

Value Profile and Corruption Propensity: Correlates Among Employees in Two Types of Government Agencies

PROSERPINA DOMINGO TAPALES, VIRGILIO G. ENRIQUEZ
AND OLIVER S. TRINIDAD*

Corruption, a perennial problem besetting the Philippine bureaucracy, is once more explored from a psychological perspective. Values espoused by bureaucrats and their corrupt practices, if any, are correlated using the Philippine Value Orientation Inventory (PVOI) research instrument in testing corruption prone and noncorruption prone agencies. One significant conclusion derived from the study is that propensity and propinquity reinforce a culture of corruption within corruption prone agencies.

Introduction

Corruption as a Cultural and Psychological Phenomenon

Corruption, although a worldwide phenomenon, is considered to occur more extensively in developing countries because of a marked discrepancy between legal norms which call for rationality and universalistic principles of action, and cultural norms which emphasize reliance and obligation toward kinship, friendship and primary groups (Bautista 1982: 241). However, within countries, corruption is not equally spread in all sectors of the polity. Even in the bureaucracy, there are agencies considered to be more corrupt than others and sectors more corruption prone. Briones wrote that corruption "tends to be concentrated only in areas where boundary exchange processes take place and in positions where a bureaucrat can exercise powers and discretion" (Briones 1979: 261).

The cultural explanation advanced by anthropologists, has been accepted with some understanding by political scientists looking at public

*Professor of Public Administration at the University of the Philippines (UP) and President of the *Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (National Association for Filipino Psychology); *Professor Emeritus* in Psychology, University of the Philippines (died in 1994); and former Executive Director of the Philippine Psychology Research and Training House, respectively. The authors are grateful to the Office of Research Coordination, UP Diliman, for funding assistance to the project.

administration with a cultural perspective. Riggs, early in his career, devised his prismatic model of administration to capture the so-called "polynormativism" (Riggs 1964) of societies in transition, which explained discrepancies between the theory and practice of administration. In the Philippines, Lynch acknowledged the difficulties faced by civil servants who, knowing they have to act impersonally in the Weberian sense, are "entangled" with the culture and are unable to do so. Corpuz (quoted by Cariño 1975: 282) agreed that in the Philippine bureaucracy, because of social standards within which a bureaucrat operates, some acts may be considered "both unethical and illegal at the same time." Cariño put the cultural explanation succinctly:

... The ideal Filipino would lie at the opposite pole from the ideal bureaucrat... Because of the cultural imperative, a Filipino is expected to take account of all facets of an individual's personality and memberships in dealing with him. As he does so, he is also expected to treat persons according to the closeness or congruence of their group memberships and their other similarities to him (Cariño 1979: 231).

Varela takes these into consideration in explaining the Filipino administrative culture as depicting "the conflict between culture, values and norms of western bureaucracy, and the culture, values and norms of the Filipino people" (Varela 1995: 176). Varela noted the incongruence between the values espoused for the bureaucracy and the values actually in use by the government. She attributed these again to the culture which political leadership changes do not seem to alter much.

The cultural explanation may suffice to explain the extent of corruption in the Philippines, but it does not give answers about the discrepancy in the occurrence of corrupt practices within the society itself. For instance, Briones (1979) lamented political corruption (or corruption among the elected officials) because of the powers the politicians wield in policy decisions. In the bureaucracy, certain agencies have been labelled corruption prone and others less so, and within agencies, some units are more prone than others. The University of the Philippines College of Public Administration research team, which studied corruption during the height of Martial Law when it was most dangerous to do so, considered corrupt practices to be a combination of propensity and propinquity.¹ In other words, a person may have a propensity for corruption but may not have the opportunity to commit graft. That same person, given opportunity that consistently tempts, may yield to his propensity.

This study aims to look at bureaucratic corruption from a psychological perspective, since the cultural dimension has been accepted as an explanation. Are there really personalities espousing (or not espousing) certain values which contribute to corruption?

Corruption in the Philippines: Historical and Cultural Explanations

Corruption in the Philippines has been traced to colonial experience which introduced alien institutions in their perverse form to a citizenry not accustomed to them.

Veneracion (1988) said no bureaucracy in the strict sense existed in precolonial Philippines. Because the native Filipinos lived communally in small settlements where lawmaking and implementation structures were simple, favors from decisionmakers were not needed. The Spaniards centralized the government and introduced bureaucratic institutions. Endriga attributed the resulting corruption in the government to the conflict in theory and practice of Roman law. He said:

... Corruption during the Spanish period can be broadly defined as deviation from the idealistic, high minded norms contained in legislation of various forms. Being derived from the Roman law tradition; Spanish political philosophy was very much steeped in the idea of law determined by the authority of will ... as contrasted with the authority of custom or usage of the community The contradictory nature of the objectives not only made administration difficult, but also provided bureaucrats enough leeway for discretion (Endriga 1979: 246-247).

One blatant cause of corruption was the practice during colonial times of auctioning positions in the bureaucracy to the highest bidder (Corpuz 1957; Veneracion 1988; Endriga 1979). The price of seats varied according to type of income or reward: (1) those which carried the right to charge fees; (2) those which entitled the occupants to charge some fees but conferred a lot of influence; and (3) salaried offices, which were few in number (Endriga 1979). The sale of offices was rampant at various levels including the judiciary, because "it was a rich and customary source of revenue for the Spanish king" (Corpuz 1989: 271). Naturally, those who bought their seats at prices much beyond their salaries, if any, had to recoup their investments through different means—by charging fees beyond the legally mandated, by granting favors in policy implementation, or by making decisions in favor of certain constituents.

The Americans superimposed the civil service system on a culture unused to the principles it carried. It "ran counter to Filipino culture, experience and, in some cases, personal interests" (Endriga 1979: 252). The Americans were themselves surprised when in 1935, Filipinos drafted a constitution for their own Commonwealth government whereby they strengthened the civil service law through many innovations. As Endriga noted:

... nor was the bureaucracy clean only on paper. Except for some instances of graft and corruption, the image of the civil service in the Philippines remained much in accord with the conventional picture: clean and prestigious. It remained for another period in Philippine history to tarnish that (Endriga 1979: 254).

What tarnished that clean image? The Japanese invasion in the Second World War was met with much resentment by a populace waiting to get their political independence from America. Fighting the Japanese became a passion, and subversion of the new power was done at all levels—through military confrontations, through underground resistance, and through bureaucracy. Stealing from the government, considered a puppet of the Japanese and subverting it became a patriotic deed. It was, in the words of Corpuz, “administrative corruption, rationalized by patriotic and economic necessity” (Corpuz 1957: 223). He noted that “the practice of the spoils system was largely unknown in the Philippines before 1946” (Corpuz 1957: 223). But the system must have been learned really well, judging from the cases of corruption exposed now by the media and in some instances brought before the Ombudsman. Defects or weaknesses in the administrative system, which has had to internalize both Weberian ideals and cultural ethics, may have made the spoils system a facile lesson to learn.

One manifestation of administrative weakness is inefficiency. Reyes described red tape and corruption as “two horns of the dilemma of administrative inefficiency” (Reyes 1982: 273). Red tape occurs, he said, “when requirements are deliberately encouraged so as to saddle clients with obligations that will force them to cut through the documentation by paying ‘speed money’” (Reyes 1982: 283). Senator Miriam Defensor Santiago, who made her mark as Commissioner of Immigration and Deportation, pointed to tedious and ambiguous rules as a cause of corruption in her agency. To clarify rules on immigration, she put them up where everyone could see, and simplified them so clients would not have to resort to paying an insider for information about how to go around the rules.

Bautista’s study on a regulatory agency showed the tediousness and ambiguity of rules as a cause of corruption. Studying the procedures of getting franchise for taxicab operation or for merely sealing taxi meters, she observed that approval was given on the basis of personalistic terms which involved waiving procedures or facilitating rules. Grease money (*lagay*) was used to expedite procedures (Bautista 1979). In his case study on supply management, de Guzman documented increased cost through overpricing, short deliveries, insufficient deliveries, purchases in excess of quantity required, etc. (De Guzman *et al.* 1979). Briones (1979) noted that the prevailing administrative culture at the time tolerated corruption despite legal and administrative prohibitions because people are generally averse to paying taxes and would find ways of getting around the law. This is matched by the temptation for people within to make a fortune.

Cariño and associates studied agencies classified by it as corruption prone — a revenue raising agency, a regulatory agency and an agency undertaking huge purchases. The last one does not exist anymore, the second

has a different name, with the same functions. The team studied corruption in those agencies. The study also looked at some agencies in seven countries of Asia. Focusing on the same types of agencies, they found differences in intensity (Cariño and associates 1986). Indeed they found that propensity and propinquity caused the high incidence of corruption in those types of agencies.

This study follows up on these previous works by looking at the psychological factors that may cause people to be corrupt. It starts with the hypothesis that there are differences in value profiles among government employees in corruption prone and less corruption prone agencies. These differences predispose employees in one type of agency to corruption and render those in another type to be resistant to temptation for corruption.

Methodology

Research and Sampling Design

Based on the assumption that the type of agency attracts persons with certain values to remain in agencies which conform to their predilections, the researchers used the independent comparison group design. Particular government agencies were purposively chosen from previously classified corruption prone agencies, such as those involved in revenue-raising, revenue spending and regulation of activities. Agencies considered as less corruption prone agencies were also similarly chosen. The aim was to find out if there are indeed differences in values between those working in corruption prone and in less corruption prone agencies. The Philippine Value Orientation Inventory (PVOI), a psychological test stressing values, was administered to personnel of these selected agencies.

Because of the length of the test to be administered, the researchers relied on personal contact with personnel officers of the selected agencies. Their cooperation was sought in getting frontline service employees who would be willing to take the PVOI. We explained that we were administering a test on value orientation of Filipinos.

Variables

Through the research, the investigators sought to find out whether those working in corruption prone agencies exhibit or profess certain values significantly different from those employees in less corruption prone institutions. The variables investigated were grouped into (1) economic values, (2) moral values, (3) interpersonal values, (4) professional values, (5) social values, (6) political values,

and (7) validity of and adherence to cultural norms. In addition, the relation of age, years in service, educational attainment and gender to corruption proneness was also studied.

Participants

Participants were drawn from frontline personnel of two types of agencies — corruption prone and less corruption prone. The very nature of the test in terms of length and number of questions prevented us from doing a random sample. However, although participation was voluntary, there was homogeneity in that they all came from the same level of positions — professional/technical frontline personnel.

Procedure

Basing choice of methodology on earlier studies of corruption conducted by the University of the Philippines College of Public Administration, "corruption prone" agencies and "less corruption prone" agencies were chosen by the researchers. The Philippine Value Orientation Inventory was then administered to these agencies alongside with the collection of the following demographic data from the participants: position, department or unit, ethnicity, province, city, sex, years in service and educational attainment. The data generated from the test administration was statistically analyzed to help identify subscale and value clusters where the two groups differ statistically.

Limitations of the Study

While we aspired for randomness of sample interviewees, the difficulty we encountered in the pretest constrained us to rely on volunteer respondents. It took us several weeks to get the pretest conducted at the corruption prone agency. Despite direct instructions from the head of office, the Personnel Officer seemed to drag her feet. We then scheduled sitdown tests for 25 respondents at a time. Although the respondents were limited to volunteers in frontline positions, we ensured that their tasks were homogenous.

Because of these, the results of this study are mainly indicative. However, the study itself can be used to conduct a more refined PVOI, which can be used for pre-entry tests into government agencies.

The Research Instrument: The Philippine Value Orientation Inventory (PVOI)

The Philippine Value Orientation Inventory aims to measure orientation in terms of economic, moral/spiritual, social, interpersonal/personal, political and cultural factors. The PVOI is mainly based on the *Panukat ng Ugali at Pagkatao* (PUP) Form A, a personality test written in Filipino, composed of 160 items consisting of 26 subscales including two validity subscales. The tests were developed by Virgilio G. Enriquez and associates in the *Pambansang Samahan sa Sikolohiyang Pilipino* (National Association for Filipino Psychology).

The study chose items from the PUP and added others based on values considered important in determining propensity for corruption as well as efficiency on the job. The preliminary form of the test consisted of 101 items grouped into ten subscales (honesty/denial, adherence to cultural norms, economic motivations, moral values, interpersonal relations skills, regard for society as a whole, professional values, political values, indifference to improprieties of others and ability to reason). The inventory was pretested using 67 government employees. After pretesting, 24 additional items were added and the items were reclassified into 36 subscales including two validity subscales. The test was then administered to 286 government employees and reliability analysis and item-analysis were done using the data. The subscales and items were again reviewed and revised according to the results of the statistical analysis. The present version of the test is in Filipino and is composed of 89 items distributed into 36 subscales including two validity subscales.

Item Analysis

Item analysis using item-total correlation and inter-item correlation resulted in the exclusion of 36 items leaving 89 out of the original 125 items.

Reliability Analysis

Data from the administration to a total of 286 government employees who participated in the present study were used in the computation of the *coefficient alpha reliability*. The resulting reliability coefficient is high at $r=0.8035$. In addition, computed split half-reliability coefficient is $r=0.7828$.

Norms

The norms are presented as mean scores. Norms for the entire sampling population were computed from the raw scores of 286 respondents from five (5) participating agencies. Norms for less corruption prone (n=141) and corruption prone agencies (n=145) were also computed.

Scoring

The PVOI uses a five-point scale: *Totoong totoo* [very true] (TT), *Totoo* [true] (T), *Walang Masabi* [no comment], *Hindi totoo* [not true] (H), and *Hinding-hindi* [definitely not true] (HH). The respondent (R) can get a maximum score of five (5) and a minimum of one (1). To counteract possible "yes" and "no" answering biases, the developers of the test formulated two directions of scoring. Thus, the test includes positively and negatively worded items. For positively stated items the R will get a score of 5 if he/she answers TT, 4 for T, etc. For negatively stated items the reverse applies, i.e., 1 for TT, 2 for T, etc. The scores for the items in the subscales are summed and divided by the number of items in each of the subscales to get the mean score for the subscales. The mean scores are the basis for interpretation.

Statistical Analysis of Results

Comparison of Corruption Prone and Less Corruption Prone Agencies

Mean scores of individuals coming from corruption prone and less corruption prone agencies for the 36 subscales were separately computed. The mean scores were then computed taking note which type of agency scored higher as well as the magnitude of the difference between means.

Comparison of Scores of Males and Females

Mean scores of males and females across agencies were separately computed and were also compared by computing for the difference between means to ascertain sex differences in scores in the PVOI.

Correlation between Scores and Age, Years in Service and Educational Attainment

Mean Scores of the 286 participants in the study for the 36 subscales were correlated with the following variables: age, years in service, and

educational attainment, using Pearson's Product Moment correlation coefficient.

Findings

The investigators sought to find out whether those working in corruption prone agencies exhibit or profess certain values significantly different from those of employees in less corruption prone institutions. The variables tested were grouped into (1) economic values, (2) moral values, (3) interpersonal values, (4) professional values, (5) social values, (6) political values and (7) validity of and adherence to cultural norms. In addition, the relation of age, years in service, educational attainment and sex to corruption was also studied. The variables in each category are:

A. Economic

1. *Ambisyon* (Ambition/Purposefulness — Goal Orientedness)
2. *Katipiran* (Thrift/Prudence/Austerity)
3. *Karangyaan* (Extravagance)
4. *Pagkasigurista* (Cautious/Non-risk Taking Attitude)
5. *Pabuya/Pagkilala* (Recognition/Reward)

B. Moral

6. *Pagkamakatotohanan* (Accepting of Reality)
7. *Pagka-Ispiritual* (Spirituality)
8. *Sekswalidad* (Sexuality)
9. *Bisyo* (Tendency for Vice) - e.g., cigarettes, alcohol, gambling

C. Interpersonal Skills

10. *Hirap Kausapin* (Difficult to Persuade)
11. *Lakas Loob* (Guts/Self-Confidence)
12. *Pagkamaalalahanin* (Thoughtfulness/Consideration or Concern for Others)
13. *Pagkamagalang* (Respect for Others)
14. *Pagkamapunahin* (Critical of Others)
15. *Pagkamaramdamin* (Sensitivity)
16. *Pagkapalaaway* (Quarrelsome means)
17. *Pagkasalawahan* (Fickle-mindedness)
18. *Pagkamapagtimpi* (Self-Control)
19. *Pikon* (Easily Offended/Oversensitive)
20. *Pagkamahiyain* (Shyness/Timidity/Hesitancy)
21. *Pagkamapagpakumbaba* (Humility)

RECEIVED BY: _____
 DATE: _____
 ACC. NO. _____
 CALL NO. _____
 DEN. _____

22. *Tigas ng Ulo* (Stubbornness/Fixed or set in Purpose or Opinion)
23. *Pagkamausisa* (Inquisitiveness)

D. Professional

24. *Pagkaresponsible* (Responsibleness/Trustworthiness/Reliability)
25. *Pagkamatiyaga* (Diligence/Perseverance/Steadfastness)
26. *Sipag at Kusa* (Industry and Initiative)
27. *Disiplina* (Discipline)
28. *Pagkamasinop* (Neatness/Orderliness)
29. *Pagkamalikhain* (Creativity)

E. Social

30. *Pagsisilbi sa Kapwa* (Service Orientation)
31. *Respeto sa Sarili* (Self-Concept in Relation to Others in Society)

F. Political

32. *Pakikibagay* (Conformity/Compliance)
33. *Sariling Pag-iisip* (Independence of Mind)
34. *Pakikisanghot* (Active Involvement with People and Causes)

G. *Pagpapahalaga sa Kultura* (Adherence to Cultural Norms)

H. *Pagkakaila* (Effort to Project Favorable Image of Self - this is a test of internal validity and honesty).

Among these variables, the most important are the professional values. For resisting corruption (or internalizing noncorrupt behavior), the important values to be tested are service-orientation, involvement with people and causes, and possibly, spirituality.

Pretests

For the pretests the two agencies chosen were: Agency A, a social service agency considered to be less corruption prone and Agency B, a revenue raising agency considered to be corruption prone. There were immediate problems of administration. The choice of agencies was made based on their differences in terms of corruption propensity as well as in terms of personal contacts with the heads of both offices. However, although contacts were made earlier with the head of the corruption prone agency (Agency B), tests could not be

administered in that agency as scheduled. On the other hand, response in the less corruption prone agency (Agency A) was swift and cooperative. As a result of these efforts, the total number of respondents in Agency A was 46, while for Agency B it was only 24. Out of the 24 respondents, the responses of three males from Agency B were discarded because they clearly violated the subscales of internal validity.

The Personnel Officer of Agency B kept postponing the testing, despite repeated follow ups. Word reached the researchers that there was reluctance among Agency B personnel to comply because they suspected that we would test their honesty! These despite statements from us that we were developing a test of value orientation for Filipinos, which their heads of offices welcomed as a test which may be used later for recruitment purposes. In the end, we were able to get ten more respondents, bringing the total for Agency B to 34, and the total for both agencies to 80.

These differences in experience in our two pretest agencies have given us a reflection of the types of persons in the two agencies. The personnel in Agency A were more trusting, while those in Agency B were suspicious of the personality test.

Those tested were professional/technical employees who deal directly with the clientele. Majority of those tested in both agencies have been in those agencies for ten years or less. A full third have been in agencies for less than five years. In terms of educational qualifications, personnel in Agency A have higher qualifications (in terms of educational attainment) than those in Agency B. In terms of gender, Agency A is predominantly female, where 30 of the 46 respondents are female.

Noticeable differences among Agency A and Agency B respondents can be found in values affecting professional conduct. Agency A respondents are more responsible (4.097 as against 3.97), more patient (3.79 as against 3.61) and more disciplined (4.326 as against 4.265). They scored higher in service-orientation (3.702 as against 3.38). In the denial subscale (a test of validity), they showed that they are less prone to dishonesty (2.648 versus 2.838).

There are other noticeable differences. Agency A respondents are more ambitious (3.505 as against 3.31). They are less concerned with rewards (3.152 as against 3.705) and less prone to vice (1.688 versus 1.814). (Specific data are in Appendix A.)

The main difference between Agency A and Agency B is in service orientation. Agency A has higher service orientation than Agency B, at 3.703 as against 3.383.

These results made us look at our scale again. We added more specific questions to remove the ambiguity of the responses, bringing the number of questions to 125. Those new questions were pretested with groups of students of the two researchers. Having thus revised the *Panukat ng Ugali at Pagkatao* (PUP), we proceeded to administer it to respondents from five other agencies. In doing so, we made sure to choose regulatory agencies rather than revenue collecting agencies, to weed out respondents from those agencies like Agency B which are notoriously corrupt and whose answer in the self-image items are questionable.

The Tests in Five Agencies

As previously mentioned, we added questions to the PUP to make the values we are after stand out. The number of questions was thus increased from 101 to 125. Again aspiring for 50 respondents from each agency, the respondents were drawn from four other agencies, two corruption prone and two less corruption prone; the corruption prone agencies chosen are regulatory agencies, while the less corruption prone are staff and service agencies. The less corruption prone agencies are a personnel agency and a hospital. Again, because we drew more cooperation from the less corruption prone agencies, we added another regulatory agency to the sample of corruption prone agencies, to come up with more equal samples for the statistical tests. We added a police agency to the corruption prone sample. The tests were conducted between January and July of 1994. The total number of respondents is 286; 145 for corruption prone and 141 for less corruption prone agencies.

In our discussion, we shall label our sample agencies in the following manner: Agency 1 is a personnel office; Agency 2 is a government hospital; Agency 3 is a regulatory agency dealing with land; Agency 4 is a regulatory agency dealing with transportation; and Agency 5 is a police agency.

Profile of Respondents. Agency 1 is a female-dominated agency; of 71 respondents, only twelve are male and 59 female. Because the respondents chosen were in the technical/professional rank and file level, most of the respondents have been in the service for only ten years or less, the average being 8.98 years. The mean age is 34.14 years.

As many as 96 percent of the respondents in Agency 1 hold bachelor's degrees, with the mean years of schooling at 14.9.

In Agency 2, where there are also more female than male workers, 29 of the 70 respondents are male and 41 female. The mean age is 34.86 years. As frontline service providers, there is an almost equal representation in terms of number of years in the agency, from below five years to above fifteen, although

the mean years in the hospital is 9.79. More than half (58.57%) of the respondents have finished a bachelor's degree. Again because of the nature of the jobs in a hospital, which include midwives and attendants, ten percent have had trade or vocational school training while 11.43 percent have had some college training.

Agencies 3 and 4 have a good mix of male and female employees, with females slightly outnumbering the males. In Agency 3, there were 26 female respondents (26 out of 40); from Agency 4, there were 38 females out of 51 respondents. The respondents in Agency 4 are older than in the other agencies, with a mean age of 44.25; in Agency 3, the respondents have a mean age of 36.37. In terms of mean years in the services the respondents in Agency 3 have been in government for an average of 15.56 years, while in Agency 4, they have a mean of 9.21 years in the government. As many as 65 percent of respondents in Agency 3 have bachelor's degrees while a full 84.31 percent in Agency 4 hold college degrees. For Agency 5, a male-dominated agency, 44 of the respondents are male and only ten are female. Their mean age is 38.21 years while their mean years in the agency is 13.30 years. Half of the respondents (51.85%) hold bachelor's degrees.

Table 1 shows the profiles of the respondents.

Table 1. Profiles of Respondents in Five Agencies

| | Agency 1 | Agency 2 | Agency 3 | Agency 4 | Agency 5 |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Mean Age | 34.14 | 34.86 | 44.25 | 36.37 | 38.21 |
| Mean Years in the Service | 8.99 | 9.80 | 15.56 | 9.21 | 13.30 |
| Mean Years in School | 14.90 | 13.38 | 13.34 | 14.18 | 13.41 |

As seen in Table 1, the respondents have similar characteristics. The oldest respondents, however, are in Agency 3, with a mean age of 44.25 years, while the rest are below 40. Agency 3 personnel also have the longest number of years in government, at 15.56 years, although Agency 5 respondents follow closely at 13.3. As for the mean years in school, Agency 1 and 4 have similar averages of 14 years, while Agencies 2, 3, and 5 have mean years at thirteen.

Value Profiles

The agencies were collapsed by type. Cluster A respondents come from less corruption prone agencies (agencies 1 and 2) while Cluster B respondents come from corruption prone agencies (agencies 3, 4 and 5).

Mean scores and standard deviations were computed for clusters of questions corresponding to specific values. These were first computed for each agency, then the means for corruption prone and less corruption prone agencies were combined and compared.

Responses in profession-related values show noticeable differences among respondents in Cluster A (less corruption prone agencies) and Cluster B (corruption prone). Cluster A respondents are more patient (3.796 compared to 3.653), have more initiative (3.305 as against 2.952), have more self-discipline (4.319 versus 4.255), are more tidy (3.711 compared to 3.652) and more creative (2.787 as against 2.634). In terms of relationship with the larger society, they have more service orientation (3.512 as against 3.269). (See Appendix B.)

Other noticeable differences are in ambition. Cluster A respondents are more ambitious than Cluster B (3.541 as against 3.395), more frugal (3.081 compared to 2.986) and more desirous of reward or recognition (3.397 versus 3.241). They are more realistic (3.792 as against 3.632), more spiritual (4.033 versus 3.888) and less prone to vice (1.744 as against 1.956). Moreover, they are more apt to be involved with others (3.996 as against 3.731).

Gender Differences

Correlations were also made between subscale scores and certain variables such as age, length of service and educational attainment. The mean scores of male and female respondents were also compared.

Significant correlation can be drawn for certain values and for some of the variables. For instance, respondents in all agencies get less ambitious as they grow older and as they stay longer in the agency, but ambition increases as they attain higher educational qualifications. Tendency toward vice increases with age and length of service but decreases with higher educational attainment. Concern for others decreases with age and length of service. Humility also decreases with age, just as inquisitiveness decreases with age and length of service. Sense of responsibility decreases with length of service; perseverance also decreases with age and length of service. Service orientation likewise decreases with age and length of service. However, high education correlates positively with more perseverance, industry and initiative, discipline and neatness. Higher education also increases one's understanding of cultural norms. (Refer to Appendix C for specific data.)

The implications of these findings point to the positive effects of higher education among government personnel. Higher education is able to neutralize tendencies brought about by aging and long years of service which

seem to cause respondents from both types of agencies to be less ambitious, more lazy and more prone to vice.

Values upheld by male and female respondents differ. Hewing to the Filipino stereotypes, female respondents are more spiritual than the males (4.06 as against 3.798). On the other hand, male respondents are more accepting of premarital and extramarital sex as well as homosexuality compared to the females (2.597 as against 2.621). Expectedly, males are also more prone to vice (2.206) than females (1.631). (See Appendix D for specific data.)

In terms of professional values, the female respondents scored higher than the males in terms of responsibility (4.048 versus 3.918), creativity (2.755 as against 2.636), self discipline (4.301 compared to 4.263) and industry and initiative (3.182 as against 3.036). Female respondents scored only slightly higher in patience (3.726 as against 3.721) and surprisingly scored lower in terms of neatness (3.668 as against 3.702 for the males).

Females also scored higher in service orientation (3.397 versus 3.375) and self respect (4.105 as against 3.986). They also tend to be more involved with others (3.957 as against 3.709).

There are, however, non-stereotyped results. For instance, female respondents showed more stubbornness (3.233 as against 3.045 among the males), tended to be more realistic in outlook (3.752 versus 3.645) and surprisingly, scored higher in the internal test of validity on denial (2.771 as against 2.685).

For the comparison between male and female, only three value subscales had absolute difference between means higher than 0.2: (a) spirituality (.262), (b) concern for others (.2613) and (c) involvement with others (.2483).

Differences by Agency Type

The top six scales where the less corruption prone agencies scored higher are: (a) initiative (absolute difference between means = .3533); (b) involvement with other people (.2655); (c) being critical (.2629); (d) easily embarrassed (.25); (e) service-orientation (.2433); and (f) concern for others (.2163). (Refer to Appendix E for specific data.)

We also ranked the values according to the mean scores derived from responses of two types of agencies. The ten highest ranked values are shown in Appendix G. These are: (1) discipline, (2) adhering to cultural norms, (3) inquisitiveness, (4) courtesy, (5) responsibility, (6) self-respect, (7) spirituality,

(8) involvement with others, (9) patience, and (10) sense of reality. We can say that there are values held in high esteem by government personnel, whether working in corruption prone or less corruption prone agencies. Among these are professional values: discipline, patience and sense of responsibility. Spirituality and sense of reality are moral values; inquisitiveness and courtesy have to do with the individual in relation to others. Service orientation has to do with relating to other people.

These tell us the values held in high esteem by people who work in government and reflect positive outlooks. Juxtaposed against Appendix E, however, we can infer that service orientation, concern for others and involvement with other people are the values which make a difference as far as less propensity for corruption is concerned.

Conclusions

The difference of means test and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation provide some useful results:

- (1) There are some noticeable difference in values and behavior among personnel in corruption prone and less corruption prone agencies, as shown in Appendix B. The differences are statistically significant in regard to the following variables, which show that respondents from less corruption prone agencies are more ambitious, regard incentive and recognition higher, are more cautious, more spiritual, more concerned about others, more sensitive, more critical, more easily offended, more easily embarrassed, more humble, more industrious and have more initiative, more service-oriented and more involved with people and causes.

The most important of these values, as far as corruption propensity is concerned, are ambition, cautiousness, sensitivity, more easily offended, humility, service orientation and involvement with people and causes. A person with such characteristics would find it more difficult to accede to temptation of graft and corruption.

- (2) Looking deeper, we find a magnitude of difference between means of some subscale results, reinforcing our hypothesis that employees from less corruption prone agencies have certain values which determine their attitudes and behaviors toward corruption. These values, we discovered, are: industry and perseverance, getting involved with people and causes and service orientation. After

these we have cautiousness, higher sense of embarrassment and ambition. (See Appendices E and F.)

- (3) An additional finding is a bonus. We found that there are values considered by people who work in government to be important, as seen in Appendix G. Those values are ranked among the highest ten by respondents from both corruption prone and noncorruption prone agencies. The order they occur may differ, but nine of the ten values ranked are espoused by respondents from both agencies. These are: discipline, adherence to cultural norms, inquisitiveness, respect for others, sense of responsibility, self-respect, spirituality, involvement with people and causes and perseverance. Only one value is ranked higher by those in less corruption prone agencies — regard for the truth.
- (4) There are also noticeable differences in values and attitudes between male and female respondents (Appendix D). Some of those findings contradict certain stereotypes about females. However, some of the values the female respondents espouse may account for their attraction to noncorruption prone agencies — spirituality, concern for others and greater involvement with people and causes.
- (5) There are also correlations between values held and variables such as age, length of service and educational attainments, as seen in Appendix C. Certain values such as humility, inquisitiveness, perseverance and ambition and even sense of responsibility and service orientation, decrease with age and length of service. Nevertheless, some value premises are reinforced by higher education. Higher education correlated positively with perseverance, industry and initiative and discipline, and provides a deeper understanding of Philippine cultural values. These point to positive effects of higher education for government personnel.
- (6) The Philippine Value Orientation Inventory (PVOI) can be a useful device for determining values held by Filipino government personnel, as the *Panukat ng Ugali at Pagkatao* (PUP) is used to determine personality characteristics.

Perhaps the most important of values for government are service orientation and involvement with people and causes, because these mitigate against temptation for corruption. Ambition, desire for recognition, industry and initiative are also good professional values to cultivate in the public service. These initial findings show the possibility of determining corruption propensity through a test of values. But the sample is still small. There is still need to administer the test to larger samples of government bureaucrats.

Moreover, our study shows that the PUP can be used as basis for the construction of a test on values for government personnel or possible recruits to the service.

We used corruption prone and less corruption prone agencies as convenient devices for determining corruption propensity. Our findings now show that individual employee values may influence the administrative culture of corruption or noncorruption in specific agencies. But does it work the other way around? Can a strong culture of corruption within an agency influence the behavior of recruits in that office? Only tests of employees before recruitment and after a period of, say, five years in an agency can reveal that. For now, we can say that persons working in less corruption prone agencies hold certain values which reinforce efficiency and "less corruption propensity" within those offices. On the other hand, as case studies on corruption prone agencies cited earlier have shown, the culture of corruption within agencies is strong. Thus, propensity as well as propinquity reinforce a culture of corruption within certain agencies.

On the larger social system, the Weberian concepts of impersonality and rationality, superimposed on a culture of personalism, familism and particularism cause a deviation from norms which may be labelled as corruption. Varela explained this:

For example, the giftgiving propensity of Filipinos as an expression of esteem, a gesture of *utang na loob* (gratitude), or an act of hospitality which are all acceptable behavior in Filipino society becomes "bribery" or "lagay" which is a negative and corrupt behavior in the bureaucracy. Similarly, helping relatives find employment in government is branded as nepotism which is now a grave offense punishable by suspension or dismissal from service but which is not only a positive expected behavior but even an honorable act which can earn the helping person respect and esteem of his family and community (Varela 1995: 176).

This was reaffirmed by anthropologist F. Landa Jocano in a lecture on Human Behavior in Organizations in 1993. He said that Filipino values like *awa* (pity) become silly sentimentalism in the bureaucracy and helping townmates becomes influence peddling. While no Filipino is rigid, he said, bureaucracy has little room for flexibility and nonconfrontation.

As this study has shown, the PVOI, as a scale developed using Filipino psychology as methodology, is a step toward expansion of the cultural explanation to test individual values and tendencies, based on non-Weberian concepts of efficiency and effectiveness in administration. It may be further refined to come up with a subtest focusing on Filipino values in administration.

Endnote

¹Please refer to various articles that appeared in the PJPA (i.e. January 1973, October 1975 and July-October 1979) that discussed "Negative Bureaucratic Behavior in the Philippines: Causes, Consequences and Control Measures," a series of studies on bureaucratic corruption conducted by the UP-CPA from 1972 to 1979.

References

- Alfiler, Ma. Concepcion P.
1985 Corruption Control Measures in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 29(2) (April): 180-220.
- Bautista, Victoria A.
1982 Nature, Causes and Extent of Corruption: A Review of the Literature. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 26 (3&4) (July-October): 235-270.
- Briones, Leonor M.
1979 Negative Bureaucratic Behavior and Development: The Case of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 23(3&4) (July-October): 255-278.
- Cariño, Ledivina V. (ed.)
1986 *Bureaucratic Corruption in Asia: Causes, Consequences and Controls*. Manila: JMC Press and U.P. College of Public Administration.
1979 The Definition of Graft and Corruption and the Conflict of Ethics and Law. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 23(3&4) (July-October): 221-240.
1975 Bureaucratic Norms, Corruption and Development. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 19(4) (October): 257-277.
- Carlota, Annadaisy J.
1985 The Development of the Panukat ng Pagkataong Pilipino (PPP). *Philippine Journal of Education and Measurement*. 4(1): 55-68.
- Corpuz, O.D.
1989 *The Roots of the Filipino Nation*. Quezon City: Aklahi Foundation.
1957 *The Bureaucracy in the Philippines*. Manila: U.P. Institute of Public Administration.
- De Guzman, Raul P. et al.
1979 Bureaucratic Behavior and Development: A Case Study of Supply Management in a Philippine Government Agency. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 23(3&4) (July-October): 279-295.
- Endrigo, Jose N.
1979 Historical Notes on Graft and Corruption in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 23(3&4) (July-October): 241-254.
- Enriquez, Virgilio G.
1992 *From Colonial to Liberation Psychology*. Quezon City: U.P. Press.

Enriquez, Virgilio and Ma. Angeles Guanzon

1985 Towards the Assessment of Personality and Culture: The Panukat ng Ugali at Pagkatao. *Philippine Journal of Education and Measurement*. 4(1): 15-54.

1983 *Manual ng Panukat ng Ugali at Pagkatao* (Test Manual). Quezon City: Philippine Psychology Research and Training House.

Reyes, Danilo R.

1982 Control Processes and Red Tape in Philippine Bureaucracy: Notes on Administrative Inefficiency. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 26(3&4) (July-October): 271-285.

Riggs, Fred W.

1964 *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Tapales, Proserpina D. and Ma. Concepcion P. Alfiler

1991 Sustaining Filipino Unity: Harnessing Indigenous Values for Moral Recovery. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 35(2) (April): 99-113.

Varela, Amelia P.

1995 Different Faces of Filipino Administrative Culture. In Proserpina D. Tapales and Nestor N. Pilar, eds. *Public Administration by the Year 2000: Looking Back Into the Future*. Quezon City: U.P. College of Public Administration and U.P. Press. 161-177.

Veneracion, Jaime B.

1988 *Merit and/or Patronage: A History of the Philippine Service*. Quezon City: Great Books Trading.

Appendix A

Pretest Population and Agency Means and Standard Deviations

| Scale | Population (N = 80) | | Agency A (n = 46) | | Agency B (n = 34) | | Difference Between Means (A-B) |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean (A) | SD | Mean (B) | SD | |
| Economic | | | | | | | |
| 1. <i>Ambisyon</i> | 3.4250 | .4472 | 3.5054 | .4549 | 3.3162 | .7834 | 0.1892 |
| 2. <i>Katipiran</i> | 3.1253 | .7164 | 3.1237 | .6715 | 3.1274 | .8502 | -0.0037 |
| 3. <i>Karangyaan</i> | 3.5500 | 1.0176 | 3.6739 | .9673 | 3.3824 | 1.0735 | 0.2915 |
| 4. <i>Pagkasigurista</i> | 3.2750 | .7991 | 3.2717 | .8213 | 3.2794 | .7804 | -0.0077 |
| 5. <i>Pabuya/Pagkilala</i> | 3.3875 | 1.1194 | 3.1522 | 1.1920 | 3.7059 | .9384 | -0.5537 |
| Moral | | | | | | | |
| 6. <i>Pagkamakatotohanan</i> | 4.0000 | 1.1474 | 4.0000 | 1.1547 | 4.0000 | 1.1547 | .0000 |
| 7. <i>Spiritual</i> | 4.2000 | .7860 | 4.1087 | .8493 | 4.3235 | .6840 | -0.2148 |
| 8. <i>Sekswal</i> | 2.0958 | .8806 | 2.1265 | .7972 | 2.0362 | .9331 | 0.0903 |
| 9. <i>Bisyo</i> | 1.7420 | .6815 | 1.6885 | .6829 | 1.8144 | .6831 | -0.1259 |
| Interpersonal | | | | | | | |
| 10. <i>Hirap Kausapin</i> | 3.1375 | .7159 | 3.1413 | .7123 | 3.1324 | .7314 | 0.0863 |
| 11. <i>Lakas ng Loob</i> | 2.0938 | .6516 | 2.1304 | .7072 | 2.0441 | .5822 | 0.2315 |
| 12. <i>Pag-aalala</i> | 2.6625 | 1.0427 | 2.7609 | 1.1192 | 2.5294 | .9288 | 0.2315 |
| 13. <i>Pagkamagalang</i> | 4.0188 | .6818 | 4.0109 | .6008 | 4.0294 | .7867 | -0.0185 |
| 14. <i>Pagkamapunahin</i> | 2.4500 | 1.0897 | 2.3696 | 1.1227 | 2.5588 | 1.0500 | -0.1892 |
| 15. <i>Pagkamaramdamin</i> | 3.1188 | .5597 | 2.9891 | .5602 | 3.2941 | .5167 | -0.305 |
| 16. <i>Pagkapalaaway</i> | 3.5875 | .7194 | 3.6522 | .6572 | 3.5000 | .7977 | 0.1522 |
| 17. <i>Pagkasalawahan</i> | 3.3375 | .7867 | 3.4130 | .7910 | 3.2353 | .7808 | 0.1777 |
| 18. <i>Pagkamapagtimpi</i> | 3.3750 | .7815 | 3.2283 | .8076 | 3.5735 | .7085 | -0.3452 |
| 19. <i>Pagkapikon</i> | 3.2375 | .7875 | 3.1522 | .8156 | 3.3529 | .7440 | -0.2007 |
| 20. <i>Pagkamahiyain</i> | 2.7000 | .8329 | 2.6739 | .8833 | 2.7353 | .7710 | -0.0614 |
| 21. <i>Pagkamapagpakumbaba</i> | 3.9411 | .4528 | 3.8689 | .4359 | 4.0388 | .4633 | -0.1699 |
| 22. <i>Tigas ng Ulo</i> | 2.6313 | .7149 | 2.6304 | .7989 | 2.6324 | .5943 | -0.002 |
| 23. <i>Pagkamausisa</i> | 4.2125 | .6879 | 4.1522 | .7293 | 4.2941 | .6291 | -0.1419 |
| Professional | | | | | | | |
| 24. <i>Pagkaresponsible</i> | 4.0438 | .5910 | 4.0978 | .5540 | 3.9706 | .6389 | 0.1272 |
| 25. <i>Pagkamatiyaga</i> | 3.7156 | .5816 | 3.7935 | .5199 | 3.6103 | .6490 | 0.1832 |
| 26. <i>Sipag at Kusa</i> | 3.0375 | .7947 | 3.1087 | .6490 | 2.9412 | .9595 | 0.1675 |
| 27. <i>Disiplina</i> | 4.3000 | .6038 | 4.3261 | .4740 | 4.2647 | .7511 | 0.0614 |
| Social | | | | | | | |
| 28. <i>Service Orientation</i> | 3.566 | .5789 | 3.7026 | .4972 | 3.3826 | .6360 | 0.32 |
| Political | | | | | | | |
| 29. <i>Pakikibagay</i> | 3.4500 | 1.0662 | 3.4160 | 1.0662 | 3.5000 | 1.0801 | -0.084 |
| 30. <i>Sariling pag-iisip</i> | 3.2578 | .6224 | 3.2967 | .6520 | 3.2050 | .5855 | 0.0917 |
| Cultural (31) | | | | | | | |
| 31. <i>Pagkakaila</i> | 4.2539 | .4237 | 4.2896 | .4172 | 4.2056 | .4338 | 0.084 |
| Cultural (32) | | | | | | | |
| 32. <i>Pagkakaila</i> | 2.7295 | .4659 | 2.6489 | .4797 | 2.8385 | .4295 | -0.1896 |

Legend: SD - standard deviation

Appendix B

**Comparison between Corruption Prone and
Noncorruption Prone Agencies**

| Scale | Population (N = 286) | | Agency A Less Corruption Prone (n=141) | | Agency B Corruption Prone (n=145) | | Difference Between Means (A-B) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|--|-------|---|------|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | |
| Economic | | | | | | | |
| 1. <i>Ambisyon</i> | 3.4668 | .4629 | 3.5408 | .435 | 3.3948 | .479 | 0.146 |
| 2. <i>Katipiran</i> | 3.0332 | .8365 | 3.0816 | .799 | 2.9862 | .872 | 0.0954 |
| 3. <i>Karangyaan</i> | 3.5734 | .9587 | 3.6525 | .918 | 3.4966 | | 0.1559 |
| 4. <i>Pagkasigurista</i> | 3.4056 | .7924 | 3.4220 | .852 | 3.3897 | .732 | 0.0323 |
| 5. <i>Pabuya/Pagkilala</i> | 3.3182 | .6531 | 3.3972 | .677 | 3.2414 | .621 | 0.1558 |
| Moral | | | | | | | |
| 6. <i>Pagkamakatotohanan</i> | 3.7110 | .4731 | 3.7921 | .436 | 3.6321 | .485 | 0.16 |
| 7. <i>Spirituwal</i> | 3.9594 | .5580 | 4.0326 | .555 | 3.8883 | .554 | 0.1443 |
| 8. <i>Sekswal</i> | 2.1302 | .7869 | 2.0178 | .7982 | 2.2395 | .760 | -0.2217 |
| 9. <i>Bisyo</i> | 1.89 | .7796 | 1.7445 | .776 | 1.9562 | .774 | -0.2117 |
| Interpersonal | | | | | | | |
| 10. <i>Hirap Kausapin</i> | 3.1014 | .6703 | 3.1525 | .694 | 3.0517 | .645 | 0.1008 |
| 11. <i>Lakas ng Loob</i> | 2.2640 | .7104 | 2.2518 | .729 | 2.2579 | .692 | -0.0061 |
| 12. <i>Pag-aalala</i> | 2.4790 | .9429 | 2.5887 | 1.029 | 2.3724 | .841 | -0.2163 |
| 13. <i>Pagkamagalang</i> | 4.1294 | .6386 | 4.0993 | .666 | 4.1586 | .612 | -0.0593 |
| 14. <i>Pagkamapunahin</i> | 2.3986 | 1.0539 | 2.5319 | 1.137 | 2.2690 | .952 | 0.2629 |
| 15. <i>Pagkamaramdamin</i> | 3.5555 | .5901 | 3.5787 | .573 | 3.5330 | .607 | 0.0457 |
| 16. <i>Pagkapalaaway</i> | 3.3763 | .7924 | 3.3723 | .782 | 3.3759 | .805 | -0.0036 |
| 17. <i>Pagkasalawahan</i> | 3.2360 | .7250 | 3.2411 | .719 | 3.2310 | .734 | 0.0101 |
| 18. <i>Pagkamapagtimpi</i> | 3.5769 | .6852 | 3.6099 | .689 | 3.5448 | .682 | 0.0651 |
| 19. <i>Pagkapikon</i> | 3.0892 | .7445 | 3.1879 | .733 | 2.9931 | .745 | 0.1948 |
| 20. <i>Pagkamahiyain</i> | 2.8129 | .7930 | 2.9397 | .792 | 2.6897 | .777 | 0.25 |
| 21. <i>Pagkamapagpakumbaba</i> | 3.7037 | .5059 | 3.7730 | .511 | 3.6362 | .493 | 0.1368 |
| 22. <i>Tigas ng Ulo</i> | 3.1608 | .7748 | 3.1631 | .708 | 3.1586 | .837 | 0.0045 |
| 23. <i>Pagkamausisa</i> | 4.1189 | .7008 | 4.1702 | .686 | 4.0690 | .714 | 0.1012 |
| Professional | | | | | | | |
| 24. <i>Pagkaresponsible</i> | 3.9983 | .6304 | 4.0674 | .601 | 3.9310 | .653 | 0.1364 |
| 25. <i>Pagkamatiyaga</i> | 3.7238 | .5258 | 3.7961 | .511 | 3.6534 | .955 | 0.1427 |
| 26. <i>Sipag at Kusa</i> | 3.1259 | .7620 | 3.3050 | .765 | 2.9517 | .720 | 0.3533 |
| 27. <i>Disiplina</i> | 4.2867 | .5248 | 4.3191 | .565 | 4.2552 | .483 | 0.0639 |
| 28. <i>Pagkamasinop</i> | 3.6815 | .6068 | 3.7113 | .613 | 3.6523 | .601 | 0.059 |
| 29. <i>Pagkamalikhain</i> | 2.7098 | 1.0377 | 2.7872 | 1.074 | 2.6345 | .999 | -0.1527 |
| Social | | | | | | | |
| 30. <i>Service Orientation</i> | 3.3891 | .6290 | 3.5124 | .623 | 3.2691 | .614 | 0.2433 |
| 31. <i>Respeto sa sarili</i> | 4.0594 | .6156 | 4.0638 | .643 | 4.0522 | .590 | 0.0116 |
| Political | | | | | | | |
| 32. <i>Pakikibagay</i> | 3.0769 | .7116 | 3.1241 | .655 | 3.0310 | .762 | 0.0931 |
| 33. <i>Sariling Pag-iisip</i> | 3.2343 | .7406 | 3.2660 | .757 | 3.2034 | .725 | 0.0626 |
| 34. <i>Pakikisangkot</i> | 3.8619 | .6709 | 3.9965 | .661 | 3.7310 | .656 | 0.2655 |
| Cultural (35) | | | | | | | |
| | 4.1951 | .4501 | 4.1949 | .450 | 4.1948 | .453 | 0.0001 |
| Pagkakaila (36) | | | | | | | |
| | 2.7378 | .4874 | 2.7235 | .509 | 2.7516 | .467 | -0.0281 |

Legend: SD - standard deviation

Appendix C

Correlation of Subscale Scores with Age, Length of Service and Educational Attainment

| Scale | Age (n = 279) r value | Length of Service (n = 276) r value | Educational Attainment (n = 277) r value |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Economic | | | |
| 1. <i>Ambisyon</i> | -0.1411* | -0.1636* | 0.1866** |
| 2. <i>Katipiran</i> | -0.0925 | -0.1029 | -0.0263 |
| 3. <i>Karangyaan</i> | -0.0581 | -0.0884 | 0.0340 |
| 4. <i>Pagkasigurista</i> | -0.0419 | -0.0080 | -0.0690 |
| 5. <i>Pabuya/Pagkilala</i> | 0.0178 | -0.0121 | -0.0031 |
| Moral | | | |
| 6. <i>Pagkamatotohanan</i> | -0.0576 | -0.0624 | 0.1287 |
| 7. <i>Spirituwal</i> | -0.0470 | -0.1004 | 0.1617* |
| 8. <i>Sekswal</i> | -0.0407 | -0.0844 | 0.0080 |
| 9. <i>Bisyo</i> | 0.2487** | 0.2487** | -0.2028** |
| Interpersonal | | | |
| 10. <i>Hirap Kausapin</i> | 0.0264 | -0.0519 | -0.0460 |
| 11. <i>Lakas ng Loob</i> | 0.0216 | 0.0213 | 0.0785 |
| 12. <i>Pag-aalala</i> | 0.1613* | 0.1815* | 0.0361 |
| 13. <i>Pagkamagalang</i> | -0.0044 | -0.0282 | -0.0107 |
| 14. <i>Pagkamapunahin</i> | -0.1304 | -0.1297 | 0.1790* |
| 15. <i>Pagkamaramdamin</i> | -0.0765 | -0.1155 | 0.0830 |
| 16. <i>Pagkapalaaway</i> | 0.0000 | -0.0129 | 0.0535 |
| 17. <i>Pagkasalawahan</i> | -0.0177 | 0.0264 | 0.0719 |
| 18. <i>Pagkamapagtimpi</i> | 0.0017 | 0.0106 | 0.0174 |
| 19. <i>Pagkapikon</i> | -0.0143 | -0.0316 | -0.0283 |
| 20. <i>Pagkamahiyain</i> | 0.0398 | 0.0467 | 0.0331 |
| 21. <i>Pagkamapagpakumbaba</i> | -0.1710* | -0.1249 | -0.0590 |
| 22. <i>Tigas ng Ulo</i> | -0.0644 | -0.0220 | 0.0017 |
| 23. <i>Pagkamausisa</i> | -0.1407* | -0.1471* | 0.1092 |
| Professional | | | |
| 24. <i>Pagkaresponsable</i> | -0.1240 | -0.1579* | 0.0961 |
| 25. <i>Pagkamatiyaga</i> | -0.2086** | -0.2186** | 0.1667* |
| 26. <i>Sipag at Kusa</i> | -0.0793 | -0.1137 | 0.1517* |
| 27. <i>Disiplina</i> | -0.0483 | -0.0674 | 0.1582* |
| 28. <i>Pagkamasinop</i> | -0.0622 | -0.1168 | 0.1727* |
| 29. <i>Pagkamalikinhain</i> | -0.0578 | -0.0492 | 0.0371 |
| Social | | | |
| 30. <i>Service Orientation</i> | -0.2178** | -0.1985** | 0.0584 |
| 31. <i>Respeto sa Sarili</i> | 0.0693 | 0.0415 | 0.1233 |
| Political | | | |
| 32. <i>Pakikibagay</i> | -0.0211 | -0.0118 | 0.1037 |
| 33. <i>Sariling Pag-iisip</i> | 0.0018 | 0.0176 | 0.0034 |
| 34. <i>Pakikisangkot</i> | -0.02165 | -0.02933 | 0.2020** |
| Cultural (35) | 0.0128 | -0.0140 | 0.0661 |
| Pagkakaila (36) | 0.0014 | 0.0186 | 0.0579 |

Legend: r value significant at: p<.01 = *; p<.001 = **

Appendix D

Comparison between Females and Males

| Scale | Population (N = 286) | | Females (n = 176) | | Males (n = 110) | | Difference Between Means (A-B) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|----------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | |
| Economic | | | | | | | |
| 1. <i>Ambisyon</i> | 3.4668 | .4629 | 3.5014 | .475 | 3.4114 | .438 | 0.09 |
| 2. <i>Katipiran</i> | 3.0332 | .8365 | 2.9716 | .860 | 3.1318 | .792 | -0.1602 |
| 3. <i>Karangyaan</i> | 3.5734 | .9587 | 3.5909 | .952 | 3.5455 | .973 | 0.0454 |
| 4. <i>Pagkasigurista</i> | 3.4056 | .7924 | 3.4205 | .757 | 3.3818 | .848 | 0.0387 |
| 5. <i>Pabuya/Pagkilala</i> | 3.3182 | .6531 | 3.3352 | .656 | 3.2909 | .651 | 0.0443 |
| Moral | | | | | | | |
| 6. <i>Pagkamakatotohanan</i> | 3.7110 | .4731 | 3.7520 | .455 | 3.6454 | .496 | 0.1066 |
| 7. <i>Spirituwal</i> | 3.9594 | .5580 | 4.0602 | .556 | 3.7982 | .505 | 0.262 |
| 8. <i>Seksual</i> | 2.6063 | 1.1045 | 2.5969 | 1.259 | 2.6213 | .7946 | -0.0244 |
| 9. <i>Bisyo</i> | 1.8519 | .7796 | 1.6305 | .701 | 2.2061 | .772 | -0.5756 |
| Interpersonal | | | | | | | |
| 10. <i>Hirap Kausapin</i> | 3.1014 | .6703 | 3.0938 | .694 | 3.1136 | .634 | -0.0198 |
| 11. <i>Lakas ng Loob</i> | 2.2640 | .7104 | 2.3125 | .728 | 2.1864 | .677 | 0.1261 |
| 12. <i>Pag-aalala</i> | 2.4790 | .9429 | 2.5795 | .971 | 2.3182 | .877 | 0.2613 |
| 13. <i>Pagkamagalang</i> | 4.1294 | .6386 | 4.1676 | .662 | 4.0682 | .596 | 0.0994 |
| 14. <i>Pagkamapunahin</i> | 2.3986 | 1.0539 | 2.4318 | 1.088 | 2.3455 | .999 | 0.0863 |
| 15. <i>Pagkamarandamin</i> | 3.5555 | .5901 | 3.4863 | .633 | 3.6664 | .496 | -0.1801 |
| 16. <i>Pagkapalaaway</i> | 3.3763 | .7924 | 3.3466 | .836 | 3.4182 | .718 | -0.0716 |
| 17. <i>Pagkasalawahan</i> | 3.2360 | .7250 | 3.2983 | .689 | 3.1364 | .772 | 0.1619 |
| 18. <i>Pagkamapagtimpi</i> | 3.5769 | .6852 | 3.5767 | .704 | 3.5773 | .657 | -0.0006 |
| 19. <i>Pagkapikon</i> | 3.0892 | .7445 | 3.0455 | .762 | 3.1591 | .713 | -0.1136 |
| 20. <i>Pagkamahiyain</i> | 2.8129 | .7930 | 2.8693 | .825 | 2.7227 | .734 | 0.1466 |
| 21. <i>Pagkamapagpakumbaba</i> | 3.7037 | .5059 | 3.7045 | .518 | 3.7023 | .488 | 0.0022 |
| 22. <i>Tigas ng Ulo</i> | 3.1608 | .7748 | 3.2330 | .727 | 3.0455 | .837 | 0.1875 |
| 23. <i>Pagkamausisa</i> | 4.1189 | .7008 | 4.1591 | .754 | 4.0545 | .603 | 0.1046 |
| Professional | | | | | | | |
| 24. <i>Pagkaresponsible</i> | 3.9983 | .6304 | 4.0483 | .665 | 3.9182 | .565 | 0.1301 |
| 25. <i>Pagkamatiyaga</i> | 3.7238 | .5258 | 3.7259 | .546 | 3.7205 | .495 | 0.0054 |
| 26. <i>Sipag at Kusa</i> | 3.1259 | .7620 | 3.1818 | .755 | 3.0364 | .768 | 0.1454 |
| 27. <i>Disiplina</i> | 4.2867 | .5248 | 4.3011 | .540 | 4.2636 | .501 | 0.0375 |
| 28. <i>Pagkamasinop</i> | 3.6815 | .6068 | 3.6685 | .624 | 3.7024 | .580 | -0.0339 |
| 29. <i>Pagkamalikhaan</i> | 2.7098 | 1.0377 | 2.7557 | 1.092 | 2.6364 | .946 | 0.1193 |
| Social | | | | | | | |
| 30. <i>Service Orientation</i> | 3.3891 | .6290 | 3.3974 | .625 | 3.3756 | .638 | 0.0218 |
| 31. <i>Respeto sa Sarili</i> | 4.0594 | .6156 | 4.1051 | .606 | 3.9864 | .626 | 0.1187 |
| Political | | | | | | | |
| 32. <i>Pakikibagay</i> | 3.0769 | .7116 | 3.0256 | .753 | 3.1591 | .635 | -0.1335 |
| 33. <i>Sariling Pag-iisip</i> | 3.2343 | .7406 | 3.2642 | .731 | 3.1864 | .757 | 0.0778 |
| 34. <i>Pakikisangkot</i> | 3.8619 | .6709 | 3.9574 | .648 | 3.7091 | .682 | 0.2483 |
| Cultural (35) | 4.1951 | .4501 | 4.2347 | .435 | 4.1317 | .471 | 0.103 |
| Pagkakaila (36) | 2.7378 | .4874 | 2.7709 | .466 | 2.6848 | .518 | 0.0861 |

Legend: SD - standard deviation

Appendix E

**Scales Ranked According to the Magnitude
of Difference Between Means
(Corruption Prone vs. Less Corruption Prone)**

| <i>Scale*</i> | <i>Absolute Difference Between Means</i> |
|---|--|
| Scales Where the Less Corruption Prone Agencies Score Higher | |
| (26) <i>Sipag at Kusa</i> | 0.3533 |
| (34) <i>Pakikisangkot</i> | 0.2655 |
| (14) <i>Pagkamapunahin</i> | 0.2629 |
| (20) <i>Pagkamahiyain</i> | 0.2500 |
| (30) <i>Service Orientation</i> | 0.2433 |
| (12) <i>Pag-aalala</i> | 0.2163 |
| (19) <i>Pagkapikon</i> | 0.1948 |
| (06) <i>Pagkamakatotohanan</i> | 0.1600 |
| (03) <i>Karangyaan</i> | 0.1559 |
| (05) <i>Pabuya/Pagkilala</i> | 0.1558 |
| (29) <i>Pagkamalikhain</i> | 0.1527 |
| (01) <i>Ambisyon</i> | 0.146 |
| (07) <i>Spirituwal</i> | 0.1443 |
| (25) <i>Pagkamatiyaga</i> | 0.1427 |
| (21) <i>Pagkamapagpakumbaba</i> | 0.1368 |
| (24) <i>Pagkaresponsible</i> | 0.1364 |
| (23) <i>Pagkamausisa</i> | 0.1012 |
| (10) <i>Hirap Kausapin</i> | 0.1008 |
| (02) <i>Katipiran</i> | 0.0954 |
| (32) <i>Pakikibagay</i> | 0.0931 |
| (18) <i>Pagkamapagtimpi</i> | 0.0651 |
| (27) <i>Disiplina</i> | 0.0639 |
| (33) <i>Sariling Pag-uusip</i> | 0.0626 |
| (28) <i>Pagkamasinop</i> | 0.059 |
| (15) <i>Pagkamaramdamin</i> | 0.0457 |
| (04) <i>Pagkasigurista</i> | 0.0323 |
| (31) <i>Respeto sa Sarili</i> | 0.0116 |
| (17) <i>Pagkasalawahan</i> | 0.0101 |
| (22) <i>Tigas ng ulo</i> | 0.0045 |
| Cultural (35) | 0.0001 |
| Scales Where the Corruption Prone Agencies Score Higher | |
| (08) <i>Sekswal</i> | 0.2217 |
| (09) <i>Bisyo</i> | 0.2117 |
| (13) <i>Pagkamagalang</i> | 0.0593 |
| <i>Pagkakaila (36)</i> | 0.0281 |
| (11) <i>Lakas ng Loob</i> | 0.0061 |
| (16) <i>Pagkapalaaway</i> | 0.0036 |

*Number in parentheses indicates the subscale number.

Appendix F

**Subscales Ranked According to Magnitude of Absolute Difference
Between Means of Males and Females**

| <i>Subscale*</i> | <i>Absolute Difference Between Means (A - B)</i> |
|---|--|
| Subscales Where Females Score Higher | |
| (07) <i>Spirituwal</i> | 0.262 |
| (12) <i>Pag-aalala</i> | 0.2613 |
| (34) <i>Pakikisangkot</i> | 0.2483 |
| (22) <i>Tigas ng Ulo</i> | 0.1875 |
| (17) <i>Pagkasalawahan</i> | 0.1619 |
| (20) <i>Pagkamahiyain</i> | 0.1466 |
| (26) <i>Sipag at Kusa</i> | 0.1454 |
| (24) <i>Pagkaresponsible</i> | 0.1301 |
| (11) <i>Lakas ng Loob</i> | 0.1261 |
| (29) <i>Pagkamalikhain</i> | 0.1193 |
| (31) <i>Respeto sa sarili</i> | 0.1187 |
| (06) <i>Pagkamakatotohanan</i> | 0.1066 |
| (23) <i>Pagkamausisa</i> | 0.1046 |
| Cultural (35) | 0.103 |
| (13) <i>Pagkamagalang</i> | 0.0994 |
| (01) <i>Ambisyon</i> | 0.09 |
| (14) <i>Pagkamapunahin</i> | 0.0863 |
| Pagkakaila (36) | 0.0861 |
| (33) <i>Sariling Pag-iisip</i> | 0.0778 |
| (03) <i>Karangyaan</i> | 0.0454 |
| (05) <i>Pabuya/Pagkilala</i> | 0.0443 |
| (04) <i>Pagkasigurista</i> | 0.0387 |
| (27) <i>Disiplina</i> | 0.0375 |
| (30) <i>Service Orientation</i> | 0.0218 |
| (25) <i>Pagkamatiyaga</i> | 0.0054 |
| (21) <i>Pagkamapagpakumbaba</i> | 0.0022 |
| Subscales Where Males Score Higher | |
| (09) <i>Bisyo</i> | 0.5756 |
| (15) <i>Pagkamaramdamin</i> | 0.1801 |
| (02) <i>Katipiran</i> | 0.1602 |
| (32) <i>Pakikibagay</i> | 0.1335 |
| (19) <i>Pagkapikon</i> | 0.1136 |
| (16) <i>Pagkapalaaway</i> | 0.0716 |
| (28) <i>Pagkamasinop</i> | 0.0339 |
| (08) <i>Sekswal</i> | 0.0244 |
| (10) <i>Hirap Kausapin</i> | 0.0198 |
| (18) <i>Pagkamapagtimpi</i> | 0.0006 |

*Number in parentheses indicates the subscale number.

Appendix G

**Ten Values where Respondents
from Both Kinds of Agencies Scored High**

| <i>Scale</i> | <i>Less Corruption Prone</i> | <i>Corruption Prone</i> |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. <i>Disiplina</i> | 4.3191 | 4.2552 |
| 2. <i>Cultural</i> | 4.1949 | 4.1948 |
| 3. <i>Pagkamausisa</i> | 4.1702 | 4.0690 |
| 4. <i>Pagkamagalang</i> | 4.0993 | 4.1586 |
| 5. <i>Pagkaresponsible</i> | 4.0674 | 3.9310 |
| 6. <i>Respeto sa sarili</i> | 4.0638 | 4.0522 |
| 7. <i>Spirituwal</i> | 4.0326 | 3.8883 |
| 8. <i>Pakikisangkot</i> | 3.9965 | 3.7310 |
| 9. <i>Pagkamatiyaga</i> | 3.7961 | 3.6534 |
| 10. <i>Pagkamakatotohanan</i> | 3.7921 | 3.6321 |