# Police Attitudes and Corruption: The Findings of the Police Integrity Measurement Survey at three police stations in Johannesburg



by

#### **Gareth Newham**

Research report written for the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, October 2003.

**Gareth Newham** is a former Project Manager in the <u>Criminal Justice Programme</u> at the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

### Introduction

This document presents the comprehensive data sets from the Police Integrity Measurement Survey. This report was designed for use by the SAPS Johannesburg Area Commissioner in consultation with the author. Please note that this is not a formal report and is not for general distribution. The data has not been contextualised and therefore no conclusions should be drawn without prior discussion with the author. This data merely represents the average perceptions of police members at all ranks in the stations where the research took place. To understand why these perceptions are held it is necessary to consider further qualitative research.

Police Integrity Measurement Survey is an internationally recognised data gathering instrument. This survey is based on contemporary thinking about obtaining a quantifiable measurement of key factors directly related to police occupational culture. The benefit of this survey is twofold:

- 1. It will provide quantitative data on the key organisational characteristics that support or undermine police integrity.
- 2. It will provide the management component with a quantifiable starting point against which to measure improvements in police integrity over time.

What the survey does: it describes some of the key characteristics of a police agency's culture that encourages its members to resist or tolerate certain types of misconduct. The survey obtains numerically ranked opinions from members on hypothetical case scenarios describing integrity related conduct. The survey will provide quantifiable data on the following:

- 1. How seriously police members as a whole perceive typical forms of police conduct related to integrity?
- 2. How police members as a whole perceive the overall normative environment at the station
- 3. The extent to which members as a whole know if certain forms of conduct are against SAPS regulations?
- 4. The extent to which there is consistency in perceiving disciplinary sanctions for

- various forms of misconduct.
- 5. The extent to which members as a whole perceive the disciplinary sanctions as appropriate.
- 6. The extent to which members and their colleagues would be willing to report various forms of misconduct?

### The survey does not do the following:

- It cannot not identify either corrupt or honest police officers;
- It cannot not provide any evidence of misconduct or dishonest practices past, present or future.

The following tables indicate the results of the police integrity survey conducted at three police stations, namely Alexandra, Hillbrow and Sandton. The data was weighted to reflect the population distribution across these three stations. So for example, the population of Alexandra constituted 30% of the total population, but only 26% of the sample. The data for Alexandra was therefore weighted up to correct for this deviation. On the other hand, the sample size for Sandton, represented a greater proportion of the whole than the population for this station. The Sandton data was therefore weighted down to correct for this deviation.

Station	Population size	Population %	Sample size	Sample %	Weight
Alexandra	290	30%	103	26%	1.1250656
Hillbrow	442	45%	163	42%	1.0835569
Sandton	249	25%	126	32%	0.7896704
Total	981	100%	392	100%	

The following tables indicate the average responses given by participants in the police integrity survey. A score of 1 indicates the lowest denominator or least serious, and a score of 5 indicates the highest, or most serious. These tables outline the respective averages and their rankings for each of the 11 case scenarios posited.

Seriousness							
Own view	Mean	Rank	Other Officers	Mean	Rank		
Shop owner gifts:	2.71	1	Private bus:	2.51	1		
Private bus:	2.77	2	Shop owner gifts:	2.65	2		
Violence for resisting arrest:	3.63	3	Jewellery shop:	3.11	3		
Lawyer:	3.74	4	Certify documents:	3.26	4		
Drunk Police driver:	3.77	5	Commander loan:	3.29	5		
Lost wallet:	3.81	6	Lost wallet:	3.29	5		

After hours bar:	4.10	7	Illegal immigrant:	3.63	7
Commander loan:	4.30	8	After hours bar:	3.86	8
Illegal immigrant:	4.39	9	Violence for resisting arrest:	3.88	9
Jewellery shop:	4.46	10	Lawyer:	3.98	10
Certify documents:	4.50	11	Drunk Police driver:	4.15	11
Mean	3.83		Mean	3.42	

- Overall, individuals were slightly more inclined to think they would view the above offences in a serious light than their colleagues, although this differential is not overly significant.
- While individuals saw the certifying of documents as being the most serious offence, they deemed that other officers would view the drunk police driver offence as being the most serious.

Would this behaviour be regarded as against SAPS regulations					
	Mean	Rank			
Private bus:	3.15	1			
Shop owner gifts:	3.34	2			
Jewellery shop:	3.83	3			
Certify documents:	3.85	4			
Lost wallet:	3.85	4			
Commander loan:	3.95	6			
Illegal immigrant:	4.23	7			
After hours bar:	4.38	8			
Violence for resisting arrest:	4.48	9			
Drunk Police driver:	4.51	10			
Lawyer:	4.57	11			
Mean	4.01				

- The corrupt lawyer/police officer scenario ranked highest in terms of how respondents viewed it vis-à-vis contravening police regulations.
- Overall, a score of 4.01 indicates a general perception that these actions represent a contravention of SAPS regulations.

## Discipline

Should receive	Mean	Rank	Would receive	Mean	Rank
Shop owner gifts:	2.09	1	Shop owner gifts:	2.19	1
Private bus:	2.21	2	Private bus:	2.28	2
Drunk Police driver:	2.75	3	Violence for resisting arrest:	2.77	3
After hours bar:	2.93	4	Drunk Police driver:	2.99	4
Lawyer:	3.04	5	Lost wallet:	3.07	5
Commander loan:	3.10	6	After hours bar:	3.08	6
Violence for resisting arrest:	3.19	7	Lawyer:	3.12	7
Jewellery shop:	3.57	8	Commander loan:	3.55	8
Illegal immigrant:	3.58	9	Illegal immigrant:	3.62	9
Certify documents:	3.83	11	Certify documents:	3.74	10
Lost wallet:	3.96	11	Jewellery shop:	3.89	11
Mean	3.11		Mean	3.12	

- While the rankings of the cases across the two categories differ, overall there was no distinction between what people thought the form of discipline should be, and what they thought it would be.
- The average for both falls between a written warning and a period of suspension without pay, although it lies closer to the former.

Willingness to report							
Own view	Mean	Rank	Other Officers	Mean	Rank		
Private bus:	2.39	1	Private bus:	2.31	1		
Shop owner gifts:	2.53	2	Shop owner gifts:	2.31	1		
Violence for resisting arrest:	3.12	3	Violence for resisting arrest:	2.69	3		
Lost wallet:	3.32	4	Lost wallet:	2.95	4		
Drunk Police driver:	3.36	5	Drunk Police driver:	2.95	4		
Lawyer:	3.41	6	Lawyer:	3.02	6		
After hours bar:	3.57	7	After hours bar:	3.11	7		
Commander loan:	3.90	8	Commander loan:	3.27	8		
Illegal immigrant:	3.90	8	Illegal immigrant:	3.35	9		

Certify documents:  Jewellery shop:	3.96	Certify documents:  Jewellery shop:	3.44	11
Mean	3.40	Mean	2.99	

- Overall, while the individual thinks that s/he is more willing to report an offence than his/her counterpart, the ranking for all cases across the two categories follow the same order.
- The certification of documents case, and the jewellery shop case, are most likely to be viewed as cases that police officers and their colleagues would report, while the cases of the private business and the shop owner dispensing gifts are least likely to be viewed as incidents that would be reported.

Own view versus view of others	Seriousness	Discipline	Willingness to report
	Differential	Differential	Differential
After hours bar:	0.24	-0.15	0.08
Certify documents:	1.24	0.09	0.22
Commander loan:	1.01	-0.45	0.43
Drunk Police driver:	-0.38	-0.24	0.37
Illegal immigrant:	0.76	-0.04	0.41
Jewellery shop:	1.35	-0.32	0.39
Lawyer:	-0.24	-0.08	0.46
Lawyer:	-0.24	-0.08	0.46
Lost wallet:	0.52	0.89	0.63
Private bus:	0.26	-0.07	0.55
Shop owner gifts:	0.06	-0.10	0.52
Violence for resisting arrest:	-0.25	0.42	0.54
Mean	0.42	0.00	0.42

- The above table reflects the differential in the average ranking figures between a respondents' own view, and the view they think others hold. For all cases, a positive differential reflects a higher ranking for the individual, while a negative differential reflects a higher ranking for others.
- Thus, in the case of the jewellery shop and the commander loan, the individual is more likely to view these incidents in a more serious light than they think their colleagues would. This applies to the levels of seriousness with which these cases are viewed in general.
- In terms of discipline, there is no difference overall, but in 8 out of 11 cases, there are marginal differences where the individual perceives the disciplinary action to be taken would be greater than s/he thinks it should be.

• In all cases reflecting a willingness to report an incident, the individual thinks s/he would be more willing to report an offence than a colleague would.

Case 1: A police member runs his own private business in which he sells and installs security devices, such as alarm clocks, special locks etc. He does this work in his office hours.

		Private bus: How	Takal		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total
	Alexandra	38.45	14.3%	47.3%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	48.6%	16.0%	35.4%	100.0%
	Sandton	59.2%	13.3%	27.6%	100.0%
Total		48.3%	14.8%	36.9%	100.0%

		Private bus: H Police conside	Total		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total
	Alexandra	44.3%	16.5%	39.1%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	53.8%	16.8%	29.5%	100.0%
	Sandton	56.8%	22.1%	21.1%	100.0%
Total		51.7%	18.0%	30.3%	100.0%

		Private bu	Total			
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes		
	Alexandra	35.5%	9.1%	55.5%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	36.0%	8.1%	55.8%	100.0%	
	Sandton	41.1%	9.5%	49.5%	100.0%	
Total		51.7%	18.0%	30.3%	100.0%	

Private bus: What discipline should be applied?	otal
---	------

		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	
	Alexandra	25.9 %	38.4%	23.2%	9.8%	0%	2.7%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	31.0 %	29.3%	27.0%	5.2%	2.3%	5.2%	100.0
	Sandton	41.5	31.9%	23.4%	0%	1.1%	2.1%	100.0
Total		32.1	32.6%	25.0%	5.3%	1.3%	3.7%	100.0

			Private b	us: What o	liscipline wo	uld be appli	ed?	Total
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	
	Alexandra	23.7 %	42.1%	21.1%	7.9%	.9%	4.4%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	35.6	23.0%	27.0%	6.3%	1.1%	6.9%	100.0
	Sandton	37.6 %	30.1%	22.6%	4.3%	3.2%	2.2%	100.0
Total		32.5	30.4%	24.1%	6.3%	1.6%	5.0%	100.0

		Private bus:	Would you i	report police member?	Total
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	Total
	Alexandra	56.3%	9.8%	33.9%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	59.8%	16.7%	23.6%	100.0%
	Sandton	62.0%	14.1%	23.9%	100.0%
Total		59.3%	14.0%	26.7%	100.0%

Private bu	ıs: Would Po memb	lice members report per?	Total
Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	

Station	Alexandra	61.1%	13.3%	25.7%	100.0%
	Hillbrow	63.8%	16.7%	19.5%	100.0%
	Sandton	59.8%	17.4%	22.8%	100.0%
Total		62.0%	15.8%	22.2%	100.0%

Case 2: A police member regularly accepts free meals, cigarettes, and other items of small value from shop owners and hawkers. He does not ask for these gifts and is careful not to abuse the generosity of those who gave the gifts to him.

		Shop owner gi you consider	Takal		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total
	Alexandra	47.8%	12.2%	40.0%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	44.3%	16.1%	39.7%	100.0%
Sandton		63.2%	15.8%	21.1%	100.0%
Total		50.0%	14.8%	35.2%	100.0%

		Shop owner gifts Police conside	Total		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total
Alexandra		51.9%	14.2%	34.0%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	52.0%	17.5%	30.4%	100.0%
Sandton		66.0%	18.1%	16.0%	100.0%
Total		55.5%	16.7%	27.8%	100.0%

			Shop owner gifts: Considered a violation of SAPS regulations?				
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes			
	Alexandra	41.2%	6.9%	52.0%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	34.9%	9.5%	55.6%	100.0%		
	Sandton	50.6%	13.5%	36.0%	100.0%		

		S	hop owner	gifts: Wha	nt discipline s	should be ap	plied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	31.8	33.6%	28.0%	2.8%	1.9%	1.9%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	32.4	33.5%	25.9%	4.1%	2.9%	1.2%	100.0
	Sandton	46.7	28.9%	17.8%	3.3%	2.2%	1.1%	100.0
Total		35.7 %	32.4%	24.5%	3.5%	2.5%	1.4%	100.0

		S	Shop owner gifts: What discipline would be applied?					
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	27.6 %	37.1%	25.7%	5.7%	1.9%	1.9%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	30.8	27.8%	29.6%	7.7%	3.0%	1.2%	100.0
	Sandton	44.6	26.1%	22.8%	1.1%	3.3%	2.2%	100.0
Total		33.3	30.1%	26.8%	5.5%	2.7%	1.6%	100.0

		Shop own	Total					
		Def no/no	Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes					
	Alexandra	52.3%	9.3%	38.3%	100.0%			
Station	Hillbrow	54.4%	14.6%	18.5%	100.0%			
Sandton		67.4%	14.1%	18.5%	100.0%			
Total		57.0%	13.0%	30.0%	100.0%			

		Shop owner	gifts: Would memb	Police members report er?	Total	
		Def no/no	Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes			
Alexandr	Alexandra	60.5%	9.6%	29.8%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	59.2%	14.4%	26.4%	100.0%	
Sandton		72.5%	14.3%	13.2%	100.0%	
Total		62.8%	12.9%	24.3%	100.0%	

Case 3: A police member stops a person who is behaving suspiciously and discovers he is an illegal immigrant. The police member agrees to accept money from him in exchange for not arresting him.

		Illegal immigr you consider			Total
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Total		
	Alexandra	22.8%	7.0%	70.2%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	6.8%	4.5%	88.6%	100.0%
	Sandton	10.8%	3.2%	86.0%	100.0%
Total		12.5% 5.0% 82.5%		82.5%	100.0%

		Illegal Immigran Police conside			Takal
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Total		
	Alexandra	24.3%	14.8%	60.9%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	17.1%	13.7%	69.1%	100.0%
Sandton		17.2%	14.0%	68.8%	100.0%
Total		19.3%	14.1%	66.6%	100.0%

		t: Considered a S regulations?	Total
Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	

	Alexandra	14.9%	7.9%	77.2%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	2.9%	5.1%	92.0%	100.0%
	Sandton	12.8%	6.4%	80.9%	100.0%
Total		8.9%	6.3%	84.9%	100.0%

		III	egal immiş	grant: Wh	at discipline	should be a	pplied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	8.8%	26.5%	31.0%	23.9%	2.7%	7.1%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	.6%	8.0%	35.6%	28.7%	1.7%	25.3%	100.0
	Sandton	6.6%	17.6%	25.3%	39.6%	2.2%	8.8%	100.0
Total		4.5%	15.9%	31.7%	29.9%	2.1%	15.9%	100.0

		II	legal immi	grant: Wh	at discipline	would be ap	plied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	10.6	28.3%	31.0%	16.8%	5.3%	8.0%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	2.4%	6.5%	36.7%	20.7%	7.7%	26.0%	100.0
	Sandton	6.6%	16.5%	25.3%	29.7%	6.6%	15.4%	100.0
Total		5.9%	15.5%	32.2%	21.7%	6.7%	18.0%	100.0

		Illegal imi	migrant: Wou memb	ıld you report police er?	Total		
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes			
Station	Alexandra	27.3%	27.3% 9.1% 63.6% 100.0%				

Hi	illbrow	12.3%	15.2%	72.5%	100.0%
Sa	andton	24.4%	14.4%	61.1%	100.0%
Total		19.7%	13.2%	67.1%	100.0%

		Illegal immig	Total				
		Def no/no	Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes				
Alexandra		32.7%	18.7%	48.6%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	31.5%	19.6%	48.8%	100.0%		
Sandton		34.1%	27.5%	38.5%	100.0%		
Total		32.5%	21.3%	46.2%	100.0%		

Case 4: A police member working in the CSC is responsible for certifying copies of documents for members of the public. He asks people who come to the police station for this service for R10 in exchange for certifying their documents.

			Certify documents: How serious do you consider behaviour to be?			
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Total			
	Alexandra	15.9%	7.1%	77.0%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	1.8%	7.0%	91.2%	100.0%	
	Sandton	8.6%	7.5%	83.9%	100.0%	
Total		7.7%	7.2%	85.1%	100.0%	

		Certify document Police conside			Total	
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious  Unsure Serious/ very serious				
	Alexandra	17.9%	12.5%	69.6%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	16.6%	12.0%	71.4%	100.0%	
	Sandton	20.2%	12.8%	67.0%	100.0%	
Total		17.8%	12.3%	69.8%	100.0%	

			•	es: Considered a eS regulations?	Total		
		Def no/no	Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes				
	Alexandra	10.0%	10.9%	79.1%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	2.9%	4.6%	92.5%	100.0%		
	Sandton	12.9%	3.2%	83.9%	100.0%		
Total		7.4%	6.1%	86.5%	100.0%		

		Ce	rtify docu	ments: Wh	at discipline	should be a	pplied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	5.3%	28.3%	31.9%	12.4%	4.4%	17.7%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	.6%	10.3%	24.7%	24.1%	9.2%	31.0	100.0
	Sandton	3.3%	21.7%	26.1%	25.0%	6.5%	17.4%	100.0
Total		2.6%	18.5%	27.2%	20.8%	7.1%	23.7%	100.0

		Ce	ertify docu	ments: Wh	nat discipline	would be a	pplied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	8.8%	25.7%	31.9%	15.9%	4.4%	13.3%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	2.4%	8.8%	32.4%	17.1%	9.4%	30.0%	100.0
	Sandton	4.3%	16.1%	29.0%	21.5%	12.9%	16.1%	100.0
Total		4.8%	15.7%	31.4%	17.8%	8.8%	21.5%	100.0

Certify documents: Would you report police	Total

			memb		
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	
	Alexandra	24.1%	15.2%	60.7%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	13.7%	12.0%	74.3%	100.0%
	Sandton	21.3%	16.0%	62.8%	100.0%
Total		18.6%	13.9%	67.5%	100.0%

		Certify docu	Certify documents: Would Police members report member?				
		Def no/no	Unsure	Unsure Yes/definitely yes			
	Alexandra	31.8%	16.4%	51.8%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	32.7%	21.1%	46.2%	100.0%		
	Sandton	32.6%	18.5%	48.9%	100.0%		
Total		32.4%	19.0%	48.5%	100.0%		

Case 5: A police member discovers a burglary of a jewellery shop. The display cases are smashed, and it is clear that many items have been taken. While searching the shop, he takes a watch worth about two days salary. He reports that the watch had been stolen during the robbery.

		Jewellery sho you consider	-		Total
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Not at all serious/ Unsure Serious/		Total
	Alexandra	14.3%	10.7%	75.0%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	5.8%	5.8%	88.3%	100.0%
	Sandton	9.5%	7.4%	83.2%	100.0%
Total		9.3%	7.7%	83.1%	100.0%

		Jewellery shop: Police conside			Total
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total
Station	Alexandra	15.9%	13.3%	70.8%	100.0%

Hillbrow	9.4%	10.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Sandton	17.7%	13.5%	68.8%	100.0%
Total	13.5%	11.9%	74.7%	100.0%

		Jewellery sh	op: Consider regulati	Total			
		Def no/no	Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes				
	Alexandra	15.2%	12.5%	72.3%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	2.4%	4.7%	92.9%	100.0%		
	Sandton	8.4%	7.4%	84.2%	100.0%		
Total		7.7%	7.7%	84.6%	100.0%		

		J	Jewellery s	hop: What	t discipline sl	ould be app	olied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	9.8%	23.2%	26.8%	17.9%	5.4%	17.0%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	1.1%	9.8%	22.4%	22.4%	6.3%	37.9%	100.0
	Sandton	5.4%	12.9%	18.3%	33.3%	6.5%	23.7%	100.0
Total		4.7%	14.5%	22.7%	23.7%	6.1%	28.2%	100.0

			Jewellery s	hop: Wha	t discipline w	ould be app	olied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
Station	Alexandra	8.9%	25.0%	25.9%	16.1%	5.4%	18.8%	100.0
	Hillbrow	4.0%	9.8%	28.9%	19.1%	6.4%	31.8%	100.0
	Sandton	4.3%	16.1%	18.3%	22.6%	7.5%	31.2%	100.0

							%
Total	5.6%	15.9%	25.4%	19.0%	6.3%	27.8%	100.0

		Jewellery sho	lewellery shop: Would you report police member?			
		Def no/no	Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes			
	Alexandra	25.7%	12.4%	61.9%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	13.3%	10.4%	76.3%	100.0%	
	Sandton	18.3%	14.0%	67.7%	100.0%	
Total		18.2%	11.9%	69.9%	100.0%	

		Jewellery s	Jewellery shop: Would police members report member?			
		Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes				
	Alexandra	28.8%	1.6%	49.5%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	28.2%	17.2%	54.6%	100.0%	
	Sandton	25.8%	19.4%	54.8%	100.0%	
Total		27.8%	19.0%	53.2%	100.0%	

Case 6: A police member has a private arrangement with a defence lawyer whereby he recommends the lawyer to people who have been arrested and are in need of legal assistance. In exchange, the lawyer pays the police member some of the fee he gets from the client.

		Lawyer: How serious de	o you consi be?	ider behaviour to	Total	
		Not at all serious/slightly serious Unsure Serious/very serious				
Alexandra		35.8%	10.1%	54.1%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	15.1%	10.5%	74.4%	100.0%	
Sandton		25.8%	19.4%	54.8%	100.0%	
Total		23.8%	12.6%	63.6%	100.0%	

		Lawyer: How so consider b	erious do m ehaviour to	Total		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total	
	Alexandra	37.6%	15.6%	46.8%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	27.9%	20.3%	51.7%	100.0%	
	Sandton	39.1%	16.3%	44.6%	100.0%	
Total		33.5%	18.0%	48.5%	100.0%	

		Lawyer: Co	Lawyer: Considered a violation of official SAPS regulations?			
		Def no/no	Yes/definitely yes	Total		
Alexandra	Alexandra	34.6%	9.3%	56.1%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	10.5%	12.8%	76.7%	100.0%	
	Sandton	25.6%	14.4%	60.0%	100.0%	
Total		21.1%	12.2%	66.7%	100.0%	

			Lawyer	: What dis	scipline shoul	d be applied	d?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	24.3	21.6%	26.1%	14.4%	5.4%	8.1%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	5.7%	20.0%	37.1%	19.4%	5.7%	12.0%	100.0
	Sandton	18.3	25.8%	25.8%	8.6%	7.5%	14.0%	100.0
Total		14.2	21.9%	31.1%	15.3%	6.1%	11.3%	100.0

Lawyer: What discipline would be applied?						
None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total

Station	Alexandra	22.5 %	22.5%	25.2%	16.2%	5.4%	8.1%	100.0
	Hillbrow	12.1	16.8%	35.3%	16.2%	5.8%	13.9%	100.0
	Sandton	17.4 %	22.8%	25.0%	13.0%	7.6%	14.1%	100.0
Total		16.5	19.9%	29.8%	15.4%	6.1%	12.2%	100.0

		Lawyer: W	Total		
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	Total
	Alexandra	33.6%	15.5%	50.9%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	28.4%	13.6%	58.0%	100.0%
	Sandton	33.3%	20.4%	46.2%	100.0%
Total		31.1%	15.8%	53.0%	100.0%

		Lawyer: Wou	Total			
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	Total	
	Alexandra	39.6%	19.8%	40.6%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	43.8%	19.9%	36.4%	100.0%	
	Sandton	43.0%	18.3%	38.75	100.0%	
Total		42.4%	19.5%	38.1%	100.0%	

Case 7: A commander needs R500 to pay off a loan. A junior member offers to give him the money in exchange for extra rest days, which the commander accepts.

		Commander le you consider			Total
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	10(a)
	Alexandra	18.9%	8.1%	73.0%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	6.9%	9.1%	84.0%	100.0%
Sandton		14.1%	10.9%	75.0%	100.0%

Total	12.2%	9.3%	78.6%	100.0%

		Commander loar Police conside	Tatal		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious  Unsure Serious/ very serious		Total	
	Alexandra	19.3%	15.6%	65.1%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	16.6%	12.6%	70.9%	100.0%
	Sandton	20.0%	18.9%	61.1%	100.0%
Total		18.2%	15.0%	66.8%	100.0%

				n: Considered a 'S regulations?	Total		
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes			
	Alexandra	14.6%	9.7%	75.7%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	4.7%	9.4%	85.9%	100.0%		
	Sandton	13.3%	10.0%	76.7%	100.0%		
Total	Total		9.6%	80.7%	100.0%		

		Co	ommander	loan: Wha	at discipline s	should be ap	plied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	10.3	24.3%	28.0%	11.2%	13.1%	13.1%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	1.7%	14.4%	30.5%	19.0%	21.3%	13.2%	100.0
	Sandton	9.9%	17.6%	30.8%	16.5%	11.0%	14.3%	100.0
Total		6.2%	18.0%	29.8%	16.1%	16.4%	13.4%	100.0

п		
ı	Commander loan: What discipline would be applied?	Total

		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	
	Alexandra	11.0	21.1%	29.4%	14.7%	11.0%	12.8%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	4.7%	14.0%	31.4%	15.1%	20.9%	14.0%	100.0
	Sandton	7.7%	19.8%	30.8%	18.7%	8.8%	14.3%	100.0
Total		7.3%	17.5%	30.6%	15.9%	15.1%	13.7%	100.0

		Commander loan: Would you report police member?			Total		
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	}		
	Alexandra	20.9%	12.7%	66.4%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	15.8%	14.6%	69.6%	100.0%		
	Sandton	25.6%	14.4%	60.0%	100.0%		
Total		19.7%	14.0%	66.3%	100.0%		

		Commander	Total		
		Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes			
	Alexandra	29.1%	15.5%	55.5%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	30.1%	18.8%	51.1%	100.0%
	Sandton	31.1%	14.4%	54.4%	100.0%
Total		30.1%	16.8%	53.2%	100.0%

Case 8: An on-duty police member sees another vehicle that has driven off the road and had a minor accident. The driver is unhurt, but is very drunk. It transpires that the driver is an off-duty police member. Instead of reporting the incident he transports the driver to his home.

Drunk Police driver: How serious do	Total
you consider behaviour to be?	

		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	
	Alexandra	25.7%	9.2%	65.1%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	17.7%	13.1%	69.1%	100.0%
	Sandton	27.0%	20.2%	52.8%	100.0%
Total		22.3%	13.7%	64.1%	100.0%

		Drunk Police drive Police conside	Takal		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total
	Alexandra	30.0%	14.5%	55.5%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	33.5%	16.5%	50.0%	100.0%
	Sandton	40.4%	27.0%	32.6%	100.0%
Total		34.1%	18.4%	47.5%	100.0%

				er: Considered a 'S regulations?	Total
	Def no/no Unsure			Yes/definitely yes	
	Alexandra	19.1%	15.5%	65.5%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	13.6%	13.1%	73.3%	100.0%
	Sandton	25.8%	13.5%	60.7%	100.0%
Total		18.1%	13.9%	68.0%	100.0%

		Dru	unk Police	driver: W	hat discipline	should be	applied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
Station	Alexandra	14.5	29.1%	32.7%	8.2%	6.4%	9.1%	100.0
	Hillbrow	10.3	19.4%	44.0%	13.7%	6.9%	5.7%	100.0
	Sandton	14.4	24.0%	39.2%	12.0%	5.6%	6.7%	100.0

	%						%
Total	12.5 %	24.0%	39.2%	12.0%	5.6%	6.7%	100.0

		Dr	unk Police	driver: W	hat disciplin	e would be a	applied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	15.3	20.7%	37.8%	12.6%	5.4%	8.1%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	9.8%	19.7%	42.8%	15.0%	7.5%	5.2%	100.0
	Sandton	14.3	26.4%	30.8%	16.5%	5.5%	6.6%	100.0
Total		12.5	21.6%	38.4%	14.7%	6.4%	6.4%	100.0

		Drunk Poli	ce driver: Wo memb	ould you report police er?	Total		
		Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes					
	Alexandra	29.4%	13.8%	56.9%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	27.2%	20.8%	52.0%	100.0%		
	Sandton	37.1	21.3%	41.6%	100.0%		
Total		30.2%	18.9%	50.9%	100.0%		

		Drunk Police	Total				
		Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes					
	Alexandra	32.7%	21.8%	45.5%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	36.8%	26.4%	36.8%	100.0%		
	Sandton	46.7%	22.2%	31.1%	100.0%		
Total		38.0%	24.1%	38.0%	100.0%		

Case 9: A police member accepts free drinks from a bar owner in exchange for turning a blind eye to the fact that the bar is operating after hours.

		After hours b	Total		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total
	Alexandra	20.%	12.6%	66.7%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	7.5%	9.2%	83.3%	100.0%
	Sandton	25.6%	7.8%	66.7%	100.0%
Total		15.7%	9.9%	74.4%	100.0%

		After hours bar: Police conside	Total		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Unsure	Serious/ very serious	Total
	Alexandra	25.5%	16.4%	58.2%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	21.1%	15.4%	63.4%	100.0%
	Sandton	31.1%	18.9%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		24.8%	16.5%	58.7%	100.0%

		After hours	Total		
		Def no/no			
	Alexandra	17.6%	10.2%	72.2%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	5.7%	8.0%	86.3%	100.0%
	Sandton	23.3%	12.2%	64.4%	100.0%
Total		13.4%	9.7%	76.9%	100.0%

		After hours bar: What discipline should be applied?						
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
Station	Alexandra	10.9	26.4%	37.3%	12.7%	6.4%	6.4%	100.0

	Hillbrow	4.6%	16.7%	40.2%	17.2%	8.0%	13.2%	100.0
	Sandton	9.9%	29.7%	34.1%	13.2%	6.6%	6.6%	100.0
Total		7.7%	22.7%	37.9%	14.9%	7.2%	9.6%	100.0

		A	After hours	bar: Wha	ıt discipline v	vould be ap	plied?	
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	13.1	36.4%	30.8%	11.2%	2.8%	5.6%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	6.4%	19.9%	36.8%	15.8%	8.8%	12.3%	100.0
	Sandton	10.1	33.7%	31.5%	10.1%	3.4%	11.2%	100.0
Total		9.3%	28.1%	33.8%	13.1%	5.7%	10.1%	100.0

		After hou	Total				
		Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes					
	Alexandra	27.6%	16.2%	56.2%	100.0%		
Station	Hillbrow	17.8%	18.3%	63.9%	100.0%		
	Sandton	31.1%	25.6%	43.3%	100.0%		
Total		23.9%	19.5%	56.6%	100.0%		

		After hours	Total		
		Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes			
	Alexandra	34.7%	20.8%	44.6%	100.0%
Station Hillbrow	Hillbrow	33.7%	26.0%	40.2%	100.0%
Sandton		39.6%	25.3%	35.2%	100.0%

Total	35.5%	24.4%	40.2%	100.0%	
					4

Case 10: Two police members on patrol surprise a man who is attempting to break into a motor vehicle. The man starts running away. The police members chase him on foot for two blocks before they catch him by tackling him and wrestling him to the ground. After he is under control both officers punch him a couple of times in the stomach as punishment for running away and resisting arrest.

		Violence for resist do you consid	Total		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	iotai		
	Alexandra	28.3%	13.2%	58.5%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	20.1%	15.5%	64.4%	100.0%
Sandton		28.6%	18.7%	52.7%	100.0%
Total	<b>Cotal</b> 24.5% 15.6% 59.8%		100.0%		

		Violence for resist do most Police co	Total		
				Serious/ very serious	lotai
Alexandra	36.8%	13.2%	50.0%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	36.8%	21.8%	41.4%	100.0%
Sandton		37.4%	23.1%	39.6%	100.0%
Total	36.9% 19.7% 43.4%		100.0%		

		Violence a viol	Total		
		Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes			
	Alexandra	30.5%	10.5%	59.0%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	12.1%	16.2%	71.7%	100.0%
Sandton		23.9%	18.2%	58.0%	100.0%
Total		20.2%	15.0%	64.8%	100.0%

		Violence for resisting arrest: What discipline should be applied?						
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	22.4	31.8%	30.8%	6.5%	2.8%	5.6%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	14.2	20.5%	41.5%	13.6%	5.7%	4.5%	100.0
	Sandton	14.4	36.7%	23.3%	12.2%	6.7%	6.7%	100.0
Total		16.6	27.6%	34.0%	11.3%	5.1%	5.4%	100.0

					resisting arre would be ap			
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	22.9	31.2%	31.2%	7.3%	2.8%	4.6%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	14.6	21.1%	40.4%	15.2%	2.3%	6.4%	100.0
	Sandton	14.3	33.0%	25.3%	13.2%	7.7%	6.6%	100.0
Total		17.0	27.0%	34.0%	12.4%	3.8%	5.9%	100.0

			Violence for resisting arrest: Would you report police member?			
		Def no/no	Def no/no Unsure Yes/definitely yes			
	Alexandra	41.8%	15.5%	42.7%	100.0%	
Station	Hillbrow	32.8%	17.8%	49.4%	100.0%	
Sandton		40.4%	23.6%	36.0%	100.0%	
Total	tal 37.3% 18.5% 44.2%		100.0%			

		Violenc Police	Total		
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	
Alexandra		46.3%	21.3%	32.4%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	51.1%	20.1%	28.7%	100.0%
Sandton		48.3%	23.6%	28.1%	100.0%
Total		49.1%	21.3%	29.6%	100.0%

Case 11: A police member finds a wallet in a parking lot. It contains an amount of money equal to a full days pay for the member. He reports the wallet as lost property but he keeps the money for himself.

		Lost wallet: How beha	v serious do y aviour to be?	ou consider	Total
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	Total		
Alex	Alexandra	31.5%	8.3%	60.2%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	17.3%	12.1%	70.%%	100.0%
Sandton		27.0%	12.4%	60.7%	100.0%
Total	23.8% 11.1% 65.1%		100.0%		

		Lost wallet: H Police conside	Total		
		Not at all serious/ slightly serious	iotai		
Alexandra		34.6%	17.8%	47.7%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	31.0%	20.1%	48.9%	100.0%
Sandton		38.2%	16.9%	44.9%	100.0%
Total		33.8% 18.6% 47.6%		100.0%	

		Lost walle	Total		
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	
Station	Alexandra	30.3%	6.4%	63.3%	100.0%

Hillbrow	16.2%	14.5%	69.4%	100.0%
Sandton	28.6%	8.8%	62.6%	100.0%
Total	23.3%	10.7%	66.0%	100.0%

Lost wallet: What discipline should be applied?									
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total	
	Alexandra	16.5	29.4%	31.2%	11.0%	4.6%	7.3%	100.0	
Station	Hillbrow	15.7	19.8%	32.0%	15.7%	8.7%	8.1%	100.0	
	Sandton	6.7%	25.8%	30.3%	19.1%	3.4%	14.6%	100.0	
Total		13.8	24.1%	31.4%	15.1%	6.2%	9.5%	100.0	

	Lost wallet: What discipline would be applied?							
		None	Verbal Warning	Written warning	Period of suspension w/o pay	Demotion	Dismissal	Total
	Alexandra	17.8 %	25.2%	33.6%	11.2%	2.8%	9.3%	100.0
Station	Hillbrow	15.5	16.1%	35.7%	16.1%	8.3%	8.3%	100.0
	Sandton	8.9%	26.7%	30.0%	13.3%	6.7%	14.4%	100.0
Total		14.5 %	21.4%	33.7%	14.0%	6.3%	10.1%	100.0

		Lost wallet:	Total		
		Def no/no	Unsure	Yes/definitely yes	Total
Station	Alexandra	34.9%	14.7%	50.5%	100.0%
	Hillbrow	30.8%	16.3%	52.9%	100.0%

Sandton	36.4%	19.3%	44.3%	100.0%
Total	33.3%	16.5%	50.1%	100.0%

		Lost wall	Total		
		Def no/no			
	Alexandra	40.6%	23.6%	35.8%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	40.9%	22.2%	36.8%	100.0%
Sandton		40.9%	21.6%	37.5%	100.0%
Total		40.8%	22.5%	36.7%	100.0%

		Do you think i	ered survey	Total	
		Missing			
	Alexandra	4.3%	56.9%	38.8%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	2.8%	51.7%	45.5%	100.0%
	Sandton	2.0%	54.5%	43.4%	100.0%
Total		3.1%	54.0%	43.0%	100.0%

		Did you an	onestly?	Total	
		Missing Yes No		No	Total
	Alexandra	2.6%	77.6%	19.8%	100.0%
Station	Hillbrow	2.8%	91.5%	5.7%	100.0%
	Sandton	2.0%	75.0%	23.0%	100.0%
Total		2.6%	83.2%	14.3%	100.0%

## Note:

<sup>1</sup>The survey was first designed and piloted in 30 police agencies in the USA during 1999. To date the survey has been successfully conducted amongst 15 000 police officers in Austria, Croatia, Finland, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, and the U.S. Information on the survey was obtained from the U.S. Department of Justice May 2000 edition of *The National Institute of Justice – Research in Brief*, entitled "The Measurement of Police Integrity" and written by Klockers, CB., Ivokovich, SK., Harver, WE., and Haberfiedl, MR.