

Appendix “G”

NATIONAL STATISTICAL REPORT ON THE SURVEY ON CORRUPTION

I. Perceptions on the causes of corruption

Table 1. Perceived major cause of corruption

Perceived Major Causes of Corruption	DOJ Prosecutors November 2002-May 2003 (n=448)
Low pay	70.98 %
Corrupt leaders	69.64 %
Lack of moral values	67.86 %
“Padrino” / Patronage system	43.97 %
Poor selection and recruitment of government officials and employees	43.75 %
“Pakikisama” / camaraderie	36.38 %
Lack of control mechanisms	31.47 %
Nepotism	27.46 %

** Note that more than one response was possible for this question. Therefore the total number of reasons given may add to more than 100%.*

Table 2. Perceived reasons for corruption’s continued prevalence

Reasons why corruption still persists today	DOJ Prosecutors November 2002-May 2003 (n=448)
Leaders’ lack of political will	69.64 %
Economic conditions	55.80 %
Public apathy / Indifference	50.89 %

Systemic nature of corruption	48.44 %
Lack of coordinated efforts	30.36 %
Lack of sufficient manpower to combat corruption	25.45 %
Ineffective anti-graft agencies	25.00 %
Ineffective laws	14.06 %
Inadequate laws	5.13 %

II. Evaluation of anti-graft agencies

Table 3. Evaluation of anti-graft bodies (in terms of substantially contributing to the reduction if not eradication of corruption in the country)

Anti-graft Agency	Overall Rating*
Office of the Ombudsman	7.22
Department of Justice	6.94
Supreme Court	6.44
Sandiganbayan	6.41
Lower courts (RTCs, CTCs, and MTCs)	5.76
Civil Service Commission	5.12
Commission on Audit	4.85
Presidential Anti-Graft Commission	4.36

**10 as the highest rating while 0 being the lowest*

Table 4. Evaluation of Anti-graft agencies (Perceived Efficiency of anti-graft efforts)

Agency	Efficiency Rating	Interpretation
--------	-------------------	----------------

Office of the Ombudsman	1.93	Efficient
Department of Justice	2.02	Efficient
Supreme Court	2.04	Efficient
Sandiganbayan	2.14	Efficient
Lower courts (RTCs, CTCs, and MTCs)	2.33	Somewhat efficient
Civil Service Commission	2.54	Inefficient
Commission on Audit	2.61	Inefficient
Presidential Anti-Graft Commission	2.80	Inefficient

Table 5. Evaluation of Anti-graft agencies (Perceived Effectiveness of anti-graft efforts)

Agency	Efficiency Rating	Interpretation
Office of the Ombudsman	1.89	Effective
Department of Justice	2.02	Effective
Supreme Court	2.04	Effective
Sandiganbayan	2.13	Effective
Lower courts (RTCs, CTCs, and MTCs)	2.35	Somewhat effective
Civil Service Commission	2.48	Somewhat effective
Commission on Audit	2.61	Ineffective
Presidential Anti-Graft Commission	2.66	Ineffective

III. Evaluation of Anti-Graft Laws

Table 6. Familiarity with anti-graft laws

Anti-Graft Law	Familiarity Rating	Interpretation
Presidential Decree No. 46	1.97	Familiar
Presidential Decree No. 749	2.05	Familiar
Republic Act No. 1379	2.09	Familiar
Republic Act No. 3019	1.63	2 nd Most Familiar
Republic Act No. 6713	1.86	Familiar
Republic Act No. 6770	1.89	Familiar
Republic Act No. 6981	1.78	3 rd Most Familiar
Republic Act No. 7080	2.12	Familiar
Republic Act No. 7975	2.21	Somewhat Familiar
Republic Act No. 9160	2.35	Somewhat/Least Familiar
Title VII, Revised Penal Code	1.53	Most Familiar

Table 7. Adequacy of existing anti-graft laws

Anti-Graft Law	Adequacy Rating	Interpretation
Presidential Decree No. 46	2.22	Somewhat adequate
Presidential Decree No. 749	2.24	Somewhat adequate
Republic Act No. 1379	2.24	Somewhat adequate
Republic Act No. 3019	1.90	2 nd Most Adequate
Republic Act No. 6713	2.03	Adequate
Republic Act No. 6770	1.91	3 rd Most Adequate
Republic Act No. 6981	2.05	Adequate

Republic Act No. 7080	2.15	Adequate
Republic Act No. 7975	2.03	Adequate
Republic Act No. 9160	2.25	Somewhat/Least adequate
Title VII, Revised Penal Code	1.84	Most Adequate

Table 8. Enforcement of anti-graft laws

Anti-Graft Law	Enforcement Rating	Interpretation
Presidential Decree No. 46	2.66	Least effectively enforced
Presidential Decree No. 749	2.58	Somewhat not effectively enforced
Republic Act No. 1379	2.65	Somewhat not effectively enforced
Republic Act No. 3019	2.22	Somewhat effectively enforced
Republic Act No. 6713	2.32	Somewhat effectively enforced
Republic Act No. 6770	2.14	2 nd Most Effectively enforced
Republic Act No. 6981	2.28	Somewhat effectively enforced
Republic Act No. 7080	2.43	Somewhat effectively enforced
Republic Act No. 7975	2.19	Effectively enforced
Republic Act No. 9160	2.54	Somewhat not effectively enforced
Title VII, Revised Penal Code	2.13	Most Effectively enforced

IV. Recommendations

Table Recommended measures to curb corruption

9.	Recommended Measures	DOJ Prosecutors November 2002-May 2003 (n=448)
	Increase in salaries of government employees	71.88 %
	Strict implementation of the existing laws	69.20 %
	More transparency in government transactions	67.63 %
	Strict monitoring of agencies	53.57 %
	Streamline government operations	43.08 %
	Improvement of recruitment system	42.86 %
	Creation / designation of special courts to hear and decide graft cases involving low ranking officials	30.80 %
	Imposition of heavier penalties on violations of anti-graft laws	25.89 %
	Enactment of new anti-graft laws	8.04 %

Table 10. Recommended measures to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Office of the Ombudsman (OMB) in fighting graft

Measures to enhance OMB Effectiveness and Efficiency in fighting graft and corruption	DOJ Prosecutors November 2002-May 2003 (n=448)
Strengthen investigation and prosecution efforts	71.65 %
More information dissemination	52.68 %
More coordination with the private sector	46.88 %
Increase visibility / presence	43.30 %

** Note that more than one response was possible for this question. Therefore the total number of reasons given may add to more than 100%.*