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Executive Summary

In response to the call for re-evangelization of the Philippine political culture, the Philippine Province through the Commission on Evangelization of Culture initiated the study of Corruption in the Philippines, and the production of a reflection and action manual on corruption.

An extensive consultation on corruption across socio-economic classes over Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao was conducted using focus group discussions. The sectors consulted were: the business people, urban poor, parents/teachers, government, non-government organizations, farmers/fishers, Couples for Christ/ecumenical group, indigenous people, students, out-of-school youth, rural youth, and internally displaced persons.

The consultation aimed to provide information towards a cross-sectoral understanding of corruption in the Philippines. Specifically, it aimed to determine people's perception on the concept of corruption; define the roles they perceived themselves playing in situations of corruption; identify people's beliefs regarding the tolerability and justifiability of corruption acts; identify reasons underlying these beliefs on the tolerability and justifiability of corruption acts; identify perceived effects of corruption on individual, community and society; and enumerate concrete strategic interventions to address the problem of corruption.

Hypothetical situations of corruption acts such as vote padding, money laundering including kidnap for ransom syndicate, taking money from illegal sources, nepotism and low-cost quality education for low-income and acts of heroism or honor, and the FGD participants' personal knowledge and experiences of situations of corruption were used to elicit responses to the stated objectives.
The focus group discussions' results revealed that people's perception indicated a broad understanding of corruption that embraces the common, legal definition of corruption; they tended to associate corruption with symbols, effects, forms, local parlance, and characteristics of the act itself.

Symbols of corruption varied among sectors. Among the government and non-government organizations, business people, students and urban poor, corruption was depicted as a cancer or neo-classical cancer which cut across social classes. They also likened it to a voracious crocodile (buwaya) intent on devouring beyond its fill. Indigenous people, on the other hand, associated corruption with jueteng lords; farmers/fishers, some government representatives, and parents/teachers with an octopus having tentacles (galamay) and head (ulo); urban poor with roots (ugat) of a tree that deeply penetrates into and holds on to the soil; students with the men in blue/brown uniforms, those in barong, and past political personalities like ex-presidents Marcos and Estrada as well as political icons like mansions, shoes, the spade, the pork barrel, and internal revenue allowance.

Corruption was also viewed in such forms as extortion, bribery, various sectoral types of cheating or stealing, plunder, and nepotism in all levels and across most sectors of the society.

The wide range of responses on notions about corruption seemed to reflect both the pervasiveness of the phenomenon in the various sectors of the society as well as a lack of agreement as to what constitute it. The association of corruption with adverse effects on the economy and on the morality of the society reflected the participants high level of awareness of its debilitating effects. In particular, the strong assertion of the moral effects of corruption was consistent with the participants' characterization of corruption as intrinsically deviant from moral and legal norms.

Generally, the participants identified seven (7) roles they perceived themselves playing in situations of corruption: (1) the initiator/instigator, sometimes referred to as mastermind by some participants, (2) the willing collaborators, (3) the silent collaborators, (5) the interveners, (6) the gainers, and (7) the losers.
The initiator/instigator reflected persons from the higher echelons of society with personal resources and control of institutional resources; so were the collaborators although to a lesser degree. Those who are directly involved are those in power and who have resources which they use in exploiting and influencing others to corrupt.

The interveners identified by the respondents were few but were pointed out as being found in various sectors of the society, even in the government. They, too, were perceived to possess resources which matched those of the corrupt. Their behavior was described as concretely manifesting a higher degree of morality permeating their persons.

The gainers were mostly those who instigate/initiate or the mastermind and the collaborators, the silent and the reluctant.

The losers, finally, were viewed to be those among the less powerful, the passive ones, the objects of manipulation. Very few individuals, however, referred to the instigator/initiator and the collaborators as the losers.

The focus group discussions indicated a wide recognition and admission of the participants' involvement in and sense of responsibility for the existence of a culture of corruption, regardless of the roles they play, their weaknesses, strengths, and struggles, and the various possible forms of intervention that might be adopted. The existence of a culture of corruption was counteracted by the espoused belief that the presence of interveners in almost all sectors even among the high-ranking government officials warranted great hope in combating corruption.

The focus group discussions also identified some acts opposite to corruption, or acts considered as heroic or honorable. Generally, people involved in heroic or honorable acts were regarded as modern day heroes (bayani), God-fearing people, good samaritans, endangered species, or derogatorily as stupid (tanga), abnormal, crazy (balitaw), dumb (hangal) and others.

A general contention that corruption in all forms and situations could not be justified prevailed among the FGD participants. However, differing opinions on its justifiability given certain conditions also existed. Depending on a given context and on which sector was looking at which situation, some corruption
acts were viewed as justifiable. These perceived justifiable individual corruption acts referred to those done solely for humanitarian and security reasons.

Corruption situations that grossly and adversely impinged on the interest of the public such as vote padding, money laundering, and taking money from illegal sources were regarded as non-justifiable. So was nepotism but to a lesser degree. Farmers/fishers, PTAs, and IPs justified nepotism only for an overriding need for basic necessities, while Filipino-Chinese students for trustworthiness. The provision of a sub-standard salary for teachers for a low-cost quality education for low-income groups was seen as justifiable by the farmers/fishers, PTAs and OSY but contested by the groups of NGOs and the government.

Except for some individual farmers/fishers from Bicol and IP participants who seemed to be merciful towards the corruption acts of the religious priest, all the other sector participants expressed a strong stance against him despite a paramount need to support the marginalized sector, the youth and the orphans. Such attitude seems to exhibit a culture of high deference to religious authority and a moral perception that as a priest, he cannot be morally complacent to sin.

While it was generally contended that all corruption acts were non-justifiable, there were some acts which were seen as tolerable and acceptable. Corruption acts done when one's self- and family's security was threatened and when economic need was severe were tolerated by sectors such as Filipino-Chinese students and some individuals from the OSY, IDP, PTAs, IPs and farmers/fishers.

Nepotism was regarded as acceptable by the government and IPs of Basilan who perceived that the practice had also become acceptable to the society and that nothing could be done about it. Likewise, the Filipino-Chinese students who believed that blood is thicker than water, indicating the trustworthiness of one's relatives. Some tended to believe that corruption done at random, or to save time, money and effort was tolerable.

In the non-specific, global context, however, corruption was considered intolerable because it was viewed as sinful, immoral and unethical. This was likewise the stance with acts of corruption that
were blatantly exploitative, against public interest or contributory to the perpetuation of poverty and the deterioration of security. Corruption done out of blindly reciprocating a favor or done using *palakasan* or *padrino* system received disapproval. The situation was much more unacceptable when the practice had become a way of life. Both the NGOs and the CFC were staunch in their stand that the means does not justify the end.

The findings show that corruption may be tolerated especially if these were negligible, minimized, and not systematized. It can also be surmised that corruption acts are tolerated because of a primordial need that must be fulfilled within a certain period of time through means that do not significantly adversely affect the public. In other words, when a primordial need is at stake, one may be forced to compromise something he values in himself for the satisfaction of such need. This implies that when systems are set that respond to such need, tolerability level may diminish and the incidence of corruption be lessened.

When tolerable acts, if at all, become repetitive and systematic, blatant, brazen, callous and already distort or destroy one's orientation and values, these acts become intolerable, certainly unjustifiable and therefore undesirable. This confirms the earlier findings that the PPD participants still exhibit a strong sense of right and wrong, thus depicting a strong moral climate that restricts deviant behaviors of a society whose moral fabric is still reparable.

Determinants of corruption were manifold and complex. These were classified into: individual, institutional and social factors. Individual-related factors included economic needs, greed, security, cost and benefit considerations, ignorance and apathy; institutional factors were bureaucratic red tape, too many discretionary powers, inadequate internal control, lack of law enforcement and information available to the public, and low wages/salaries; and societal factors consisted of *utang na loob* reciprocity (debt of gratitude), social tolerance, personalism and particularism, culture of deference to authority, materialism and poverty.

Besides the worsening poverty situation, feeling of insecurity, and weakening of nationalistic consciousness, the sectors believed
that corruption promoted a sense of hopelessness and pessimism as well as individualism and callousness to reality among individuals. On the community and society levels, corruption was perceived to have been responsible for the plunging economy, the massive environmental destruction, the destabilization of the peace and order situation as crime rate increases, among others.

The above motivations underlying corruption and perceived effects suggest that corruption is deeply embedded and interwoven not only in the socio-eco-political and cultural context of a community or society but also within the personality of the corruptor and corruptee. The multiplicity and complexity of corruption makes it a seemingly intractable problem but finds hope among individuals who still reject corruption despite its costs, groups of individuals who still have a strong sense of rights and wrong, and a society that exhibits a strong moral-orientation climate.

The above findings further suggest the need to approach the problem from various perspectives and at various levels: the individual, family, community and society. It implies the need for a deeper understanding of the occurrence of corruption and its tolerability and intolerability as well as a knowledge of the nature or characteristics of the sector and actors involved, what is at stake, the magnitude of the impact, and the socio-eco-political and cultural context of corruption.

The results of the consultations also revealed that a number of sectors had attempted to intervene in situations of corruption. The reasons for intervention ranged from individual convictions to the installation of systems that help in preventing or exposing acts of corruption. Individual convictions included personal beliefs, integrity and the sense of duty to report corruption, idealism, strong spirituality and values orientation among others. The installation of systems included the provision of awards and incentives for those who resist corruption, workable checks and balances, transparency in transactions, and the presence of reliable and credible organizations and financial systems.

Forms of intervention varied from sector to sector. For the parents/teachers, employees of business, government and non-government organizations, forms of intervention assumed such
forms as monitoring financial records, punching in bundy clocks, vigilance in associations or unions, formal filing of reports and complaints among others. For the grassroot sectors, these included collective negotiations with government agencies without favor and rent-seeking activities. For the students and the out-of-school youth, the forms of intervention mostly consisted of reporting to authorities.

Recommendations to enhance acts of heroism/honor and reduce corruption in the Philippines emerged on three levels: individual, group and institutional. Besides individual reporting, the group discussion participants believed that an individual’s sense of responsibility, accountability and spirituality that keep him or her from engaging in corruption must be enhanced and nurtured.

Group actions as a means to fight corruption was deemed necessary. Possible avenues for groups to combat this ill may include renewal movements, integrity circles, prayer groups, citizens’ watchdogs and autonomous community-based anti-corruption movements.

Recommended institutional responses varied according to the nature and functions of institutions whether they were from government, the media, the church, the non-government organizations, the business chambers and the schools. Examples of these specific recommendations were: for the government, implementation of checks and balances on discretionary powers of government, simplification of bureaucratic and complicated systems and processes, the review and introduction of “over hauls” in the top corrupt government agencies, and the improvement of poverty alleviation programs; for the media, documentation and recognition of best practices in government service; for the school, formulation and integration of anti-corruption curriculum at all levels of education, and the integration of values formation programs; for the non-government organizations, the setting up of public monitoring systems on contractors; for the church, the strengthening of family institutions in building foundations of good values and practices; and for the business sector, the provision of support for all these anti-corruption endeavors.
All sectors mentioned that the dissemination of information on Philippine laws on anti-corruption, the conducting of anti-corruption dialogs and public fora, the deglamourization of corruption, the organizing of initiatives to promote and enhance heroism, the promotion of transparency and exploration of creative modes and techniques to enhance transparency, among others, were things to be encouraged.

To start the process of a long-term anti-corruption program in the Philippines by the Jesuit Commission on Evangelization of Culture, some concrete and doable interventions have already been specifically formulated in the area of policy reforms agenda, research agenda, and capacity-building and institutional development based on these findings.
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Introduction

BACKGROUND

For more than a decade, the entire nation witnessed the significant economic, social and political transformation of Philippine society. Most, if not all, saw how, after the democratic political institutions were restored, and decentralization and devolution commenced with the enactment of the Local Government Code, the Philippine economy evolved from a “sick man of Asia” to a promising prospect for the 21st Century. However, the economic downturn brought about by the Asian financial crisis, followed by the socio-political and moral upheaval associated with the downfall of former President Joseph Estrada, almost robbed the Philippines of the freedom, justice and growth for which the country had long fought.

The May 1, 2001 uprising of the masses, though orchestrated by the political allies of President Estrada, was a shocking, mind-boggling and humbling experience to many, the church and civil society in particular, who had worked endlessly for the betterment of the lives of the poor. The conviction that their long years of working with the masses for social change and development had made significant impact on their lives suddenly crumbled. The very same people they were working for or with were now at the forefront of the upheaval providing support to the corrupt administration of Estrada. The incident indicated
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that, despite the sophistication of their social development paradigms and education programs, they had not fully understood the poor nor responded adequately to their needs.

For the Jesuits in the Philippines, the above conflict demonstrated how their promotion of faith that does justice had badly fallen short of its goal. As suggested by its 34th General Congregation, their faith-impelled pursuit of justice lacked the cultural sensitivity and cultural transformation required of genuine evangelization. A culture of politics and a culture of the poor appeared impervious to the efforts of church workers, no matter how much they had attempted to come closer to the poor. Thus, the call for a re-evangelization of the Philippine political culture which involves influencing not only the poor but the wealthy and the powerful as well.

As a concrete response, the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus convened a Committee on the Evangelization of Culture. This committee was tasked to better understand Philippine culture, especially Philippine political culture, as an object of evangelization. After its exhaustive discussions and deliberations, the Committee then identified corruption as a pervasive social problem that required deeper understanding and immediate attention. It subsequently recommended to the Philippine Province the production of a reflection and action manual on corruption that could aid the apostolate programs of the Jesuits – and all of kindred spirits – to better understand corruption and respond effectively against it.

Thus, the call for a re-evangelization of the Philippine political culture which involves influencing not only the poor but the wealthy and the powerful as well.

As a step towards the production of this manual, the Committee decided to conduct extensive consultations on corruption across socio-economic classes in Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao. It was thought that through the consultation process, the Commission would be able to not only generate information on the people’s views on corruption but also allow the various sectors to reflect on their own personal experiences thus raising their level
of social, political and cultural awareness with regard to the social problem of corruption.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Generally, this study attempted to provide pertinent information towards a cross-sectoral understanding of corruption in the Philippines.

Specifically, it aimed to:

1. Determine people’s perceptions of corruption;
2. Define the roles they perceived themselves playing in situations of corruption;
3. Identify people’s beliefs regarding the tolerability and justifiability of corruption acts;
4. Identify reasons underlying these beliefs on the tolerability and justifiability of corruption acts;
5. Identify perceived effects of corruption on individual, community and society; and
6. Enumerate concrete strategic interventions to address the problem of corruption.

METHOD

The Research Design

This research was highly qualitative in nature; no attempt was made to conduct statistical analysis. The study solely employed the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) approach. Its appropriateness to the task stemmed largely from its ability to elicit and document untrammeled opinions and views of various sectors through an environment of listening, sensitivity and respect for opposing positions. The FGD sessions allowed the participants to freely voice out their views. In the process, the FGD facilitators heard the views, beliefs, and perceptions of the participants on topics that were chosen to gather the information needed for the study. The complex flow of information, the sharing of knowledge based on experience, and the interplay of attitudes and emotions
among participants made for a rich understanding of the participants’ views and convictions about corruption.

The FGD Process

Depending on the sector and the time factors, a mix of methods was employed to generate the required responses from the participants. Aside from the usual round-robin type of acquiring responses, the Technology of Participation (TOP) was used. This technique requires the participants to write their responses on metacards or idea cards and mount them on the board. The facilitators then process these responses. Common ideas are clustered and titled, and any unclear ideas fed back to the group for clarifications. This enables every participant to share their ideas without the apprehension that comes parcel with giving unpopular or dissenting responses.

The FGD Instrument

The FGD set of questions had three main parts. The first part gauged the notions of people on what corruption is and what it is not. It began by posing the question: What comes to mind when you see or hear the word “corruption”? Personal experiences of corruption were then drawn out of the participants by asking them how they had personally encountered corruption; subsequently, they were led to explore the roles they played in these experiences. In order to facilitate a concrete framework by which the respondents could reflect on these experiences, six (6) hypothetical cases pertaining to vote padding, money laundering, nepotism, taking money from illegal sources, the situation of a taxi driver, and low-cost quality education were also presented and tackled.

To determine the participants’ awareness of cases counter to corruption, they were asked to identify the elements in each of the hypothetical cases which were contrary to corruption, and to characterize the act or the person who so acted in such manner. This served as a take off point for participants to share their personal experiences of similar heroic and honorable acts.

The second part attempted to determine the participants’ attitudes towards corruption by enabling them to reflect on their personal experiences, attitudes and behavior. The process asked them to imagine themselves in the cases and determine which of these were tolerable or non-tolerable. They were led to reflect on
their values, belief systems and behavior, then determine which situations were, in the cultural context, acceptable or tolerable in normal practice, even though in themselves they might be unacceptable or unjustifiable in theory, i.e., in one’s set of principles, beliefs, convictions. Questions on the possible effects of corruption on the individual, community and society were then asked.

The third part sought to elicit ways to address corruption. Questions on reasons for interventions and non-interventions, and forms of intervention were asked. The final questions focused on the possible concrete actions that an individual, a group or an institution might take to reduce corruption and reinforce acts of heroism and honor.

The FGD Participants, Their Geographical Areas, and the Sectors Represented

A total of 24 FGDs were conducted over Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao. Shown below is the list of Jesuit apostolate areas by geography and the corresponding sectors tapped in the study. These identified sectors cut across the socio-economic classes of society.

Geographical Areas and Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Area</th>
<th>Luzon</th>
<th>Visayas</th>
<th>Mindanao</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baguio</td>
<td>Students, Ecumenical Group, Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordillera</td>
<td>Urban Poor, NGOs, Businesspeople/Traders, Government Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>Farmers/Fishers, Parents/Faculty, Urban Poor, Couples for Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagayan</td>
<td>Parents/Faculty, Out-of-School Youth (urban-based), Farmers/Fishers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davao</td>
<td>Parents/Faculty, Businessmen/Traders, Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamboanga</td>
<td>Businessmen/Traders, Internally Displaced Persons, Moslem Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilan</td>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The key informants or participants in the FGDs were selected based on their availability, willingness, position, and active involvement in their respective organizations; as well as assertiveness and ability to articulate their opinions. Letters of invitation were sent to those who were identified as potential participants.

Key informants among the business sector were the presidents, chief executives and lawyers of big private corporations including banks, real estate developers, insurance companies and construction firms. High-ranking officers of the local Chambers of Commerce as well as owners of jewelry shops and stall owners were also in this group.

Those from the government sector included executives from such agencies as the Civil Service Commission (CSC), Bureau of Internal Revenue (DIR), Philippine Charity Sweepstakes Office (PCSO), Presidential Commission for the Urban Poor (PCUP), Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HNDCC), Department of Transportation and Communication (DTC), Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Land Transportation Office (LTO), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG). Barangay officials, city councilors, heads of the urban poor offices, city health officers, and the women’s desk of the Philippine National Police were also included in this sector.

The partners of the Society of Jesus in their social apostolate in Manila comprised the Non-Government Organizations (NGO) sector. These included the
Ateneo Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs (ACSSPPA), the Institute of Social Order (ISO), the Sentro ng Alternatibong Lingap Panlegal (Saligan), the HEALTHDEV Institute, the Center for Community Services (CCS), the Kristong Hari Foundation, Inc., Environmental Science for Social Change (ESSC), the Catholic Ministry to Deaf People, Inc. (CMDP), and Institute on Church and Social Issues (ICSI).

The Council of Elders, area provincial coordinators, and private individuals of the Catholic-affiliated Couples for Christ (CFC) organization represented the religious sector. Included, too, were a mix of Roman Catholics, Born-again Christians, and Buddhists.

The parents/faculty sector included officers and selected individuals with significant involvement in the Parents/Teachers Association (PTA), youth formation and community affairs. They came from different schools and universities of the designated geographical areas and cut across elementary, high school and college levels.

Those from the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) sector was composed of those who had temporarily left the municipality of Sumisip in the Province of Basilan. They were mostly Yakans who had once been part of the Christian Children’s Fund Program.

The Lumads of Davao and Iballoys of Baguio, teachers, barangay officials, members of the barangay justice system (lupon), and housewives in their respective places belonged to the sector of Indigenous People (IP).
The **farmers/fishers sector** was composed of members of barangay councils involved in the farming or fishing industry, members and officers of peoples' organizations, and fish vendors from within the city and neighboring coastal/farming municipalities.

The **urban poor sector** consisted of officers and members of urban poor organizations from five (5) provinces in mainland Bicol and different areas in Metro Manila such as Commonwealth, Makati, Kasiglahan Village in Montalban, Rizal, and Payatas.

The **urban youth or Out-Of-School Youth (OSY) sector** included the active members of religious youth organizations and partners of *Kristohanong Katilingban sa Pagkababa* (KKP) in its various programs such as the tutorial program.

The 4th year high school students of *Samahan sa Pagpalambo sa Kabataan* (SAPAK) of Compostela, Cebu constituted the **rural youth sector**.

The **student sector** was mostly made up of high school students from two Chinese schools in Cebu: the Sacred Heart School and Cebu Eastern College. One participant was a college student of the University of Cebu. The other group of students was
made up of mostly Social Science majors from the University of the Philippines, Baguio.

The total number of participants for all the FGD sessions reached 270 or an average of 11 participants per FGD.

Procedure

The research work started off with a meeting with other members of the Commission. In this meeting, a brief orientation on the project and clarification on and inclusion of some questions in the FGD questionnaires were undertaken. Initial identification of target sectors and Geographical Center Leaders (GCL) who would facilitate the FGDs and the charting of research activities were also accomplished.

The succeeding days were spent finalizing the list of GCLs and documentors, contacting them, eliciting their commitment to participate in the project, disseminating the FGD schedule of activities, and preparing for the orientation of GCLs and documentors.

The first orientation, pre-testing and critiquing of the FGD questionnaires with the Mindanao-based GCLs and documentors was conducted in Davao City on January 4, 2002. The event resulted in the revision of the FGD questionnaires for the second time.

The second orientation, pre-testing and critiquing of the FGD questionnaires with the Luzon and Visayas-based GCLs and documentors was conducted on January 7, 2002 in Quezon City. The third and final revision was done after the said orientation.

The conduct of FGDs lasted for two weeks. Plenary sessions for presentation and validation of results were conducted on January 28, 2002 for the Mindanao group and February 2, 2002 for the Luzon-Visayas group. The national plenary session involving all the GCLs from Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao was held on February 15, 2002. Comments and suggestions that surfaced during these sessions were incorporated into the report.

Preliminary results of the FGDs were presented and submitted to the Commission on March 18, 2001. The members of the Commission were then allotted roughly a month to review the
report. Then followed the editing of the manuscript. The final report incorporating all the comments and suggestions was submitted on May 8, 2002.

Table 1. Chronology of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2001</td>
<td>Review and revision of FGD questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of target sectors and GCLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduling of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 19, 2001 to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2, 2002</td>
<td>Engagement of GCLs and documentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalization GCL and documentors’ terms of reference (ToR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination of the FGD schedule and its distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination of invitation letters to GCLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 4, 2002</td>
<td>Mindanao orientation and pre-testing of FGD questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and revision of identified FGD sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second revision of FGD questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signing of Mindanao GCLs’ ToRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 2002</td>
<td>Luzon orientation and pre-testing of FGD questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signing of Luzon-Visayas GCLs’ ToRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 8-11, 2002</td>
<td>Third and final revision of FGD questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listing of FGD sectors finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination of documentation guide to GCLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal invitation of FGD participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalization and allocation of budget outlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12-26, 2002</td>
<td>Conduct of FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28, 2002</td>
<td>Mindanao regional plenary session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2, 2002</td>
<td>Luzon-Visayas regional plenary session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2002</td>
<td>Presentation of FGD preliminary results to the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 2002</td>
<td>National plenary session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16 – March 15, 2002</td>
<td>Consolidation and drafting of final FGD report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 2002</td>
<td>Presentation and submission of final FGD report to the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19 – May 7, 2002</td>
<td>Reviews and editing of final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2002</td>
<td>Submission of final edited report and plans for manualization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-Sectoral Study of Corruption in the Philippines

A project of the Philippine Province of the Society of Jesus, presents the findings of a study that sought to determine the perceptions of various sectors in Philippine society toward corruption. Employing the Focus Group Discussion Method, the study provided insight to prevailing views of business people, representatives in government, NGO’s, parent/teacher groups, the internally displaced persons sector, indigenous people sector, farmers and fishermen, the urban and rural poor, and students on issues related to corruption. Recommendations on combatting this insidious social ill are likewise offered.
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