

Ethics Resource Center

New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey

August 22, 2007



New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey

August 2007

NOTICE

This report summarises questions and intellectual property that are confidential and proprietary and may not be replicated, duplicated, or reused in any form without explicit written permission from the Ethics Resource Center.

All applicable treaties and conventions regarding international copyrights apply; users of this report agree to be bound to those conditions.

Requests regarding permission rights should be directed to:
Permissions, Ethics Resource Center

Ethics Resource Center
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006 U.S.A.
001-202-737-2258
001-202-737-2227 (fax)
ethics@ethics.org
www.ethics.org

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Executive Summary	2
Findings	3
International Comparisons	7
Recommendations	9
Specific Recommendations for the Four Agency Groups	11
Methodology	18
How to Understand the Tables.....	20
Presentation of the Findings.....	22
Survey Results by Table	24
Appendix A: Sample Selection Methodology	54
Appendix B: Sampling Structure – Core Sample	57
Appendix C: Comparison of Survey Questions to the “Six Elements”	58

Introduction

This report summarises the responses of New Zealand State servants in an April 2007 integrity and conduct survey designed and administered by the Ethics Resource Center (ERC). The survey contained 55 questions, including 45 content questions and 10 demographic questions.

The evaluation initiative is intended to satisfy the following objectives:

- Inform the Minister of the State Services, the Government, State Services agencies, and the general public about perceptions of the current state of integrity and conduct of State servants in New Zealand
- Provide an overall assessment of the standards of integrity and conduct of State servants across the State Services under the ‘six elements’¹ that are successful in supporting integrity and ethical behaviour in the workplace
- Establish a baseline so trends on the state of integrity and conduct at a State Services wide level can be identified, and in subsequent surveys, be monitored and understood
- Benchmark the data gathered from the survey against other organisations, nationally and internationally
- Examine the differences that may exist between State servants, based on the type and size of the State Services agency they work in
- Give larger State Services agencies the opportunity to receive an individualised report, which would specifically analyse that agency’s standards of integrity and conduct
- Identify any areas for improvement and make recommendations

¹ The six elements are drawn from Stuart C Gilman and Jeffrey Stout, *Assessment Strategies and Practices for Integrity and Anti-Corruption Measures: Comparative Overview*. OECD, 2005. The six elements are:

1. Agencies of the State Services have standards of integrity and conduct that meet the State Services Commissioner’s minimum standards
2. Agencies of the State Services promote their standards of integrity and conduct
3. Standards of integrity and conduct are integrated into the behaviour of State servants
4. Managers model the standards of integrity and conduct in their behaviour
5. The consequences for behaviour that breaches the standards of integrity and conduct are known by State servants
6. Agencies act decisively when breaches occur

Please refer to the following publication for a lengthier explanation of the “six elements” - State Services Commission, *State of the Development Goals Report 2006*. State Services Commission. July 2006.

Executive Summary

To inform the Trusted State Services Development Goal, the State Services Commission contracted the Ethics Resource Center to administer the New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey. This survey will allow the State Services Commission to monitor trends in the factors that influence the level of trustworthiness exhibited by State servants. The survey report provides an overall assessment of the standards of integrity and conduct of State servants under four agency groupings²; establishes a baseline from which to compare New Zealand data against United States (US) government benchmarks; and makes recommendations for improvements. A total sample size of 7,782 State servants from 38 State Services agencies were randomly selected to participate in the survey. A total of 4,642 of these State servants completed the survey, with an overall response rate of 60 percent.

New Zealand is held internationally as being one of the least corrupt countries in the world and many of the results of the survey are consistent with this belief. Of the 33 percent of State servants who observed breaches, the vast majority believed it breached their agency's standards of integrity and conduct, rather than the law. The most prevalent types of observed breaches included abusive and intimidating behaviour, improper use of internet or email, and lying to other employees. New Zealand State servants experience comparable levels of pressure to US government employees to compromise their agency's standards of integrity and conduct. However, they experience this pressure much less often.

More than half of State servants who observed misconduct reported it. Of the 43 percent of State servants who observed a breach but did not report it, the main reasons they gave were that they did not believe that corrective action would be taken, they did not believe that they could report anonymously; and they feared retaliation. Additionally, only one-third were aware of the Protected Disclosures Act 2000, which provides for confidential complaints about "serious wrongdoing," despite it being obligatory for agencies to have a protected disclosures policy.

The survey found that 96 percent of State servants reported that their agencies have written standards of integrity and conduct. On average, fewer New Zealand State servants than US government employees reported that their agency provides training on its standards of integrity and conduct. Among those who were aware of integrity training, 85 percent indicated that they found it to be useful.

² The survey data was reported for the State Services as a whole and for four agency groupings: Public Service Departments, Crown Agents, Crown Agents – District Health Boards, and Other Crown Entities (including Autonomous Crown Entities, Independent Crown Entities, and Crown Entity Companies).

Findings

Table A: Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme (pp. 24-36)

The majority of misconduct that State servants observed in the past year pertained to internal issues and were believed to only breach the organisation's standards of integrity and conduct, rather than the law. Among the four agency groups, Autonomous Crown Entities (ACEs), Independent Crown Entities (ICEs), and Crown Entity (CE) Companies (referred to as "Other Crown Entities") had the highest level of breaches that violated both the law and the organisation's standards of integrity and conduct, but their rating is lower than the US government employee average.

- One-third of State servants claimed to have observed misconduct that breached the law or their organisation's standards of integrity and conduct within the past year.
- The vast majority (75%) of those who observed misconduct believed it breached the organisation's standards of integrity and conduct, rather than the law, or both combined. This could indicate that the misconduct observed by State servants is less severe and/or that State servants are better at recognising conduct that is legal but unethical.
- The following types of observed misconduct are ranked in order of prevalence, and, with the exception of the third and seventh points, are observed by a higher proportion of New Zealand State servants than US government employees:
 - Abusive or intimidating behaviour (36% average)
 - Improper use of internet or email (27%)
 - Lying to other employees (21%)
 - Breaches of safety regulations (20%)
 - Provision of goods, services, or work products failing to meet specifications (17%)
 - Discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, gender, age or similar categories (17%)
 - An action that places an employee's interests over the organisation's interests (17%)
- The types of misconduct most frequently observed within agencies are internal in scope and tend toward procedural issues. For example, the percentage who observed lying to employees (21%) was higher than those who observed lying to customers, vendors, or the public (9%). Similarly, the numbers for theft (only 5%) were much more favourable than those for abusive or intimidating behaviour (36%).
- Observations of theft were low.
- A far lower percentage of New Zealand State servants observed lying to customers, vendors, or the public (9%), than those who observed lying to other employees (21%).
- Abusive or intimidating behaviour; and goods, services, or work products failing to meet specifications are higher among Crown Agents – District Health Board (DHB) employees than other employee groups.

Pressure is a key indicator of programme effectiveness. Past research indicates that pressure is directly linked to misconduct; roughly 90% of those who feel pressure also observe misconduct.

- In terms of quantity, New Zealand State servants experience almost the same level of pressure as US government employees.
- DHB employees experience almost twice as much pressure to commit misconduct as those in Other Crown Entities.
- Middle management and colleagues were identified as the largest sources of pressure among Public Service Departments, Crown Agents, and DHBs. However, senior management is, by far, the main source of pressure among Other Crown Entity employees.
- Almost half of State servants only experience pressure “Periodically” and over one-third said “Very rarely.” This pattern, by and large, is similar cross all four agency groups.

More than half of State servants said they reported the breaches of conduct they observed, except for the employees in Other Crown Entities, whose reporting rate is lower than the other three agency groups and the US government employee rates.

- Of the 43% who observed breaches of conduct but chose not to report, 58% did not believe that corrective action would be taken; 56% did not believe they could report anonymously;³ and one-half feared retaliation.
- Among those who chose not to report, fear of retaliation and lack of an anonymous reporting mechanism are the biggest threats, especially for those in DHBs.
- Among those choosing not to report, three in ten DHB employees indicated that they did not report because they did not want to get someone fired. Only one in ten Crown Agent and Other Crown Entity employees indicated this as a reason for not reporting.
- Twice as many Other Crown Entity employees indicated “The misconduct came from the person to whom I should report” as a reason for not reporting, as compared to Crown Agent employees.
- Of those choosing to report (55%), three in four believed it was the right thing to do and three in four felt they could count on the support of their immediate manager or colleagues.
- Other Crown Entity employees expressed the lowest level of confidence that corrective action would be taken – most likely because they feel less able to count on their immediate managers’ support, and because they expressed more concern about anonymous reporting mechanisms than those in the other agency groups.

A large majority of New Zealand State servants are satisfied with their organisation and seek advice when facing issues of integrity and conduct.

- Sixty-three percent of State servants said they are willing to seek advice when facing an issue of integrity and conduct “Every time” or “Most of the time.”
- Over three-fourths claimed they are satisfied with the organisation they work for and about 9% said they are dissatisfied. DHB employees indicate the most dissatisfaction.

³ This finding is not surprising because many agencies do not currently have anonymous reporting systems in place.

Table B: Elements of an Integrity and Conduct Programme (pp. 37-40)

- **Of those who expressed a view, a high percentage of State servants report that New Zealand State Services agencies have written standards of integrity and conduct, a location to obtain advice, and a way to report breaches; however, about half were unaware of a way to report breaches anonymously⁴ or confidentially.** Additionally only one-third were aware of the Protected Disclosures Act 2000, which allows them to make complaints about “serious wrongdoing.”
- **Half of State servants said that their immediate manager disciplines employees who breach their organisation’s standards of integrity and conduct** and almost two-thirds said that evaluation of integrity and conduct is part of their regular performance appraisal. Both the disciplinary action and performance appraisal are least implemented among Other Crown Entity employees.
- **While 55% of State servants believe their organisation provides training on standards of integrity and conduct, just more than one in five still ‘do not know’ if their organisation does.** Of those who reported that their organisation provided training, most found it “Very useful” or “Somewhat useful,” although the State servants that found it “Very useful” was slightly less.

Table C: Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture (pp. 41-49)

The ethics-related actions (ERAs)⁵ and accountability of employees studied in the twenty questions⁶ of this survey are used to signify an organisational culture that encourages ethical conduct. Organisations that receive high percentages for these have a strong culture that encourages ethical conduct and are more likely to see positive programme results.

- **New Zealand State servants assign more credibility to management levels nearer to them.** This finding mirrors results for other organisations. A potential explanation for this more negative view of senior and middle management with respect to ethics-related actions may be that State servants feel disconnected from these higher levels. An example of this difference is that State servants see immediate managers and colleagues as setting a better example than middle or senior management. All agency groups except for the Crown Agents exhibit this pattern.
 - These less positive perceptions of higher management and more favourable views of immediate managers and non-management employees seems to indicate that culture is strongest among those who spend the most time together. However, for New Zealand State servants, these small pockets of culture are not entirely positive, considering that State servants indicated that most pressure to commit misconduct comes from immediate managers and colleagues.
- **DHB employees rated senior and middle managements’ ERAs significantly lower than the other three agency groups,** especially concerning “keeping their promises and commitments.” Yet

⁴ Again, this finding is consistent with expectations.

⁵ Ethics-related actions (ERAs) are the specific behaviours of individuals, and are the actions (behaviours) measured in the survey. The term is equivalent to ethical behaviours.

⁶ The twenty questions are those shown in Table C, and are described in the section “Presentation of the Findings: Table C Elements of Ethical Culture,” on pages 22-23.

Other Crown Entity employees rated their immediate manager's ERAs lower than others, especially on "communication of the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing."

Table D: Characteristics of State servants (pp. 50-53)

- **Over half of State servants indicated that they experienced a merger or restructuring within the last two years.** DHBs have the highest percentage experiencing a merger or restructuring, and Crown Agents have the lowest percentage experiencing an event of this type, thus demonstrating the highest level of organisational stability.
- **Among the four agency groups, DHB employees are generally older and have longer periods of service with the same agency,** while Other Crown Entity employees are younger, and have the shortest period of service with the same agency.
- **The four agency groups show a relatively distinctive picture among themselves:**
 - Public Service Departments resemble the national average distribution of employees
 - Crown Agents had higher proportions of middle management and overall have fewer non-management employees than the other agency groups
 - DHBs had higher proportions of non-management than the other agency groups, and
 - Other Crown Entities have more senior managers than the other agency groups

General Findings

- **Many State servants indicated that they did not feel prepared to handle integrity and conduct issues or that they could not report anonymously.** This is not surprising given that integrity and conduct programme elements, including training and reporting mechanisms, have not been consistently implemented through all of the State Services. In agencies and areas where these elements are lacking, a high percentage of employees will not know how to interpret what they observe or how to respond in situations where issues of integrity and conduct arise. This finding is critical because research shows a strong correlation between the existence of programme elements and positive results.
- **"Neutral" responses are extremely high across all ethics-related actions' questions no matter which management level was being asked about. New Zealand State servants also respond that they "Don't know" to many questions at notable levels.** This could indicate that New Zealand State servants are less familiar with terms used throughout and concepts addressed in the survey and/or that they are less accustomed to linking these ideas to their everyday work environment. Creating a "common language" in terms of integrity and conduct will help employees articulate concerns and recognise and address potential problems, and will help managers to successfully promote the organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.

International Comparisons

For over ten years, ERC has conducted a national random sample survey of the US workforce about the ethics management programme and ethical culture in their organisations. In 2005, ERC collected 3015 responses; the US Government Employee Average included in the data table is a subset of the respondents who self-identified as government workers. The sample size of this subset is 524 responses, which includes national, state, and local government employees.

This study inquires about four main sections⁷ (Outcomes, Programme Elements, Culture, and Demographics) which correspond with Tables A-D in this report. Among ERC's four-group structure, Programme Elements reflects the ERC's six ethics programme elements that the US Federal Sentencing Guidelines for Organizations (FSGO) specify. Please note when comparing US government employee averages and New Zealand State Services averages that the majority of US government agencies have installed the FSGO elements; thus, US government employee averages often present the New Zealand State Services averages in a less favourable light. Nonetheless, comparisons to this US counterpart provide a spectrum of possibility.

- **Compared to US government employees, New Zealand State servants observe less law-breaking and more breaches of an organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.**
- **New Zealand State Services' employees feel pressure less frequently than US government counterparts.** New Zealand State Services' employees are more likely attribute their colleagues and less likely attribute their middle management as the main source of pressure than US government employees.
- **ERC's six formal integrity and culture programme elements measured in this study do not reflect well the current New Zealand situation, since they are based on US government guidelines.** For example, anonymous reporting, which is almost a standard ethics programme management practice in US government agencies, is not yet fully incorporated in New Zealand State Services' agencies. As a result, formal programme elements less favourably reflect the New Zealand State Services situation. When New Zealand and US averages on these measures are compared, formal programme elements currently installed in New Zealand State Services' agencies should be considered.
- **In general, the ratings of ethics-related actions (ERAs) of the top and middle management levels by the New Zealand State Services employees are lower than US ratings, while the immediate manager and colleague ratings are closely comparable.** Ethical culture in New Zealand State Services agencies measure as weaker than the US government average. Often such perceptions are the result of incomplete or ineffective communication and differing understanding across managerial levels.

⁷ This four group structure is somewhat similar to New Zealand State Services' "six elements" in integrity and ethical behaviour in the work place. As stated previously, cross-comparison of ERC's metrics and State Services' six element structures is in the Appendix C p. 58.

- **New Zealand State Services employees experienced much more re-organisation or mergers, and have a relatively shorter period of service to the same organisation** than US government employees, and thus, have less job stability. As indicated in the main analysis section, ERC's previous research indicates that employees in organisations in transition more frequently observe misconduct than employees in stable organisations.
- **Finally, differences between the cultures of the New Zealand and US government agencies should not be forgotten.** ERC does not believe that the US should be the only benchmark for other countries when analysing ethical culture; we simply possess data that can prove beneficial. Recognising that history, structure, and location most deeply influence each country's culture and thus the organisations within, we offer our research as a mechanism for comparison that expresses the range of opinions among government employees. We provide these comparisons to contribute insights and new approaches to the ongoing, global effort to positively influence ethical culture.

Recommendations

The recommendations here are general in nature, and further investigation is needed to determine other actions that might be taken by New Zealand State Services agencies and how to prioritise them.

1. ERC research shows that the culture of an organisation most strongly impacts on the ethical decisions of its employees; however, ERC has learned that programme elements have a strong impact on ethical culture and are an excellent first step in improving employees' ability to recognise, discuss, and analyse ethical dilemmas in their workplace. Survey responses indicate limited awareness of training and reporting mechanisms, which **suggests that New Zealand State Services agencies should focus their energy on implementing more programme elements and making them more accessible to State servants.**

Recommendation: In order to promote a strong ethical culture and foster positive outcomes, establish programmes that are consistent, genuine, and relevant to the needs of State servants.

2. When asked about preparedness to respond to situations inviting misconduct, disparity between the State servants' responses (only 44%) and the benchmark (74%) is notable. Many State servants do not feel prepared to handle situations they might encounter.

Recommendation: Develop and implement integrity and conduct training programmes. Keep in mind, though, that training itself is not an indicator of an effective integrity and conduct programme. Continue to monitor within the organisation and look for improvements in outcomes that would result from an effective training programme.

3. Based on survey data, it appears that State servants are not satisfied with the information they receive from senior management, nor do they trust that management will keep its promises and commitments. Similarly only half were satisfied with the results of their decision to report breaches they observed. It is not surprising, then, that they do not feel they can safely report breaches they observe.

Recommendation: Increase communication within the organisation vertically and develop systems for both sharing information and resolving situations laterally. The objective is to build trust.

4. State servants report high levels of dissatisfaction with New Zealand State Service agencies' responses to reports of misconduct, believing that matters are covered up, there is no response, or the responses are not adequate. This finding is not uncommon, even in organisations that work hard to address breaches of conduct swiftly and appropriately. Often the problem stems from ineffective communication (back to the reporter), rather than inaction towards the claim. Reporting mechanisms and ways to follow up on previous reports are especially critical for the ethical health of an organisation. The importance of communication with reporters should not be underestimated because

reporters' experiences often become a part of workplace lore, thereby influencing the opinions of other potential reporters.

Recommendation: Keep individual employees informed, if not specifically, then generally, of the response to their report. Provide reports of outcomes in a way that maintains the privacy and confidentiality of everyone involved, while providing instructional guidance for employees in future situations.

5. ERC's findings that ethical culture drives the decisions and behaviours of employees within an organisation make it clear that upper-level management must "set the tone from the top." Senior managers have a major impact on the ethical culture of their organisation, so they must make intentional efforts to create a strong ethical culture.

Recommendation: Encourage leaders to walk the walk and talk the talk, when it comes to integrity and conduct. By frequently communicating and modelling the importance of integrity and conduct to employees, trust and motivation to act ethically will increase across all employee levels, as will positive perceptions of top management.

Specific Recommendations for the Four Agency Groups

Demographics of Public Service Departments

As a group, employees of Public Service Departments are:

- More likely to be younger than 29 years old compared to employees in the other agency groups, and have an average service period within the same agency close to the New Zealand State Service's average;
- More likely to be in non-management positions or middle management compared to employees in the other agency groups;
- Highly likely to be a member of a union; and
- Less likely to have regular contact with the general public as compared to the other agency groups.

Recommendations for Public Service Departments

- Public Service Departments' average awareness of the provisions of the Protected Disclosures Act 2000 is higher than those of other three agency groups. However, only 38% of employees are aware of the Act. Steps for improvement include more employee training on integrity and conduct and efforts to increase communication. Half the employees of Public Service Departments who decided not to report breaches of conduct were concerned about whether they could report anonymously.

Recommendation: Increasing the awareness of the Protected Disclosures Act will lessen this concern, and thus should be a high priority.

- Employees of Public Service Departments generally expressed higher or equivalent levels of horizontal cohesiveness among colleagues than their US counterparts or employees in the other agency groups. However, compared to the US government employees benchmark, employees of Public Service Departments displayed lower level of vertical trust across managerial levels, especially with senior and middle management.

Recommendation: As indicated earlier, ERC's research consistently demonstrates that effective integrity and conduct programmes require not only the installation of formal programmes, but also, and more importantly, continuous reinforcement of the system with strong commitment from senior management. "Tone at the top" should be communicated consistently throughout the agency.

Demographics of Crown Agents

As a group, Crown Agent employees are:

- Middle-aged (40 to 50 years) compared to employees in the other agency groups, with one in four having an average service period between one and three years within the same agency, and with fewer or the same number working 16 years or more within the same agency compared to employees in the other agency groups;
- More likely to be male than the other agency groups;
- More likely to be middle and senior management than the other agency groups;
- Experiencing “Very regular contact” or “Regular contact” with the general public;
- Paid slightly more than the other agency groups;
- Less likely to experience a merger or restructuring;
- Mostly working at local branches, or secondarily at national offices; and
- Interacting in a more ethnically diverse setting than the other agency groups.

Recommendations for Crown Agents

Crown Agents frequently ranked either second lowest or second highest in percentages throughout the survey and mirrored the New Zealand State Services average on most issues. Reporting of breaches of conduct appears to be a major concern among Crown Agent employees and percentages for reasons why employees chose to report observed misconduct reflect positively on the Crown Agents.

- The main reason employees who witnessed breaches of conduct chose to report was because they believed it was the right thing to do. This indicates that personal moral obligations do influence employees’ workplace decisions. The second most popular reason for reporting (and the highest among all agency groupings) was because Crown Agents believed corrective action would be taken. And finally, employees feel that they can count on the support of immediate managers and colleagues; the Crown Agents percentage also surpassed the other groups for this choice. They are least likely among agency groups to believe that no one else will report observed misconduct.

Although Crown Agents are comparatively quite satisfied with their organisations’ responses to reports of misconduct, percentages for reasons why employees are dissatisfied reveal some areas of concern. Crown Agent employees do not know what is happening after they report observed misconduct. Moreover, they are distrustful that correction action even occurred, and if so, whether or not it was adequate for the offence. Mechanisms for reporting are clearly in place, but this lack of communication or faith in follow-through is dissuading employees from reporting as frequently as they should.

- Most notably, 94% of those that were dissatisfied believed that corrective action was not severe nor complete enough; this is 30% higher than any other groups’ response for this reason. Furthermore, over one third claimed, “Management told me what they did but I didn’t believe them.”

The percentage of Crown Agent employees stating that they did not report observed misconduct is higher than both the New Zealand and US government averages, yet their reasons for not reporting do indicate that reporting mechanisms are in place.

- For example, over half did not believe corrective action would be taken; almost half did not believe the misconduct was significant enough to report; and slightly less than half did not believe they could report anonymously.
- Far fewer Crown Agent employees than any other agency groupings claimed they did not know whom to contact; that the misconduct came from the person to whom they should report it; or that they feared retaliation—which are the most severe reasons available for survey participants to choose.

Recommendation: Corrective action is a major issue for both employees that reported observed misconduct and those that did not. This indicates either disconnection among the members of the organisation or lack of communication about what happens after someone reports. **Crown Agents need to make all employees aware of existing reporting mechanisms. Furthermore, they need to be more transparent about what happens after a report is made.** Not following-up with those who report breaches of conduct, either directly to the individual or indirectly to the organisation as a whole, negatively affects employees' trust, as survey results indicate. Often, employees will share their doubts and scepticism with one another and perpetuate a belief that corrective action does not occur. **ERC research shows that there are ways to follow-up that greatly improve employees' faith in their organisation while still maintaining the offender's confidentiality.**

Relationships among colleagues appear to be quite fragile among Crown Agent employees.

- Despite experiencing the least amount of pressure from senior management as compared to the other agency groups, employees of Crown Agents experience the second highest amount of pressure from middle management among agency groupings, and by far the most pressure from colleagues.
- Percentages of ethics-related actions occurring among colleagues dips significantly compared to all other management levels. Percentages fall below the average for colleagues talking about the importance of integrity and conduct and colleagues carefully considering standards of integrity and conduct when making work-related decisions.
- A corresponding dip also occurs for questions pertaining to colleagues and non-management being held accountable if caught breaching the agencies' standards of integrity and conduct.

Recommendation: Despite comparatively high percentages of perceived ethics-related actions across management levels as compared to the other New Zealand averages, these percentages are slightly less favourable than the US government employee averages and do raise concerns about colleague relationships. **Colleagues need more opportunities to positively interact.** The higher percentages of middle and senior management employees within Crown Agents suggests that these employees are most likely experiencing a great deal of competition among and/or isolation from each other. **Improved trainings and increased communication among colleagues may improve interactions and allow employees to see one another in a more positive light, which ultimately affects the culture of the organisation.**

Demographics for Crown Agents – District Health Boards (DHBs)

As a group, the DHB employees are:

- Mostly women;
- Very likely to interact regularly with the public ;
- Members of unions at fairly high rates;
- Older in age compared to employees in the other agency groups (75% being 40 years or older compared to 60% or less for other agency groups) with longer lengths of service to the same organisation (40% with 11 or more years of service compared to 29% or less for other agency groups);
- Paid less than the other agency groups; and
- Likely to have experienced a recent restructuring or merger.

Recommendations for Crown Agents – District Health Boards (DHBs)

Observed misconduct and how reports are handled are major areas of concern for DHB employees. They report seeing more breaches of conduct than the other agency groups. Additionally, DHB employees report breaches of conduct at the same rate as the State Services average, but their reasons for not reporting typically are more fear-based.

- Two-thirds have observed one or more kinds of behaviours in the past year.
- Almost one in five have seen five or more kinds of behaviours. For every type, they see similar or higher amounts than the State Services' averages.
- There is no overriding characteristic to the types they observe – they observe both interpersonal types, e.g. discrimination, and organisational types, e.g. breaches of safety regulations.
- Highest percentages for reasons for not reporting breaches of conduct, including: not believing they could report anonymously (71%); fearing retaliation (59%); believing someone else would report it; and not believing corrective action would be taken (both 57%).
- Most chosen reasons for dissatisfaction with the organisation's handling of reports include: corrective actions was not severe enough (50%); the organisation did not respond (39%); and belief that a cover-up occurred (31%).
- When asked about their preparedness to handle situations that invite misconduct, DHB employees reported feeling well prepared 10% less than the State Services' average.

Recommendation: The frequency and types of misconduct observed suggest that DHB employees are unclear about appropriate behaviours or experience a great deal of pressure to commit misconduct. This pressure, and even fear, was also expressed as a reason for not reporting. Reasons for not reporting also suggest that integrity and conduct programmes are not widely communicated to DHB employees. Even if reporting mechanisms are in place, which actions are severe enough to report and what type of follow-up occurred after the report are still unclear for employees. **All of this suggests that training and information about how reports are handled could be better communicated to employees.**

Employees' perceptions of ethics-related actions follow the common trend of being most positive at the colleague and immediate management levels and decrease vertically through middle and upper management. Although this is quite common, there are certainly actions that can be taken to improve the organisational culture overall, and particularly pertaining to integrity and conduct.

- DHB employees categorically report less belief than the other agency groups that senior management and middle management exhibit the ethics-related actions asked about in the survey. For example, 5% agree that senior management keeps their promises and commitments while 13% to 15% of the other agency groups believe senior management keeps their promises and commitments. Additionally, employees disagree at greater levels than other agency groups that senior and middle management practice these ethics-related actions.
- DHB employee perceptions of actions of their immediate managers are better than their perceptions of actions by upper management. Although they are slightly below the State Services' average, many "Strongly agree" that their immediate managers perform these actions.
- Employees' perceptions of their colleagues' actions are highest or at least equal to perceptions held by the four agency groups.

Recommendation: Often employees' understanding about proper behaviour comes from their immediate managers, thus **it may be useful to couple attempts to improve employees' perceptions of upper management with training for immediate managers so that they can model appropriate behaviours and better answer questions regarding integrity and conduct programmes.** Considering that DHB employees are rather homogenous in demographic characteristics, it is not surprising that they hold colleagues in the most favourable view. **It may be valuable to conduct focus groups comprised of just those who match the group's demographic characteristics to learn what they most admire about their colleagues, why their views of upper management are low, and how their shared, built-up perceptions of integrity and conduct can improve without undermining this groups' values, norms, and cohesiveness.**

Concerning accountability, DHB employees perceive that management, including immediate managers, would be held less accountable than their colleagues and non-management employees. This is a typical pattern in organisations; however, for this group it is especially meaningful given their different perceptions of management as seen in response to other questions.

Recommendation: Taking care not to appear punitive or setting up management as a scapegoat, it would be valuable when publicising information about the integrity and conduct programme for this group to see that management is treated like non-management when it comes to disciplining and rewarding behaviours associated with integrity and conduct.

Demographics for ACEs, ICEs, and Crown Entity Companies (Other Crown Entities)

As a group, Other Crown Entity employees are:

- Younger in age compared to employees in the other agency groups, with shorter lengths of service to the same organisation ;
- Predominantly female;
- At a higher employee level and pay;
- More likely to work in a national office and to have less interaction with the public; and
- Less likely to be in a union and to have experienced a merger or restructuring in the last two years.

Recommendations for ACEs, ICEs, and Crown Entity Companies (Other Crown Entities)

In terms of desired outcomes Other Crown Entity employees compare very favourably to the other groups. Only 28% of Other Crown Entity employees reported observing misconduct as opposed to 33% for New Zealand's State Services as a whole. More Other Crown Entity employees responded "no" to all forms of misconduct than any other group (43% versus 38% for the State Services average as a whole). Consistent with this finding is that Other Crown Entity employees had the lowest numbers responding "yes" to many kinds of misconduct. Far fewer (only 15%) Other Crown Entity employees responded that they are exposed to situations inviting misconduct than the State Services average (32%).

- Other Crown Entity employees report the breaches of conduct they observe because they feel a sense of personal responsibility. All of those who reported felt it was the right thing to do. Almost half (49%) reported because they felt that no one else would. Among the State Services as a whole, only 36% reported for that reason.
- In terms of the severity of misconduct, Other Crown Entity employees are less likely to see only breaches of the law. This is a positive trend which could be the result of several positive factors:
- Compared to other groups, Other Crown Entity employees are seeing less severe forms of misconduct.
- Other Crown Entity employees are better able to recognise that breaches of the law are also breaches of integrity and conduct standards.
- Other Crown Entity employees are better at discerning that breaches, even if they are not against the law, still constitute misconduct.
- Other Crown Entity employees are much less aware of integrity and conduct programme resources and are less likely to feel prepared to deal with integrity and conduct issues that arise. Only 79% of Other Crown Entity employees recognised that they have standards, as opposed to 96% for the State Services as a whole. Similarly, only 24% of Other Crown Entity employees were aware of the Protected Disclosures Act 2000, as opposed to 31% for the State Services as a whole. Compared to the State Services wide average, Other Crown Entity employees are less likely to report that their immediate manager disciplines breaches (40% versus 52%) and less likely to report that their immediate manager evaluates integrity and conduct (42% versus 63%). Finally, they are far less aware of integrity and conduct training programmes (23% versus 55%).

Recommendation: Where needed, put in place additional integrity and conduct programme resources, e.g., Standards, reporting and advice lines, training, and the inclusion of ethical behaviour as a standard part of employee management.

- Among Other Crown Entity employees, reporting is one of the areas of greatest concern. Only 43% of Other Crown Entity employees who observe misconduct report it, as opposed to 55% for the State Services as a whole. Other Crown Entity employees chose not to report because they feared that no corrective action would be taken (56%). Of those who did report, almost one in three (30%) experienced retaliation as a result and only 41% of reporters were satisfied with the experience, compared to half for the State Services as a whole. Of those who were dissatisfied with their report, over one in 10 (12%) believed there was a cover-up and another 37% were not sure whether one had taken place, and no one was sure that corrective action was severe and complete.

Recommendation: Address communication lapses in terms of the existence of integrity and conduct programmes and their impact. This is particularly critical in terms of the reporting process; even if reports are addressed exactly as they should be, if there is not communication with the reporter, people will be less likely to report in the future.

- **Managers at all levels can be doing more to communicate about the importance of integrity and conduct and to intentionally set an example of ethical behaviour.** Other Crown Entity employees' responses about managers—at all levels—are less favourable than the State Services as a whole when asked about whether managers communicate the importance of integrity and conduct and whether they set a good example of this. Additionally, they are less favourable (73% versus 81%) when asked about support from their immediate managers. This finding coincides with the fact that only 46% of reporters did so because they expected that their manager would support them, as opposed to 74% for State Services as a whole.

Recommendation: Encourage managers at all levels to promote the standards of integrity and conduct and to model them with employees. Our past research highlights the important role of managers in setting the tone and creating culture. **Other Crown Entity managers need to recognise that encouraging integrity and proper conduct is an essential part of their role.**

Methodology

Stratified Random Sampling and Sample Selection

The New Zealand State Services Commission (SSC) developed a random stratified sample of agencies within the State Services to ensure the results of the survey were representative of the State Services as a whole. ERC also added an additional weight factor to adjust for non-response bias. The sample was stratified by agency type and size. Depending on the size of the agency, either a number of current employees were randomly selected to participate in the survey; or, in the case of a small agency (less than 100 current employees), all current employees were invited to participate. (See Appendix A: Sample Selection Methodology, p. 54 for detailed procedures and rules applied in stratification and sampling). This methodology generated a total sample size of 7,782 employees from 38 agencies (See Appendix B: Recommended Sampling Structures p. 57 for selected agencies).

Participation in the survey was completely voluntary. To protect the confidentiality of respondents, the data was aggregated and no individual responses are identified. A total of 4,642 employees completed the survey from 17 April – 1 May 2007, producing an overall response rate of 60%. This is a significant achievement, as usually response rates for this type of survey average between 30 – 40%.

Data Collection

On 17 April 2007, approximately 7,000^[1] State servants received email invitations via their government-provided email accounts. The invitation provided a unique link through which each individual could access his or her specific, secure, online survey. Individuals who experienced difficulty accessing their online survey could contact the ERC Helpdesk on a New Zealand toll-free 0800 number or by email.

Paper surveys were posted to the work addresses of those employees within the sample population who did not have Internet and/or e-mail access. Enclosed with each survey were a covering letter (with survey confidentiality information) and a postage-paid return envelope that employees used to return their completed and sealed surveys to a designated liaison at the SSC. The liaison then sent the sealed surveys directly to ERC. Employees who needed a replacement survey contacted the ERC Helpdesk and requests were forwarded to the SSC liaison.

Based on the employee list^[2] provided by the SSC in April 2007, 6,889 State servants in 38 agencies received the online survey invitation. Of those, 4,271 State servants participated in the survey, giving an online response rate of 61.99%. For paper surveys, 893 State servants were sent hard copies and 371 completed and returned the survey, rendering a paper survey response rate of 41.55%. The total sample included 7,782 State servants, yielding 4,642 actual participants, for a final response rate of 59.65%. New Zealand State Services data has a confidence interval of +/- 1.4% at the 95% confidence level. In other words, ERC is 95% certain that 'x' percent of employees report a certain way, plus or minus 1.4 percentage points.

Final sample distribution used in the analysis is as below:

	Sample Size	Actual Percentage	Percentage after Weight Adjustment
Public Service Departments	3,063	66%	52%
Crown Agents	1,013	22%	13%
Crown Agents - DHBs	375	8%	33%
Other Crown entities (ACEs, ICEs, and CE Companies)	190	4%	2%
Total	4,641	100%	100%
Note: Two other agencies voluntarily participated in the survey. However, their data were not included in the analysis, since the agencies were not selected in the random sampling process.			
US Average	3,015		
US Government Employees Average	524		

How to Understand the Tables

Understanding Percentages and Notations in the Tables

Some tables do not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

Cells Containing “N/A”

Cells in which “n/a” appears indicate that either the question or the answer was not offered in the survey or that the question or responses offered in the two surveys were dissimilar enough that they could not be compared. Footnotes describe situations where a comparison was made because the questions or answers were similar, although not identical.

Columns in the Tables

Each of the questions listed in the tables on pp. 24-53 is accompanied by several columns of percentages. These columns represent the responses of the following groups of employees which serve as benchmarks, giving context to the data collected by the ERC:

2007 New Zealand State Services Average

The first column shows the average response for all New Zealand State servants who participated in the 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey. In total, 4,642 State servants participated in this survey.

2007 Public Service Departments Average

The second column shows the average response for the New Zealand State servants who participated in the 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey who are employed by Public Service Departments. In total, 3,063 employees of Public Service Departments participated in this survey.

2007 Crown Agents Average

The third column shows the average response for the New Zealand State servants who participated in the 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey who are employed by all Crown Agents (except District Health Boards). In total, 1,013 employees of Crown Agents participated in this survey.

2007 District Health Boards Average

The fourth column shows the average response for the New Zealand State servants who participated in the 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey who are employed by District Health Boards. In total, 375 employees of District Health Boards participated in this survey.

2007 Autonomous Crown Entities (ACEs), Independent Crown Entities (ICEs) & Crown Entity Companies

The fifth column shows the average response for the New Zealand State servants who participated in the 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey who are employed by ACEs, ICEs, and Crown Entity Companies. In total, 190 employees of ACEs, ICEs, and Crown Entity Companies participated in this survey.

2005 US Average – Government Employees

The last column shows a subset of ERC's 1995 US National Business Ethics Survey, referred to as the US government employee average. This subset represents those who identified themselves as government employees within the US. This subset was calculated from the responses of 524 US government employees. The 2005 version of the study was a telephone survey of 3,015 respondents carried out between March and June 2005.

Presentation of the Findings

The questions in the 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey are listed in the rows in the tables on pp. 24-53 of this report and are organised into four categories:

- Table A: Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme
- Table B: Elements of an Integrity and Conduct Programme
- Table C: Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture
- Table D: Characteristics of State servants

The background context for each of these categories is explained in further detail below. The use of the expression ‘integrity and conduct’ is used interchangeably with ‘ethics and compliance.’

Table A: Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme

The 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey measured several results that ERC generally expects of an integrity and conduct programme, including:

- Reduction in types and severity of observed misconduct;
- Fewer sources and decreased frequency of pressure to commit misconduct;
- Improved decision-making criteria leading to reporting of observed misconduct;
- Greater satisfaction with responses to reports of misconduct;
- Increased willingness to seek advice when making ethical decisions; and
- Overall satisfaction with the organisation.

Table B: Elements of an Integrity and Conduct Programme

The 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey measured employees’ awareness of the existence of several elements of an integrity and conduct programme, including:

1. Written standards of integrity and conduct;
2. Training on integrity and conduct;
3. Provision of a mechanism for seeking ethics-related advice or information;
4. Provision of mechanisms for reporting misconduct, including anonymously;⁸
5. Discipline of employees who breach the agency’s standards of the integrity and conduct; and
6. Integrity and conduct as a part of immediate managers’ evaluations of employee performance.

The six elements listed above are part of ERC’s standard classification for analysis and while they differ from the six elements outlined in the footnote on p. 1, they are still comparable. ERC has provided a comparison of the New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct survey question set to the “six elements” in Appendix C: Comparison of Survey Questions to the “Six Elements” on p. 58.

⁸ We recognise that anonymous reporting is not standard practice through New Zealand’s government and that not all agencies provide mechanisms for anonymous reporting of misconduct.

Table C: Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture

Through extensive research, ERC has found that ethical culture has a significant impact on programme results. Furthermore, ethical culture can be measured using several indicators of the behaviour of employees at various levels throughout an organisation. Fifteen of these indicators plus five questions about accountability (described below) are included in the 2007 New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey, including:

1) Senior managers engage in ethics-related activities, specifically:

- Provides information about what is going on in the organisation
- Keeps commitments and promises
- Communicates the importance of integrity and conduct
- Sets a good example of ethical behaviour

2) Middle management engages in ethics-related activities, specifically:

- Keeps commitments and promises
- Communicates the importance of integrity and conduct
- Sets a good example of ethical behaviour

3) Immediate manager engages in ethics-related activities, specifically:

- Keeps commitments and promises
- Communicates the importance of integrity and conduct
- Sets a good example of ethical behaviour
- Supports employees' adherence to standards of integrity and conduct

4) Colleagues engage in ethics-related activities, specifically:

- Talk about importance of integrity and conduct
- Set a good example of ethical behaviour
- Support employees' adherence to standards of integrity and conduct
- Consider standards of integrity and conduct when they make decisions

5) Senior managers, middle management, immediate managers, colleagues, and non-management employees would be held accountable if caught breaching standards of integrity and conduct.

Table D: Characteristics of State Servants

The concluding category presents demographic information about survey participants, including agency restructuring, tenure (length of service), managerial status, union/collective agreement membership, age, gender, frequency of interaction with the New Zealand public, salary, work location, and ethnicity.

Survey Results by Table

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
1. Observed misconduct							
During the past year, have you personally observed conduct that you thought was unlawful or breached your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct?	Yes	33%	31%	35%	36%	28%	29%
	No	62%	63%	60%	60%	68%	70%
	Don't know	5%	6%	6%	4%	4%	1%
Did that misconduct breach the law, your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct, or both?	The law	2%	3%	1%	1%	0%	5%
	My organisation's standards of integrity and conduct	75%	75%	76%	75%	63%	55%
	Both	16%	16%	18%	14%	19%	36%
	Don't know	8%	7%	5%	10%	17%	3%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
2. Observed Specific Types of Misconduct							
<i>The following table lists several kinds of behaviour. For each one, please indicate whether you have personally observed this behaviour among employees within your organisation during the past 12 months.</i>							
Incidence of observation of kinds of behaviours	Zero kinds of behaviour	38%	41%	39%	32%	43%	n/a
	One kind of behaviour	18%	18%	19%	19%	19%	n/a
	Two to four kinds of behaviours	29%	27%	28%	31%	26%	n/a
	Five to ten kinds of behaviours	15%	14%	13%	17%	11%	n/a
	Eleven or more kinds of behaviours	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	n/a
Sexual harassment	Yes	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	8%
	No	91%	91%	91%	91%	92%	91%
	Don't know	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%
Giving or accepting inappropriate payments, perks or inappropriate gifts?	Yes	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%	3%
	No	93%	93%	94%	93%	91%	97%
	Don't know	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	1%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Abusive or intimidating behaviour towards employees?	Yes	36%	31%	33%	45%	32%	23%
	No	62%	67%	65%	52%	64%	77%
	Don't know	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	0.2%
Discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, gender, age or similar categories?	Yes	17%	16%	15%	18%	15%	14%
	No	80%	80%	82%	79%	81%	85%
	Don't know	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%
Breaches of safety regulations?	Yes	20%	19%	16%	23%	15%	16%
	No	75%	76%	78%	72%	79%	83%
	Don't know	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	2%
An action that places an employee's interests over the organisation's interests?	Yes	17%	16%	16%	19%	23%	21%
	No	75%	75%	77%	73%	72%	77%
	Don't know	8%	8%	7%	8%	6%	2%
Provision of goods or services or work product that fail to meet specifications?	Yes	17%	15%	13%	23%	14%	8%
	No	75%	78%	82%	69%	81%	89%
	Don't know	7%	7%	5%	8%	5%	3%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Inappropriate alteration of documents?	Yes	6%	5%	3%	8%	5%	7%
	No	91%	92%	93%	89%	89%	91%
	Don't know	3%	3%	3%	4%	6%	2%
Improper use of the internet or email?	Yes	27%	28%	23%	26%	16%	19%
	No	68%	66%	71%	71%	74%	79%
	Don't know	5%	6%	6%	3%	10%	2%
Misuse of your organisation's information?	Yes	5%	5%	2%	6%	8%	10%
	No	91%	91%	93%	90%	85%	89%
	Don't know	5%	4%	5%	5%	7%	1%
Falsification or misrepresentation of any records and reports?	Yes	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	6%
	No	91%	92%	92%	90%	89%	93%
	Don't know	4%	3%	4%	6%	6%	1%
Lying to other employees? <i>NBES: Lying to employees, customers, vendors, or the public</i>	Yes	21%	19%	22%	25%	21%	23%
	No	72%	74%	72%	70%	70%	76%
	Don't know	7%	7%	6%	5%	8%	1%
Lying to customers, vendors, or the public? <i>NBES: Lying to employees, customers, vendors, or the public</i>	Yes	9%	8%	10%	10%	8%	23%
	No	84%	85%	84%	82%	84%	76%
	Don't know	7%	7%	6%	8%	8%	1%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Misreporting of actual time or hours worked?	Yes	17%	16%	12%	20%	10%	21%
	No	78%	78%	84%	76%	82%	78%
	Don't know	5%	6%	4%	4%	8%	1%
Theft?	Yes	5%	4%	3%	7%	2%	8%
	No	91%	92%	93%	88%	95%	92%
	Don't know	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	0.4%
3. Pressure to commit misconduct							
Do you ever feel pressured by other employees or management to compromise your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct? <i>NBES: Do you ever feel pressured by others employees or management to compromise your organisation's standards of ethical business conduct in order to achieve business or political objectives?</i>	Yes	12%	10%	11%	17%	9%	10%
	No	85%	87%	85%	81%	88%	89%
	Don't know	3%	4%	4%	2%	3%	0.4%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Who is the main source of pressure to compromise your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct?	Senior management	21%	26%	16%	18%	42%	22%
	Middle management	34%	36%	35%	32%	23%	52%
	Colleagues	31%	27%	41%	33%	21%	15%
	Sources outside of my organisation	7%	8%	2%	7%	7%	9%
	Don't know	7%	3%	7%	10%	7%	(Other) 2%
How often do you feel pressured by other employees or management to compromise your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct?	All the time	2%	5%	2%	1%	9%	22%
	Fairly often	11%	12%	11%	11%	7%	27%
	Periodically	46%	47%	45%	46%	59%	33%
	Very rarely	37%	35%	41%	38%	19%	18%
	Don't know	3%	1%	2%	5%	5%	0%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
4. Reporting Misconduct and Reasons for Reporting or Not Reporting							
Did you report your observation of misconduct to management or to another appropriate person?	Yes	55%	56%	54%	56%	43%	58%
	No	43%	42%	45%	43%	53%	42%
	Don't know	2%	2%	1%	1%	4%	0%
<i>If you decided not to report the misconduct you observed, please tell us if any of the following influenced your decision. [If you have observed multiple incidents, please think back to the most recent incident you have observed.]</i>							
I didn't believe corrective action would be taken	Yes	58%	61%	54%	57%	56%	66%
	No	25%	24%	34%	23%	31%	34%
	Don't know	16%	15%	11%	20%	13%	0%
I didn't know whom to contact	Yes	17%	20%	9%	17%	13%	19%
	No	71%	67%	84%	70%	75%	81%
	Don't know	12%	13%	7%	13%	12%	0%
I feared retaliation	Yes	49%	47%	32%	59%	42%	50%
	No	43%	45%	60%	33%	52%	50%
	Don't know	8%	8%	8%	7%	6%	0%
I didn't believe I could report anonymously	Yes	56%	50%	43%	71%	52%	45%
	No	34%	36%	50%	25%	38%	55%
	Don't know	9%	14%	7%	4%	11%	0%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
I thought someone else would report it	Yes	17%	15%	15%	21%	19%	17%
	No	68%	71%	80%	57%	78%	83%
	Don't know	15%	14%	5%	22%	3%	0%
I resolved the issue myself <i>NBES: Not Asked</i>	Yes	22%	18%	28%	26%	22%	n/a
	No	70%	73%	67%	67%	75%	n/a
	Don't know	8%	10%	5%	7%	3%	n/a
I did not think it was significant enough to report <i>NBES: Not Asked</i>	Yes	37%	42%	47%	26%	32%	n/a
	No	51%	46%	47%	60%	59%	n/a
	Don't know	12%	12%	5%	15%	10%	n/a
I didn't want to get someone fired <i>NBES: Not Asked</i>	Yes	19%	17%	9%	29%	10%	n/a
	No	67%	68%	87%	55%	85%	n/a
	Don't know	14%	15%	4%	16%	5%	n/a
The misconduct came from the person to whom I should report it <i>NBES: Not Asked</i>	Yes	22%	22%	15%	25%	30%	n/a
	No	68%	67%	82%	65%	64%	n/a
	Don't know	10%	11%	3%	10%	6%	n/a

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
<i>If you decided to report the misconduct you observed, please tell us if any of the following influenced your decision to report the misconduct you observed. [If you have observed multiple incidents, please think back to the most recent incident you have observed.]</i>							
I believed corrective action would be taken	Yes	75%	80%	82%	67%	58%	69%
	No	11%	8%	8%	14%	27%	25%
	Don't know	14%	12%	10%	19%	15%	6%
I felt I could count on the support of my immediate manager	Yes	74%	79%	81%	68%	46%	59%
	No	17%	13%	7%	24%	41%	39%
	Don't know	9%	8%	12%	8%	13%	2%
I felt I could count on the support of my colleagues	Yes	70%	73%	77%	62%	75%	63%
	No	14%	11%	8%	19%	20%	34%
	Don't know	17%	15%	15%	20%	5%	3%
I believed I could report anonymously.	Yes	44%	45%	40%	44%	23%	58%
	No	44%	42%	42%	47%	55%	42%
	Don't know	12%	13%	17%	9%	23%	0%
I believed it was the right thing to do	Yes	99%	99%	97%	99%	100.0%	100%
	No	0.3%	0.1%	0%	1%	0%	0%
	Don't know	1%	1%	3%	0.0%	0.0%	0%
I didn't think anyone else would report it	Yes	36%	39%	30%	33%	49%	48%
	No	34%	35%	41%	31%	36%	45%
	Don't know	30%	26%	29%	36%	15%	7%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
5. Satisfaction with Organisation's Response to Report of Misconduct							
How satisfied were you with your organisation's response to your report of misconduct?	Very satisfied	15%	20%	19%	7%	6%	19%
	Satisfied	35%	36%	34%	33%	35%	20%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20%	16%	15%	25%	13%	11%
	Dissatisfied	17%	17%	18%	17%	30%	27%
	Very dissatisfied	11%	9%	11%	13%	17%	22%
	Don't know	2%	1%	2%	4%	0%	1%
<i>For each of the following statements, please indicate whether it was a reason for why you were dissatisfied.</i>							
My organisation did not respond	Yes	43%	50%	27%	39%	49%	48%
	No	38%	28%	61%	41%	27%	45%
	Don't know	20%	21%	12%	20%	24%	7%
There was a cover-up	Yes	32%	35%	28%	31%	12%	59%
	No	34%	38%	61%	21%	51%	39%
	Don't know	34%	26%	11%	49%	37%	2%
Management told me what they did but I didn't believe them	Yes	21%	16%	37%	21%	0%	21%
	No	61%	64%	48%	62%	51%	69%
	Don't know	19%	20%	15%	16%	49%	10%
Corrective action wasn't severe or complete enough	Yes	62%	64%	94%	50%	60%	76%
	No	17%	15%	1%	26%	0%	19%
	Don't know	21%	21%	5%	25%	40%	5%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
5a. Consequences of Report of Misconduct							
Did you experience retaliation as a result of your report of misconduct?	Yes	21%	15%	18%	30%	30%	25%
	No	72%	77%	72%	65%	64%	75%
	Don't know	7%	8%	10%	5%	6%	0%
Did you receive any positive feedback as a result of your report of misconduct?	Yes	40%	42%	43%	37%	39%	46%
	No	55%	53%	52%	58%	61%	53%
	Don't know	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%	1%
5b. Willingness to Seek Advice							
When you are faced with a situation where you are unsure of the appropriate legal or ethical course of action to take, how often do you seek guidance from your organisation's	Every time	41%	42%	38%	40%	32%	n/a
	Most of the time	22%	21%	18%	25%	14%	n/a
	Sometimes	11%	10%	10%	11%	16%	n/a
	Rarely	11%	12%	13%	9%	13%	n/a
	Never	9%	8%	13%	9%	17%	n/a
	Don't know	6%	6%	8%	6%	8%	n/a

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Code of Conduct, a person within the organisation or another organisational resource? <i>NBES: Not Asked</i>							
6. Employee satisfaction with organisation							
I am satisfied, in general, with the organisation I work for. <i>This statement is equivalent, but not precisely comparable, to the NBES, as the phrase, 'in general,' was not included in the NBES statement.</i>	Strongly agree	21%	25%	28%	11%	28%	32%
	Agree	56%	54%	56%	59%	53%	50%
	Neither agree nor disagree	14%	14%	10%	17%	9%	5%
	Disagree	7%	6%	5%	9%	7%	10%
	Strongly disagree	2%	2%	0.4%	3%	3%	3%
	Don't know	0.3%	0.1%	1%	0.4%	0%	0%

A. Expected Outcomes of an Integrity and Conduct Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
7. Risk							
Do you feel that in your current work environment there are situations that invite misconduct?	Yes	32%	34%	30%	31%	15%	38%
	No	57%	55%	60%	58%	73%	59%
	Don't know	11%	11%	10%	10%	11%	3%
How prepared do you feel to handle these situations? <i>NZ survey did not include the 'Very Well Prepared' response.</i>	Very well prepared	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	34%
	Well prepared	44%	51%	48%	34%	30%	40%
	Neither well prepared nor poorly prepared	39%	36%	37%	45%	41%	14%
	Poorly prepared	10%	9%	10%	13%	17%	9%
	Very poorly prepared	2%	1%	1%	3%	6%	3%
	Don't know	4%	3%	3%	6%	7%	0.5%

B. Elements of an Integrity and Culture Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
1. Code of Conduct							
Does your organisation have any written standards of integrity and conduct, for example, a code of conduct, policies, or guidelines for behaviour in the workplace?	Yes	96%	98%	95%	95%	79%	90%
	No	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0%	8%	7%
	Don't know	4%	2%	4%	5%	12%	2%
2. Reporting and advice line							
Does your organisation have a specific person, telephone line, e-mail address, or web site where you can get advice about integrity and conduct issues?	Yes	50%	50%	55%	48%	43%	67%
	No	13%	13%	15%	12%	30%	25%
	Don't know	37%	37%	29%	40%	27%	8%

B. Elements of an Integrity and Culture Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Protected Disclosures Act enables you to make a complaint about “serious wrongdoing.” Are you aware of the provisions outlined in the Protected Disclosures Act? <i>NBES: Not Applicable</i>	Yes	31%	38%	29%	23%	24%	n/a
	No	63%	56%	66%	71%	73%	n/a
	Don’t know	6%	6%	5%	6%	2%	n/a
Does your organisation have a way to report breaches of integrity and conduct anonymously or confidentially? <i>Anonymously: that is, without giving a name or other information that could identify an individual</i> <i>Confidentially: that is,</i>	Yes, anonymously	8%	8%	5%	9%	4%	(Yes) 69%
	Yes, confidentially:	21%	18%	23%	26%	20%	n/a

B. Elements of an Integrity and Culture Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
identifying information is collected but protected or known only to the responsible person <i>NBES: Does your organisation have a way to report violations of workplace ethics anonymously – without giving their names or other information that could identify them?</i> <i>Responses: Yes, No, Don't know</i>	Both anonymously and confidentially	19%	23%	18%	15%	16%	n/a
	No	7%	5%	9%	9%	11%	18%
	Don't know	44%	46%	44%	41%	49%	13%
3. Discipline of ethics violators							
My <u>immediate manager</u> disciplines employees who breach my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct. <i>NBES: N/A was not a valid answer choice</i>	Strongly agree	14%	15%	12%	13%	9%	19%
	Agree	38%	37%	43%	38%	31%	55%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18%	17%	19%	19%	28%	7%
	Disagree	6%	5%	7%	6%	6%	10%
	Strongly disagree	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%
	Don't know	21%	24%	18%	19%	20%	8%
	Not applicable - I don't have an immediate manager	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	n/a

B. Elements of an Integrity and Culture Programme		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
4. Immediate manager evaluates ethical conduct							
Does your <u>immediate manager</u> evaluate your integrity and conduct as part of your regular performance appraisals? <i>NBES: N/A was not a valid answer choice</i>	Yes	63%	59%	62%	70%	42%	65%
	No	21%	22%	24%	17%	38%	29%
	Don't know	15%	17%	13%	12%	17%	5%
	Not applicable – I don't have an immediate manager	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%
5. Training							
Does your organisation provide training on its standards of integrity and conduct?	Yes	55%	65%	57%	43%	23%	71%
	No	22%	17%	23%	29%	50%	26%
	Don't know	22%	19%	20%	28%	27%	3%
How useful have you found the integrity and conduct training to be in guiding your decisions and conduct at work?	Very Useful	36%	41%	32%	27%	19%	46%
	Somewhat Useful	49%	47%	55%	50%	60%	39%
	Not very Useful	6%	6%	5%	4%	8%	13%
	I have not yet been through integrity training	9%	6%	6%	17%	13%	2%
	Don't know	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	0.30%

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
1. Ethics-related actions of senior management							
I am satisfied with the information I get from <u>senior management</u> about what's going on in my organisation.	Strongly agree	13%	15%	17%	8%	13%	19%
	Agree	46%	48%	45%	43%	37%	52%
	Neither agree nor disagree	18%	18%	20%	19%	19%	6%
	Disagree	16%	13%	14%	22%	19%	14%
	Strongly disagree	6%	5%	4%	8%	10%	7%
	Don't know	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	2%	0.4%
I trust that <u>senior management</u> in my organisation will keep their promises and commitments.	Strongly agree	10%	13%	14%	5%	15%	19%
	Agree	39%	44%	43%	32%	37%	50%
	Neither agree nor disagree	26%	23%	22%	32%	24%	8%
	Disagree	15%	14%	12%	18%	13%	15%
	Strongly disagree	7%	6%	6%	10%	7	8%
	Don't know	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	0.4%

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Senior management in my organisation communicate the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.	Strongly agree	20%	26%	22%	10%	16%	29%
	Agree	47%	50%	50%	41%	47%	54%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21%	15%	17%	31%	21%	4%
	Disagree	7%	5%	7%	10%	9%	10%
	Strongly disagree	3%	2%	3%	5%	4%	3%
	Don't know	2%	1%	2%	3%	4%	1%
Overall, senior management sets a good example of integrity and conduct.	Strongly agree	19%	23%	23%	11%	18%	26%
	Agree	44%	46%	47%	38%	46%	50%
	Neither agree nor disagree	23%	20%	18%	28%	23%	6%
	Disagree	8%	6%	6%	12%	6%	13%
	Strongly disagree	2%	1%	3%	3%	3%	4%
	Don't know	5%	4%	3%	8%	4%	1%
2. Ethics-related actions of middle management							
I trust that middle management in my organisation will keep their promises and commitments.	Strongly agree	11%	13%	14%	7%	12%	19%
	Agree	44%	47%	49%	39%	40%	55%
	Neither agree nor disagree	26%	24%	22%	31%	29%	7%
	Disagree	12%	11%	9%	15%	10%	12%
	Strongly disagree	4%	3%	5%	6%	5%	5%
	Don't know	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
<u>Middle management</u> in my organisation communicate the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.	Strongly agree	16%	21%	16%	10%	13%	24%
	Agree	49%	52%	51%	44%	38%	54%
	Neither agree nor disagree	23%	18%	23%	30%	30%	7%
	Disagree	8%	6%	7%	11%	8%	11%
	Strongly disagree	2%	1%	1%	3%	4%	3%
	Don't know	3%	2%	3%	3%	7%	2%
Overall, <u>middle management</u> sets a good example of integrity and conduct.	Strongly agree	17%	20%	19%	11%	16%	22%
	Agree	49%	51%	51%	45%	42%	58%
	Neither agree nor disagree	22%	19%	20%	26%	25%	6%
	Disagree	7%	6%	5%	10%	8%	10%
	Strongly disagree	1%	1%	2%	1%	4%	2%
	Don't know	4%	3%	3%	7%	4%	2%

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
3. Ethics-related actions of immediate management							
I trust that my <u>immediate manager</u> will keep his or her promises and commitments. <i>NBES:N/A was not a valid answer choice</i>	Strongly agree	28%	31%	34%	22%	28%	32%
	Agree	46%	44%	44%	49%	41%	50%
	Neither agree nor disagree	14%	14%	14%	14%	15%	5%
	Disagree	7%	6%	5%	9%	6%	8%
	Strongly disagree	3%	2%	3%	3%	7%	4%
	Don't know	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
	Not applicable - I don't have an immediate manager	1%	1%	0.2%	2%	1%	n/a
My <u>immediate manager</u> communicates the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do. <i>NBES:N/A was not a valid answer choice</i>	Strongly agree	28%	31%	32%	23%	24%	32%
	Agree	51%	49%	48%	55%	40%	52%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13%	13%	14%	12%	20%	5%
	Disagree	4%	4%	4%	5%	6%	6%
	Strongly disagree	2%	1%	1%	2%	5%	3%
	Don't know	1%	1%	1%	0.4%	2%	1%
	Not applicable - I don't have an immediate manager	1%	1%	0%	2%	3%	n/a

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
<p>Overall, my <u>immediate manager</u> sets a good example of integrity and conduct. <i>NBES:N/A was not a valid answer choice</i></p>	Strongly agree	31%	34%	34%	26%	26%	31%
	Agree	48%	47%	49%	51%	44%	53%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12%	13%	12%	11%	14%	5%
	Disagree	4%	3%	3%	6%	8%	6%
	Strongly disagree	2%	2%	1%	2%	4%	3%
	Don't know	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Not applicable - I don't have an immediate manager	1%	1%	0.3%	2%	3%	n/a
<p>My <u>immediate manager</u> supports me in following my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct. <i>NBES:N/A was not a valid answer choice</i></p>	Strongly agree	30%	32%	31%	27%	27%	29%
	Agree	51%	51%	51%	51%	46%	58%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13%	13%	12%	14%	15%	4%
	Disagree	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	7%
	Strongly disagree	1%	0.3%	1%	2%	4%	1%
	Don't know	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
	Not applicable - I don't have an immediate manager	1%	1%	0.2%	2%	3%	n/a

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
4. Ethics-related actions of colleagues							
My <u>colleagues</u> talk about the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.	Strongly agree	19%	18%	14%	23%	19%	23%
	Agree	50%	48%	48%	52%	49%	50%
	Neither agree nor disagree	21%	22%	25%	17%	17%	9%
	Disagree	8%	8%	10%	7%	8%	14%
	Strongly disagree	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	2%
	Don't know	1%	2%	1%	0.5%	2%	1%
Overall, my <u>colleagues</u> set a good example of integrity and conduct.	Strongly agree	24%	25%	23%	24%	24%	26%
	Agree	60%	59%	62%	63%	59%	60%
	Neither agree nor disagree	12%	13%	12%	10%	12%	6%
	Disagree	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	6%
	Strongly disagree	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0%	1%
	Don't know	1%	1%	1%	0.5%	2%	1%

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
My <u>colleagues</u> support me in following my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.	Strongly agree	24%	24%	21%	25%	22%	28%
	Agree	56%	55%	59%	57%	57%	61%
	Neither agree nor disagree	16%	17%	16%	15%	14%	4%
	Disagree	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	7%
	Strongly disagree	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	3%	0.4%
	Don't know	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	0%
My <u>colleagues</u> carefully consider standards of integrity and conduct when making work-related decisions.	Strongly agree	29%	29%	25%	30%	23%	33%
	Agree	47%	48%	49%	45%	49%	54%
	Neither agree nor disagree	14%	12%	17%	15%	15%	4%
	Disagree	5%	4%	6%	4%	4%	6%
	Strongly disagree	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%
	Don't know	4%	5%	3%	5%	6%	0.4%

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
5. Accountability for breaches of ethics standards							
<u>Senior managers</u> would be held accountable if they were caught breaching my organisation's integrity and conduct standards. <i>NBES: Asks if employee groups is or are held accountable.</i>	Strongly agree	30%	34%	30%	23%	32%	26%
	Agree	37%	38%	39%	33%	41%	48%
	Neither agree nor disagree	14%	12%	16%	17%	13%	6%
	Disagree	9%	8%	7%	12%	6%	11%
	Strongly disagree	2%	2%	2%	4%	3%	6%
	Don't know	8%	6%	7%	12%	6%	3%
<u>Middle managers</u> would be held accountable if they were caught breaching my organisation's integrity and conduct standards. <i>NBES: Asks if employee groups is or are held accountable.</i>	Strongly agree	29%	35%	27%	22%	26%	25%
	Agree	41%	41%	46%	39%	47%	53%
	Neither agree nor disagree	13%	10%	12%	16%	14%	6%
	Disagree	7%	6%	7%	8%	4%	10%
	Strongly disagree	2%	1%	1%	3%	4%	2%
	Don't know	8%	6%	6%	13%	7%	3%

C. Ethical Elements of Organisational Culture		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
<p>My <u>immediate manager</u> would be held accountable if caught breaching my organisation’s standards of integrity and conduct.</p> <p><i>NBES: Not Asked</i></p>	Strongly agree	32%	35%	31%	27%	26%	n/a
	Agree	45%	44%	46%	44%	45%	n/a
	Neither agree nor disagree	11%	8%	11%	15%	15%	n/a
	Disagree	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%	n/a
	Strongly disagree	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	n/a
	Don’t know	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	n/a
	N/A- Don’t have immediate manager	1%	1%	0.3%	2%	3%	n/a
<p>My <u>colleagues</u> would be held accountable if they were caught breaching my organisation’s standards of integrity and conduct.</p> <p><i>NBES: Not Asked</i></p>	Strongly agree	40%	43%	33%	38%	30%	n/a
	Agree	48%	45%	52%	49%	55%	n/a
	Neither agree nor disagree	7%	6%	8%	8%	11%	n/a
	Disagree	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	n/a
	Strongly disagree	0.3%	0.3%	1%	0.2%	0%	n/a
	Don’t know	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	n/a
<p><u>Non-management employees</u> would be held accountable if they were caught breaching my organisation’s standards of integrity and conduct.</p> <p><i>NBES: Asks if employee groups is or are held accountable.</i></p>	Strongly agree	34%	38%	29%	31%	30%	30%
	Agree	49%	46%	50%	51%	54%	58%
	Neither agree nor disagree	8%	7%	10%	9%	10%	4%
	Disagree	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	6%
	Strongly disagree	0.5%	0.3%	1%	1%	0.5%	1%
	Don’t know	6%	6%	7%	7%	5%	2%

D. Characteristics of State Servants		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Within the last two years, has your organisation been involved in a merger or restructuring?	Yes	55%	57%	35%	60%	48%	18%
	No	33%	32%	55%	26%	46%	79%
	Don't know	12%	11%	11%	14%	6%	3%
How many years have you been working for your organisation?	Less than one year	13%	14%	14%	11%	15%	4%
	At least one year but less than 3 years	21%	24%	25%	14%	28%	12%
	At least 3 years but less than 6 years	19%	18%	20%	19%	20%	18%
	At least 6 years but less than 11 years	15%	15%	14%	15%	17%	20%
	At least 11 years but less than 16 years	9%	8%	9%	13%	4%	12%
	16 years or more	22%	21%	16%	27%	16%	34%
	Don't know	0.1%	0.1%	1%	0%	0%	0%

D. Characteristics of State Servants		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
What is your management level at your organisation? <i>NBES: Asked different managerial levels</i>	Senior management	5%	4%	7%	4%	10%	7%
	Middle management	18%	20%	25%	13%	16%	29%
	Non-management	72%	71%	65%	77%	73%	n/a
	Don't know	5%	4%	3%	6%	1%	7%
Are you a member of a union or collective agreement?	Yes	66%	60%	43%	85%	37%	41%
	No	33%	40%	52%	15%	62%	57%
	Don't know	1%	1%	4%	0%	1%	2%
What is your age?	29 years or less	14%	16%	13%	11%	8%	11%
	30 – less than 40 years	21%	23%	26%	14%	35%	18%
	40 – less than 50 years	31%	30%	32%	32%	27%	29%
	50 – less than 60 years	25%	22%	23%	31%	19%	33%
	60 years or older	9%	8%	4%	11%	10%	9%
	Prefer not to answer	1%	2%	3%	0.1%	1%	2%
What is your gender?	Male	32%	38%	44%	17%	39%	37%
	Female	66%	59%	50%	82%	57%	63%
	Prefer not to answer	2%	3%	5%	1%	4%	0%

D. Characteristics of State Servants		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
In your current position how frequently do you have interaction or contact with the general public? <i>NBES: Not Asked</i>	Very regular contact	49%	36%	45%	72%	34%	n/a
	Regular contact	22%	25%	25%	16%	29%	n/a
	Infrequent contact	21%	27%	20%	11%	32%	n/a
	No contact	8%	12%	10%	1%	4%	n/a
	Don't know	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0%	0%	n/a
What is your approximate annual salary? <i>NBES: Asked based on US\$ in different income categories</i>	\$25,000 or less	4%	3%	3%	7%	3%	n/a
	\$25,001 to \$30,000	4%	2%	1%	9%	1%	n/a
	\$30,001 to \$40,000	15%	16%	12%	16%	7%	n/a
	\$40,001 to \$50,000	24%	26%	23%	22%	19%	n/a
	\$50,001 to \$60,000	20%	18%	18%	25%	19%	n/a
	\$60,001 to \$70,000	10%	11%	17%	6%	16%	n/a
	\$70,001 to \$100,000	14%	17%	16%	9%	24%	n/a
	More than \$100,000	6%	7%	8%	4%	9%	n/a
	Don't know	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	n/a

D. Characteristics of State Servants		2007 New Zealand State Servants Average (%)	NZ Public Service Departments Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents Average (%)	NZ Crown Agents – DHB Average (%)	NZ ACE, ICE, & CE Companies Average (%)	2005 US Average Government Employees (%)
Where do you work? <i>NBES: Not Applicable</i>	National office	22%	32%	27%	1%	75%	n/a
	Regional Office	19%	19%	15%	19%	12%	n/a
	Local Branch Office	27%	31%	39%	18%	1%	n/a
	Satellite Office	4%	4%	8%	4%	2%	n/a
	Other	25%	13%	10%	51%	8%	n/a
	Don't know	3%	1%	1%	6%	2%	n/a
Which of the following ethnic groups do you belong to? You can choose more than one group. <i>NBES: Not Applicable</i>	New Zealand European or Pakeha	78%	75%	75%	84%	79%	n/a
	Maori	13%	17%	11%	8%	12%	n/a
	Samoan	2%	3%	4%	.5%	3%	n/a
	Cook Island Maori	1%	1%	2%	0%	2%	n/a
	Tongan	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	n/a
	Niuean	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0%	1%	n/a
	Chinese	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	n/a
	Indian	2%	2%	3%	0.2%	1%	n/a
	Other ethnic group	11%	11%	12%	12%	10%	n/a
Don't know	1%	1%	3%	0.4%	3%	n/a	

Appendix A: Sample Selection Methodology⁹

The sampling for the New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey was designed and managed by the State Services Commission (SSC).

A two stage selection process was used to:

- randomly select 42 of the 120 New Zealand Public Service Departments and Crown Entity Companies (excluding School Boards of Trustees) within the State Services Commissioner's integrity and conduct mandate,¹⁰ and
- randomly select individuals within agencies.

The sample selection methodology is outlined below.

Agency Stratification, Agency Sample Allocation, and Agency Selection

This section outlines the criteria used to stratify agencies, the factors that were considered when the sample was allocated across strata, and explains the method for random selection.

Agencies were initially stratified by type and size (**Stratification**).

- 1.1 The four types of agencies are Public Service Departments, Crown Agents, Crown Agents – District Health Boards (DHBs), and Other (Autonomous Crown Entity Companies, Independent Crown Entity Companies, and Crown Entity Companies).
- 1.2 Three size categories were created based on estimates of the number of full time equivalent (fte) employees in each agency. The “small” category contained those agencies with fewer than 100 employees; the “medium” category contained those agencies with between 100 to 1000 employees; and the “large” category contained those agencies with 1000 or more employees (See Appendix B.)

Number of agencies to select from each stratum (**Allocation**).

- 1.3 The task of liaising with all the 120 agencies was considered too costly and impractical, so SSC selected approximately 42 agencies to take part in the survey. SSC arrived at a sample size of 42 agencies by balancing the number of agencies that it could manage to liaise with, against the need to select enough agencies within each stratum to ensure the sample adequately covered the “in-scope” agencies.
- 1.4 In determining the number of agencies to select from each stratum, the following factors were considered:
 - ***In total 42 agencies would be selected***
 - ***Larger agencies required a higher chance of selection***, and in some cases, an absolute chance of selection. This constraint ensured that key agencies, with large numbers of staff, were included in the sample and improved the accuracy and reliability of results.
 - ***Enough agencies needed to be selected from each agency type***. This provided more confidence in the results at the four sub-levels and allowed results to be produced for these sub-levels.

⁹ Sample Selection Methodology was developed by and the text in this appendix was written by SSC staffs. ERC does not have the authorship of this appendix.

¹⁰ Section 57(1)(a) and (b) of the State Sector Act 1988.

- **All agencies (and therefore all State servants) needed to have a chance of selection.** If SSC moved away from this random approach and decided which agencies were sampled based on other criteria, the integrity of the sample would have been reduced.
- **The level of similarity within the types of agencies needed to be accounted for.** For example, the number of employees in DHBs is large and makes up around 50% of the New Zealand State Services population. However, the functions carried out by each DHB are similar (i.e. more homogeneous and less variable than the functions carried out by Public Service Departments), therefore the number of agencies sampled relative to the size of this group could be reduced.

1.5 Considering these factors, SSC recommended the sampling structure shown in Appendix B.

Randomly selecting agencies (**Selection**)

- 1.6 Once the number of agencies within each stratum was finalised, the selection procedure started. A four digit random number was assigned to each agency. Within each stratum the agencies were sorted by this random number. The first x agencies were selected into the sample (where x was the required sample size in the stratum). These random numbers were kept to allow agencies that refused to take part in the survey to be replaced. Five selected agencies did not respond to the survey, however, only one of these agencies provided enough notice to allow a replacement agency to be selected. In total, 38 out of 42 agencies in the core sample took part in the survey (producing a 90% response rate at agency level).

Employee Selection

This section outlines the method used for the selection of employees within selected agencies.

Sampling fractions within agencies and weights.

- 1.7 A sample size of just under 4000 employees was initially suggested by the Ethics Resource Center (ERC). Based on a 30% response rate this would have provided a final sample size of over 1000 employees, and at least +/- 3% accuracy at the 95% confidence level.
- 1.8 Based on SSC's previous experience of surveying State servants, a response rate of 50% was considered a better estimate. This allowed a lower sample size for a State Services-wide view with the same level of accuracy. However, because estimates at the sub-group level were required (Public Service Departments, Crown Agents, Crown Agents - DHBs, and Other entities), the sample size in each sub-group needed to be large enough for comparison across sub-groups. The sample was allocated so that the level of accuracy for each sub-group would be in the range of +/- 3% to +/- 6%.
- 1.9 To ensure that the sample was spread across the State Services, the sampling fraction (or the proportion of employees selected within an agency) varied within the different stratum. The sampling fractions within agencies were chosen to balance the following factors:
- **To ensure that the sampling weights were not too large.** The weight is the number of other State servants a selected employee represents. In SSC's case, selected employees represented both non-selected employees in their own agency and employees in non-selected agencies. SSC had a complex design instead of a simple random sample; therefore selected individuals did not have the same weight. SSC wanted to avoid some individuals having a large influence over the final results.

- *To ensure that the sample size in each of the four sub-groups was large enough to produce robust estimates.*
 - *To generate a proportionally larger sample in small agencies.* If SSC used the same sampling fraction across the whole survey sample then it would only be selecting a handful of employees from the smaller agencies. If SSC included a small agency, then SSC needed to select more people to justify the agency's inclusion.
 - *When Agencies "opt-in" their "within-agency" sample size was boosted.*
- 1.10 The "within-agency" sampling fractions for the core sample are shown in Appendix B. The core sample involved selecting approximately 5000 employees from across the 42 agencies.
- 1.11 In addition to the core sample, all agencies were given the opportunity to "opt-in" to the survey and receive their own agency specific report. Six agencies within the core sample "opted-in;" their sample size was boosted to allow for robust estimates at an agency level. The six agencies that decided to boost their sample size had their data "down-weighted" so they would not unduly influence the overall results. Two agencies from outside the random sample also "opted-in." These two "opt-in" agencies were not included in the analysis for this report.

Employee selection method.

SSC managed the collection of employee lists and the random selection of employees. Within each selected agency, employees were assigned a random number which was used to select the required numbers of employees. ERC was sent a list of 9009 employees from 40 agencies for inclusion in the survey.

Appendix B: Sampling Structure – Core Sample

Public Service Department	Crown Agents	Crown Agents - DHBs	ACEs, ICEs, & CE Companies
Large Public Service Departments (11) Select: All (11 out of 11) Within agency sampling fraction (1/20) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 20	Large Crown Agents (2) Select: All (2 out of 2) Within agency sampling fraction (1/10) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 10	Large DHBs (14) Select: (7 out of 14) Within agency sampling fraction (1/20) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 40	Large Other Entities (1) Select: All (1 out of 1) Within agency sampling fraction (1/10) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 10
Medium Public Service Departments (17) Select (4 out of 17) Within agency sampling fraction (1/5) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 21.25	Medium Crown Agents (12) Select: All (4 out of 12) Within agency sampling fraction (1/5) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 15	Medium DHBs (14) Select: (2 out of 7) Within agency sampling fraction (1/5) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 17.5	Medium Other Entities (7) Select: (4 out of 7) Within agency sampling fraction (1/2) Initial weight for each respondent ~3.5
Small Public Service Departments (6) Select (2 out of 6) Within agency sampling fraction (all) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 3	Small Crown Agents (11) Select: All (2 out of 11) Within agency sampling fraction (all) Initial weight for each respondent ~ 5	No agencies in this group	Small Other Entities (32) Select: (3 out of 32) Within agency sampling fraction (all) Initial weight for each respondent ~10.6
Total Public Service Departments Selected: 17 Estimated Initial Sample Size: 1680 + 250 + 100 = 2030	Total Crown Agents Selected: 8 Estimated Initial Sample Size: 450 + 400 + 50 = 900	Total DHBs Selected: 9 Estimated Initial Sample Size: 1140 + 482 = 1622	Total Other Agencies Selected: 8 Estimated Initial Sample Size: 115 + 400 + 80 = 595

Total Sample Size (Agencies): 42

Total Estimated Sample Size (People): 5147*

* this is an initial estimate and will differ depending on which agencies are selected

~ the initial selection weights will depend on which agencies are selected and may also need to be adjusted for non response

42 agencies were initially selected for the sample from the possible 120 New Zealand State Services agencies. Five selected agencies chose not to participate in the survey, one of which withdrew from the sample early enough to allow a substitute agency to be identified following the same selection criteria (see Appendix A). In total, 38 agencies were surveyed as part of the New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Survey.

In addition to this core sample, six agencies from inside the sample and two from outside the sample frame opted to receive an agency specific report. This required their sample size to be boosted. The two agencies from outside the sample were excluded from the analysis of the New Zealand State Services Integrity and Conduct Report, while the agencies within the sample that opted to receive an agency specific report were down-weighted in the overall analysis, so they did not unduly influence the results.

Appendix C: Comparison of Survey Questions to the “Six Elements”

New Zealand Elements of Integrity and Conduct	ERC Elements of Ethics and Compliance
Agencies of the State Services have standards of integrity and conduct.	Q1: Does your organisation have any written standards of integrity and conduct, for example, a code of conduct, policies, or guidelines for behaviour in the workplace?
	Q6: The Protected Disclosures Act enables you to make a complaint about “serious wrongdoing.” Are you aware of the provisions outlined in the Protected Disclosures Act?
Agencies of the State Services promote their standards of integrity and conduct.	Q2: Does your organisation provide training on its standards of integrity and conduct?
	Q3: How useful have you found the integrity and conduct training to be in guiding your decisions and conduct at work? Would you say the training was very useful, somewhat useful, or not very useful?
	Q5: Does your organisation have a specific person, telephone line, e-mail address, or web site where you can get advice about integrity and conduct issues?
	Q14: <u>Senior management</u> in my organisation communicate the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.
	Q15: <u>Middle management</u> in my organisation communicate the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.
Q16: My <u>immediate manager</u> communicates the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.	

New Zealand Elements of Integrity and Conduct	ERC Elements of Ethics and Compliance
	<p>Q17: My <u>colleagues</u> talk about the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.</p> <p>Q45: How prepared do you feel to handle these situations [that invite misconduct]?</p>
<p>Standards of integrity and conduct are integrated into the behaviour of State servants.</p>	<p>Q7: Does your organisation have a way to report breaches of integrity and conduct anonymously or confidentially?</p> <p>Q8: When you are faced with a situation where you are unsure of the appropriate legal or ethical course of action to take, how often do you seek guidance from your organisation's Code of Conduct, a person within the organisation or another organisational resource?</p> <p>Q9: My <u>colleagues</u> carefully consider standards of integrity and conduct when making work-related decisions.</p> <p>Q18: During the past year, have you personally observed conduct that you thought was unlawful or breached your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct?</p> <p>Q19: Did that misconduct breach the law, your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct, or both?</p> <p>Q20: Did you report your observation of misconduct to management or to another appropriate person?</p> <p>Q27: <i>The following table lists several kinds of behaviour. For each one, please indicate whether you have personally observed this behaviour among employees within your organisation during the past 12 months.</i></p> <p>a. Sexual harassment?</p>

New Zealand Elements of Integrity and Conduct	ERC Elements of Ethics and Compliance
	b. Giving or accepting inappropriate payments, perks or inappropriate gifts?
	c. Abusive or intimidating behaviour towards employees?
	d. Discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, gender, age or similar categories?
	e. Breaches of safety regulations?
	f. An action that places an employee's interests over the organisation's interests?
	g. Provision of goods or services or work product that fail to meet specifications?
	h. Inappropriate alteration of documents?
	i. Improper use of the internet or email?
	j. Misuse of your organisation's information?
	k. Falsification or misrepresentation of any records and reports?
	l. Lying to other employees?
	m. Lying to customers, vendors, or the public?
	n. Misreporting of actual time or hours worked?
	o. Theft?
	Q28: Do you ever feel pressured by other employees or management to compromise your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct?
	Q29: How often do you feel pressured by other employees or management to compromise your organisation's standards of integrity and conduct?
	Q39: Overall, my <u>colleagues</u> set a good example of integrity and conduct.

New Zealand Elements of Integrity and Conduct	ERC Elements of Ethics and Compliance
	<p>Q41: My <u>colleagues</u> support me in following my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.</p>
	<p>Q44: Do you feel that in your current work environment there are situations that invite misconduct?</p>
<p>Managers model the standards of integrity and conduct in their behaviour.</p>	<p>Q11: I trust that <u>senior management</u> in my organisation will keep their promises and commitments.</p>
	<p>Q12: I trust that <u>middle management</u> in my organisation will keep their promises and commitments.</p>
	<p>Q13: I trust that my <u>immediate manager</u> will keep his or her promises and commitments.</p>
	<p>Q14: <u>Senior management</u> in my organisation communicate the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.</p>
	<p>Q15: <u>Middle management</u> in my organisation communicate the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.</p>
	<p>Q16: My <u>immediate manager</u> communicates the importance of integrity and conduct and doing the right thing in the work we do.</p>
	<p>Q36: Overall, <u>senior management</u> sets a good example of integrity and conduct.</p>
	<p>Q37: Overall, <u>middle management</u> sets a good example of integrity and conduct.</p>
<p>Q38: Overall, my <u>immediate manager</u> sets a good example of integrity and conduct.</p>	
<p>Q40: My <u>immediate manager</u> supports me in following my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.</p>	
<p>The consequences for behaviour that</p>	<p>Q4: Does your <u>immediate manager</u> evaluate your integrity and conduct as part of your regular</p>

New Zealand Elements of Integrity and Conduct	ERC Elements of Ethics and Compliance
breaches the standards of integrity and conduct are known by State servants.	performance appraisals?
Agencies act decisively when breaches occur.	<p>Q21: <i>If you decided not to report the misconduct you observed, please tell us if any of the following influenced your decision. [If you have observed multiple incidents, please think back to the most recent incident you have observed.]</i></p>
	a. I didn't believe corrective action would be taken
	b. I didn't know whom to contact
	c. I feared retaliation
	d. I didn't believe I could report anonymously
	e. I thought someone else would report it
	f. I resolved the issue myself
	g. I did not think it was significant enough to report
	h. I didn't want to get someone fired
	i. The misconduct came from the person to whom I should report it
	<p>Q22: <i>If you decided to report the misconduct you observed, please tell us if any of the following influenced your decision to report the misconduct you observed. [If you have observed multiple incidents, please think back to the most recent incident you have observed.]</i></p>
	a. I believed corrective action would be taken
	b. I felt I could count on the support of my immediate manager
c. I felt I could count on the support of my colleagues	
d. I believed I could report anonymously	
e. I believed it was the right thing to do	

New Zealand Elements of Integrity and Conduct	ERC Elements of Ethics and Compliance
	f. I didn't think anyone else would report it
	Q23: How satisfied were you with your organisation's response to your report of misconduct?
	Q24: <i>For each of the following statements, please indicate whether it was a reason for why you were dissatisfied.</i>
	a. My organisation did not respond
	b. There was a cover-up
	c. Management told me what they did but I didn't believe them
	d. Corrective action wasn't severe or complete enough
	Q25: Did you experience retaliation as a result of your report of misconduct?
	Q26: Did you receive any positive feedback as a result of your report of misconduct?
	Q31: <u>Senior managers</u> would be held accountable if they were caught breaching my organisation's integrity and conduct standards.
	Q32: <u>Middle managers</u> would be held accountable if they were caught breaching my organisation's integrity and conduct standards.
	Q33: My <u>immediate manager</u> would be held accountable if caught breaching my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.
	Q34: My <u>colleagues</u> would be held accountable if they were caught breaching my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.
	Q35: <u>Non-management employees</u> would be held accountable if they were caught breaching my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.
	Q42: My <u>immediate manager</u> disciplines employees who breach my organisation's standards of integrity and conduct.