



2016 National Household Survey on Experience with Corruption in the Philippines

Office of the Ombudsman

August 2016

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Rationale

The Philippine Statistical Authority accommodated the Office of the Ombudsman in running a survey in 2010 and 2013 to measure the extent or pervasiveness of petty or bureaucratic corruption in the Philippines. The survey titled *National Household Survey on Experience with Corruption in the Philippines* was a rider to the 2010 and 2013 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey conducted in July of both years.

Unlike most domestic and international surveys on corruption conducted in the Philippines, the Ombudsman surveys aimed to measure the extent or pervasiveness of corruption not in terms of the perception of the respondents but in terms of their actual experience. This is to minimize any bias or preconceived notion of the respondents against certain government agencies or officials brought about by media reports or stories handed down by other people who experienced corruption themselves. The Ombudsman surveys also differed from most other surveys in the choice of the respondents. Whereas other surveys utilized respondents coming from a particular class or stratum of society (e.g., businessmen, expats), the Ombudsman survey employed members of the sample families as respondents.

A third survey was conducted in 2016 based on the recommendations of the 2010 and 2013 surveys. Whereas the 2010 and 2013 surveys generated data on petty or bureaucratic corruption in the Philippines at the start and in the middle of the term of the Aquino government, the 2016 survey generated data at the end. Thus, the results of this survey may be used to assess the effectiveness of the national anti-corruption campaign of the government over a 6-year period. Inasmuch as the survey was conducted at the beginning of the term of President Duterte, it also generated baseline data on corruption in the Philippines at the start of his term.

1.2 Objectives

As in previous surveys, the 2016 survey seeks to measure the extent or pervasiveness of petty or bureaucratic corruption, in particular, bribery or facilitation payment, in the public sector in the Philippines not in terms of how the respondents perceive corruption but in terms of their actual experience. It also seeks to identify the public agencies/services that are vulnerable to corruption and determine whether the type of corruption in those services is supply-driven or demand-driven, i.e., whether the bribe or grease money was volunteered by the giver or asked by the public official. Moreover, it aims to determine if the person from whom the bribe or grease money was demanded reported the incidence to the proper authorities. Furthermore, it attempts to discover the reasons for non-reporting of corruption to the proper authorities in order to identify strategies to encourage reporting or whistleblowing.

Finally, for the first time, this survey will attempt to determine how much was paid as bribe or facilitation payment during the period of the survey.

More specifically, the survey endeavors to answer the following questions:

1. What percentage of Filipino families have officially transacted with a public official or availed of a government service?
2. What percentage of Filipino families who had had official transaction with a public official or availed of a government service have given bribe or grease money?
3. What percentage of Filipino families who had given bribe or grease money have been asked by a public official to give?
4. How much bribe or grease money was paid by Filipino families to facilitate their official transaction or avoid problems? Specifically, how much bribe or grease money was paid when asked by a public official and how much was paid voluntarily without being asked?
5. What percentage of Filipino families who had been asked to give bribe or grease money have reported the incidence to the proper authorities?
6. What are the main reasons why Filipino families did not report the solicitation of bribe or grease money by public officials to the proper authorities?
7. In what particular government agencies/services have Filipino families given bribe or grease money for an official transaction?
8. In what particular government agencies/services have Filipino families been asked to give bribe or grease money for an official transaction?

1.3 Scope and Delimitations

The survey aims to gather information on incidence of corruption at the family level. A family is defined as an aggregate of persons bound by ties or kinship, which live under the same roofs and eat together or share in common the family food. For the purpose of this survey, a sample household can be classified as a nuclear family, extended family or a single person family. For a household comprising of members who are not related with each other by blood, marriage or adoption, only the head of the household is considered. This is a single family.

A family is said to have experienced corruption if any member has given or was asked to give bribe or grease money. Ideally, it is best to administer the questionnaire to the member of the family who actually experienced corruption. However, it cannot be assured that at the time of the survey, that family member would be present to answer the questionnaire. Hence, the survey resorted to the alternative of interviewing a knowledgeable adult member of the sample family who can give reliable information and who has the best knowledge on the family's experience on corruption.

The term “corruption” in the survey pertains to a particular typology, i.e., bribery (*lagay, suhol, tong, kotong, tongpats, komisyon*) and facilitation payment (grease money, *padulas, tip, pakimkim, langis*). Bribery both direct and indirect is defined under the Revised Penal Code as follows:

Art. 210. *Direct bribery.* — Any public officer who shall agree to perform an act constituting a crime, in connection with the performance of his official duties, in consideration of any offer, promise, gift or present received by such officer, personally or through the mediation of another, shall suffer the penalty of $x \times xx$, if the same shall have been committed.

If the gift was accepted by the officer in consideration of the execution of an act which does not constitute a crime, and the officer executed said act, he shall suffer the same penalty $x \times x$.

If the object for which the gift was received or promised was to make the public officer refrain from doing something which it was his official duty to do, he shall suffer the penalties $x \times x$.

Art. 211. *Indirect bribery.* — The penalties $x \times x$ shall be imposed upon any public officer who shall accept gifts offered to him by reason of his office.

Art. 212. *Corruption of public officials.* — The same penalties imposed upon the officer corrupted, $x \times x$ shall be imposed upon any person who shall have made the offers or promises or given the gifts or presents as described in the preceding articles.

Bribery as understood in this survey uses the same definition above. Thus, for this survey, the term “bribe” refers to money, gift or anything of value given to a government official to avoid any problem in an official transaction. The term “facilitation payment or grease money,” on the other hand, refers to money, gift or anything of value given to a government official to facilitate an official transaction. It should be noted that the term “facilitation payment” is included under the term bribery as the same is understood under the law.

For comparability of the results of both surveys, the number of categories for the government agencies or services covered is consistently limited to four (4) clusters: registry and licensing, payment of taxes, duties, and other imposts, access to social services, and access to justice. Because the survey is a rider to another survey, the same limitations of the APIS in regard to the respondents also apply.

1.4 Survey Utility

The results of this survey will be compared with those of the 2010 and 2013 surveys. The comparison will allow the Office of the Ombudsman to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing national anti-corruption programs in terms of any improvement on baseline corruption incidences indicated by percentages of families with actual experience with corruption.

The results of the survey will also enable the Office of the Ombudsman to strategically focus its limited resources on particular aspects of anti-corruption work. Because the survey seeks to identify the type of government agencies or services that are more vulnerable to bribery or facilitation payment, the survey can help the Office of the Ombudsman select the agencies where more interventions, both reactive and preemptive, are necessary.

In the 2010 and 2013 surveys, the respondents were not asked how much they had paid as bribe or grease money due to limitation in the space allocated for the Ombudsman rider questions in the APIS questionnaire. The 2016 survey attempted for the first time to determine how much money was actually paid as bribe or facilitation payment. The results may be used to determine how much is lost to corruption and red tape in government.

Finally, because the survey revealed whether or not the families who have experienced corruption actually reported the incidence to authorities, the results of the survey can help the Office of the Ombudsman evaluate its trust rating as a venue for reporting corruption or the effectiveness of its advocacy campaigns to encourage the public to report acts of corruption. On the other hand, for those who did not report, the results of the survey will enable the Office of the Ombudsman to discover the reasons for lack of motivation. Data will inform policy making to encourage victims of corruption to report to the authorities.

2. METHODS

2.1 The 2016 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey

The National Household Survey on Experience with Corruption in the Philippines is a rider to the 2016 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey (APIS). The APIS is a nationwide sample survey designed to provide information on the different indicators related to poverty. It aims to provide inputs to the development of an integrated poverty indicator and monitoring system which would enhance timely, accurate and consistent production of poverty-related data that can be used at the national level. It also aims to supplement the identification of the poor families through the use of non-income indicators.

The 2016 APIS make use of the 2013 Master Sample. The 2013 Master Sample (2013 MS) is utilized by the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) for household-based surveys. The 2013 MS is designed to produce reliable quarterly estimates of selected indicators at the national and regional levels. The design can also provide reliable province level estimates after completing four quarterly rounds of about 45,000 samples for each round or a total of 180,000 sample housing unit.

In the 2013 MS, each sampling domain (i.e, province/HUC) is subdivided into numbers of exhaustive and non-overlapping area segments known as Primary Sampling Units (PSUs). Each PSU is formed to consist of about 100 to 400 households. A single PSU can be a barangay/Enumeration Area (EA) or a portion of a large barangay or two or more adjacent small barangays/EAs. For the whole country, about 81 thousand PSUs are formed from more than 42 thousand barangays.

From the ordered list of PSUs, all possible systematic samples of 6 PSUs were drawn to form a replicate for the most of the province domain or 75 out of 81 provinces. On the other hand, for the majority of highly urbanized cities, all possible systematic samples of 8 PSUs were drawn to form a replicate.

¹For the 2016 run, it covers around 11,000 sample households (one replicate of the quarterly sample of the MS) deemed sufficient to provide reliable estimates of the population at the national level subject to some sampling variations.

Since the survey entails a complex probability sampling design, the results are weighted. The weight is composed of the 3-stage probability of selections, weight adjustment factors due to

¹<http://www.psa.gov.ph/sites/default/files/APIS%202016%20Inside%20Pages.pdf>

non-response and non-coverage, and population post-stratification weights. The final weights are applied to each sample to conform to the July 2016 Projected Population.

2.2 Operational Concepts and Definitions

The following concepts used in the 2016 APIS are defined below:

Household – Aggregate of persons, generally but not necessarily bound by ties of kinship, who live together under the same roof and eat together or share in common the household food. Members comprise the head of the household, relatives living with him/her and other persons who share the community life for reasons of work or other consideration. A person who lives alone is also considered a separate household. (*Integrated Survey of Households Bulletin, Series 99, NSO*)

Family – Aggregate of persons bound by blood or ties of kinship through adoption, marriage, etc. which live under the same roofs and eat together or share in common the family food. For the purpose of this survey, a household can be classified as a nuclear family, extended family or a single-person family. For a household comprising of members who are not related with each other by blood, marriage or adoption, only the head of the household is considered. This case is a single-person family.

Family head – An adult member of the family who is responsible for the care and organization of the family or who is regarded as such by the members of the family.

Respondent – An adult knowledgeable member of the sample family who can provide accurate answers to all or most of the questions in the survey, preferably the head or the spouse.

2.3.Survey Questions

Six questions with sub-questions were included in the 2016 APIS questionnaire under Part I (Access to Government Services). The final questions were as follow:

II. From July 2015 up to present, did you or any member of your family see or visit any person working in a government-run agency, institution, or facility for any of the following reasons or purposes?

Payment of Taxes and Duties

A. Paying of cedula, income tax, real estate tax, capital gains tax, documentary stamp tax, customs duties and other similar taxes and duties

Access to Justice

- B. Filing of a complaint or seeking assistance from law enforcers like police, barangay, NBI, PDEA, etc.*
- C. Going to the fiscal's office or public attorney's office in connection with cases*
- D. Going to court in connection with cases*

Availing of Social Services

- E. Enrolling in public school/college/university, availing of government scholarships, and other educational services*
- F. Medical check-up, hospitalization, vaccination, getting free medicines or other health services from public hospitals/urban and rural health units*
- G. Applying or getting loans or benefits from SSS, PagIbig, GSIS, PhilHealth and other government institutions*
- H. Seeking assistance for employment or livelihood or getting subsidy/benefits for the poor from government institutions*

Securing Registry Documents, Permits and Other Licenses

- I. Getting civil registry documents like birth, death and marriage certificate and CENOMAR*
- J. Getting passports, authenticating documents at the DFA, and securing government issued IDs (e.g., postal ID, voter's ID, PRC card)*
- K. Getting land title and registration of documents relating to property*
- L. Getting permits (e.g., mayor's permit, building permit, sanitary permit, fire permit, occupancy permit), licenses (e.g., driver's license, firearms license) and clearances (e.g., NBI, police, barangay)*

I2. Did anybody working in that government-run agency, institution, or facility ask you or any member of your family to give money, gift, donation, favor, or anything of value for any of the following reasons or purposes?

Same enumeration as in I1.

I3. Did you or any member of your family give money, gift, donation, favor, or anything of value to that person in order to speed up the service (facilitate) or avoid problems in any of the following reasons or purposes?

Same enumeration as in I1.

I4. If YES in I3, how much is the worth of money, gift, donation, favor, or anything of value given to that person?

Same enumeration as in I1.

I5. When you or any member of your family was asked or obliged to give money, gift, donation, favor, or anything of value, did you or any member of your family report the incident to any authority?

I5. Why was it not reported to the proper authority? What else?

- A. Lack of time to report*
- B. Lack of money to spend to file a case*
- C. Don't know which government agency to report to*
- D. Fear of reprisal / afraid of consequences*
- E. Difficulty in proving the cases*
- F. Don't know the procedure*
- G. Don't trust any government agency*
- H. Nothing will happen anyway*
- I. Government does not reward those who report corruption*
- J. Not worth reporting / too small to bother*
- K. Others (Specify) _____*

Because the survey aims to elicit information about actual experience with corruption, the questions were so formulated as a sequence of skipping questions to ensure that only respondents who have actual experience will be asked. Question I1 was specifically intended to delimit the respondents to only those who have had official transactions with government for a specific purpose will be asked. Logically, only those who see or visit any person working in government for an official transaction can have experience with corruption. If the answer to I1 is Yes, the respondent will then be asked Question I2 to find out if he/she was asked to give bribe or grease money. Regardless of the answer, he proceeds to I3 to find out if he/she did pay the bribe or grease money. If the answer in I2 is Yes, he is then asked in I4 to find out how much was paid and in I5 if he reported the incident to any authority. If the answer in I5 is No, he/she is then asked to indicate the reason for non-reporting.

To ensure comparability of the results of this survey to those of the 2010 and 2013 surveys, the same questions were asked except that the sequence of the second and third questions was different in 2010. The change in the sequence is for the purpose of capturing the responses of family members who were solicited or demanded bribe or grease money but did not give. In the 2010 survey, respondents were only asked if they were solicited or demanded bribe or grease money if they previously said that they had given.

In 2016, the word “donation” was inserted among the money, gift, favor, or anything of value that may be given by the respondents. During the pre-test conducted for the 2016 survey,

the possibility of “donation” that may be asked of the respondent cropped up. In some instances, it is a clever way to ask gifts indirectly from people who transact business with a government agency because donations are not usually considered personal. Also, in 2016, the respondents were asked how much was paid as bribe or grease money. The question was non-existent in the 2010 and 2013 run.

The sequence of the four clusters of government services was different in 2010, 2013, and 2016. This is to ensure that the particular sequence in which these services appear in the questionnaire does not affect the responses.

The questionnaire also asked the respondents for experience with corruption within a timeframe of one year reckoned from July 2015 to the date of interview. The reckoning was one year because most permits are renewed every year, a number of taxes are paid annually, and some social services are availed of from year to year.

Instead of directly asking the respondent whether he/she gave bribe or grease money, he/she was asked instead whether he/she gave money, gift, donation, favor or anything of value to facilitate or avoid problems in an official transaction to elicit honest responses. Legally speaking, a bribe is anything of value given to avoid problems in an official transaction while grease money is anything of value given to speed up facilitate such transaction.

Because the APIS is a nationwide survey and not all of the respondents can be presumed to understand English, the questions were also translated in Filipino. The Tagalog translation served as a guide for the interviewers and included in the appendix portion of the APIS Interviewer’s Manual. This also served as guide for the interviewers in other regions in translating the questions in their dialects such as Ilocano, Cebuano, Hiligaynon, Bicolano and Waray, etc.

2.4 Conducting the APIS

Training. The PSA hired and trained field interviewers to conduct the face-to-face interviews of the APIS. Two (2) levels of training were employed in the survey to ensure uniform understanding of the concepts, definitions, and interviewing procedures. The first-level training is the Task Force Training. Participants during the Task Force training were regional statisticians and selected central office personnel who served as trainers during the second-level training at the regional-level. Staff from the Ombudsman Research and Special Studies Bureau served as resource persons during the Task Force Training. Participants during the second-level training included Provincial Statistics Officers (PSOs), provincial focal persons, hired interviewers, and District Statistical Officers (DSOs)/Statistical Coordination Officers (SCOs), who served as team supervisors. Resource persons from the Office of the

Ombudsman and its area offices acted as resource persons during the second-level training held on the last week of June in all 17 regions.

For each level of training, concepts, definitions, and topics on whom to interview, how to conduct an interview, how to ask questions, how to record the answers, and consistency checking of completed questionnaires were included. Mock interviews and field practice were also performed to familiarize the field interviewers in accomplishing the questionnaire completely and efficiently according to instructions.

Field Interview. The PSA has the primary responsibility for implementing the survey. Providing the overall direction of the survey is the Deputy National Statistician for the Sectoral Statistics Office and the Assistant National Statistician for the Social Sector Statistics Service. The division in charge is the Demographic and Health Statistics Division. In each region, the PSA Regional Director (RD) regulates the day to day operation in their respective region. Assisting the RD are the PSOs, in their respective provinces. They manage the efficient allocation of workload among the field interviewers and see to it that the interviewing procedure was adhered to accordingly.

To ensure quality in the data gathered, a close supervision was applied. A team supervisor (DSO or SCO) handles 2 to 3 field interviewers. The team supervisor oversees the field interviewers during the 21-day field operation in their respective areas of assignment. A daily output rate of 2-3 completed questionnaires was required from each interviewer.

During the supervision, a focal person (one in the region and one in the province) reviews the questionnaires each time he/she meets with the field interviewer. The details of these reviews depend on the quality of work and how well the field enumerator followed the procedures. The team supervisor may ask the field enumerator to return to sample household and verify from the respondent any error in the accomplished questionnaire that needs to be corrected.

The actual field interview was conducted during the entire month of July 2016. The accomplished questionnaires were sent to PSA provincial offices for further processing.

Data Processing. At the provincial office, another set of scrutiny was performed. Provincial processors check for completeness, consistency, and reasonableness of entries in the questionnaire. If there are inconsistencies, PSOs immediately inform the focal Person for field verification. The questionnaires were then sent to Regional Office for data encoding and machine processing. Further machine editing was done at the NSO Central Office.

2.5 Data Analysis

The data files of the 2016 APIS in CSPro was provided to the Office of the Ombudsman which uses STATA in the generation of the tables. The estimates from samples were generalized to the population represented using weights or raising factors that entered into the calculations to conform to the complex design of the survey. This explains why the figures presented in the analysis are numbers of families in the population from which the sample was derived.

Caution was exercised in interpreting the results to guarantee reliability since the estimates come from a sample survey. Normally, the standard error is compared with the actual estimate. In making the comparison, the standard error is divided by the estimate obtained and the quotient is converted to a percentage known as the Coefficient of Variation (CV) or Relative Standard Error. In Philippine Statistical System, 10% CV is usually acceptable. This standard was used in assessing the reliability of the estimates.

To vet the data obtained and the conclusions drawn, a round-table discussion was held with personnel from the Demographic and Health Statistics Division of the PSA.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Response Rate

The total number of sample households is around 11,000 but the number of eligible families is 10,642. The number of responding families is 10,332 with a response rate of 97.1%. This number represents 23,771,363 families nationwide.

3.2 Demographic Profile

Respondents. The respondent is defined as any knowledgeable adult member of the family who can provide accurate answers to all or most of the questions in the survey. Both sexes are represented. Usually, the respondent is the most responsible adult left at home who ordinarily is the wife. The ages of the respondents range from 15 to over 75.

The respondents are distributed nationwide. Those from the National Capital Region comprise about 13%; Northern Luzon, 21%, and Southern Luzon, 23%. Respondents from Visayas comprise about 19% while those from Mindanao, 23%.

Family Head Profile. The profile of the family head is different from that of the respondents. The respondent is not usually the family head in a sampled housing unit. In terms of sex, about 8 out of 10 family heads are male. Usually, the family head is the father of the family, hence, mostly male. The ages of the family heads also range from 15 to over 75. Almost half of them belong to the 35 to 54 age bracket. Three out of four are married or living together. Others are either widowed, single, or separated, in the order of decreasing percentage.

In terms of formal education, around 36% reached elementary while 44% reached high school. About 20% either had a few years in college or graduated with college or graduate degrees.

Almost 4 out of 5 household heads did work or had a job or business during the first semester of 2016. Around 1 out of 4 is self-employed; 1 out of 3 also worked for a private establishment.

3.3 Transacting with Government Agencies

Question I1 seeks to determine how many among the 23,771,363 families have had official transaction with a government agency for any of the listed reasons or purposes. The table below

shows the number and distribution of families for the four different clusters of government services and the more specific services included under each cluster.

*Table 1. Number and Percentage of Families
With Official Transaction in a Government Agency*

| | Government Service | No. of Families | Percentage |
|-----------|---|-----------------|------------|
| 1. | Payment of Taxes and Duties | 11,166,889 | 47.0% |
| 2. | Access to Justice | 1,557,937 | 6.6% |
| 2.1 | -Law enforcement agencies | 1,368,544 | 5.8% |
| 2.2 | -Prosecutor's & public attorney's office | 280,639 | 1.2% |
| 2.3 | -Court | 142,223 | 0.6% |
| 3. | Availing of Social Services | 11,586,961 | 48.7% |
| 3.1 | -Educational services | 7,688,145 | 32.3% |
| 3.2 | -Health care services | 6,662,843 | 28.0% |
| 3.3 | -Social security benefits | 1,789,523 | 7.5% |
| 3.4 | -Employment, livelihood and subsidies | 457,731 | 1.9% |
| 4. | Securing Registry Documents & Licenses | 6,803,530 | 28.6% |
| 4.1 | -Civil registry documents | 3,288,577 | 13.8% |
| 4.2 | -Identification documents | 1,992,538 | 8.4% |
| 4.3 | -Property registration | 362,716 | 1.5% |
| 4.4 | -Permits, clearances, and licenses | 3,934,572 | 16.6% |
| 5. | Any service | 16,685,805 | 70.2% |

The percentages appearing in the table refer to the percentage of the 23.77 million families with official transactions specified. Note that the sum of the percentages for specific services included under each cluster is not equal to the percentage for the cluster. The latter refers to the percentage of the 23.77 million families with at least one official transaction for a service under each cluster. This is to avoid multiple counting. It is possible that the same family has had official transaction in two or more services under a particular cluster. Using the same argument, the sum of the percentages for all four service clusters do not add up also to the percentage for 'any service'.

The table shows that of the different government services, more families accessed the services of government agencies which deliver basic social services such as education, health, social security, and employment/livelihood. The table also shows that far fewer families accessed the services of the law enforcement and justice system. The number of families which have had any of the kinds of transactions mentioned is more than 16 million or 70% of the represented population of households.

3.4 Soliciting Bribe or Grease Money

Question I2 aims to determine whether a member of the family was asked for bribe or grease money when he/she had an official transaction with a government official or in a government agency. By “asked” is meant that the money, gift, or benefit was requested, solicited, demanded, extorted or insinuated through clear words, or acts or gestures, or symbolisms. Table 2A and 2B show the number and percentage of families that were asked and not asked to give bribe or grease money by a government official with whom they transacted. The percentage is computed by dividing the number of families that were asked for bribe or grease money (or not asked) by the number of families that had had transaction with a government official for a particular purpose appearing in Table 1. Whereas in Table 1, the particular kinds of services under each cluster were specified, in Table 2A and 2B, there is no such disaggregation due to sampling variation².

Table 2A. Number of Families That Were Asked and Not Asked To Give Bribe or Grease Money

| Government Service | No. of Families That Were Asked | No. of Families That Were Not Asked |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 50,948 | 11,115,941 |
| Access to Justice | 11,531 | 1,546,406 |
| Availing of Social Services | 267,861 | 11,319,101 |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 131,785 | 6,671,746 |
| Any Service | 435,029 | 16,250,776 |

² The coefficient of variation for the disaggregated estimates exceeds 10% which is more than the acceptable value. The coefficient which is equal to the standard error divided by the estimate gives an estimate of the reliability of the data.

*Table 2B. Percentage of Families That Were Asked
and Not Asked To Give Bribe or Grease Money*

| Government Service | % of Families That Were Asked | % of Families That Were Not Asked |
|--|--|--|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 0.5% | 99.5% |
| Access to Justice | 0.7% | 99.3% |
| Availing of Social Services | 2.3% | 97.7% |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 1.9% | 98.1% |
| Any Service | 2.6% | 97.4% |

The tables reveal that less than 3% or 1 of 40 families with at least one official transaction have been solicited for bribe or grease money. Far more families with official transaction were not asked by a government official with whom they transacted. Of the different services, the rate of solicitation of bribe or grease money is least in payment of taxes and duties and highest in availing of social services. Incidentally, the people who usually avail of social services belong to the lower income stratum. Apparently, they are the ones more likely solicited for bribe or grease money compared to those in higher income stratum.

3.5 Giving Bribe or Grease Money

Question I3 seeks to determine whether a member of the family with official transaction gave or did not give money or anything of value to a government official to facilitate the transaction or avoid any problem. Table 3A and 3B show the number and percentage of families that gave and did not give money or anything of value when they accessed the services of a government agency. The percentage is computed by dividing the number of families that gave bribe or grease money (or did not give) by the number of families that had had transaction with a government official for a particular purpose appearing in Table 1.

Table 3A. Number of Families That Gave and Did Not Give Bribe or Grease Money

| Government Service | No. of Families That Gave | No. of Families That Did Not Give |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 24,043 | 11,142,846 |
| Access to Justice | 10,635 | 1,547,302 |
| Availing of Social Services | 270,097 | 11,316,864 |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 97,800 | 6,705,730 |
| Any Service | 364,248 | 16,321,557 |

Table 3B. Percentage of Families That Gave and Did Not Give Bribe or Grease Money

| Government Service | % of Families That Gave | % of Families That Did Not Give |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 0.2% | 99.8% |
| Access to Justice | 0.7% | 99.3% |
| Availing of Social Services | 2.3% | 97.7% |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 1.4% | 98.1% |
| Any Service | 2.2% | 97.8% |

The tables reveal that about 2% or 1 of 45 families that had had any transaction with a government official gave bribe or grease money to that official. Note that the percentages are the same as those in Table 2B with the exception of payment of taxes and other duties. The table also shows that a higher percentage of families gave bribe or grease money to a government official to avail of social services compared to other purposes.

Because those who avail of social services usually belong to the lower income stratum, it is surprising that they are also the ones who are more likely to give bribe or grease money despite their lower financial capacity. It may be surmised that the reason why they are more likely to give is to ensure that the social services of the government which they badly needed are made available to them.

Using the data in Tables 2 and 3, it can be deduced that public officials in certain government agencies are more vulnerable to corruption by soliciting or accepting gifts or

benefits from the transacting public compared to other agencies. These agencies are those involved in the delivery of basic social services such as educational institutions, health facilities, social security and welfare agencies, and others.

Of the 364,248 families that gave bribe or grease money when transacting business, 72.4% belong to the lower 70% of income stratum as defined by the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA) while 27.6% belong to the upper 30% bracket. Because the percentages match, the families that give bribe or grease money are evenly distributed between the two income groups.

In terms of the highest educational achievement of the household head, more than half or 52.4% of the total number of families that gave bribe or grease money are either high school graduate or reached a few years or secondary education or took some post-secondary or vocational courses. On the other hand, about 31.4% are either elementary graduate or had a few years of elementary education. College undergraduates comprise about 5.6% while those who graduated from college or had higher degrees comprise about 10.6%

Most of the families that gave bribe or grease money are headed by a household member who has a job or business (91.8%). Only 8.2% do not have any job or business.

Geographically, the families that gave bribe or grease money are distributed nationwide. Most of them are from Mindanao (36.4%) followed by those from Southern Luzon (32.4%). Families from Northern Luzon comprise about 13.5% while those from Visayas, about 11.6%. Families from the National Capital Region comprise about 6.0%. Compared to the percentage of distribution of the respondents among the regional clusters, the percentage of families giving bribes or grease money coming from Mindanao and Southern Luzon is notable.

Table 4 compares the data on giving bribe or grease money obtained in the 2010, 2013, and 2016 surveys.

Table 4. Percentage of Families That Gave Bribe or Grease Money in 2010, 2013, and 2016

| Government Service | % of Families That Gave (2010) | % of Families That Gave (2013) | % of Families That Gave (2016) |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 6.1% | 0.5% | 0.2% |
| Access to Justice | 9.9% | 2.3% | 0.7% |
| Securing Registry Documents & Licenses | 10.3% | 2.1% | 1.4% |
| Availing of Social Services | 4.1% | 4.5% | 2.3% |
| Any Service | 9.3% | 4.4% | 2.2% |

The table shows that in general, the percentage of families that gave bribe or grease money is on a downtrend over a six-year period. This means that fewer families gave bribe or grease money in 2016 than in 2010 and 2013.

The results show that more and more families that accessed government services did not pay bribe or grease money to facilitate the transaction or avoid problems. The low bribe incidence may be considered an indication that Filipino families are becoming more intolerant of corruption which may be attributed to a change in the values of the people who are becoming more conscious of its ill effects.

Tables 5A and 5B show the number and percentage of families that gave bribe or grease money either voluntarily or at the behest of a government official. The percentage is computed by dividing the number of families that were asked for bribe or grease money (or not asked) by the number of families that paid bribe or grease money.

Table 5A. Number of Families That Gave Bribe or Grease Money When Asked to Give or Not

| Government Service | No. of Families That Gave When Asked | No. of Families That Gave But Not Asked | Total No. of Families That Gave |
|--|---|--|--|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 20,407 | 3,637 | 24,044 |
| Access to Justice | 7,500 | 3,135 | 10,635 |
| Availing of Social Services | 190,872 | 79,225 | 270,097 |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 59,507 | 38,293 | 97,800 |
| Any Service | 257,653 | 106,595 | 364,248 |

Table 5B. Percentage of Families That Gave Bribe or Grease Money When Asked to Give or Not

| Government Service | % of Families That Gave When Asked | % of Families That Gave But Not Asked | Total |
|--|---|--|--------------|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 84.9% | 15.1% | 100% |
| Access to Justice | 70.5% | 29.5% | 100% |
| Availing of Social Services | 70.7% | 29.3% | 100% |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 60.8% | 39.2% | 100% |
| Any Service | 70.7% | 29.3% | 100% |

Tables 5A and 5B show that more families paid bribe or grease money when asked to than those that paid even when not asked to, across all four government service clusters. This means that payment of bribe or grease money is more likely at the behest of a government official than purely voluntary. In absolute terms, Table 5A shows that the most number of families that paid bribe or grease money when asked to are those availing of social services (190,872 families). Percentwise, however, the highest percentage appears to be for those paying taxes and duties (84.9%).

Table 6 compares the data on the proportion of families that gave bribe or grease money when asked to give by a government official. The table shows that compared with 2010, more families paid bribe or grease money only after they were asked when not asked to. Compared, however, with 2013, overall, there is no difference in the percentage of families that gave bribe or grease money when asked although there is a notable decrease in the percentage for those who accessed justice and secured registry documents and licenses.

Table 6. Percentage of Families That Gave Bribe or Grease Money When Asked to Give (2010 vs. 2013 vs. 2016)

| Government Service | % of Families That Were Asked (2010) | % of Families That Were Asked (2013) | % of Families That Were Asked (2016) |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 26.8% | 52.3% | 84.9% |
| Access to Justice | 16.9% | 73.7% | 70.5% |
| Availing of Social Services | 26.9% | 68.1% | 70.7% |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 29.8% | 76.0% | 60.8% |
| Any Service | 25.3% | 69.9% | 70.7% |

3.6 Supply-Driven or Demand-Driven Bribery

Because there are two parties involved in bribery and facilitation payment, there are also two sides to bribe or grease money from an economic perspective: the supply side (i.e., the transacting public) and the demand side (i.e., government officials). Payment is demand-driven if more families paid bribe or grease money when asked by a government official compared to those who were not. On the other hand, payment is supply-driven if more families paid bribe or grease money voluntarily compared to those who merely gave in to the demand of a government official. Hence, the following conditions should be met:

If $\frac{\text{No. of paying families that were asked}}{\text{No. of paying families that were not asked}} < 1$, supply-driven

If $\frac{\text{No. of paying families that were asked}}{\text{No. of paying families that were not asked}} > 1$, demand-driven

Table 7 gives the ratio of the number of paying families that were asked to the number of paying families that were not asked, purposely to show what drives the payment of bribe or grease money from an economic perspective, i.e., supply or demand driven.

Table 7. Comparative Ratio of the Number of Families That Paid Bribe or Grease Money When Asked to the Number of Percentage of Families That Paid Bribe or Grease Money But Not Asked

| Government Service | Ratio (2010) | Ratio (2013) | Ratio (2016) |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 0.37 | 1.10 | 5.61 |
| Access to Justice | 0.20 | 2.80 | 2.39 |
| Availing of Social Services | 0.37 | 2.14 | 2.41 |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 0.42 | 3.16 | 1.55 |
| Any Service | 0.34 | 2.32 | 2.42 |

The table shows that in 2010, bribes are more likely initiated by the people transacting business. In 2013, bribes are more likely imposed upon them by government officials. This is also true in 2016 most notably for payment of taxes and duties. The results reveal that bribe payment is driven by demand rather than supply.

Table 8A and 8B show the number and percentage of families that were solicited for bribe or grease money and whether they actually paid or not. Note that the entries on the second column of Table 8A are equal to those on the second column of Table 5A. The percentage is computed by dividing the number of families that paid bribe or grease money or not by the number of families that were asked to give.

Table 8A. Number of Families That Were Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money and Actually Gave or Not

| Government Service | No. of Families That Were Asked and Gave | No. of Families That Were Asked But Did Not Give | Total No. of Families That Were Asked |
|--|---|---|--|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 20,407 | 30,542 | 50,949 |
| Access to Justice | 7,500 | 4,031 | 11,531 |
| Availing of Social Services | 190,872 | 76,989 | 267,861 |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 59,507 | 72,277 | 131,784 |
| Any Service | 257,653 | 177,376 | 435,029 |

Table 8B. Percentage of Families That Were Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money and Actually Gave or Not

| Government Service | % of Families That Were Asked and Gave | % of Families That Were Asked But Did Not Give | Total |
|--|---|---|--------------|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 40.1% | 59.9% | 100% |
| Access to Justice | 65.0% | 35.0% | 100% |
| Availing of Social Services | 71.3% | 28.7% | 100% |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 45.2% | 54.8% | 100% |
| Any Service | 59.2% | 40.8% | 100% |

The table shows that overall, more families who were asked to pay bribe or grease money gave in compared to those who did not. Notably, however, more families who paid taxes and duties and secured registry documents and licenses did not give in when asked to pay bribe or grease money compared to those who gave in. The non-payment of bribe may be due to financial inability to pay bribe or refusal to pay for varied reasons.

3.7 Amount of Bribe or Grease Money

Question I4 estimates the amount of bribe or grease money actually paid by families. An estimate of the amount is computed by multiplying the amount stated by a respondent during the field enumeration by the corresponding weight of the household he/she represents. Table

9 shows the amount given as bribe or grease money disaggregated into whether it was given voluntarily or at the behest of a government official.

Table 9. Amount Given as Bribe or Grease Money (in Thousand Pesos)

| Government Service | Amount Given When Asked | Amount Given Voluntarily | Total Amount Given |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 874,062 | 1,469 | 875,531 |
| Access to Justice | 104,636 | 59,085 | 163,721 |
| Availing of Social Services | 70,786 | 145,702 | 216,489 |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 82,207 | 35,440 | 117,647 |
| Total Amount | 1,131,851 | 241,537 | 1,373,388 |

The table shows that the highest amount of bribe or grease money was paid by families who paid taxes and duties and this is more than half (64%) of the total bribe or grease money paid. The least amount was paid by families who secured registry documents and licenses. The aggregate amount of bribe or grease money paid for the period covered by the survey is 1.373 billion pesos.

The table also shows that 82.4% of the 1.373 billion pesos was paid as bribe or grease money by families transacting business who gave in to the demand of a government official. Only a small fraction (i.e., 17.6%) was voluntarily paid without any bidding from a government official. Across all government service, this is the trend. The only exception is availing of social services. The table reveals that bribe or grease money is voluntarily given by families to access social services of the government.

Table 10 shows the average amount of bribe given by families when they transacted business in government agencies. The average is computed by dividing the amount given as bribe or grease money by the number of families that gave the amount.

Table 10. Average Amount Given as Bribe or Grease Money (in Pesos)

| Government Service | Total Amount Given ('000) | No. of Families That Gave | Average Amount Given |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Payment of Taxes and Duties | 875,531 | 24,043 | 36,400 |
| Access to Justice | 163,721 | 10,635 | 15,400 |
| Availing of Social Services | 216,489 | 270,097 | 800 |
| Securing Registry Documents and Licenses | 117,647 | 97,800 | 1,200 |
| Total | 1,373,388 | 364,248 | 3,800 |

The table reveals that the bribe or grease money given in connection with payment of taxes and duties have the highest average amount compared to other government services. The least is in connection with availing of social services.

3.8 Reporting of Solicitation or Extortion

Question I5 was designed to find out how many families that have experienced being solicited or extorted for bribe or grease money actually reported the solicitation or extortion incident to the proper authorities. Table 11 shows the percentage of families who reported and not reported any incident. The table also compares the reporting rate to that obtained in the 2010 and 2013 surveys. Unfortunately, we are no longer able to disaggregate the reporting rate into 4 different types of services accessed due to sampling variation.

Surprisingly, there was a spike in the percentage of families that reported any such incident to the proper authorities when they accessed government services. Compared to 2013, the percentage of reporting families increased by more than seven-fold. The increase may be attributed to a lower tolerance of corruption by the respondent families since the survey shows that more families do not give in to the request or demand of a government official for bribe or grease money.

Table 11. Comparative Percentage of Families That Reported and Not Reported Solicitation of Bribe or Grease Money to the Proper Authorities

| Survey Year | % of Families That Reported | % of Families That Did Not Report |
|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2010 | 0.8% | 99.2% |
| 2013 | 5.3% | 94.7% |
| 2016 | 38.4% | 61.6% |

Question I5 was asked to elicit from the respondents the reasons for non-reporting of the bribery solicitation to the proper authorities. The respondents were asked to list at most three reasons for non-reporting by selecting from 11 choices including the “others” category. Table 11 presents the frequency of responses in terms of percentage of families which is computed by dividing the number of families who gave a particular reason by the number of families that were asked for bribe or grease money whether they paid or not but did not report to the proper authorities. Note that the percentages do not add up to 100% because of multiple responses.

The table shows that the No. 1 reason for non-reporting of solicitation of bribe or grease money is that it is not worth reporting or too small to bother, with about one-third of the families responding, a stark reduction from the more than half of the families responding in

2013. That nothing will happen anyway and lack of time to report came in at No.2 and 3 respectively with less than one-fifth of the families responding.

Table 12. Percentage of Families That Cited Various Reasons for Non-Reporting of Solicitation of Bribe or Grease Money

| Reason for Not Reporting Solicitation to the Authorities | % of Families That Did Not Report |
|---|--|
| Lack of time to report | 17.6% |
| Lack of money to spend to file a case | 0.9% |
| Don't know which government agency to report to | 5.0% |
| Fear of reprisal / afraid of consequences | 12.8% |
| Difficulty in proving the case | 1.6% |
| Don't know the procedure | 8.1% |
| Don't trust any government agency | 7.3% |
| Nothing will happen anyway | 18.6% |
| Government does not reward those who report corruption | 1.9% |
| Not worth reporting / too small to bother | 32.3% |
| Others | 10.3% |

3.9 Summary of Findings and Generalizations

Below is a summary of the findings and generalizations arrived at after a careful analysis of the results of the survey:

1. During the survey period, only 1 of 40 families has been solicited for bribe or grease money when transacting business in a government agency. More families have been asked to pay bribe or grease money when availing of social services. Fewer families have been asked when paying taxes and duties.

2. Only 1 of 40 families has paid bribe or grease money to a government official when transacting business in an agency. More families paid bribe or grease money when availing of social services. The agencies that are more vulnerable to bribery are those involved in the delivery of basic social services such as educational institutions, health facilities, social security agencies, and agencies providing employment and livelihood opportunities.

3. Compared to 2013, fewer families paid bribe or grease money in 2016. The lower incidence of bribe payment may be attributed to lower tolerance of corruption by Filipino families.

4. More families or 7 out of 10 gave bribe or grease money when asked to. Thus, payment of bribe or grease money is more likely at the behest of a government official rather than purely voluntary. Of the different types of services, more families gave bribe or grease money when asked by a government official in paying taxes and duties.

5. Compared to 2013, the percentage of families that paid bribe or grease money when asked to give by a government official remained the same. Notably, compared to 2013, the number of families that paid bribe or grease money is higher in 2016 in connection with payment of taxes and duties and lower in 2016 in connection with availing of social services.

6. The pattern of bribery in the Philippines is unchanged since 2013. Whereas in 2010, bribe or grease money is supply-driven, i.e., the public initiates payment, in 2013 and 2016, it is demand-driven, i.e., a government official initiates payment.

7. During the survey period, Filipino families who had had official transaction in government agencies, facilities, or institution paid bribes or grease money in the total amount of 1.373 billion pesos. More than half of this amount or 64% was paid in connection with payment of taxes and duties. About 1.132 billion pesos was solicited by government officials and only 242 million pesos was given voluntarily.

8. Almost 4 of 10 families whose member had been asked to give bribe or grease money, reported the solicitation to proper authorities. This is a remarkable increase in the number of people reporting a solicitation from both 2010 and 2013.

9. The most cited reasons for non-reporting of bribery incidents are: low amount of the bribe or grease money demanded; that nothing will happen anyway; and lack of time to report to the authorities.

3.10 Recommendations

The results of the survey show that the efforts of the government and other anti-corruption stakeholders appear successful in reducing the incidence of payment of bribe or grease money by household members when transacting with government agencies, facilities, or institution over a six-year period from 2010 to 2016. Despite this improvement in the anti-corruption drive, bribe or grease money continues to be solicited from household members. For this reason, the Office of the Ombudsman ought to address the issue by lobbying Congress for

tougher penalties on solicitation of bribe or grease money and enactment of a whistleblower program to encourage more reporting. Moreover, it should also aggressively prosecute government officials who solicit or demand bribe or grease money. Furthermore, the office should intensify its campaign to reduce the incidence of bribery and facilitation payment in revenue collection agencies because of the finding that the demand-driven nature of bribery in these agencies is the most pronounced and the amount of bribe or grease money paid is highest. It should likewise sustain its anti-corruption efforts in agencies involved in the delivery of basic social services and providing social protection; in the issuance of registry documents, permits and licenses; as well as in law enforcement such as the police, or in the delivery of justice such as the courts and fiscal's offices, in order to reduce their vulnerability to red tape which brings about bribery in these agencies.

In order to effectively evaluate the national integrity system, it behooves that longitudinal data on actual experience with corruption be generated in order to track any progress in the national anti-corruption program. For this purpose, it is recommended that this survey be institutionalized as a periodic survey every year not necessarily as a mere rider to the Annual Poverty Indicators Survey.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Office of the Ombudsman wishes to extend its multitude of thanks to its partner institution, the Philippine Statistical Authority which made this project a reality. In particular, we are grateful to the National Statistician Dr. Liza Grace S. Bersales, Assistant National Statistician for the Social Sector Statistics Service, staff and officials of the Demographic and Health Statistics Division, the officials of NSO regional offices, provincial offices, and the many field interviewers of the PSA, for accommodating rider questions on experience with corruption in the 2017 APIS, for the various help in improving the survey questions, and for running the survey in the remotest barangays with diligence to insure the integrity of the responses.

Annex A: Questionnaire

| I. ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT SERVICES | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Now, I would like to talk about all the transactions you or any member of your family made from July 2015 up to present with any government-run agency, institution, or facility whether from the national government, government owned and controlled corporations, public schools, hospitals, or any transactions/services availed from the local government unit. | | | | | |
| QN | GOVERNMENT SERVICES | I1. From July 2015 up to present, did you or any member of your family see or visit any person working in the government-run agency, institution, or facility for any of the following reasons or purposes? | I2. Did anybody working in that government-run agency, institution or facility ask or oblige you or any member of your family to give money, gift, donation, favor or anything of value for any of the following reasons or purposes? | I3. Did you or any member of your family give money, gift, donation, favor or anything of value to that person in order to speed-up the service (facilitate) or avoid problems in any of the following reasons or purposes? | I4. If YES in I3, how much is the worth of money, gift, donation, favor or anything of value given to that person? |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| PAYMENT OF TAXES AND OTHER DUTIES | | | | | |
| A | Paying cedula, income tax, real estate tax, capital gains tax, documentary stamp tax, customs duties & other similar taxes & duties | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO B | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO B | Amount <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |
| ACCESS TO JUSTICE | | | | | |
| B | Filing a complaint or seeking assistance from law enforcers like from the police, barangay, NBI, PDEA, etc. | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO C | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO C | Amount <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |
| C | Going to the fiscal's office or public attorney's office in connection with cases | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO D | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO D | Amount <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |
| D | Going to court in connection with cases | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO E | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO E | Amount <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |
| AVAILING OF SOCIAL SERVICES | | | | | |
| E | Enrolling in public school/college/university, availing of government scholarships, and other educational services | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO F | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO F | Amount <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |
| F | Medical check-up, hospitalization, vaccination, getting free medicines or other health services from public hospitals/urban/rural health units. | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO G | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO G | Amount <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |
| G | Applying or getting loans or benefits from SSS, Pag-ibig, GSIS, PhilHealth & other government institutions | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO H | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO H | Amount <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |
| H | Seeking assistance for employment or livelihood or getting subsidy/benefits for the poor from government institutions | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO I | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO I | Amount <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"></div> |

| SECURING REGISTRY, PERMITS AND OTHER LICENSES | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------------|---|---|
| I | Getting civil registry documents like birth, death, marriage certificate and CENOMAR | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO J | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO J | Amount <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| J | Getting passport, authenticating documents at the DFA, & securing gov't issued IDs (e.g. Postal ID, COMELEC Voter's ID, PRC ID). | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO K | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO K | Amount <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| K | Getting land title & registration of documents relating to property. | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO L | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 NO 2 → GO TO L | Amount <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| L | Getting <u>permits</u> (e.g. mayor's permit, building permit, sanitary permit, fire permit, occupancy permit), <u>licenses</u> (driver's, firearms), & clearances (e.g. NBI, police, barangay). | YES 1 → GO TO I2 NO 2 → GO TO ENUMERATOR'S CHECK | YES 1 NO 2 | YES 1 → GO TO I4 NO 2 → GO TO ENUMERATOR'S CHECK | Amount <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| ENUMERATOR'S CHECK: | | | | | |
| AT LEAST ONE YES (CODE 1) IN I2 (COLUMN 4). (WAS ASKED TO GIVE) 1 → GO TO I5 | | | | | |
| ALL NO (CODE 2) AND/OR BLANK IN COLUMN 4. (WAS NOT ASKED TO GIVE) 2 → GO TO SECTION J | | | | | |
| I5. | When you or any member of your family were/was asked or obliged to give money, gift, donation, favor, or anything of value, did you or any member of your family report the incident to any authority? | YES 1 → GO TO SECTION J NO 2 | | | |
| I6. | Why was it not reported to the proper authority? What else? (MULTIPLE RESPONSE) | <p> A - Lack of time to report B - Lack of money to spend to file a case/complaint C - Don't know which government agency to report to D - Fear of reprisal/afraid of consequences E - Difficulty in proving the case F - Don't know the procedure G - Don't trust any gov't agency H - Nothing will happen anyway I - Government does not reward those who report corruption J - Not worth reporting/too small to bother K - Others (Specify) _____ </p> | | | REASON 1 <input type="text"/> REASON 2 <input type="text"/> REASON 3 <input type="text"/> |

Annex B: Words and Phrases

Government-run facility – a place operated by a government agency for delivery of public services

Example: Public Schools, Public Hospitals, Health Centers, DSWD operated welfare centers like Boy's Town, Home for the Unwed Mothers

Government - pertains to offices, bureaus, agencies of government including divisions, sections, and units. It may be national or local.

Example: Bureau of Customs, Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR), Land Registration Authority (LRA), Register of Deeds, National Bureau of Investigation (NBI), Philippine National Police, Government Service Insurance System (GSIS), Social Security System (SSS), Fiscal's Office, Local Government Unit.

Person working in the government - refers to any person who has been elected or appointed to a government agency (including those in state colleges/universities; government owned or controlled corporations) or anyone who is considered an insider or employee in a government office whether regular or contractual/casual.

Example 1. A clerk hired in the Personnel Division of a city hall is considered a person working in the government even if his work has nothing to do with the issuance of registry documents.

Example 2. A janitor who works for a job by a contracting agency hired by a government office may be an insider but not considered a person working in government.

Go - an act of a person in purposely going to a government office or hall where government functions are carried out and making an official transaction (such as applying for permits) or meeting with/talking to a person working in government. This does NOT include talking to a person working in a chance encounter anywhere else. But this includes a planned meeting with a government official or employee outside his office for any of the purposes mentioned.

Example 1: A person who visited a government employee in the latter's house for the purpose of seeking assistance in getting permits issued by the government office where he works is considered to have seen or visited a person working in the government.

Permit – a right or permission granted in accordance with law by a competent authority to engage in some business or corporation or to engage in some transaction.

Example 1: Mayor's Permit or Business Permit – an authority to engage in the kind of business granted to the permittee.

Other Example: Sanitary Permit, Health Permit, Occupancy Permit, Building Permit, etc.

Pay Taxes, etc. – includes availing of exemption from payment

Example: If a person sees an official of the Bureau of Customs NOT to pay customs duties but to seek an exemption under the law, he is considered to have seen a government official to pay taxes, etc.

Capital Gains Tax – a tax that is assessed and collected out of the gain realized from the sale of the property.

Customs Duties – taxes assessed on merchandise imported from or exported to a foreign country.

Avail of Social Services – any act of applying for a benefit or privilege from government offices which deliver basic social services such as:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|--------|
| ○ public schools | ○ NHA | ○ OWWA |
| ○ health centers | ○ Pag-ibig | ○ POEA |
| ○ Government hospitals and centers | ○ SSS | ○ DOLE |
| ○ Philhealth | ○ GSIS | ○ DSWD |
| ○ TESDA | ○ PDEA | ○ NEDA |

Seek Police Assistance – includes filing a complaint in a police station or precinct, getting police clearance, causing an entry in the police blotter or getting a copy of the blotter, talking to the desk officer for advice.

Go To A Court Of Justice or Fiscal's Office – refers to any instance when a person has to seek the services of a court (such as attending hearings, getting transcripts, following up cases, filing pleadings, etc.) or the fiscal's office (such as attending preliminary investigation or inquests and mediation conferences, following up cases, court clearances, etc.)

Money – includes all money given to a person working in government in excess of the lawful fees. It includes amount equal to the lawful fees to be paid but which was not properly receipted (without official receipt or O.R.). It does NOT include however, money paid to the cashier or official designated to receive payment for which an O.R. is issued.

Example: If a person applying for a permit gave money to a government employee as an accommodation party such that the person need not go to the government office to actually pay but it is the government employee who will pay on behalf of that person, the money given is NOT included.

Gift – any tangible token given in appreciation. It includes gifts given to bribe or facilitate transaction or to return a favor.

Example: snacks, food, cellphone load, bag, wallet, jewelry, cellphone, tablet, radio, tv, laptop kitchen ware, office supply, or any tangible item.

Donation – any modest money supposedly given voluntarily the amount of which may be determined by the giver or insinuated by the public officer but is not considered as payment for the lawful fees.

Example: Any amount which health workers ask from indigents for medical services which are otherwise freely available at the health centers.

Favor – any intangible item given in appreciation, or as bribe or grease money

Example: a favorable recommendation, promotion, discounts, personal services including sex

Speed-up – means to facilitate/hasten official transactions, waive certain requirements, gives special privileges not deserved, accommodate beyond office hours or deadlines, cutting short of time or being served first without need to wait.

Avoid Problems – means NOT having difficulty, complications, hardships, etc. It includes exemption from liability or penalty, if there is any.

Anything of Value – any item whose value in pesos can be ascertained

Ask – means that the money, gift, favor or anything of value was not given at the first instance of the giver but was requested, solicited, demanded, extorted or insinuated through clear words, or acts or gestures, or symbolism, or through texts, phone calls, letters, notes, e-mails, etc.

Example: Suppose a government employee motions his hand to a person applying for permits and the person takes that as a gesture to give money, the thing given is said to have been asked even if the person gave his money without any feeling of being coerced or intimidated. But if the person slips a few money bills into the drawer of the government employee who has NOT insinuated anything, then the money is NOT said to have been asked even if the person feels it is his obligation to do so.

Oblige – to compel without necessarily applying any force as amounts to extortion. It is necessary that the public officer creates in the mind of a person the necessity or requirement to give without which the public service being availed of cannot be given.

Report - it does not necessarily mean filing a formal complaint. It may pertain to the act of going to a government agency to inform them of the incident.

Authority – any person or office where corruption acts may be reported to, such as the Ombudsman, PAGC, Commission on Audit (COA), Civil Service Commission (CSC), and heads of government agencies. It does NOT include media, church, and the NGO's or other advocacy groups.

Annex C: Tabulations

| Number and Percentage of Families with Official Transaction in a Government Agency, Solicitation of Bribe and Grease Money, Giving of Bribe or Grease Money in Different Government Services: 2016 APIS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|---|---------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| Indicators | AVAILING OF SOCIAL SERVICES | | PAYMENT OF TAXES AND OTHER DUTIES | | ACCESS TO JUSTICE | | SECURING REGISTRY, PERMITS AND OTHER LICENSES | | BRIBERY INCIDENCE IN THE PHILIPPINES | |
| | Number of Families | Percent | Number of Families | Percent | Number of Families | Percent | Number of Families | Percent | Number of Families | Percent |
| I1. TRANSACTING WITH GOVERNMENT AGENCY | | | | | | | | | | |
| With Official Transaction in a Government Agency | 11,586,961 | 48.7% | 11,166,889 | 47.0% | 1,557,937 | 6.6% | 6,803,530 | 28.6% | 16,685,805 | 70.2% |
| Without Official Transaction in a Government Agency | 12,184,402 | 51.3% | 12,604,474 | 53.0% | 22,213,426 | 93.4% | 16,967,832 | 71.4% | 7,085,558 | 29.8% |
| Total Families | 23,771,363 | 100.0% | 23,771,363 | 100.0% | 23,771,363 | 100.0% | 23,771,363 | 100.0% | 23,771,363 | 100.0% |
| I2 SOLICITATION OF BRIBE OR GREASE MONEY | | | | | | | | | | |
| Were Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money | 267,861 | 2.3% | 50,948 | 0.5% | 11,531 | 0.7% | 131,785 | 1.9% | 435,029 | 2.6% |
| Were Not Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money | 11,319,101 | 97.7% | 11,115,941 | 99.5% | 1,546,406 | 99.3% | 6,671,746 | 98.1% | 16,250,776 | 97.4% |
| Total Families | 11,586,962 | 100.0% | 11,166,889 | 100.0% | 1,557,937 | 100.0% | 6,803,531 | 100.0% | 16,685,805 | 100.0% |
| I3 FAMILIES THAT WERE ASKED TO GIVE BRIBE OR GREASE MONEY | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gave Bribe or Grease Money | 190,872 | 71.3% | 20,407 | 40.1% | 7,500 | 65.0% | 59,507 | 45.2% | 257,653 | 59.2% |
| Did Not Give Bribe or Grease Money | 76,989 | 28.7% | 30,542 | 59.9% | 4,031 | 35.0% | 72,277 | 54.8% | 177,376 | 40.8% |
| Total Families | 267,861 | 100.0% | 50,949 | 100.0% | 11,531 | 100.0% | 131,784 | 100.0% | 435,029 | 100.0% |
| I3 FAMILIES THAT WERE NOT ASKED TO GIVE BRIBE OR GREASE MONEY | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gave Bribe or Grease Money | 79,225 | 0.7% | 3,637 | 0.0% | 3,135 | 0.2% | 38,293 | 0.6% | 102,951 | 0.6% |
| Did Not Give Bribe or Grease Money | 11,239,876 | 99.3% | 11,112,304 | 100.0% | 1,543,271 | 99.8% | 6,633,453 | 99.4% | 16,147,825 | 99.4% |
| Total Families | 11,319,101 | 100.0% | 11,115,941 | 100.0% | 1,546,406 | 100.0% | 6,671,746 | 100.0% | 16,250,776 | 100.0% |
| I3 WITH OFFICIAL TRANSACTION IN A GOVERNMENT AGENCY | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gave Bribe or Grease Money | 270,097 | 2.3% | 24,043 | 0.2% | 10,635 | 0.7% | 97,800 | 1.4% | 364,248 | 2.2% |
| Did Not Give Bribe or Grease Money | 11,316,864 | 97.7% | 11,142,846 | 99.8% | 1,547,302 | 99.3% | 6,705,730 | 98.6% | 16,321,557 | 97.8% |
| Total Families | 11,586,961 | 100.0% | 11,166,889 | 100.0% | 1,557,937 | 100.0% | 6,803,530 | 100.0% | 16,685,805 | 100.0% |
| I2 FAMILIES THAT GAVE BRIBE OR GREASE MONEY | | | | | | | | | | |
| Were Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money | 190,872 | 70.7% | 20,407 | 84.9% | 7,500 | 70.5% | 59,507 | 60.8% | 257,653 | 70.7% |
| Were Not Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money | 79,225 | 29.3% | 3,637 | 15.1% | 3,135 | 29.5% | 38,293 | 39.2% | 102,951 | 28.3% |
| Total Families | 270,097 | 100.0% | 24,043 | 100.0% | 10,635 | 100.0% | 97,800 | 100.0% | 364,248 | 99.0% |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. BACKGROUND | 1 |
| 1.1 Rationale | 1 |
| 1.2 Objectives | 1 |
| 1.3 Scope and Delimitations | 2 |
| 1.4 Survey Utility | 4 |
| 2. METHODS | 5 |
| 2.1 The 2016 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey | 5 |
| 2.2 Operational Concepts and Definitions | 6 |
| 2.3 Survey Questions | 6 |
| 2.4 Conducting the APIS | 9 |
| 2.5 Data Analysis | 11 |
| 3. RESULTS | 12 |
| 3.1 Response Rate | 12 |
| 3.2 Demographic Profile | 12 |
| 3.3 Transacting with Government Agencies | 12 |
| 3.4 Soliciting Bribe or Grease Money | 14 |
| 3.5 Giving Bribe or Grease Money | 15 |
| 3.6 Supply-Driven or Demand-Driven Bribery | 19 |
| 3.7 Amount of Bribe or Grease Money | 21 |
| 3.8 Reporting Solicitation or Extortion | 23 |
| 3.9 Summary of Findings and Generalizations | 24 |
| 3.10 Recommendations | 25 |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | 27 |
| ANNEXES | 28 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| Table 1 | <i>Number and Percentage of Families with Official Transaction in a Government Agency</i> | 13 |
| Table 2A | <i>Number of Families That Were Asked and Not Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money</i> | 14 |
| Table 2B | <i>Percentage of Families That Were Asked and Not Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money</i> | 15 |
| Table 3A | <i>Number of Families That Gave and Did Not Give Bribe or Grease Money to a Government Official</i> | 16 |
| Table 3B | <i>Percentage of Families That Gave and Did Not Give Bribe or Grease Money to a Government Official</i> | 16 |
| Table 4 | <i>Percentage of Families That Gave Bribe or Grease Money in 2010, 2013, and 2016</i> | 17 |
| Table 5A | <i>Number of Families That Gave Bribe or Grease Money When Asked to Give or Not</i> | 18 |
| Table 5B | <i>Percentage of Families That Gave Bribe or Grease Money When Asked to Give or Not</i> | 18 |
| Table 6 | <i>Percentage of Families That Gave Bribe or Grease Money When Asked to Give (2010 vs. 2013 vs. 2016)</i> | 19 |
| Table 7 | <i>Comparative Ratio of the Number of Families That Paid Bribe or Grease Money When Asked to the Number of Percentage of Families That Paid Bribe or Grease Money But Not Asked</i> | 20 |
| Table 8A | <i>Number of Families That Were Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money and Actually Gave or Not</i> | 21 |
| Table 8B | <i>Percentage of Families That Were Asked to Give Bribe or Grease Money and Actually Gave or Not</i> | 21 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 9 | <i>Amount Given as Bribe or Grease Money (in Thousand Pesos)</i> | 22 |
| Table 10 | <i>Average Amount Given as Bribe or Grease Money (in Pesos)</i> | 22 |
| Table 11 | <i>Comparative Percentage of Families That Reported and Not Reported Solicitation of Bribe or Grease Money to the Proper Authorities</i> | 23 |
| Table 12 | <i>Percentage of Families That Cited Various Reasons for Non-Reporting of Solicitation of Bribe or Grease Money</i> | 24 |

NATIONAL SURVEY ON HOUSEHOLD EXPERIENCE WITH CORRUPTION IN THE PHILIPPINES PROJECT

The National Survey on Household Experience with Corruption in the Philippines is a project undertaken by the Office of the Ombudsman through the Research and Special Studies Bureau (RSSB) and Public Assistance and Corruption Prevention Bureau of MOLEO, in cooperation with the area/sectoral offices. Conceptualized in 2010, the project aims to measure the extent or pervasiveness of corruption in the Philippines not in terms of public perception but in terms of actual experience to provide a more accurate and precise measure of corruption incidence.

The project was undertaken through the direct collaboration of the Philippine Statistical Authority (formerly National Statistics Office) and its regional and provincial offices in all 17 regions nationwide.

The members of the Ombudsman Project Group are:

- 1. Atty. Alan R. Cañares, Acting Director, PACPB, MOLEO*
- 2. Glenn B. Barcenas, Graft Investigation officer I (Statistician), RSSB*
- 3. Fernando M. Mendoza, RSSB*
- 4. Sally R. Gimpayan, RSSB*
- 5. Maria Edna S. Urriza, RSSB*
- 6. Ma. Mercedes B. Gonzalez, RSSB*
- 7. Emmanuel Rex N. Roseus, RSSB*
- 8. Vilma C. Lavares, RSSB*
- 9. Arnel B. Ambas, RSSB*
- 10. Melody C. Iglesias, RSSB*

under the direct supervision of Acting Assistant Ombudsman Mary Susan S. Guillermo, Public Assistance and Corruption Prevention Office.