names are then drawn for survey purposes.

Systematic sampling, in practice, requires the researcher to select, for example, every 10th element – the sampling interval - on the sampling frame. Usually, the researcher will start the selection from a random number between 1 and ten. Using a table of random numbers, the researcher might start with 6, thereafter proceed to 16, 26, 36 ...and so forth. If the sampling frame contains 1000 elements, and the researcher required 100 respondents, the sampling ratio is 1/10. Of course, to avoid a biased sample, the researcher should guard against using a sample frame with cyclical arranged elements.

Stratified sampling does not differ greatly from both simple random and systematic sampling. Rather than selecting a sample from the study population at large, stratified sampling requires the researcher to first group homogeneous subsets of the total population, thus producing greater representativeness in the sample. For example, in this case, the researcher might arrange the sampling frame in terms of length of service (stratification variable). Thereafter, the researcher would employ systematic sampling to select the sample. Alternatively, the researcher could produce subsets of the sampling frame using the same stratification variable. Then, for example, four groups could be established from the sampling frame. The first group of officials with service between 0 and 8 years, the second group with service between 8 and 16 years, the third group with service between 16 and 24 years, and the last group with service between 24 and 32 years. Thereafter, the researcher selects a sample - randomly or systematically – from a each subset of the study population in accordance with its relative size compared to the

study population. If the sample size is 100, and officials with a service length between 8 and 16 constitute 40 percent of the study population, then 40 elements are selected from that particular subset.

For the purpose of this study and its combination of qualitative and quantitative research approaches, this researcher will use both non-probability and probability sampling techniques. Field observation and interviews - using non-probability sampling methods - is ongoing at various management areas of the Department of Correctional Services. In respect of the survey, it is intended that the management areas of the department – contained in a sample frame - will be stratified in terms of the following stratification variables: urban/ rural- and large versus small management areas. The sample frame of the management areas in the six management regions have been drawn together with offender data that would provide the researcher with an indication of the size of the management areas listed on the sample frame. Data on the post establishment for each management area was on available at the time of writing. It is the intention of the researcher to sample management areas that have also been subjected to investigation by the Jali-Commssion in 2001 (cf section 8). Data collected from such management areas, as opposed to other management areas, will provide the researcher with an indication of whether such intervention was beneficial to the Department.

Surveys and field research are common methods for data collection (Babbie & Mouton, 2007: 130). The researcher intends to undertake the survey by visiting the sampled management areas and administering the questionnaire at the various sites of service delivery. Respondents at the various management areas will be selected using random sampling methods. The sample size is still to be determined. Not all data will be collected with the survey. Other data will be collected by the researcher by perusing, for example, the annual reports of the department submitted to the legislature and also the various audit reports by the Auditor-General.

8 Ethics management at the Department of Correctional Services: A Case Study

The author of this paper decided to investigate the extent to which departments are giving priority to public service ethics policies, and more importantly, whether adequate consideration is given to its effective implementation. For this purpose, the Department of Correctional Services was selected as a case study. Interviews and field visits in 2007 and 2008 have provided some provisional insights into the practices and processes within the Department.

A brief description of the role and history of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) is appropriate – specifically with regard to its management of ethics. The Department is responsible for *inter alia* enforcing court imposed sentences and detaining inmates in safe custody (DCS Strategic Plan for 2006/7 – 2010/11). In 2001, a Commission of Inquiry was appointed by the State President to investigate alleged incidents of corruption, maladministration and intimidation in the Department of Correctional Services. This Commission, popularly known as the Jali-Commission, found that corruption and maladministration was part of the institutional culture of the Department. Only a specified list of management areas was investigated by the Commission.

Corruption was observed to be systemic as the *Executive Summary*¹ of the Commission of Inquiry pointed to the lack of adherence to policies and regulations, poor management capacity, an absence of checks and balances and excessive union involvement in departmental activities. The Jali Commission partly attributed the dysfunctional situation in the Department since 1994 to an over emphasis on affirmative action. Other forms of the transformation agenda such as establishing a human rights ethos, creating a people oriented public service, and promoting an efficient and accountable administration have been neglected. Unions gained excessive control over the appointment of senior managers which eventually lead to lawlessness in the Department. This created an

¹ The Executive Summary was made public in 2006.

environment where irregular appointments, selective discipline, a breakdown of disciplinary procedures, abuse of power and other illicit practices were observed.

The Commission recommended intervention in a number of areas including the recruitment of staff, disciplinary inquiries, training of personnel and anti-corruption measures. In addition to the necessary departmental capacity and commitment to fight corruption, it would be preferable to undertake additional measures such as privatising certain functions, appointing an outside agency to investigate corruption, and the appointment of a prisons ombudsman.

A number of visits to departmental service delivery sites were undertaken by this researcher during 2007 and 2008. During these visits the author engaged a number of qualitative research techniques including the study of departmental policies and personal observation. Interviews with departmental officials were undertaken using mainly non-probability sampling methods. This visit pointed to the existence of anti-corruption-, anti-fraud-, whistle blowing policies; disciplinary policy (Resolution 1 of 2006), a national hotline for reporting malfeasance, workshops for the promotion of ethics policies in the department, a vetting policy in the process of being drafted, and the presence of an external investigating unit (SIU) responsible for investigating fraud and corruption (in addition to the Departmental investigating and code enforcement directorates).

It is the intention of the author to administer questionnaires in the second half of 2008 to the selected sample. This questionnaire will provide greater insights into the implementation of ethics policies in the Department. As previous scholars have pointed out (cf Warwick, 1982: 6-7) policy implementation studies should not only be concerned with formal proclamations, but also organisational behaviour within the department. The focus should not be what the department say they want to do, but what they *actually* do.

The questionnaires to be used in the survey (annexure A, B and C) have been drafted with the indicators as discussed in section 8 in mind. The following questions with

regard to the implementation of ethics policies guided the researcher in drafting the questionnaire:

- ▶ The rhetoric of fighting corruption exist, but what does the evidence show?
- ▶ Is implementation in top-down (bureaucratic context)?
- ▶ What is the intensity of implementation? : ad hoc or planned; are stakeholders, such as unions (clients and coalitions), trampled over, or are they consulted?
- ▶ Have new units been established to implement anti-corruption policies (commitment)?
- ▶ Are the ethics policies specific and do they provide clear guidance to public employees (content of policy)?
- ▶ Are the ethics policies implementable: what is the standard of conduct? What are the remedies/penalties for unethical conduct?
- ▶ Do adequate commitment (agreement; understanding) and capacity (skills) exist to prevent corruption?
- ▶ Are responsibilities and authority clearly specified with regard to implementation?

As mentioned in section 7, in addition to the survey, data will also be collected by the researcher perusing official documentation. The researcher will collect data in respect of the questions listed in annexure D. Data collected will assist the researcher in evaluating the opportunities for corruption with the Department of Correctional Services. Such data will be included in the Index as referred to in section 7.

9 Conclusion

A combination of the quantitative and qualitative research approaches to investigating corruption in the Department of Correctional Services would provide for the greatest measure of reliability and validity. Whereas the quantitative research approach provides for reliability, the qualitative research approach provides for greater validity. This researcher made use of a number of qualitative research methods including field observation, interviews, and documentary analysis. As the study population is too large

for the researcher to observe, it was decided to make use of a survey. This survey will utilise a questionnaire to elicit responses from sampled respondents.

It is particularly the index for measuring corrupt opportunities in a department that seem to be a novice contribution to corruption research. Most surveys focus on societal perceptions of corruption – in the author's view not always reliable or valid. This index makes use of a number of indicators that measure corrupt opportunities within a single state department (unit of analysis). This index does not attempt to measure corruption per se - as it is argued that corruption is not measurable – but rather the opportunities for corruption within a department. Furthermore, this index is not premised on the evolving meaning of corruption, thus avoiding Kurer's criticism of cultural relativism. For comparison purposes, as long as two or more institutions - that are subjected to the index for measurement purposes, have similar ethics policies and practices, the relativity of the concept of corruption becomes irrelevant.

10 Bibliography

Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. 2007. *The Practice of Social Research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Goerge Frederickson, H. 1997. *The Spirit of Public Administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Heath Report in Sangweni, S. & Balia, D. (eds.). 1999. *Fighting Corruption: Towards a National Integrity Strategy*. Pretoria: UNISA Press.

Interview by author. Specialised Audit Services, Office of the Auditor General. 2007.

Kurer, O. 2005. Corruption: An Alternative Approach to its Definition and Measurement. *Political Studies*. Volume 53.

Klitgaard, R., Maclean-Abaroa, R. & Lindsey Parris, H. 2000. *Corrupt Cities: A Practical Guide to Cure and Prevention*. Oakland: Institute for Contemporary Studies & World Bank Institute.

Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. 2004. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime. The Global Programme Against Corruption. 2004. *United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit*. 3rd edition.

Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act, 2004 (Act 12 of 2004), section 26

Warwick, D.P. 1982. *Bitter Pills: Population Policies and their implementation in eight developing countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Annexure A

Please complete this survey by circling your choice

For office use only

--	--	--	--

1-4

A: ETHICS MANAGEMENT		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The following questions shortly deals with general perceptions, experiences and observations within your correctional centre. Circle the number that best reflects your choice.						
1.	At least one of your supervisors/ colleagues/ subordinates have attempted to extort money from offenders	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Corruption and bribery has occurred in your correctional centre	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Corruption is a problem in the public service	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Offenders often posses substances that are not legally permissible	1	2	3	4	5
5.	You have been offered a bribe by an offender in exchange for personal favours	1	2	3	4	5
6.	You are adequately remunerated for your employment at the department	1	2	3	4	5
7.	You engage in additional forms of work to provide you with a living wage	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Your remuneration compares favourably with employees in similar jobs	1	2	3	4	5
COMMITMENT						
9.	Your supervisor often motivates you to report misconduct	1	2	3	4	5
10.	The Department is committed to prevent misconduct	1	2	3	4	5
11.	You will report your supervisor if he/ she engages in misconduct	1	2	3	4	5
12.	You will report your colleague is he/she engages in misconduct	1	2	3	4	5
13.	You will always report corruption irrespective of the consequences	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Misconduct will always be punished after an internal disciplinary inquiry	1	2	3	4	5
15.	When you report misconduct it will always be investigated	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Corruption and bribery is not always reported to the authorities	1	2	3	4	5

CAPACITY							69
17.	When you report misconduct you will be protected from victimization	1	2	3	4	5	70
18.	The Special Investigating Unit is the best suited to investigate misconduct	1	2	3	4	5	71
19.	The Departmental Investigating Unit is best suited to investigate misconduct	1	2	3	4	5	72
20.	The investigating officer based in the Office of the Area Commissioner is best suited to investigate misconduct	1	2	3	4	5	73
21.	Your supervisor is best suited to investigate misconduct	1	2	3	4	5	74
22.	The Department is effective in implementing ethics policies						75
23.	You have attended a workshop on the code of conduct	1	2	3	4	5	76
24.	You have attended a workshop on the anti-corruption policy	1	2	3	4	5	77
25.	You have attended a workshop on the anti-fraud policy	1	2	3	4	5	78
26.	You have attended a workshop on the vetting policy	1	2	3	4	5	79
27.	You have attended a workshop on the whistle-blowing policy	1	2	3	4	5	80
							81
							82

COMMUNICATION		1	2	3	4	5	64
28.	You are familiar with the Departmental Code of Conduct	1	2	3	4	5	65
29.	Your Union have communicated Resolution 1 of 2006 with you	1	2	3	4	5	66
30.	You have read and understand the contents of the Anti-Corruption Policy	1	2	3	4	5	67
31.	You have read and understand the contents of the Anti-fraud Policy	1	2	3	4	5	68
32.	You have read and understand the contents of the Whistle Blowing Policy	1	2	3	4	5	69
33.	You have read and understand the contents of the Vetting Policy	1	2	3	4	5	70
34.	You prefer to report misconduct to the National Anti-Corruption Hotline	1	2	3	4	5	71
35.	You prefer to report misconduct to the Departmental Investigating Unit	1	2	3	4	5	72
36.	You prefer to report misconduct to the Investigating	1	2	3	4	5	73

Annexure B

Please complete this survey by circling your choice

For office use only

--	--	--	--

1-4

A: ETHICS MANAGEMENT		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
The following questions shortly deals with general perceptions, experiences and observations within your correctional centre. Circle the number that best reflects your choice.							
CAPACITY							52
1.	Internal Disciplinary Action is an effective means to punish officials who are guilty of misconduct	1	2	3	4	5	53
2.	You are always able to investigate misconduct without interference or obstacles	1	2	3	4	5	54
4.	You have access to the department's Financial Disclosure of Interest Documentation	1	2	3	4	5	55
5.	The Departmental has engaged in integrity testing	1	2	3	4	5	56
6.	Disciplinary action always act as an deterrent for misconduct in the department	1	2	3	4	5	57
7.	All employees receive training on the department's ethics policies	1	2	3	4	5	58
8.	The national Anti-Corruption Hotline is an effective tool in detecting misconduct	1	2	3	4	5	59
9.	You are adequately trained to investigate misconduct	1	2	3	4	5	60
10.	You are adequately trained to preside at departmental inquiries	1	2	3	4	5	61
11.	The Special Investigating Unit is more effective in dealing with misconduct than internal disciplinary action	1	2	3	4	5	62
12.	The DIU's support and guidance in disciplinary action taken at Management Areas is extremely valuable	1	2	3	4	5	63
13.	You have attended a workshop on the code of conduct	1	2	3	4	5	64
14.	You have attended a workshop on the vetting policy	1	2	3	4	5	65
15.	You have attended a workshop on the whistle-blowing policy	1	2	3	4	5	66
16.	You have attended a workshop on the anti-corruption policy	1	2	3	4	5	67

17.	You have attended a workshop on the anti-fraud policy	1	2	3	4	5	68
							69
							70
							71
							72
							73
							74
	COMMUNICATION						75
18.	Employees are all given a copy of the Departmental Code of Conduct	1	2	3	4	5	76
19.	Employees are all briefed on the National Anti-Corruption Hotline	1	2	3	4	5	77
20.	Employees are all familiar with the Anti-Corruption policy	1	2	3	4	5	78
21.	Employees are all familiar with Resolution 1 of 2006	1	2	3	4	5	79
22.	Employees are all familiar with the Anti-Fraud Policy	1	2	3	4	5	80
23.	Supervisory staff are all familiar with the Vetting Policy	1	2	3	4	5	81
24.	Members of the Senior Management Service comply with the Disclosure of Financial Interest policies	1	2	3	4	5	82
25.	You prefer to report misconduct to the Departmental Investigating Unit	1	2	3	4	5	83
26.	You prefer to report misconduct to the Investigating Officer based at the Office of the Area Commissioner	1	2	3	4	5	84
27.	You prefer to report misconduct to your supervisor	1	2	3	4	5	85
28.	You believe DIU should participate more in disciplinary processes in the management areas	1	2	3	4	5	86
							87

	CLIENTS AND COALITIONS	1	2	3	4	5	76
29.	The Unions support the department's code of conduct	1	2	3	4	5	77
30.	The Unions often oppose disciplinary action against their members	1	2	3	4	5	78
31.	The Unions often engage their members on Resolution 1 of 2006	1	2	3	4	5	79
32.	The Unions often promote integrity amongst their members	1	2	3	4	5	80
							81
	COMMITMENT						82

Annexure C

Please complete this survey by circling your choice

For office use only

--	--	--	--

1-4

A: MANAGEMENT REFORM		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The following questions shortly deals with general perceptions, experiences and observations within the Department of Correctional Services. Circle the number that best reflects your choice.						
DECENTRALISATION		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Over the past FIVE years you have experienced a growing measure of decision making authority when making financial decisions	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Over the past FIVE years you have experienced a growing measure of decision making authority when making human resource decisions	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Spending within your approved budget (or savings) is more important than complying with policies and procedures	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Efficiency and effectiveness of service provision is more important than compliance with policies and procedures	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Compliance with departmental policies and procedures is of greater importance than providing quality goods and services	1	2	3	4	5
6.	You are expected to re-design departmental structures and processes to perform better	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Sub-ordinates should preferably make their own decisions without always coming back to obtain approval	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Sub-ordinates are expected to comply with policies and procedures, even when it compromises efficiency and effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
ETHICS AND INTEGRITY		1	2	3	4	5
9.	The most appropriate measure to maintain ethical conduct is through penalising unethical conduct	1	2	3	4	5
10.	The most appropriate measure to maintain ethical conduct is through rewarding good performance	1	2	3	4	5
11.	You impose integrity testing on your sub-ordinates	1	2	3	4	5

12.	Maintaining ethical conduct and promoting integrity forms part of your annual performance agreement	1	2	3	4	5	65
13.	Maintaining ethical conduct and promoting integrity is a key performance area	1	2	3	4	5	66
14.	You annually submit your Financial Disclosure of Interest documentation	1	2	3	4	5	87

B: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SUB-ORDINATE PERFORMANCE When you evaluate sub-ordinate performance, the following criteria are important... Circle the number that best reflects the priority you give to each of these criteria...	CRITERIA				
	None	Low	Medium	High	
1. Productivity	0	1	2	3	114
2. Quality services	0	1	2	3	115
3. Compliance with departmental policies and procedures	0	1	2	3	116
4. Saving on unnecessary expenses	0	1	2	3	117
5. Arriving at work on time	0	1	2	3	118
6. Acting ethically and avoiding misconduct	0	1	2	3	119

7. You personally visit your sub-ordinates and evaluate their work...

Not regularly	1	At least monthly	2	Once a year	3	120
I don't know	4					

8. You compare the performance of your sub-ordinates against pre-determined objectives...

At least for times a year	1	Once a year	2	Not regularly	3	120
I don't know	4					

C: As manager and supervisor you have various ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES in respect of SUB-ORDINATES? Circle the number that best reflects the priority you give to each of these roles...	Roles and responsibilities			
	None	Low	Medium	High
1. Motivating sub-ordinates	0	1	2	3
2. Evaluating their performance (output) against key performance indicators	0	1	2	3
3. Undertaking planning for your unit and sub-ordinates	0	1	2	3
4. Providing leadership to employees	0	1	2	3
5. Checking whether their conduct complies with policies and procedures	0	1	2	3

6. Undertaking financial planning	0	1	2	3
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---

119

D: BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please state your

1. Age
2. Race White Black Indian Coloured
3. Gender Male Female
4. Highest Qualification
5. Date of Appointment
6. Post Level
7. Post Title
8. You are employed within A Correctional Centre Administration Offices of the
Area Commissioner
9. Management Area
10. Region Eastern Cape Western Cape Northern Cape & Free State
 Gauteng Limpopo, Mpumalanga
& North West Kwa-Zulu Natal
11. Length of Service in the public service

Thank you very much for your time and for participating in this survey!

Annexure D

Data for the following questions will be obtained through documentary analysis. Data obtained from the questionnaire, interviews and documentary analysis will collectively provide data in respect of the indicators; thus reflect the existence of opportunities for corruption within a particular Department.

A Ethics Management

- 1 How many disciplinary cases have been instituted during the 2007/8 financial year?
- 2 How many internal disciplinary cases lead to successful convictions?
- 3 How many cases have been forwarded to the SAPS for further criminal prosecution?
- 4 What is the most common punishment after a conviction for misconduct? (dismissal, demotion by a salary level, written warning, final warning, verbal warning, counselling, or suspension without pay)

B Audit Reports

Data Sources: Auditor General's Audit Report for 2005/6, 2006/7, and 2007/8; DCS Year reports for 2005/6, 2006/7, and 2007/8; Performance Audit Reports; and Forensic Investigation Reports.

- 1 What were the findings of the financial audit of DCS during the past 2005/6, 2006/7, and 2007/8 financial years?
- 2 Was there an improvement of the audit opinion in respect of the financial statements of DCS from the 2005/6 to 2007/8 financial years?
- 3 What were the findings of performance audits of DCS during the past 2005/6, 2006/7, and 2007/8 financial years? (Performance audits evaluate the suitability of a department's management/control measures in ensuring the economic procurement of resources, as well as the efficient and effective spending of resources)
- 4 Were any forensic investigations of DCS undertaken during the past 2005/6, 2006/7 and 2007/8 financial years?

5 Were the findings of these reports made public? (Determine transparency; Performance or Forensic Audits commissioned by the relevant accounting officer need not be made public or reported to the relevant legislature or SCOPA.)