



Commonwealth Integrity Survey

Highlights Report Department of the Treasury (Treasury)

NOTE

The National Anti-Corruption Commission Commonwealth Integrity Survey 2024 – Treasury Highlights Report provides insights into APS officials' personal views and observations of corruption within the service and Treasury. While Treasury officials' response rate to the survey was higher than the overall APS average at 27% (compared to 21%), it remains a relatively small sample size from which to draw conclusions about Treasury employees' views or experiences.

2024
Commonwealth
Integrity Survey

- ✓ Perceive
- ✓ Measure
- ✓ Enhance

Contents	Page
Executive summary	2
How to read this report	3
Overall integrity measures	5
Factor summary	6
Detailed results: Organisational controls	7
Detailed results: Employee comprehension	12
Detailed results: Reporting likelihood	19
Detailed results: Corruption in the workplace	23

Response rate (Treasury)	Response rate (Overall)
27%	21%
527 out of 1,968 invitees/registrants	58,309 out of 278,406 invitees/registrants

Executive summary

Background

The 2024 Commonwealth Integrity Survey was conducted by the **National Anti-Corruption Commission (the Commission)** to help understand the nature and extent of corruption risk, and **perceptions of integrity and corruption** in the Australian public sector. The survey was conducted between 19 August and 20 September 2024.

Of the 191 agencies identified as potential participating agencies, 171 had at least one staff member respond to the survey (including 168 with a designated survey coordinator promoting the survey). Across the participating agencies with a survey coordinator, response rates ranged from 3% to 100%, with a median response rate of 33%. A total of 58,309 survey responses were collected.

The survey consisted of 53 evaluative questions (plus an additional nine demographic questions to facilitate further analysis). Results from these 53 questions have been grouped into three high-level factors:

- **Organisational controls**—staff members' assessment of their agency's overall integrity, its ability to detect and prevent corruption, and the extent to which the agency's culture provides opportunities for corruption to occur
- **Employee comprehension**—staff members' ability to identify corruption (measured by both their confidence in doing so, and their responses to hypothetical scenarios)
- **Reporting likelihood**—based on staff members' willingness to report corruption and the extent to which they know (or can readily find out) how to do so

Findings

Organisational controls: Respondents largely had faith in the integrity of their agency (an average of 79% positive sentiment across component questions), and to a lesser extent also had faith in the strength of the agency's anti-corruption controls (67%). This lower average rating was largely due to mixed rather than negative sentiment—for instance, while only 63% felt their agency's controls were strong, 92% considered these controls at least 'satisfactory'.

Employee comprehension: Almost all respondents (96%) were confident they could identify corruption within their area of responsibility. When presented with five scenarios (four of which constituted some form of corrupt practice), 84% of respondents provided the best response in at least three of the scenarios; however, only 20% provided the best response across all five.

Reporting likelihood: Most respondents indicated willingness to report corruption if they had direct access to specific details (88%) but were less likely to if they were merely *told* about specific details (69%), had a suspicion but no details (45%), or learned through hearsay, but with no details (34%). Most employees believed they knew or could readily find out how to report corruption either internally (83%) or to the Commission (72%).

Analysis of the results was conducted across various demographic cohorts. Some of the key findings include:

- The 1,128 respondents who indicated they had a **monitoring and audit** role had much the same assessment of the strength of organisational controls as did other staff. These staff also did slightly better at identifying corruption in the hypothetical examples—although even among these staff, only 22% provided the best response across all five scenarios.
- Across different **agency sizes**, the most positive results were recorded among 'micro' and 'extra small' agencies (those with 100 or fewer staff)—particularly with regards to organisational integrity and anti-corruption controls. Results were broadly similar across other agency sizes.

This baseline survey has highlighted a range of areas for the Commission to focus on. Future surveys will facilitate tracking the progress of the Commission's initiatives, and the culture of integrity within the Commonwealth public sector.

How to read this report

Percentages in this report are based on the total number of valid responses made to the particular question being reported. In most cases, results reflect those respondents who expressed a view and for whom the questions were applicable. 'Don't know' and 'prefer not to say' responses have generally been excluded from attitudinal questions unless otherwise specified (although respondents who did not provide demographic responses have still been included in the overall results).

Percentage results throughout the report may not add up to 100 (particularly when displayed in chart form) due to rounding or where respondents were able to select more than one response.

Note that respondents were not required to answer all questions and therefore the base number of respondents for each question may differ. Note that results for individual questions will be redacted (dashed) if fewer than 10 respondents have provided an answer.

This project has been undertaken in accordance with the International Quality Standard ISO 20252 and ISO 27001 and has complied with the Australian Privacy Principles contained in the *Privacy Act 1988*.

How to read this report (cont'd)

This report contains a series of tables that illustrate the high-level results for the 2024 Commonwealth Integrity Survey. Information on how to read these tables is provided below.

Factor scores are calculated by averaging the percentage positive of all factor questions.

Anti-corruption factors are determined by factor analysis, which groups questions on how closely correlated they are with one another. The components of each factor are grouped as **Factor question(s)**.

Factor name		Factor score:				Agency xx%	Overall xx%
Factor question(s)	Question 1 (n=xx,xxx)	75% 15% 5% 5%				X%	X%
	Question 2 (n=xx,xxx)	50% 25% 20% 5%				X%	X%
	Question 3 (n=xx,xxx)	25% 30% 40% 5%				X%	X%
Related question(s)	Question 4 (n=xx,xxx)	75% 15% 5% 5%				X%	X%

Related question(s) include questions that are related to relevant workplace factors but are not included in the factor calculations.

Question text, followed by number of valid responses to the specific question.

Results have been condensed into four categories:

- Positive responses (e.g. strongly agree/agree, very satisfied/satisfied)
- Mixed responses (e.g. neither agree nor disagree)
- Negative responses (e.g. strongly disagree/disagree)
- Unsure (e.g. not applicable / not sure)


Colour formatting for Treasury columns highlights the differences from the overall results, where your agency results are higher (blue) or lower (red) by at least five percentage points.



Overall integrity measures


Organisational controls

Measures the strength of an organisation's anti-corruption controls, views on organisation integrity, and the risk of corruption within an organisation




Employee comprehension

Measures the level of employee confidence in identifying corruption within the workplace



Reporting likelihood


Measures the propensity to report corruption, as well as the general awareness of reporting mechanisms



Factor summary

This report uses factors to summarise the findings related to particular themes canvassed in the survey. These factors are determined through factor analysis, which groups questions that are closely correlated with one another.

The chart on the right illustrates the key factor scores overall.




Detailed results: Organisational controls


2024
**Commonwealth
Integrity Survey**

-  Perceive
-  Measure
-  Enhance


Organisational controls



* % Positive: Very strong, Strong | % Mixed: Satisfactory | % Negative: Weak, Non-existent




Organisational controls



Organisational controls

		Treasury	Overall
Opportunity for corruption	Factor score:	64%	52%

Scale: % Positive: Strongly disagree, Disagree | % Mixed: Neither agree nor disagree | % Negative: Strongly agree, Agree




Key:

% Positive
 % Mixed
 % Negative
 % Unsure


Organisational controls

		Treasury	Overall
Opportunity for corruption (cont'd)	Factor score:	64%	52%

Opportunities for corrupt conduct in my organisation (n=458)



Top 5 most likely corrupting influence (Multiple response) (n=501)



Detailed results: Employee comprehension

2024
**Commonwealth
Integrity Survey**

- ✓ Perceive
- ✓ Measure
- ✓ Enhance

Employee comprehension

		Treasury	Overall
Confidence in identifying corruption	Factor score:	97%	96%

Factor question

I am confident that I can identify what constitutes corruption within my area of responsibility (n=518)

97%

97%

96%

Scenario 1

An employee was part of a procurement process involving their friend's business and didn't declare it. The employee's friend won the contract and went on to provide good quality services for your organisation.

59%

provided the best answer

Scenario 2

An employee regularly accesses records they had no reason to access. The records contain sensitive personal information about people.

53%

provided the best answer

Scenario 3

An employee uses their official letterhead to communicate with someone outside the organisation during a personal matter because they believed they would get favourable treatment.

77%

provided the best answer

Scenario 4

An employee deliberately bypassed the usual processes to get an ineligible candidate into a grant program.

92%

provided the best answer

Scenario 5


An employee repeatedly fills a vacancy using temporary or acting staff to avoid running a competitive, merit-based recruitment process.

70%

provided the best answer

83%

of respondents gave the best answer to the majority (at least 3) of the scenarios



Scenario 1

An employee was part of a procurement process involving their friend's business and didn't declare it. The employee's friend won the contract and went on to provide good quality services for your organisation.

How would you categorise the type of practice described? (n=486)



Key:

Best answer


What course of action would you take? (Multiple response) (n=445)



Scenario 2

An employee regularly accesses records they had no reason to access.
The records contain sensitive personal information about people.


How would you categorise the type of practice described? (n=482)



Key:

Best answer

What course of action would you take? (Multiple response) (n=443)



Scenario 3

An employee uses their official letterhead to communicate with someone outside the organisation during a personal matter because they believed they would get favourable treatment.


How would you categorise the type of practice described? (n=482)



Key:

Best answer


What course of action would you take? (Multiple response) (n=439)



Scenario 4

An employee deliberately bypassed the usual processes to get an ineligible candidate into a grant program.


How would you categorise the type of practice described? (n=483)



Key:

Best answer


What course of action would you take? (Multiple response) (n=435)



Scenario 5

An employee repeatedly fills a vacancy using temporary or acting staff to avoid running a competitive, merit-based recruitment process.


How would you categorise the type of practice described? (n=483)



Key:

Best answer

What course of action would you take? (Multiple response) (n=449)




Detailed results:

Reporting likelihood


2024
Commonwealth
Integrity Survey

- ✓ Perceive
- ✓ Measure
- ✓ Enhance

Reporting likelihood




Reporting likelihood




Reporting likelihood

		Treasury	Overall
Propensity to report corruption (cont'd)	Factor score:	58%	59%

Reactions of colleagues to those who report corrupt conduct (n=498)



Top 10 reasons for not reporting corrupt conduct (Multiple response) (n=490)



Detailed results: Corruption in the workplace


2024
**Commonwealth
Integrity Survey**

-  Perceive
-  Measure
-  Enhance


Awareness of corruption

Awareness of allegations or incidents of corruption in your organisation


Specific knowledge of corrupt conduct in agency (n=463)




How did you become aware of the corrupt conduct? (n=28)



How many incidents of corrupt conduct are you aware of? (n=28)




Did you know about the conduct because it was your job to do so? (n=30)




Awareness of corruption

Awareness of allegations or incidents of corruption in your organisation (cont'd)

Is the conduct something that: (n=28)




Where did you hear about the corrupt conduct? (n=18)




Responding to the most recent incident

Which of the following best describes the corrupt behaviour?
(Multiple response) (n=27)




Which of the following did the corrupt behaviour involve?
(Multiple response) (n=24)




Responding to the most recent incident

What action did you take in relation to this incident? (Multiple response) (n=26)



Why did you not take any action? (Multiple response) (n=10)





National Anti-Corruption Commission

Commonwealth Integrity Survey



Perceive



Measure



Enhance