

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (www.drCarolAdams.net). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Article citation: [Carol A. Adams, Stephen Muir, Zahirul Hoque. \(2014\) "Measurement of sustainability performance in the public sector", Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal, Vol. 5 Iss: 1, pp.46 – 67 DOI \(Permanent URL\): \[10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2012-0018\]\(https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2012-0018\)](#)

Government	Questionnaires sent	Responses received	Response rate (%)
Australian Federal	13	7	53.8
Australian Capital Territory	9	4	44.4
Northern Territory	7	2	28.6
New South Wales	16	6	37.5
Queensland	18	11	61.1
South Australia	5	2	40.0
Tasmania	9	5	55.6
Victoria	10	3	30.0
Western Australia ^a	22	11	50.0
Total	109	51	46.8

Notes: ^aRepresentation in the sample for WA may exceed population representation, however the rank mean order in the results is not substantially changed by excluding WA, there are slight changes in Table III between the order of second and third highest responses and in Table IV between the order of the first to third highest responses

Table I.
Profile of the participating departments

Table II. Profile of the respondents (n=51)

	Frequency	(%)
<i>Length of service within government departments</i>		
<i>Years</i>		
Below 2	11	21.6
2-5	13	25.5
5-8	5	9.8
8-11	10	19.6
11 or over	12	23.5
<i>Age</i>		
<i>Age group</i>		
20-29	2	3.9
30-39	13	25.5
40-49	22	43.1
50 or over	14	27.5
<i>Education level</i>		
<i>Qualification</i>		
Diploma	17	33.3
Bachelor/postgraduate	28	54.9
Other	6	11.8
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	31	60.8
Female	20	39.2

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (www.drCarolAdams.net). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Article citation: Carol A. Adams, Stephen Muir, Zahirul Hoque, (2014) "Measurement of sustainability performance in the public sector", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5 Iss: 1, pp.46 – 67 DOI (Permanent URL): [10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2012-0018](https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2012-0018)

Table III. Use of the performance measures in operational activities

Activity	Little or no extent	Some extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent	Mean rank	Valid <i>n</i>
Measure program performance	1 (2.2%)	9 (20.0%)	11 (24.4%)	13 (28.9%)	11 (24.4%)	3.53	45
Satisfy legislative requirements (law, ordinance, policy, etc.)	6 (13.0%)	6 (13.0%)	7 (15.2%)	15 (32.6%)	12 (26.1%)	3.46	46
Manage an activity or program	2 (4.5%)	9 (20.5%)	10 (22.7%)	17 (38.6%)	6 (13.6%)	3.36	44
Budget formulation	3 (6.7%)	13 (28.9%)	11 (24.4%)	11 (24.4%)	7 (15.6%)	3.13	45
Taking actions based on the results	4 (9.1%)	13 (29.5%)	8 (18.2%)	14 (31.8%)	5 (11.4%)	3.06	44
Budget execution	5 (11.6%)	10 (23.3%)	11 (25.6%)	12 (27.9%)	5 (11.6%)	3.05	43
Strategic planning	6 (13.6%)	11 (25.0%)	9 (20.5%)	12 (27.3%)	6 (13.6%)	3.02	44
Satisfy community expectations	5 (11.1%)	14 (31.1%)	14 (31.1%)	9 (20.0%)	3 (6.7%)	2.80	45
Social responsibility goals	10 (22.7%)	12 (27.3%)	10 (22.7%)	7 (15.9%)	5 (11.4%)	2.66	44
Goals in relation to local community impacts	12 (27.3%)	12 (27.3%)	11 (25.0%)	6 (13.6%)	3 (6.8%)	2.45	44
Environmental goals	19 (45.2%)	11 (26.2%)	8 (19.0%)	2 (4.8%)	2 (4.8%)	1.97	42
Satisfy professional associations	25 (58.1%)	8 (18.6%)	6 (14.0%)	3 (7.0%)	1 (2.3%)	1.77	43
Punish or reward staff	30 (71.4%)	6 (14.3%)	4 (9.5%)	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	1.50	42
Follow others	30 (71.4%)	7 (16.7%)	5 (11.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.40	42

Table IV. Use of social and environmental related measures

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (www.drCarolAdams.net). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Article citation: [Carol A. Adams, Stephen Muir, Zahirul Hoque, \(2014\) "Measurement of sustainability performance in the public sector", Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal, Vol. 5 Iss: 1, pp.46 – 67](#) DOI (Permanent URL): [10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2012-0018](https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2012-0018)

Measures	Little or no extent	Some extent	Moderate extent	Large extent	Very great extent	Mean rank	Valid <i>n</i>
Employee diversity	4 (9.1%)	11 (25.0%)	10 (22.7%)	13 (29.5%)	6 (13.6%)	3.14	44
Economic impacts (excluding financial measures used in financial accounts)	3 (7.3%)	10 (24.4%)	11 (26.8%)	13 (31.7%)	4 (9.8%)	3.12	41
Occupational health and safety	5 (11.6%)	8 (18.6%)	13 (30.2%)	15 (34.9%)	2 (4.7%)	3.02	43
Stakeholder involvement in community, social and environmental issues	5 (11.9%)	12 (28.6%)	12 (28.6%)	8 (19.0%)	5 (11.9%)	2.90	42
Community relations	6 (14.3%)	14 (33.3%)	11 (26.2%)	10 (23.8%)	1 (2.4%)	2.67	42
Employee satisfaction	10 (22.7%)	11 (25.0%)	9 (20.5%)	14 (31.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2.61	44
Other community, ethical, social and environmental issues	7 (16.3%)	17 (39.5%)	11 (25.6%)	4 (9.3%)	4 (9.3%)	2.56	43
Natural resource conservation and emission levels	14 (34.1%)	10 (24.4%)	5 (12.2%)	7 (17.1%)	5 (12.2%)	2.49	41

Table V. BSC Performance measures in practice

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (www.drcaroladams.net). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Article citation: Carol A. Adams, Stephen Muir, Zahirul Hoque, (2014) "Measurement of sustainability performance in the public sector", *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 5 Iss: 1, pp.46 – 67 DOI (Permanent URL): [10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2012-0018](https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2012-0018)

Performance measure	Little or no extent	Some extent	Moderate extent	Large extent	Very great extent	Mean rank	Valid <i>n</i>
Outputs (measures of the quantity of services provided)	1 (2.2%)	5 (10.9%)	11 (23.9%)	25 (54.3%)	4 (8.7%)	3.57	46
Cost/processes efficiency and quality measures Activity/process (measures of activities/processes)	6 (13.0%)	5 (10.9%)	13 (28.3%)	15 (32.6%)	7 (15.2%)	3.26	46
Customer/community satisfaction measures	6 (13.3%)	4 (8.9%)	13 (28.9%)	18 (40.0%)	4 (8.9%)	3.22	45
Outcomes (measures of the result that occur, at least in part, because of service provided)	7 (15.6%)	7 (15.6%)	8 (17.8%)	18 (40.0%)	5 (11.1%)	3.16	45
Inputs (activities planned)	4 (8.7%)	12 (26.1%)	12 (26.1%)	13 (28.3%)	5 (10.9%)	3.07	46
Benchmarks	10 (22.2%)	7 (15.6%)	9 (20.0%)	16 (35.6%)	3 (6.7%)	2.89	45
Learning and growth measures (employee satisfaction, employee turnover, employee training and education, employee absenteeism)	14 (31.1%)	11 (24.4%)	13 (28.9%)	6 (13.3%)	1 (2.2%)	2.31	45
	14 (30.4%)	16 (34.8%)	9 (19.6%)	7 (15.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2.20	46