

EMPOWERING ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES: DEFYING INSTITUTIONAL FAILURE AND STRENGTHENING PREVENTIVE AND REPRESSIVE CAPACITIES

Organization



In cooperation with



Co-financed by



ISCTE, Lisbon
14-16 May 2008

CORRUPTION PREVENTION:

RESEARCHING HOW AND WHERE TO INTERVENE

Dr. Angela Gorta

Principal Analyst, Police Integrity Commission, NSW Australia

ABSTRACT

Corruption prevention is about intervening before the corrupt conduct occurs. To prevent corruption and other serious misconduct one needs to decide how and where are the best ways and places to intervene. This paper argues that research techniques provide tools for informing such decisions. The paper draws on actual examples of how social science research methods have been used within two Australian anti-corruption agencies to inform efforts to minimise future corruption. These examples are used to illustrate the following five observations:

- 1. Don't rely on investigations to prevent corruption*
- 2. Divide corruption into its specific forms*
- 3. Consider your best information sources*
- 4. Engage stakeholders about the recommendations*
- 5. Monitor the implementation of the recommendations.*

INTRODUCTION

I was asked to talk today about strengthening the preventative capacity of anti-corruption agencies (ACAs) by boosting research capabilities and to talk about the role that research plays in the life of ACAs.

The purpose of this paper is to illustrate how social science research techniques can be applied to the area of corruption prevention. This paper focuses on five observations that I have made from my experience in applying social science research techniques to the area of corruption prevention. I use examples from the two Australian ACAs where I have worked to illustrate these observations.

BACKGROUND

Before I describe these observations, I shall tell you a little about my background and about the two ACAs where I have worked. I shall also briefly outline what I mean by 'research' and what I consider to be key aspects of preventing corruption.

I come from New South Wales (NSW), the most populous state in Australia. NSW covers an area of approximately 800,000 square kilometres and has a population of approximately seven million people.

I am currently the Principal Analyst at the Police Integrity Commission, where I have now worked for five years. Prior to working at the Police Integrity Commission, I was the Research Manager at the NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption, known as 'the ICAC', for ten years.

TWO AUSTRALIAN ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES

The Police Integrity Commission is an independent, NSW government, oversight body. It is separate from the NSW Police Force that it oversees. It was established on 1 July 1996 under the *Police Integrity Commission Act 1996* following a recommendation of the Royal Commission into the NSW Police Service. It became fully operational on 1 January 1997. It was established to detect, investigate and prevent police corruption and other serious police misconduct. More information about the Police Integrity Commission and its work can be found at its website: <http://www.pic.nsw.gov.au>

Like the Police Integrity Commission, the ICAC is an independent, NSW government, oversight body. The ICAC is the older of the two ACAs, having recently had its 19th birthday. The ICAC was established to investigate, expose and prevent corruption in and affecting the NSW public sector. It seeks to build and sustain public sector integrity.

The ICAC's jurisdiction is much broader than that of the Police Integrity Commission. With the exception of both sworn and unsworn police officers, all public officials in NSW government departments, statutory bodies and local councils, as well as judges, magistrates and elected officials are covered by the ICAC's charter. Further information about the NSW ICAC and its work can be found on the ICAC's website at <http://www.icac.nsw.gov.au>

Table 1: Comparison of two Australian anti-corruption agencies: the Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Police Integrity Commission

	Independent Commission Against Corruption	Police Integrity Commission
Established to	Investigate, expose and prevent corruption in and affecting the NSW public sector Educate public authorities, public officials and members of the public about corruption and its detrimental effects	Detect, investigate and prevent police corruption and other serious police misconduct
Established by	<i>Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988</i>	<i>Police Integrity Commission Act 1996</i>
Commenced/Became fully operational	March 1989	January 1997
Jurisdiction	All public officials in NSW government departments, statutory authorities, local councils as well as judges, magistrates and elected officials – except sworn and unsworn police officers	Sworn and unsworn officers of the NSW Police Force
No. of staff as at 30 June 2007	121	103
Website – for further information	www.icac.nsw.gov.au	www.pic.nsw.gov.au

Both the ICAC and the Police Integrity Commission have used social science research techniques to inform their efforts to minimise corruption, or police misconduct, as it is termed in the Police Integrity Commission Act.

The ICAC has been conducting research since 1992. Of its approximately 120 staff, more than 20 are in the Corruption Prevention, Education and Research Division. The numbers of researchers employed by the ICAC since 1992 has ranged between two and four at any one time.

The Police Integrity Commission has sought to boost its research capability more recently. Of its 103 staff, four now undertake research. However, these staff also perform other corruption prevention duties.

RESEARCH

In my work for both ACAs, I have been guided by the principle that, the better one understands the enemy - in this case corruption - the better placed one is to defeat it. More specifically, I believe that the better one understands the process of engaging in corrupt conduct, the better equipped one is to prevent it (Gorta 1998; Gorta 2001). Research techniques are tools to build that understanding.

The term 'research' means different things to different people. When I talk about 'research' in this paper, I mean the systematic collection of quantitative or qualitative information designed to answer specific questions to provide an informed foundation on which to determine how and where best to intervene to prevent corrupt conduct.

Research is both a process and a product. One of the things that I have noticed is that simply asking questions – even before any report is prepared or recommendations formulated – can have an impact in its own right. Asking people to consider whether different scenarios are corrupt or not; and asking people about corruption risks and corruption prevention strategies promotes discussion of these topics. Sometimes it also promotes revision of policies that otherwise might not be revised.

Both the ICAC and the Police Integrity Commission have used a variety of research methods to answer different types of questions. Examples of the types of research methods used include:

- surveys – for example:
 - surveys of employees to examine their understanding of what is corrupt, as well barriers that prevent them from taking action about corrupt conduct
 - surveys of organisations or police commands to understand the corruption risks their staff may face and the prevention strategies that they have in place
- focus groups – for example:
 - focus groups with police officers about their attitudes to illegal drug use by fellow officers, as well as their knowledge of relevant departmental policies and procedures
 - focus groups with public sector managers about corruption prevention strategies that they have found to work
- questions to those in other agencies outside jurisdiction – elsewhere in Australia or in other countries - to find how they approach specific issues
- literature reviews to determine what can be learnt from the work of others, and
- analyses of the types of allegations of corruption received.

PREVENTION

Prevention is all about intervening before the corrupt conduct occurs.

There are different types of prevention strategies:

- some focus on equipping employees to recognise, and then manage, the integrity risks they might face
- some focus on reducing the opportunities for corrupt conduct

- some seek to deter corruption by increasing the risks of being caught for those who engage in corrupt conduct
- some increase social controls by increasing condemnation of such conduct by colleagues, and
- some focus on the organisational culture - that is, the organisation's values, the behaviour that gets rewarded, leadership and communication - more broadly (Clarke 1992, Clarke & Homel 1997, Wortley 1996, Gorta 1998; Ede, Homel & Prenzler 2002b).

Prevention is not simply about adding more and more rules. I view corruption prevention as a form of problem solving, where the solution depends upon the problem to be solved. The best prevention strategies are not the ones which propose the most interventions; rather they are the ones that are best tailored to solve the problem at hand (Gorta 1998; Sparrow 2000).

When he reported on the NSW Police Service, as part of his Royal Commission, Wood 1997, described:

the existence of too many regulations and instructions whose main purpose often seemed to be the provision of a framework for attributing blame if something went wrong, rather than a practical guide to ensure best practice (p. 194).

Finally, in designing prevention strategies, one needs to consider the cost. Prevention strategies should not be more costly than the corrupt conduct they seek to minimise.

FIVE OBSERVATIONS

I am now going to discuss five observations or lessons that I have learnt from my experience using research methods within ACAs to better understand corrupt conduct and then design strategies to minimise it. I shall illustrate each of these observations by using examples, predominantly taken from different aspects of the one project.

OBSERVATION 1: DON'T RELY ON INVESTIGATIONS TO PREVENT CORRUPTION

Although they differ in their functions and powers, it is common for ACAs to have a function which involves investigating allegations of corruption. However, the investigation of individual allegations, which necessarily takes place after the corrupt conduct has already occurred, is not sufficient to prevent future corruption (Gorta 2003).

This is because, firstly, not all forms of corrupt conduct will become the subject of an investigation. Some types of corrupt activities - and no-one knows how many of these there are or how frequently they occur - tend to be carried out in secret, with few witnesses. That which is not witnessed, cannot be reported. Even corrupt conduct that is witnessed may not be reported for a wide range of reasons (e.g., the individual not considering that it is their responsibility to report, fear of reprisal, or a belief that nothing will be done about it if it were reported). That which is not witnessed or reported is unlikely to ever become the subject of an investigation. Even where the conduct has

been reported, it may receive only limited investigation because of a lack of corroborating evidence (Ede, Homel & Prenzler 2002, p. 29).

Secondly, most commonly the investigations of ACAs focus on the conduct of individuals, in a similar manner to the way law enforcement agencies proceed in relation to catching criminals. Investigators and investigations tend to focus on the questions of 'who did what, when'. These are different questions from those most relevant to preventing corrupt conduct, where the interest is in 'how' and 'why' the conduct occurred.

This does not mean that investigations have no value in preventing corruption. Investigations can draw attention to a problem and may act as a catalyst for organisational reform. Investigations can also be a deterrent to individuals who may engage in corrupt conduct - if such individuals believe that there is a strong chance that they will be caught. However, investigations do not provide a broad enough starting point from which more generally to prevent corrupt conduct. Nor do they usually collect the information that is most relevant to preventing corruption.

While it is not appropriate for all investigations, the ICAC has, on occasion, combined research methods with an investigation to broaden the focus from the conduct of one or more individuals and, in so doing, broaden the impact of the investigation.

Broadening the focus of an investigation from one staff member of one university to the management of student record systems in ten universities

There are ten public universities in NSW which come within the ICAC's jurisdiction. An ICAC investigation, codenamed Operation Tudor, concerned a Graduate Student Advisor from one of these universities gaining access to electronic student records without authorisation and then removing the word 'failed' from academic records belonging to eleven graduate students. The investigation also revealed problems with the university's management of its student record system. In conjunction with this investigation, the ICAC surveyed each of the other nine public universities in NSW to find out how they managed their student record systems. From this survey the ICAC identified a number of weaknesses in student record systems across the different universities.

In this example – triggered by the misconduct of one staff member from one university – research was used to gather information about the student record systems in all ten public universities in NSW, so that improvements could be made to minimise the potential for future corrupt conduct in this area in any of the universities (Independent Commission Against Corruption 2002a, 2002b).

Not only can research support investigations – it can work in the other direction – with investigations supporting research. While it is relatively uncommon for research projects to be conducted in association with investigations, where they are, research may inform questions to be asked in investigations. Also, the findings and publicity of an investigation may act as a catalyst for the organisation to engage in reform and hence implement recommendations based on the results of research.

Combining investigations and research to understand and minimise the problem of illegal drug use by police officers

The Police Integrity Commission's project, codenamed Operation Abelia, concerned understanding and minimising illegal drug use by police officers. From the outset this project was designed to combine investigations and hearings with detailed national and international research. It had three broad objectives:

1. to investigate allegations that some NSW police officers used illegal drugs, supplied illegal drugs and/or associated with suppliers of illegal drugs
2. to provide an informed understanding of the nature of the problem of illegal drug use by some NSW police officers, and
3. to examine relevant NSW Police Force policies, procedures and training materials, with a view to advising the NSW Police Force how and where it can intervene to most effectively minimise illegal drug use by its officers (Police Integrity Commission 2005).

The first of these objectives has an investigative focus, while the second and third objectives have a research focus.

OBSERVATION 2: DIVIDE 'CORRUPTION' INTO ITS SPECIFIC FORMS

While it is common for commentators to write about corruption as if it were a single phenomenon, this is not the case. 'Corruption' is a term which can encompass many different forms of misuse of power or misuse of office. For example, the term 'corruption' can be applied to behaviours as varied as bribing a government official to approve a land development application, theft of office equipment for use at home, fraudulent allocation of monies, misuse of confidential information, or a police officer protecting a drug supplier (Gorta 2001; Gorta 2006).

Speaking about it as if it were a single issue or a single problem does not assist in preventing corruption.

Firstly, 'corruption' is too big a problem to tackle, unless one is able to divide it into its specific forms.

Secondly, one of the lessons from the crime prevention literature is that effective prevention techniques differ depending on the specific type of crime. For example, in order to minimise car theft one would use different strategies from those used to minimise assault. The criminology literature suggests that the reasons for committing one form of crime are different from the reasons for committing a different form of crime (Clarke & Felson 1993). The process of committing the crime and hence the necessary and sufficient conditions, also differ with the crime (Gorta 1998).

Similarly, different prevention strategies may suit different types of corrupt conduct. Hence, to prevent corrupt conduct – rather than thinking about 'corruption' as an amorphous whole – it is useful to break the problem of corrupt conduct into its different potential forms – then, because there are likely to be a lot of them, prioritise these forms – then, work out the best strategies to minimise these different forms of corrupt conduct (Gorta 1998; Gorta 2006).

BREAKING CORRUPTION INTO ITS DIFFERENT FORMS

There are different ways of selecting the type of conduct on which to focus.

Strategy 1 – focus on corruption risks

One possible starting point is by looking at ‘corruption risks’ (Gorta 1998; Gorta 2006). Questionnaires completed by organisations in the case of the ICAC, or completed by police commands in the case of the Police Integrity Commission, can be used to collect information on high-risk functions (that is, those functions which can create greater corruption opportunities, temptations or frustrations), perceived corruption risks, and corruption prevention strategies in place to develop a ‘corruption risk profile’ for an organisation (Independent Commission Against Corruption 2003). A picture of the corruption issues facing a group of organisations can be built by combining the responses from individual organisations (Gorta 2006).

The ICAC has surveyed organisations and staff samples to develop a profile of the functions, corruption risks as well as the corruption prevention strategies of the NSW public sector (Independent Commission Against Corruption 2003, 2007). The Police Integrity Commission has assessed the identification and management of the corruption or misconduct risks facing those undertaking counter-terrorism policing (Police Integrity Commission 2006). The Police Integrity Commission is currently undertaking a project examining the identification and management of misconduct risks by individual NSW Police Force commands.

Strategy 2 – focus on identified problems

Another way is to start with an area of corrupt conduct that has been identified to be a problem. This is what led to the Police Integrity Commission deciding to undertake a major project on police officer use of illegal drugs.

Operation Abelia – Illegal drug use by officers identified as a problem

The Police Integrity Commission determined that illegal drug use by police officers is a serious problem that warranted committing research resources to obtain a better understanding of the misconduct, so that such illegal drug use could be minimised. Illegal drug use by individual officers had become apparent in several previous investigations. The Police Integrity Commission wanted to do more than to simply investigate individual instances as they came to light.

Police illegal drug use is a problem with serious consequences, partly because of the special role that officers serve in the community. Police officers differ from other community members in their obligation to uphold and enforce the law, their powers of arrest, and the ability to deprive others of their freedom. For officers to use illegal drugs, they must have obtained them through some illegal means. This compromises their position, making them vulnerable to approaches from criminals and at risk of engaging in more serious acts of corruption. Personal drug use may also reduce their willingness to carry out their duties in relation to drug law enforcement (Police Integrity Commission 2005).

OBSERVATION 3: CONSIDER YOUR BEST INFORMATION SOURCES

Consider who or what will be your best information sources. Different sources might be able to provide different insights on the problem. In particular, consider obtaining information from those who engage in corrupt conduct as well as other employees. Also look at where you might be able to learn from others.

a) THOSE WHO ENGAGE IN CORRUPT CONDUCT

The crime prevention literature suggests asking offenders why they undertook the corrupt activity to identify circumstances which encourage corrupt conduct, as well as asking them how they undertook the corrupt activity to understand in detail the process leading to the corrupt conduct. In this way, one can get a better understanding of the necessary and sufficient conditions for the corrupt conduct to occur, to identify how and where to intervene to optimise the likelihood of prevention (Cornish & Clarke 1987; Gabor 1990; Gabor 1994; Shover & Honaker 1992; Gorta 1998). The crime prevention literature also suggests asking offenders whether they considered what they did to be acceptable, and if they did, why they thought it was acceptable, so that justifications can be identified and subsequently challenged (Sykes & Matza 1957; Gorta 1998).

b) OTHER EMPLOYEES

Besides seeking information from those who have engaged in corrupt conduct, consider examining other employees' views. ICAC research has highlighted that employees' views are important for several reasons (Independent Commission Against Corruption 1994, 2001; Gorta & Forell 1995). Personal understanding of what is corrupt (also referred to as 'social definitions') can impact on the perpetuation of corrupt practices. If people do not recognise the activity which they may be witnessing, or in which they may be participating, as 'corrupt', or at least as 'undesirable' then they are unlikely to react to it as such. If they do recognise the behaviour as 'corrupt', but believe that, for example, such behaviour is appropriate given the circumstances, they are also unlikely to attempt to change the behaviour. As employees are in the best position both to observe any corruption that may take place at work and to take action about it, it is important to consider their attitudes and beliefs.

It is also useful to know the context in which the corrupt conduct occurs. Employees may be able to provide some insight in terms of the organisational culture and the types of behaviours that are rewarded by the organisation.

c) WHERE POSSIBLE, LEARN FROM OTHERS

There is an old saying – that there is no need to reinvent the wheel. The same can be said for trying to solve corruption prevention problems. Learn from others where you can.

Consider whether there are others who may have faced the same problems in other agencies – either ACAs, agencies that are being overlooked, agencies from other jurisdictions or NGOs – contact them. There may be lessons both from what has worked for them as well as has not worked for them in the past.

Although the corruption-related literature is only in its adolescence, there is already extensive material available. Along with related areas of literature, such as those

pertaining to ethical behaviour, crime prevention, and organisational change, this material can provide a basis for identifying corruption risk factors.

I shall now return to the example of research about police use of illegal drugs.

Using a variety of information sources – including the perspectives of those who have engaged in corrupt conduct, the perspectives of other employees as well as learning from others - to understand and minimise the problem of illegal drug use by police officers

The Police Integrity Commission did ask ‘offenders’. In this case current or former police officers, who had previously admitted illegal drug use and had already been sanctioned for that drug use, were questioned in private hearings about the circumstances of their drug use and any suggestions they might be able to offer about what could have prevented their illegal drug use. More specifically, they were asked about:

- their background in the NSW Police Force and why they joined
- types of drugs they used
- when they started to use drugs
- the reasons they used illegal drugs
- where they were and who they were with when they used illegal drugs
- strategies that they used to avoid their drug use being detected
- how they obtained their illegal drugs
- whether they consider drug use by police officers to be appropriate and why
- their recall of training and information about relevant NSW Police Force policies
- with the benefit of hindsight, what they thought might have prevented their own illegal drug use.

Information from available records was also used to compile, and then analyse, case studies of 81 officers found or assessed to have used illegal drugs.

Other employees’ views were also considered. Interviews with commanders and the focus groups with sworn officers and students were conducted to find out about attitudes to officer drug use, as well as their understanding and views of the effectiveness of the policies in place.

To ensure that any policy recommendations were well-informed, the Police Integrity Commission adopted a consultative approach that included learning from others by:

- interviewing experts in the drug and alcohol research field, drug testing, crime prevention, and industrial relations fields
- liaising with 23 other police departments - in Australia, Canada, USA, UK and the Netherlands - to find out from them the approaches that they took to minimise drug use by their officers
- contacting nine selected Australian non-policing agencies or other industry groups that either use drug testing, were considering using drug testing, or for whom drug use

issues were relevant but were being managed through alternative strategies

- contacting Australian and overseas researchers in policing, criminology and drugs fields to identify relevant research and associated materials to ensure that the material reviewed was comprehensive, as well as
- reviewing the available literature (Police Integrity Commission 2005).

TRANSFORMING INFORMATION TO IMPROVED PRACTICES

Transforming research results to improved practices consists of three stages:

1. interpreting the research findings and translating them into practical recommendations
2. liaising with stakeholders to ensure that the recommendations will be practical
3. following through to encourage implementation of the recommendations.

Stages 2 and 3 of this process are discussed further as the final two of the five observations which make up the core of this paper.

OBSERVATION 4: ENGAGE STAKEHOLDERS

Observation 4 concerns listening to and involving stakeholders in the process of formulating recommendations.

Returning to the example of the Police Integrity Commission project on illegal drug use by police officers:

Operation Abelia – listening to and involving the stakeholders

At the time the Police Integrity Commission was identifying potential places to intervene in order to minimise illegal drug use by police officers, it drafted a series of briefing papers on topics such as 'random drug testing', 'recruitment', and 'supervision'. These briefing papers outlined relevant issues as well as options. Stakeholders - including representatives of the NSW Police Force, the Police union, the Ombudsman's Office and of the Minister – were each asked to respond to the issues raised in the briefing papers and then to meet as a group to discuss the issues in round table discussions chaired by the Police Integrity Commission. This provided a formal opportunity for consultation on matters possibly to be the subject of recommendations, before the recommendations were formulated.

Once the Commission's report to Parliament and recommendations had been drafted, a draft was shown to these stakeholders for their comment. These comments identified where the Police Integrity Commission's arguments were either not clear or areas where additional arguments needed to be mounted.

At this point I would like to digress and briefly mention the results of Operation Abelia. While I shall not go into any detail here, the research provided a better understanding of drug use by some NSW police officers including an understanding of: the range of

types of illegal drugs used; age groups and geographical areas of officers using illegal drugs; how long after joining the NSW Police Force officers started to use illegal drugs; the circumstances when officers used drugs; how officers obtain their illegal drugs; as well as the strategies they use to avoid detection. It also provided a better understanding of the policies in place within the NSW Police Force at that time; how officers understood those policies and practices, and the strategies to minimise employee illegal drug use that were used by other organisations at that time.

The Police Integrity Commission made 64 recommendations, many of which propose policy, procedural and legislative change to strengthen the NSW Police Force's capacity to minimise illegal drug use by its officers. These recommendations combined to form a nine-part integrated strategy which, in summary, involved:

1. Communication
2. Training
3. Officer welfare
4. Deterrence
5. Detection
6. Managing officers found to have used illegal drugs
7. Demonstrating accountability
8. Review and evaluation
9. Monitoring the implementation of recommendations.

At this point I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Police Integrity Commission included 'review and evaluation' as well as 'monitoring implementation' components within its recommendations.

Many of the individual recommendations proposed in Operation Abelia involved strategies for the NSW Police Force that were new to the organisation and needed to be tested, and perhaps further developed, to optimise their utility. Other recommendations required the NSW Police Force to review and evaluate its current procedures to see whether they can be improved.

Associated with this, the Police Integrity Commission recommended that NSW Police Force collects relevant information to enable it to evaluate the effectiveness of its strategies and to make informed decisions about whether or not its strategies can be improved. For example, the PIC recommended that the NSW Police Force:

- regularly surveys a sample of officers about their knowledge and perception of random drug testing to gauge the need to further publicise drug testing or other strategies to increase the visibility and unpredictability of testing
- assesses the effectiveness of its strategies to reduce processing times for officers subject to disciplinary action.

This brings me to my fifth and final observation.

OBSERVATION 5: MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Formulating the recommendations is not the end of the process. It is important to follow up on whether and how the recommendations are implemented.

In some cases, the investigation of corruption is assigned to a special purpose commission with specific terms of reference whose role finishes with the production of a report. One of the advantages of an ACA over such a commission with a fixed term, is that it is in a position to be able to monitor the implementation of its recommendations.

Agencies that are aware that recommendations are being monitored are more likely to implement them.

Monitoring the implementation of recommendations enables an ACA to:

- 1) enter into dialogue with the agency that is to implement the recommendations to assist in resolving any issues that may impede the implementation of recommendations
- 2) measure management responses to areas of risk identified by the ACA - which in turn enables the ACA to consider whether organisations have addressed the problems identified, and
- 3) more generally review the usefulness and practicality of the recommendations made.

LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH

While research is a very useful tool for better understanding factors relevant to minimising corrupt conduct, it does have limitations.

Firstly, the nature of all research work - which involves research design, information collection and analysis or interpretation – is that it is a time-consuming process. Research is unlikely to be either cheap or fast.

Secondly, research is not able to answer all questions. Sometimes this is because the necessary data to answer the question are not available. Sometimes it is because of the nature of the question. Asking questions does not guarantee getting meaningful answers. For example, when discussing police corruption Ivkovic (2003) has related the following example:

... studying police corruption by asking police officers about the extent and nature of corruption in their agencies is more than likely to encounter resistance. A revealing example is the survey of attendees at the FBI National Academy, one of the most prestigious police academies in the United States. Under a guarantee of confidentiality, a question in the survey asked respondents – very experienced police officers, mostly supervisors from a number of agencies across the United States – to provide 'specific examples of graft or corruption in [their] department, without revealing names or places, and what [they think] could have been done to prevent it. *None* of the 49 respondents provided an answer (Ivkovic 2003, pp. 598-599).

Finally, the value of the research depends upon how effectively it is designed. Not all questions or research methods are equally effective for different problems. It requires skilled practitioners who understand how to choose the most appropriate research methods to address the issues of interest.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, I believe that the better one understands the process of engaging in corrupt conduct, the better equipped one is to prevent it. In this presentation I have attempted to illustrate that social science research methods provide tools for doing this.

I have used examples to illustrate how research methodologies may be used to inform strategies to prevent corruption. While the subject matter of the examples that I have used may not be relevant to your agency, I encourage you to consider whether research techniques may assist you to provide an evidence-based foundation to your corruption prevention work.

I have also offered five observations for you to consider when seeking to better inform your own corruption prevention efforts:

1. Don't rely on investigations to prevent corruption
2. Divide corruption into its specific forms
3. Consider your best information sources
4. Engage stakeholders
5. Monitor the implementation of recommendations.

REFERENCES¹

- Clarke, R. V. (1992) 'Situational crime prevention: Theory and practice. *British Journal of Criminology*, 20, 136-147.
- Clarke, R. V., & Felson M. (1993) Criminology, routine activity and rational choice, In R.V. Clarke & M. Felson (Eds) *Routine activity and rationale choice*. NSW Brunswick, USE: Transaction Publishers, pp. 1-14.
- Clarke, R.V. & Homel, R. (1997) A revised classification of situational crime prevention techniques, In S. P. Lab (ed.) *Crime Prevention at the Crossroads*. Cincinnati Ohio: Anderson, pp. 21-35.
- Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. (1987) Understanding crime displacement: An application of rationale choice theory. *Criminology*, 25, 933-947.
- Ede, A., Homel, R., & Prenzler, T. (2002a) Reducing complaints against police and preventing misconduct: A diagnostic study using hot spot analysis. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 35(1), 27-42.
- Ede, A., Homel, R., & Prenzler, T. Situational corruption prevention. In T. Prenzler & J. Ransley (Eds) (2002b) *Police reform: Building integrity*. Hawkins Press, pp. 210-225.
- Gabor, T. (1990) Crime displacement and situational prevention: Toward the development of some principles. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 32, 41-73.
- Gabor, T. (1994) *"Everybody does it!" Crime by the public*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Gorta, A. (1998) Minimising corruption: Applying lessons from the crime prevention literature. *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 30, 67-87.
- Gorta, A. (2001) Research: A tool for building corruption resistance. In P. Larmour & N. Wolanin (Eds) *Corruption and Anti Corruption*, Asia-Pacific Press and The Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra, pp. 11-29.
- Gorta, A. (2003) Strategies for minimising corruption: The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption experience. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, June 2003, Volume 11(1), pp. 1-21.
- Gorta, A. (2006) Corruption risks areas and corruption resistance. In C. Sampford, A. Shacklock, C. Connors, & F. Galtung (Eds) *Measuring corruption*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishers, pp. 203-219.
- Gorta, A., & Forell, S. (1995) Layers of decision: Linking social definitions of corruption and willingness to take action. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 23, 315-343.
- Independent Commission Against Corruption (1994) *Unravelling Corruption: A public sector perspective. Survey of NSW public sector employees' understanding of corruption and their willingness to take action. Summary report*. Sydney: Independent Commission Against Corruption. April 1994.
- Independent Commission Against Corruption (2001) *Corruption... Who wants to know? Report summary of the ICAC's research survey Unravelling Corruption II: Exploring changes in public sector perspectives 1993-1999*. Sydney: Independent Commission Against Corruption, April 2001.
- Independent Commission Against Corruption (2002a) *Investigation into the conduct of officers and students at the University of Technology, Sydney*. Sydney: Independent Commission Against Corruption, Investigations Issues, July 2002.

¹ Each of the Independent Commission Against Corruption publications can be found on the ICAC's website: <www.icac.nsw.gov.au>. Each of the Police Integrity Commission's publications can be found on the Police Integrity Commission's website: <www.pic.nsw.gov.au>.

- Independent Commission Against Corruption (2002b) *Degrees of risk: A corruption risk profile of the New South Wales university sector*. Sydney: Independent Commission Against Corruption, August 2002.
- Independent Commission Against Corruption (2003) *Profiling the NSW public sector Functions, risks and corruption resistance strategies*. Sydney: Independent Commission Against Corruption, January 2003.
- Independent Commission Against Corruption (2007) Survey lifts lid on corruption risks in the NSW Public Sector. *Corruption Matters* 30, p 4. Sydney: Independent Commission Against Corruption, November 2007.
- Independent Commission Against Corruption (2008) *Corruption risk management: Tip sheet for NSW public officials*. Sydney: Independent Commission Against Corruption, February 2008.
- Ivkovic, S. K. (2003) To serve and collect: Measuring police corruption. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 93, 593-649.
- Police Integrity Commission (2005) *Operation Abelia: Research and investigations into illegal drug use by some NSW Police officers. Volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4*. Sydney: Police Integrity Commission, September 2005.
- Police Integrity Commission (2006) *Management of Misconduct Risks by the NSW Police Counter Terrorist Command: An Assessment*. Sydney: Police Integrity Commission, September 2006.
- Shover, N., & Honaker, D. (1992) The socially bounded decision making of property offenders. *The Howard Journal*, 31, 276-293.
- Sparrow, M. K. (2000) *The regulatory craft: Controlling risks, solving problems and managing compliance*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Sykes, G. M. & Matza, D. (1957) Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 664-670.
- Wood J. J. R. T. (1997) *Royal Commission into the New South Wales Police Service: Final report. Volume I: Corruption*, May 1997.
- Wortley, R. (1996) Guilt, shame and situational crime prevention. In R. Homel (Ed.) *The politics and practice of situational crime prevention. Crime Prevention Studies, Volume 5*. New York Criminal Justice Press, pp. 115-132.