

Developing the Profile of a Civil Servant: An Exploratory Study of Civil Servants in Metro Manila

Research Report

Authors:¹

Maria Luisa Salonga-Agamata, PhD, CESO V

Director IV, Public Assistance and Information Office
Civil Service Commission

Jacinto Gavino, DPA

Professor, Asian Institute of Management

Marcia Czarina Corazon Medina, MA

Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Ateneo de Manila University

Executive Summary

Under the Republic Act No. 6713, the Civil Service Commission is tasked to undertake continuous research and experimentation on measures which provide positive motivation to public officials and employees in raising the general level of observance of the standards of the norms of conduct of public officials and employees. During the June 4, 2012 meeting with the CSC Multi-sectoral Advisory Council, it was agreed that the CSC should “craft an integrated profile of the civil servant. CSC should really define a meaningful, integrated, down-to-earth profile of a "civil servant hero". There should be a common standard for what a government employee should be, a profile that will be used as a basis for awards and a profile which the common tao can relate with. CSC can typify and feature this persona publicly every month (ex. an employee of the month) so that it gets noticed.”

An exploratory study was undertaken by the Public Assistance and Information Office (PAIO) in collaboration with research partners from the Asian Institute of Management (AIM) and the Ateneo de Manila University (ADMU). It focused on civil servants who were based in Metro Manila during the five-month timeframe of the study, which was from November 2012 to March 2013. This limitation was based on primarily the manageability of data gathering and the limitations from the time and resources dispensable for the study.

The research study followed a mixed method approach, comprising of both a quantitative and qualitative element. However, these two parts respond to two different sets of inquiry as outlined in the research questions. The quantitative part of the methodology sought to provide descriptive analysis of the civil servants based on the variable categories already present in their Personnel Data Sheet (PDS). Meanwhile, the qualitative part of the methodology sought to provide initial insight as to the reasons behind exemplary performance of HAP awardees over non-awardee civil servants.

The summary of findings based on quantitative approach were as follows:

- Majority of awardees are aged between 51 to 60 years old
- Individual awardees are primarily male
- Group members are female-dominated
- Individual awardees have high educational attainment
- Almost half of individual awardees are third level career executives and managers

¹With assistance from Ms. Fiaberna Salumbides and Ms. Gen Renella Leaño of the CSC-PAIO; and Ms. Emily Roque, MA (Ateneo de Manila University)

- Most of group awardees are second level employees exercising supervisory functions
- Majority of awardees have eligibilities
- Few individual awardees are non-eligibles (e.i. military, elective officials)
- More than half of individual awardees are involved in governance and institutional building (e.i. military, police, LGU)

Variables derived from the descriptive outputs which may have significant relationships/association with other variables are shown below:

- Gender and eligibility for group and non-awardees
- Gender and agency category for group and non-awardees
- Eligibility and nature of work for non-awardees
- Eligibility and agency category for non-awardees
- Educational attainment and position for group awardees and non-awardees
- Educational attainment and nature of work for non-awardees
- Educational attainment and agency category for group awardees
- Educational attainment and years of service for group and non-awardees
- Years of government service and position for group awardees
- Years of government service and nature of work (awardees and non-awardees)
- Years of government service and eligibility for non-awardees
- Years of government service and agency category for non-awardees

The following summarized the findings based on qualitative approach:

Based on the FDGs, the following personal attributed of civil servants were derived at:

- Awardees have strong, positive familial and religious values
- Mentors/role models motivate awardees to be excellent at work
- The awardees have a strong sense of grasping the significance of their work to the achievement of larger goals in the institution, and how their personal skills and attributes contribute to such goals.
- On exploring the factors within the government system that enable civil servants to work better and enhance their commitment and motivation, it was noted that the enabling factors pointed out by the awardees and non-awardees are almost the same:
- Partnerships with willing and able partners from within and outside government enable the work and enhance the motivation of awardees.
- Recognition systems have positive effects in furthering the commitment and motivation of civil servants.
- Availability and access to resources within and outside government enable civil servants to perform better.
- Continuous learning opportunities in government service motivate civil servants.

Among the recommendations of the study are as follows:

1. How can the HAP be strengthened using the information on the perceived difference between common and exemplary civil servants?

- When vetting nominees, HAP should be able to pinpoint what drove them to do what they do or what inspired them.
- There should be continual focus-group discussions with HAP awardees

2. What kinds of program support and other interventions can be provided to the “common” civil servants so that they become more of the “exemplars”?

- There should be a program that elicits from ordinary civil servants the drivers for professional growth. Why am I in public service? Leadership question: why do I do what I do?
- The challenge is to come up with an HR intervention program applicable for all agencies wherein each government employee should understand not only his/her job description, but most importantly, be able to explain the context of the job and how it relates to the larger goals of the institution.

3. How can the communication strategies of the CSC be enhanced (i.e. description of and variables) that make the “exemplary” civil servants?

- The qualities of exemplary civil servants must be intensified through the use of the quad-media and dissemination of creative and insightful information materials on HAP.
- Production of video materials focused on best practices that employees could emulate to be able to become effective in their jobs may be made.
- A literature of the traits of exemplary performers gathered from future interviews, surveys, FGDs and other modes may also be initiated.

A. **INTRODUCTION**

1. **Rationale and Overview**

The Civil Service Commission (CSC) is tasked to “[continue] research and experimentation on measures which provide positive motivation to public officials and employees in raising the general level of observance of the standards [of the norms of conduct of public officials and employees].(Republic Act 6713: Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees, 1989)” The commitment to this task is reflected in the agreements of the Multi-Sectoral Advisory Council (MSAC)’s second meeting², as the following excerpt shows:

“Craft an integrated profile of the civil servant. CSC should really define a meaningful, integrated, down-to-earth profile of a "civil servant hero". There should be a common standard for what a government employee should be, a profile that will be used as a basis for awards and a profile which the common tao can relate with. CSC can typify and feature this persona publicly every month (ex. an employee of the month) so that it gets noticed.”

² CSC’s Multi-Sectoral Advisory Council (MSAC), composed of eight members from different sectors, namely, Atty. Alexander Lacson, Director Milalin Javellana, Investors in People – Philippines CEO Gerry Plana, former CSC Chairpersons Patricia Sto. Tomas and Ricardo Saludo, UP Center for Investigative and Development Studies Executive Director Edna Co, Philippines-Australia Human Resource and Organisational Development Facility (PAHRODF) and UP Professor Solita Monsod, provide the Commission *en banc* with expert advice on CSC’s strategic directions.

As of now, CSC bases its programs on the norms of conduct of public officials and employees specified in RA 6713, which are: *commitment to public interest, professionalism, justness and sincerity, political neutrality, responsiveness to the public, nationalism and patriotism, commitment to democracy, and simple living*. De Leon(n.d.) in her paper discusses the reforms in the Philippine civil service which center around the ideas of accountability – enacted through citizens’ feedback mechanisms – and the Honor Awards Program (HAP) which recognizes exemplary performance of civil servants in the country in three categories: *Presidential Lingkod Bayan*³, *Pagasa*⁴, and *Dangal ng Bayan*⁵ awards. These initiatives of the CSC trigger awareness of the norms of conduct, and seek to inspire more civil servants to perform exceptionally and consistently in whatever agency and level of government they serve.

Aside from such, there exists no other reference for describing civil servants in the Philippines – both on the categories of what is considered “common” and “exemplary”. However, there seems to be a shared understanding of what “exemplary” civil servants are, as attested by the stories and accomplishments of the HAP awardees. Based on consultations with PAIO-CSC, the observation surfaced that there has been limited effort exerted into transforming the information available on the HAP awardees to create theories and frameworks of exceptional performance in civil service in the Philippines.

Based on the information gathered, there is a perceived difference between the “common” civil servants and the “exemplary” ones. The lack of a clear-cut distinction that differentiates one from the other is deemed evident, and is something that CSC recognizes, according to consultations with the PAIO. The relevance of identifying the characteristics that set apart the “exemplary” from the “common” civil servants is crucial in answering, for instance, the following discussion points:

- How can the HAP be strengthened using the information on the perceived difference between common and exemplary civil servants?
- What kinds of program support and other interventions can be provided to the “common” civil servants so that they become more of the “exemplars”?
- How can the communication strategies of the CSC be enhanced (i.e. description of and variables) that make the “exemplary” civil servants?

This lack of distinction is the opportunity that this research seizes in order to contribute to the literature of the civil service in the Philippines, with focus on the people serving in government. However, because this research acknowledges that the questions outlined above cannot be answered by one undertaking alone, the research positions itself in an exploratory approach, to first identify some basic profile characteristics of civil servant, and learn about the dispositions and driving elements that help them become exemplary in their work in government.

2. Research Questions

³ Presidential or *Lingkod Bayan* Award is conferred on an individual or group of individuals for exceptional or extraordinary contributions resulting from an idea or performance that had nationwide impact on public interest, security and patrimony. The contribution may be a suggestion, innovation, invention or superior accomplishment. (Lifted from the CSC website).

⁴ Civil Service Commission *Pagasa* Award is conferred on an individual or group of individuals for outstanding contribution/s resulting from an idea or performance that directly benefit more than one department of the government. (Lifted from the CSC website)

⁵ The award for exemplary conduct and ethical behavior is the Outstanding Public Officials and Employees Award or the *Dangal ng Bayan*. This award is conferred to an individual for performance of extraordinary act or public service and consistent demonstration of exemplary ethical behavior on the basis of his/her observance of the eight norms of behavior provided under Republic Act No. 6713, otherwise known as the “*Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees*”. (Lifted from the CSC website)

This research is an exploratory study that seeks to provide initial insights on the profile characteristics of civil servants, with nuances made on HAP awardees and non-awardees. More specifically, the research sought to answer the following questions:

- What are the demographic characteristics of civil servants?
 - Which demographic characteristics have an influence on the performance of civil servants?
- What factors and conditions are present in the experiences of exemplary civil servants that contributed to their work performance in government?

B. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Programs on performance management systems and institutional human resource interventions are crafted, tested, adopted or enhanced by government organizations. Numerous articles on these performance management systems are available. Several materials discuss institution-driven incentives and measures that motivate employees to perform well. However, studies and literature on the imbedded traits of government employees that motivate them to excel in their jobs are slim if not none at all. No study has explored on the traits of public servants based on the perspective of the government employees themselves. By defining these traits, a meaningful and down-to-earth profile of a civil servant hero will be established.

The following literature focuses on government institutions' initiatives to achieve quality performance, employees' work values which propel job satisfaction, and performance rewards as drivers of motivation.

Quality Performance in the New Public Administration

Mohamad Rais and Mansor, 1998 discussed the the different phases and evolution of public administration in developing countries. During the sixties and seventies, public administration was seen as an agent of change. Transformation "shifted away from traditional administration to borrowing to borrowing from private sector traits of entrepreneurship, competency, motivated staff and merit-based principle in hiring and promotion". In the late eighties and early nineties, public administration geared towards privatization of state-owned enterprises. In the late nineties, public administration is faced with different challenges, such as environment degradation, liberal market economy and excessive dependence on external funding sources, while the public's increased awareness and consciousness of their rights resulted to greater demand for better services.

The new public management, on the other hand, is anchored on the core areas of quality public services and maximizing productivity. The pathway to quality performance are varied and there are no unique solution as these should be appropriate to to the country's needs, values and national aspirations. One specific approach elaborated the Cascade Model of Hongkong which introduces five principles of gaining staff commitment in service delivery, namely, **involvement** or involving staff in identifying the need, the decision to be done and in the implementation of solution; **recognition** or the principle **to** recognize and award outstanding staff; **measurement** or the quality measures used to gauge effectiveness and quantity and monitor efficiency; **consistency** wherein departmental values and missions have to be consistently held and demonstrated by the managers; and building people's belief that what they do is worthwhile.

Despite its continuous evolution, public administration's obligation remains the same, that is, to promote public interest. "Public administration to be true to itself must always maintain the moral dimension of service to the people, honesty and integrity."

Ahmad, 1998 stated that as we approach the twenty-first century, the intensity of the globalisation phenomenon imposes tremendous pressure on nations to adjust to a rapidly changing environment. Public administration in this new phase of effective government is geared more towards public participation, a learning environment, empowerment and good governance. Good governance has to be geared for high quality performance and the effective utilisation of human resources and information technology so that there is decentralization and devolution of authority and responsibility to the lower units of the government.

In facing the challenges of globalization, government should focus more on regulating function without getting too much involved directly in the implementation. Furthermore, government's function of 'empowering rather than serving' should also be stressed to create a conducive (atmosphere) and to society because the demand of society in obtaining better service is the consequence of having better quality of life. Therefore, government bureaucracy ought to be ready in facing the globalization era which is full of challenges and their implications on government management. Hence, revitalization of government through modernizing the management of government which tends to replace the world reform is a crucial issue and calls for immediate actions which includes the renewal of management adapted to new realities in economic and social affairs. Revitalization towards a modernization of government management is aimed at achieving a professional government bureaucracy, fully competent to serve the society in a better way and increasing the competency of managers in the government bureaucracy to create a conducive environment to facilitate economic growth.

Modernization of government management which is geared towards the improvement of public service, could be identified from the development of government bureaucracy as one of the programmes of the Indonesian national development and the policy and stages in developing the Public Administration reflects the improvements of government management that includes: institutional development, public service procedures and the development of human resources in the government bureaucracy.

Organization Climate, Incentives Structure and Job Performance

Tuazon, 1994 discusses the relationship between organizational climate and job performance in the government. The research study was conducted at the Department of Budget and Management covering 149 non-supervisory technical personnel in eleven (11) of its bureaus for the primary purpose of determining whether or not there is a significant relationship between organizational climate and job performance. Findings of the study showed that the DBM was generally perceived to have positive climate, the bureau where an employee belonged to affected his job performance, age was inversely related with performance, the best predictors of job performance were perception on bureau support and bureau responsibility; age; and educational attainment.

The study also proved that job performance is the result of the interplay of various factors in the environment as well as within the employee himself. Organizational climate is only a part of it. Bureau Responsibility was essentially the sole factor found to have the strongest relationship with job performance. The researcher recommended the conduct of a more comprehensive and in-depth study on employee performance in the DBM by expanding the concept on organizational climate as well as including other variables such as those verbalized during the interviews. Such an undertaking may also cover an assessment of the present performance appraisal system of the Department particularly in the light of the fact that all respondents obtained Very Satisfactory ratings with not even one getting an Outstanding nor Satisfactory (or lower) rating. Further research may, likewise, try to link up employee performance with the achievement of overall agency goals and objectives

considering the ultimate purpose of organization efficiency, effectiveness, and economy. For the agency to, among others, assess individual bureau performance and leadership as they affect employee performance as well as overall agency operations. This suggestion is made in view of the findings that DBM bureaus appear to operate too independently from each other with very little interaction among them which may or may not be beneficial to the entire organization. Beyond this, the researcher believes that the DBM is still in the best position to determine measures to improve its operations, if found necessary.

Monsod, 2008 examines the incentives structure imbedded in the Philippine bureaucracy and determine how these have affected agency performance. It attempts to find out the reason for the inability of the public education sector to implement reform-oriented plans and programs beyond funding considerations and how formal and informal rules may be impinging on the behaviour and performance of the agents within the Department of Education and other relevant organizations.

Monsod poses characteristics of the government bureaucracies that distinguish them from private counterparts. The primary goals of public sector organizations are often ambiguous, difficult to interpret, monitor and measure. Government organizations rarely have control over revenues, productive controls, or prioritization of specific agency tasks, as control is political. Government agencies also tend to have multiplicity of principals which lead to the proliferation of contextual goals which are usually enforced by powerful interests, such as congressional committees.

These realities in the government bureaucracies have behavioural consequences. Civil servants tend to adhere to processes rather than achieving outcomes. Government managers become risk-averse. Multiple constraints and top-heavy/redundant management cause red tape. Rank and file workforce become timid.

In such environment, Monsod suggests that there is no one formula to motivate the staff. The degree to which motivation is a challenge depends on the type of agency defined according to whether agency outputs or outcomes are more or less observable. Outcomes are more observable in production and craft agencies; less observable when agencies become procedural. Coping agencies are those with observable outputs.

Among the incentive structures imbedded in the government bureaucracy is the structure of wages and other pecuniary incentives. In terms of salaries, Monsod mentioned the compensation study by the Civil Service Commission which shows that "salaries for senior managers and highly technical personnel in government were 74% below comparable jobs, and that salaries for professional and technical personnel were about 40% below, while clerical and trade personnel were actually 20% above benchmark".

There are also internal inequalities derived from job qualification distortion. There are positions with comparable qualifications and scope of work with different salary grades but are one grade higher than similar positions. Performance is also discouraged due to the compressed salary schedule and longevity policy under the Salary Standardization Law (SSL), like when a subordinate who has stayed in the government longer receives higher salary than a newly hired supervisor due to longevity policy. The increasing number of ad-hoc bodies, presidential consultants/advisers and political appointees also become a source of demoralization.

Monsod recommends reforms, namely, strengthen 3rd party enforcement on personnel hiring to reduce or check ineligible, political appointments. Reforms should be made in SSL (Note: Four-tranche salary scheme was already implemented in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012). He also suggests an official policy of transparency on the role and authorities of presidential consultants/advisers.

Yao, 2005 seeks to understand the orientation of the Filipino workers' work motivation. Her study specifically posed the question "are Filipino employees, in general, intrinsically or extrinsically motivated?" Motivation as defined in the study is a "foundational concept in human resource management, particularly in performance and rewards management." The respondents, in general, believe that rewards should be based on performance. The result of the study suggests that "majority of employees work not so much for the tangible rewards but for the personal satisfaction they get from being productive, self-determining and autonomous people in their jobs". In terms of external rewards, however, cash was the employee's top choice. Non-cash versions of external rewards also attract Filipino workers, such as travel, awards (awards nights, recognition dinners among others), food items, restaurant coupons and appliances.

Del Rosario et.al., 1995 interviewed employees from nine (9) government-owned and controlled corporations (GOCCS) relative to the implementation of performance evaluation incentive system. The respondents believe that both monetary and non-monetary incentives greatly affect the performance of GOCCs. According to them, incentives and rewards support the corporation by "motivating its employees and aspiring greater heights and targets for the corporation to achieve in the succeeding years."

Employees' Personal and Work Values as Drivers of Motivation

Hechanova et.al., 2005 analyzes two surveys conducted by the Social Weather Stations, namely the 1997 Work Orientation Survey and the 2001 Philippine Round of the World Values Survey. Accordingly, in 1997 survey, work is seen as the most important activity of a person, while three-fourths of the respondents agree that job is just a way of earning money and a means of meeting basic needs. In the 2001 survey, work is perceived as an avenue for individual growth. Majority of the respondents agree that job is needed to develop one's talents. Also, majority of the workers said good job security and good pay are the primary considerations in looking for a job. More than half of the respondents preferred work in the government rather than in the private sector where mergers and downsizing were prevalent. The Filipino workers deem "family" is most important, while "work" comes in second. The crucial role of religion in the lives of most Filipinos is also evident.

Claudio-Pascua, 2005 explores work values as a form of basic and central part of an individual's personality. Accordingly, "when an employee joins a company, he or she carries a psychological contract or a set of expectations about what he or she will do for the company, and what the company should do in return. These expectations are, to a large extent, shaped by the employee's work value. Research has shown that employees are most productive, satisfied with their jobs, and committed to the company when their own values are compatible with those of the organization. The study further identified three major theories of how work values are formed: generational differences, life-cycle model, and occupational perspective. Generational differences explained that each generation has characteristics that are linked to their unique socialization experiences as adolescents and young adults. The life-cycle model holds that value differences may be a matter of age than generation. On the other hand, the main premise of occupational values is that work values can be shaped by work experiences.

C. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

D. METHODOLOGY

In pursuing the research questions, the research focused on civil servants who are based in Metro Manila during the five-month timeframe of the study, which is from November 2012 to March 2013. This limitation is based on primarily the manageability of data gathering and the limitations from the time and resources dispensable for the study.

The methodology employed in this research follows a mixed method approach, comprising of both a quantitative and qualitative element. However, these two parts respond to two different sets of inquiry as outlined in the research questions. *The quantitative part of the methodology sought to provide descriptive analysis of the civil servants based on the variable categories already present in their Personnel Data Sheet (PDS). Meanwhile, the qualitative part of the methodology sought to provide initial insight as to the reasons behind exemplary performance of HAP awardees over non-awardee civil servants.*⁶

1. Quantitative Profiling of Civil Servants through Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) Analysis

For the quantitative profiling of civil servants, the research focused on processing the data available through PDS of employees of various agencies and levels of government. A team from PAIO-CSC selected 411 PDS from 2008-2012 (a five-year time frame), on a semi-random basis – meaning, that in the absence of a comprehensive master list of all government employees during the time frame indicated, the PDS profiles were selected through the availability of the PDS in the CSC Field Offices, and willingness and speed of response of other agencies to provide the information needed. Within the time frame set for selection of PDS, the total number of awardees in Metro Manila are 67 – 17 individual awardees and 50 group awardees. The PDS of the 67 awardees are purposively included in the total number of PDS that were coded and processed. In order to meet statistical standards, the total number of PDS used for the analysis is 411 (67 awardees, and 344 non-awardees).

The variables which these profiles were analysed from included: age, gender, civil status, employment of spouse, number of children, highest educational attainment, academic honors received, career service eligibility, work experience in private sector, years of work in private sector, age entered government service, years of government service, agency category, agency at the time of award, position, salary, nature of work, voluntary work, hours of skills training, hours of behavioral training, special skills/hobbies, non-academic distinctions/recognitions, membership in organizations, relationship/affinity with authority in work, whether civil servant was charged, whether civil servant was guilty of administrative charges, whether civil servant was convicted, whether civil servant was separated from service/AWOL, whether civil servant was a candidate for office, and whether civil servant is a member of a special group.

The study recognizes that this methodology poses limitations as to the level of generalization and depth of analysis on the correlations that emerges from the research technique employed. For instance, due to the constraints on time and resources earlier indicated, there has been no follow-up methodologies (i.e., focus group discussions) conducted to explore the categories and associations that surfaced from the data processing. The number of PDS coded and considered for the study is also very limited compared to the total number of government employees in Metro Manila, which according to CSC as of April 2013 is at 399,318⁷. These are areas for further study outlined in the final section of this report.

2. Qualitative Exploration of the Differences between Awardees and Non-Awardees

⁶ The study recognizes that the methodology poses limitations as to the level of generalization and depth of analysis on the correlations that emerges from the research techniques employed.

⁷This number is composed of 303,931 permanent employees, 7,915 co-terminus employees, 12,051 casual employees, and 7,525 casual employees.

The qualitative exploration in this study used semi-structured group discussions (SGDs) to surface themes on the differences between awardees and non-awardees. The selection of informants for the SGDs is focused on civil servants who are currently in Metro Manila. On February 6, 2013, four SGDs were conducted in the CSC Central Office in Batasan Hills, Quezon City. Out of the four SGDs, three sessions were allocated for awardees, and one session for non-awardees. The PAIO-CSC team sent invitations to target informants who were perceived by the team to be outspoken and comfortable with group discussions. Those who confirmed and actually attended the SGD sessions comprised the pool of informants, which totalled 25. The informant profiles are summarized in the table below:

Table 1. SUMMARY OF INFORMANT PROFILES

Session	Cumulative Total	Basic Informant Profile	
		Organization	Award Received, Year
1 - Awardees	1	Phil. Nuclear Research Institute (PNRI)	Dangal ng Bayan, 2007
	2	Phil. Institute of Volcanology and Seismology (PHIVOLCS)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2010
	3	Phil. Textile Research Institute (PTRI)	Pag-asa (group), 2011
	4	Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan (Group), 2012
	5	Dept. of Labor and Employment (DOLE)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan (Group), 2012
2 - Awardees	6	Philippine Air Force (PAF), Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2007
	7	Public Attorney's Office (PAO)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2004
	8	Philippine National Police (PNP)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2009
3 - Awardees	9	Dept. of Trade and Industry (DTI)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2007
	10	Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency(PDEA)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2012
	11	Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino (KWF)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2010
	12	Dept. of Education (DepEd)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2009
	13	Bureau of Jail Management and Penology (BJMP)	Dangalng Bayan, 2010
	14	Dept. of the Interior and Local Government (DILG)	Presidential Lingkod Bayan, 2009
	15	BSP	Pagasa Award, 2008
	16	BSP	Presidential Lingkod Bayan (Group), 2012
	17	BSP	Presidential Lingkod Bayan (Group), 2012
4 - Non-awardees	18	Philippine Army (PA), AFP	N/A
	19	PTRI	N/A
	20	PNP	N/A
	21	BJMP	N/A
	22	BSP	N/A
	23	Commission on Audit (COA)	N/A
	24	Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino (KWF)	N/A
	25	DepEd	N/A

The SGDs were guided by the following questions:

- Why do you do what you do?
- Why public service?

As a semi-structured discussion, the flow of ideas in each session determined the flow and range of subtopics that were explored. Meanwhile, the four sessions were documented by the PAIO-CSC staff and simultaneously pre-processed to construct second-degree categorizations from the answers (through a meta-card idea capturing technique). These categorizations are immediately seen by the informants to gather validation if their ideas are being captured according to the meaning that they intended to share. After the four sessions, the informants' answers were further coded to surface the themes which are discussed in the latter section of this report.

E. RESEARCH FINDINGS

This section provides the insights that were gathered through the data gathering techniques employed in the study.

1. QUANTITATIVE PROFILING OF CIVIL SERVANTS BASED ON PDS

Descriptive Data on Primary Categories/Groupings of Awardees and Non-Awardees

A summary of the descriptive data can be found in the table below, based on the SPSS⁸ processing of the data provided through PDS. The highlighted rows are those whose results are varied across individual awardees, group awardees, and non-awardees.

Table 2. MAJOR GROUPINGS OF PDS PROFILE CATEGORIES⁹

	Individual	Group	Non-awardee
Age	51-60		Varied
Gender	Male (70.6%)	Female (64%)	Female (52%)
Year when PDS was accomplished	2010	2008 & 2010	Not valid
Civil Status	Married		
Employment of Spouse	Local, Govt	Local, Private	Varied
Number of Children	2-4 children		
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctoral (47%)	Masteral (68%)	Masteral (45%)/ Bachelors (41%)
Academic honors received	None (47%, 50%, 37%)		
Eligibility	RA1080 (41.2%) No eligibility (29.4%)	RA1080 (60%)	RA1080 (39%) CS Professional (37.8%)
Years of government service	21 to 30 years: 58.8% 11 to 20 years: 29.4%	21 to 30 years: 25% 31 to 50 years: 22%	Less than 5 years: 25.6% 21 to 30 years: 24.1% 11 to 20 years 21.8%
Years in private sector	Majority did not work in private sector		
Age when entered government service	Majority: 20-30 y/o		
Agency category	Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other 53%	Banking & Finance 50%	Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other 34%
Position	Nonsupervisory 41.2% Managerial 35.3%	Supervisory 56%	Varied
Salary	Php100,000-500,001 annual		
Nature of work	Highly Specialized 41%	Admin & Highly Specialized 25%	Administrative 63%
Hours of training	101-500 hours		
Hours of behavioral training	None		Not valid
Non-academic distinctions/ recognition	Not valid but high in Local/Community 41%	Local/Community 42%	None 45%
Affinity to authority	No	No	Has relative (low .9%)
Formally charged	No	No	Yes (2.3%)
Convicted of crime or violation	No	No	Yes (4.1%)
AWOL	No	Presence of Yes (10%)	Presence of Yes (18.6%)
Candidate in election	No	Presence of Yes (2%)	Presence of Yes (16.3%)
Member of special group	None (88%)	IP (50%)	None (69%)

The discussion below expounds on the data presented in Table 2 above:

Age Group

Majority of the group and individual awardees are aged between 51 to 60 years old. This may be explained that in general, outstanding work performance and exemplary ethical behavior in the government are honed and require consistent practice. In terms of experience, their learning curve is already in full cycle. They have substantive experience and more exposure in different assignments. At that age, they have tried and tested their developed strategies in managing projects, therefore they are more knowledgeable in filtering creative and innovative ideas to make things more simple, economical, and yet with high impact.

⁸ SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions) Statistics is a software package used for statistical analysis.

⁹As of March 22, 2013, CSC-provided data

In early stage in government, employees are usually focused on learning the craft, career planning, and improving performance. In mid-career stage, they have gained competence and expertise in their field and are either exploring for other field of expertise or making their crafts even better. In the late career stage, they would want to make a legacy, transfer their knowledge and skills to younger staff, and share their expertise.

Gender

In terms of gender, individual awardees in NCR are primarily male and are from primarily male-dominated agencies – the Armed Forces of the Philippines and the National Police. They belong to male-stereotype jobs like police, politicians and military.

With regard to group awardees, most of the group winners were from Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas and the Commission on Audit, agencies responsible for fiscal management and audit. Majority of the group members from these institutions were female. Female-stereotype jobs involve auditing and accounting and other functions that require detailed scrutiny of data and more meticulous attention.

Education

Individual awardees have high educational attainment. As outstanding individual performers, they are self-propelling, more focused, more ambitious, and career-oriented. They can accomplish tasks on their own, as compared to group awardees who proved to excel through teamwork. Non-awardees, on the other hand, have lowest educational attainment.

Level of Position

In terms of level of position, eight (8) or 47% of the 17 individual awardees are classified as third level career executives and managers. Per CSC Resolution No. 100623, “the third level or career executive service shall only cover the positions of Undersecretary, Assistant Secretary, Bureau Director, Assistant Bureau Director, Regional Director, Assistant Regional Director, Chief of Department Service, or other officers of equivalent rank as may be identified by the Career Executive Service Board (CESB), all of whom are appointed by the President of the Republic of the Philippines”.

Group awardees, on the other hand, are dominated by female second level employees exercising supervisory functions. The profile holds true the survey that “women dominate the bureaucracy especially the technical or second-level” (based on October 2012 Fact Sheet on Women Participation in Politics and Governance, NCRFW website).

Eligibility

Per CSC Resolution No. 030962 dated September 12, 2003, relative to the Revised Policies on Qualification Standards, “**Eligibility** refers to the result of passing a merit and fitness test which may be determined as far as practicable by competitive examination, or based on highly technical qualifications or other tests of merit and fitness conducted by the Civil Service Commission, or other examinations jointly designed and coordinated by the departments or agencies with the assistance of or in coordination with the CSC, or the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) conducted board examinations, the Supreme Court conducted bar examinations, the CESB conducted CES examinations, or TESDA conducted crafted and trades examinations”.

There are qualification standards (QS) for positions in the government, except those covered by special laws. The QS includes Education, Experience, Training and Eligibility. These QS have to be met by applicants upon their entry in government service. However, there are also government positions that do not require eligibility as among the passport to landing a job in the public sector, such as elective officials, uniform personnel and military which have special laws that cover their selection and promotion.

Types of Eligibilities

- a. **Special Eligibilities** are those granted by the Civil Service Commission under special laws. These include the Honor Graduate Eligibility pursuant to **Presidential Decree (P.D.) No. 907**, dated March 11, 1976, titled “Granting Civil Service Eligibility to College Honor Graduates”; Barangay Health Worker Eligibility granted pursuant to R.A. No. 7883, dated February 20, 1995, otherwise known as the “Barangay Health Workers Benefits and Incentives Act of 1995”, and implemented through CSC Resolution No. 992845 dated December 29, 1999; Barangay Nutrition Scholar Eligibility granted pursuant to **P.D. No. 1569**, dated June 11, 1978, titled “Strengthening the Barangay Nutrition Program by Providing for a Barangay Nutrition Scholar in Every Barangay, Providing Funds Therefore, and for Other Purposes”; Barangay Official Eligibility granted pursuant to Republic Act (R.A.) No. 7160, dated October 10, 1991, otherwise known as the “Local Government Code of 1991; Electronic Data Processing Specialist granted pursuant to CSC Resolution No. 90-083 dated January 22, 1990; Science and Technology Specialist Eligibility granted pursuant to **P.D. No. 997**, dated September 16, 1976, titled “Conferring Civil Service Eligibilities on Scientific and Technological Specialists on the Bases of Their Qualifications and the Requirements of Public Service”; Skills Eligibility granted upon passing the Skills Test administered by the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) and in pursuant to CSC MC No. 11, s. 1996, as amended; and Veteran Preference Rating Eligibility granted under Executive Order (EO) No. 132 dated 1948 and EO No. 790 dated April 3, 1982.
- b. **Career Service Sub-professional Eligibility** is conferred by the Civil Service Commission to an examinee who passes the CS sub-professional examination.
- c. **Career Service Professional Eligibility** is conferred by the Civil Service Commission to an examinee who passes the CS professional examination.
- d. **CES Eligibility** is conferred to any person who is able to successfully complete the four-stage CES eligibility examination and meet such other requirements as may be prescribed by the Career Executive Board.
- e. **Board/ Bar Eligibility (RA 1080)** is automatically granted to passers of bar examination conducted by the Supreme Court and of licensure board examinations administered by the Professional Regulation Commission.

Majority of the awardees have eligibilities, mostly obtained through the professional licensure examination administered by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). Less than 30% of individual awardees, composed of military officers, executives and an elected barangay official, have no eligibilities because such positions do not require eligibilities. There are certain positions in government agencies that do not require “eligibility” as a pre-requisite in entering government service. Different qualification requirements are prescribed in accordance with other existing laws. These include:

- a. **Enlistment in the AFP**

The **Armed Forces of the Philippines** and the Department of National Defense issued Memorandum No. 13, dated July 15, 1991, providing the guidelines on Selective Enlistment/ Re-enlistment of military personnel.

A person shall be considered in qualified status for enlistment if he/she:

- 1. Is a citizen of the Philippines;*
- 2. Is unmarried and without dependent;*
- 3. Has completed the second year of a collegiate course from an educational institution recognized by the government; or; in the case of a male applicant, is a high school graduate who possesses technical or special skills needed by the AFP; or; in the case of a female applicant, is a high school graduate whose possesses technical or special skill necessary in the performance of non-combatant/administrative duties;*
- 4. Is not less than eighteen (18) years but not more than twenty-six (26) years of age;*
- 5. Has a height, barefoot, which is-*
 - (a) Non less than one (1) meter and sixty-three (63) centimeters or sixty-four (64) inches, in the case of a male applicant; or*
 - (b) Not less than one (1) meter and fifty-seven and one half (57.5) centimeters or sixty-two (62) inches, in the case of a female applicant*
- 6. Is physically and mentally fit for military service, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 11 below and other applicable regulations; and*
- 7. Is of good moral character and habits.*

Promotion in the military are considered through years of service, good service as recommended by the superior and specializations acquired through schooling. Spot promotions are also given to meritorious acts of the soldiers.

b. Hiring System in the PNP

The Philippine National Police uses as basis for the hiring and promotion of uniform officers and personnel the Republic Act No. 8551, or the Philippine National Police Reform and Re-organization Act of 1998, which identifies the qualifications for appointment to the PNP, to wit:

"SEC. 30. General Qualifications for Appointment. – No person shall be appointed as officer or member of the PNP unless he or she possesses the following minimum qualifications:

- "a) A citizen of the Philippines;
- "b) A person of good moral conduct;
- "c) Must have passed the psychiatric/psychological, drug and physical tests to be administered by the PNP or by any NAPOLCOM accredited government hospital for the purpose of determining physical and mental health;
- "d) Must possess a formal baccalaureate degree from a recognized institution of learning;
- "e) Must be eligible in accordance with the standards set by the Commission;
- "f) Must not have been dishonorably discharged from military employment or dismissed for cause from any civilian position in the Government;
- "g) Must not have been convicted by final judgment of an offense or crime involving moral turpitude;
- "h) Must be at least one meter and sixty-two centimeters (1.62 m.) in height for male and one meter and fifty-seven centimeters (1.57 m.) for female;
- "i) Must weigh not more or less than five kilograms (5 kgs.) from the standard weight corresponding to his or her height, age, and sex; and

"j) For a new applicant, must not be less than twenty-one (21) nor more than thirty (30) years of age: except for the last qualification, the above-enumerated qualifications shall be continuing in character and an absence of any one of them at any given time shall be a ground for separation or retirement from the service: Provided, That PNP members who are already in the service upon the effectivity of this Act shall be given at least two (2) more years to obtain the minimum educational qualification and one (1) year to satisfy the weight requirement.

c. Presidential appointees

Pursuant to Article VII, Section 16 of the 1987 Constitution, "The President shall nominate and, with the consent of the Commission on Appointments, appoint the heads of the executive departments, ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, or officers of the armed forces from the rank of colonel or naval captain, and other officers whose appointments are vested in him in this Constitution. He shall also appoint all other officers of the Government whose appointments are not otherwise provided for by law, and those whom he may be authorized by law to appoint."

Presidential appointments may not require eligibilities but must conform to the qualifications provided for by law.

d. Elective Officials

Elective officials enter public service not by merit and fitness but are elected at large in their respective units by qualified voters therein. However, before they qualify as candidate in any local election, they must meet the basic requirements of age and year of residency on the local unit.

Eligibility per se has no direct significance to excellent performance, as there are awardees who have no eligibility but still excel in their field of work. Eligibility is simply one of the qualification standards prescribed to be able to enter government service in general. However, it may be true that nature of work determined the requirement of eligibility. Like for instance, the technical nature of work of group awardees require CPA eligibility.

As additional information with regard to the coverage of the Honor Awards Program, officials and employees in the career and non-career service, as well as appointive barangay officials may join the annual search. Per Section 2(c), Rule 1 of the Omnibus Rules Implementing Book V of Executive Order No. 292 and other Pertinent Civil Service Laws, "career service is composed of positions appointment to which prior qualification in an appropriate examination is required". Section 2(m) states that "non-career service is composed of positions expressly declared by law to be in the non-career service; or those whose entrance in the service is characterized by (1) entrance on bases other than those of the usual tests of merit and fitness utilized for the career service; and (2) tenure which is limited to a period specified by law, or which is coterminous with that of the appointing authority or subject to his pleasure, or which is limited to the duration of a particular project from which purpose employment was made.

The HAP guidelines also prescribe that a person must be in the government service at the time of nomination and the accomplishments were carried out with the last three years immediately preceding the nomination; has at least very satisfactory performance rating for the last two

performance rating periods; and, have not been found guilty of any administrative or criminal offense involving moral turpitude at the time of the nomination.

The HAP guidelines clearly does not preclude government officials and employees who have no eligibilities from participating in the Search as it also open to those in the non-career service.

Agency category

More than half of individual awardees belong to agencies that are involved in governance and institutional building. Sectors of the government, as classified by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) are as follows:

- **Sustainable Human Development**
 - Health and Nutrition
 - Education
 - Social Welfare and Development
- **Science and Technology**
- **Environment and Natural Resources**
- **Agri-Industry Sector**
 - Agriculture
 - Trade and Industry
- **Infrastructure Development**
 - Communications
 - Power, Energy
 - Water Development
 - Public Works
- **Governance & Institutional Building**
 - Constitutional
 - LGU
 - Fire Protection
 - Police
 - Judiciary
 - Military
 - Civilian
 - Legislative
 - Local Government
 - Jail Management
 - Executive & Other Offices
- **Macro-economic Policy and Development Financing**
 - Banking and Finance
 - Labor and Employment
 - Taxation

More than half of the individual awardees belong to the “governance and institutional building” sector, which is the commonly nominated sector to the Honor Awards Program. This may be explained by the fact that officials and employees under this sector are more noticeable by the public and the media, visible in public service delivery and are considered as frontliners. They have better opportunity to showcase their excellent performance.

Correlations and Chi-square Tests

This section elaborates on some variables derived from the descriptive outputs which may have significant relationships/association with other variables. Since most variables are nominal (and some ordinal), chi-square analysis was used to determine whether there was a significant relationship between variables. Likewise, phi and lambda were also utilized to determine the strength of the association between them. In each of the tables, the highlighted rows are those whose correlations are significant.

- **GENDER**

The descriptive data analysis shows that majority of the individual awardees are male, while majority of the group awardees are female. The table below shows how the variable gender correlates with other variables of interest:

Table 3. CORRELATION OF GENDER WITH OTHER VARIABLES¹⁰

Variables	Awardee Type	Chi Square	Significance	Phi & Cramer's V	Remarks
Gender & Position	Individual	2.321	.509	.369	Not significant
	Group	4.892	.180	.313	Not significant
	Non-awardee	3.363	.499	.099	Not significant
Gender & Nature of Work	Individual	6.336	.275	.610	Not significant
	Group	.347	.556	.083	Not significant
	Non-awardee	11.347	.124	.182	Not significant
Gender & Eligibility	Individual	4.339	.227	.505	Not significant
	Group	8.325	.040	.408	Significant & moderately weak association
	Non-awardee	39.712	.000	.340	Significant & moderately weak association
Gender & Agency Category	Individual	6.296	.178	.609	Not significant
	Group	6.907	.032	.372	Significant & weakly/moderately associated
	Non-awardee	164.318	.000	.691	Significant & strongly associated
Gender & Educational Attainment	Individual	.503	.778	.172	Not significant
	Group	.385	.943	.088	Not significant
	Non-awardee	11.885	.065	.186	Not significant

Only the variables gender and career service eligibility are significant for group awardees and non-awardees. With a chi square of 8.325 and a significance value of .408, gender and eligibility in group awardees have a moderately weak association. This means that the two variables can be related (and further examined) and that gender has a significant impact on the career service eligibility of the individual awardee. Likewise, in non-awardees, the relationship is significant and is also moderately weakly associated at .340. This could mean that being male or female affects the eligibility level of the awardee.

The variables Gender and agency category are also significant for group awardees and non-awardees at .032 and .000 respectively. For group awardees, gender and agency category have a weak to moderate association. For non-awardees, gender and agency category are strongly associated at .691. This means that gender may have an impact on the kind of agency that they are in.

There is a correlation between gender and eligibility for group awardees (more than half are female). It may be said that females are more patient to scrutinize, study and pass the eligibility requirement. Most of them are in banking and finance which require eligibility for technical positions. It is also observed that because of the *meticulous* female trait, even females are also taking skills competency

¹⁰From CSC PDS Data as of March 22, 2013

exams like “Welding” administered by the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA).

- **ELIGIBILITY**

Since more than half of the awardees (individual; group) have passed eligibility standards – primarily through Republic Act 1080 (An Act Declaring the Bar and Board Examinations as Civil Service Examinations, 1954) – correlational analysis was conducted to check if eligibility has significant relationships with other variables. The results are summarized in the table below:

Table 4. CORRELATION OF ELIGIBILITY WITH OTHER VARIABLES¹¹

Variables	Awardee Type	Chi Square	Significance	Phi & Cramer's V	Remarks
Eligibility & Position	Individual	7.251	.611	.653	Not significant
	Group	10.679	.298	.377	Not significant
	Non-awardee	35.873	.056	.323	Not significant
Eligibility & Nature of Work	Individual	8.722	.892	.716; .414	Not significant
	Group	2.063	.559	.203	Not significant
	Non-awardee	59.099	.042	.414, .169	Significant & moderately weak association (Phi)
Eligibility & Agency Category	Individual	16.325	.177	.177	Not significant
	Group	9.324	.156	.156	Not significant
	Non-awardee	57.058	.014	.407; .166	Significant & moderately weak association (Phi)
Eligibility & Educational Attainment	Individual	4.329	.632	.505; .357	Not significant
	Group	14.395	.109	.536; .310	Not significant
	Non-awardee	38.573	.354	.335; .137	Not significant

The cross-variable analysis shows that eligibility has no significant relationship with the awardees' position and education attainment. However, a significant relationship between eligibility and (a) nature of work, and (b) agency category is seen:

Eligibility & Nature of Work. Out of the three awardee types, only the non-awardees can be seen having a significant relationship between their eligibility and nature of work (.042). The variables also possess a moderately weak association (phi= .414; weak for Cramer's V at .169). Majority of the non-awardees is working in administrative positions (63%).

Forty-one out of fifty group awardees profiled were from the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas and the Commission on Audit. Most of the positions in these agencies require technical skills and Certified Public Accountant (CPA) license to perform their jobs. On the other hand, majority of non-awardees profiled perform administrative functions which require career service eligibility, specifically the Career Service Professional eligibility. The non-awardees enter the government on the basis of their eligibility. Eligibility may be required depending on the nature of work.

Eligibility and Agency Category. Only the non-awardees have a significant relationship between their eligibility and agency category at .014, with a moderately weak association at .407 (phi). Non-awardees have a varied agency category (i.e. 34% are in Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other 34%), and this reflects their eligibility level (39% RA1080 and 37% CS Professional).

¹¹From CSC PDS Data as of March 22, 2013

Majority of the non-awardees perform administrative and technical functions despite their varied agency affiliations, thus, need to have eligibility as a requirement for appointment to positions in their chosen agencies.

In addition, RA 1080 license can be used either for practice of professions requiring specific licenses like doctors, lawyers and accountants, while at the same time considered as equivalent to Career Service Professional Eligibility and may be used for administrative positions requiring such eligibility.

- **HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT**

The study explored the relationship of “highest educational attainment” with other variables, and compared to the two earlier variables discussed, educational attainment showed more significant associations. The table below summarizes the cross-variable analysis:

Table 5. CORRELATION OF HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT WITH OTHER VARIABLES¹²

Variables	Awardee Type	Chi Square	Significance	Phi & Cramer's V	Remarks
Educational Attainment & Position	Individual	12.163	.058	.846	Not significant
	Group	32.020	.000	.800	Significant & strongly associated
	Non-awardee	129.200	.000	.613	Significant & strongly associated
Educational Attainment & Nature of Work	Individual	17.710	.060	1.021	Not significant
	Group	5.471	.140	.331	Not significant
	Non-awardee	64.784	.014	.434	Significant & moderately associated
Educational Attainment & Agency Category	Individual	6.517	.590	.619	Not significant
	Group	15.394	.017	.555	Significant & strongly associated
	Non-awardee	44.419	.158	.359	Not significant
Educational Attainment & Years of Government Service	Individual	18.889	.274	1.054/ .527	Not significant
	Group	20.727	.189	.644/ .455	Significant & strongly/moderately associated
	Non-awardee	183.342	.000	.730	Significant & strongly associated
Educational Attainment & Gender	Individual	.503	.778	.172	Not significant
	Group	.385	.943	.088	Not significant
	Non-awardee	11.885	.065	.186	Not significant
Educational Attainment & Eligibility	Individual	4.329	.632	.505; .357	Not significant
	Group	14.395	.109	.536; .310	Not significant
	Non-awardee	38.573	.354	.335; .137	Not significant

The data processing shows that educational attainment has no significant association with any subcategories of gender and eligibility. However, strong and moderate associations were seen with the subcategories of the variables as explained below.

Educational Attainment & Position. Only the group awardees and non-awardees are significant at .000. Group awardees have a chi square of 32.020 and strongly associated at .800, while non-awardees have a chi square of 129.200 and strongly associated at .613.

More than half of the group awardees and non-awardees (231 out of 393) belong to second level positions performing non-supervisory functions or those requiring bachelor’s degree as basic

¹²From CSC PDS Data as of March 22, 2013

educational attainment and second level positions exercising supervisory functions which need Masteral degree as requirement. For group awardees, most of them occupy positions in their chosen agencies that require specific educational requirements.

Educational Attainment & Nature of Work. With a chi square of 64.784, only the non-awardees are significant at .014 and moderately associated at .434.

More than half of the non-awardees are incumbents of second level positions performing administrative and non-supervisory functions that require bachelor’s degree as education requirement set by the agency.

However, it is important to note that there are 76 out of 118 or 64% of non-awardees performing non-supervisory functions are already holders of Masteral degree.

Educational Attainment & Agency Category. With a chi square of 15.394, only the group awardees are significant at .017 and moderately associated at .434.

As clarified earlier, majority of the group awardees were from the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas and Commission on Audit. These agencies are involved in banking and finance that require relevant education to technical jobs.

Years of Government Service & Educational Attainment. Only group awardees and non-awardees have a significant and strong association. Group awardees have a chi square of 36.698 with a significance of .047 and strongly associated at .857. Similarly, non awardees have a chi square of 98.844 significant at .000 and with a strong association at .536.

Group awardees have an average of 24.5 years in government service, while non-awardees have an average 6.32 years as average length of service in the public sector. Group awardees have higher attainment of Masteral degree. It may be explained that, in terms of promotion, length of service (experience) and educational attainment is necessary. For example, supervisory positions like Division Chief require four years of supervisory experience and Masteral Degree among other minimum qualifications standards.

- **YEARS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE**

The study seeks to explore if years in government service has a relationship with the other variables in profiling the civil servants. The cross-variable data processing is summarized in the table below:

Table 6. CORRELATION OF YEARS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE WITH OTHER VARIABLES¹³

Variables	Awardee Type	Chi Square	Significance	Phi & Cramer’s V	Remarks
Years of Government Service & Position	Individual	11.171	.514	.811	Not significant
	Group	43.245	.009	.930	Significant & very strong association
	Non-awardee	38.049	.376	.333	Not significant
Years of Government Service & Nature of Work	Individual	34.000	.026	1.414/ .707	Significant & very strong association
	Group	17.388	.026	.590	Significant & strong association

¹³From CSC PDS Data as of March 22, 2013

	Non-awardee	107.992	.000	.560	Significant & strong association
Years of Government Service & Eligibility	Individual	13.551	.330	.893	Not significant
	Group	17.162	.842	.586	Not significant
	Non-awardee	77.529	.020	.475	Significant & moderately associated
Years of Government Service & Agency Category	Individual	18.889	.274	1.054/ .527	Not significant
	Group	20.727	.189	.644/ .455	Significant & weakly/moderately associated
	Non-awardee	183.342	.000	.730	Significant & strongly associated
Years of Government Service & Educational Attainment	Individual	10.540	.229	.787	Not significant
	Group	36.698	.047	.857	Significant & strong association
	Non-awardee	98.844	.000	.536	Significant & strong association
Years of Government Service & Gender	Individual	3.513	.476	.455	Not significant
	Group	5.488	.704	.331	Not significant
	Non-awardee	71.149	.000	.455	Significant & moderately weak association

The data shows that years of government service has significant associations with subcategories in each of the variables presented.

Years of Government Service and Position. With a chi square of 43.245, only the group awardees have a significant (.009) and very strong association (.930) between years of government service and position.

Group awardees have an average of 24.5 years of stay in government service. More than half of them (28 awardees out of 50) occupy second level supervisory functions. Fourteen awardees or 28% are holders of executive managerial positions.

The data shows that length of service has significance to the level of position, or the longer the stay in government, the higher the chance of promotion to higher positions because of more training exposure, experience and expertise necessary for bigger responsibilities associated with promotion.

Years of Government Service & Nature of Work. Individual, group and non-awardees all have significant and strong associations between years of government service and nature of work. Individual awardees have a chi square of 34.00 with a significance of .026. The variables also have a very strong association at 1.414 (Phi) and .707 (Cramer's V). Likewise, group awardees have a chi square of 17.388 with a significance of .026. The variables have a strong association at .590. Similarly, non-awardees have a chi square of 107.992 with a significance of .000. The variables have a strong association at .560.

The longer the stay in government service, the more chance to develop competencies and expertise towards work excellence. Years in government service provides work experience and opportunity to become expert in what one does.

Years of Government Service & Eligibility. With a chi square of 77.529, only the non-awardees have a significant (.020) and moderately weak association (.475).

Almost all the non-awardees have eligibilities (332 out of 344 or 96.5%) have eligibilities. For non-awardees, eligibility is among the qualification standards (QS: Education, Experience, Training and

Eligibility). In their chosen agencies, eligibility is among the bases for employment. Eligibility requirement also depends on the nature of work and agency category.

Years of Government Service & Agency Category. With a chi square of 183.342, only the non-awardees have a significant (.000) and strong association (.730).

Non-awardees stay and continue to perform jobs in their chosen agencies because they need to gain experience. They still possess basic competencies.

Years of Government Service & Educational Attainment. Only group awardees and non-awardees have a significant and strong association. Group awardees have a chi square of 36.698 with a significance of .047 and strongly associated at .857. Similarly, non awardees have a chi square of 98.844 significant at .000 and with a strong association at .536.

Group awardees are in technical and supervisory levels of position which require masteral degree but not necessarily doctoral degree.

Years of Government Service & Gender. Only the non-awardees have a significant value with a chi square of 71.149 significant at .000 and have a moderately weak association at .455.

Based on the 2010 Inventory of Government Personnel in the Philippines, out of the 1,409,660 total population, 827,157 or 58.68% are females, while 582,503 or 41.32% are males. More than half of the non-awardees are females. It may be said that at whether the length of service is less than five years up to thirty years, government service in general is dominated by females.

However, it may be speculated that t(Prof. Gavino’s input) The need for a longer runway may be due to the nature of the workplace and the challenges of working in a large organization. But this is speculative. A managerial implication is the challenge of employee retention if they are to make an impact.

2. QUALITATIVE EXPLORATION OF CIVIL SERVANT CHARACTERISTICS

The documentation and coding of the answers of the informants in the four sessions surfaced some recurring ideas that are summarized in the table below. The second-order categorization of the answers is based on (a) personal attributes, and (b) enabling factors within the government system. In the coding, the negative responses are presented within the subcategories of the positive statements of the topic/themes (i.e., lack of funds and availability of funds are nested into “Resources”). Other suggestions forwarded by the informants are taken into account. The table below provides the summary of the themes that emerged from the discussions, followed by a discussion of each item.

Table 7. SUMMARY OF THEMES FROM THE SGDs

Categories	Particulars	Session Reference
Personal attributes of the civil servant	The awardees have strong, positive familial and religious values, as well as a general “drive”, that affect their work ethics.	1, 2, 3 (4 – difference)
	The civil servants have had mentors/role models that affected their disposition and motivation to be excellent at work for the awardees, or to work in government for the non-awardees.	1, 2, 3, 4
	The awardees have a strong sense of grasping the significance of their work to the achievement of larger goals in the institution, and how their personal skills and attributes contribute to such goals.	1, 2, 3 (4 – difference)

Categories	Particulars	Session Reference
	The awardees have a strong innate passion to help, care and respect for other people.	1, 2, 3 (4 – difference)
Enabling factors within the government system	Partnerships with willing and able partners from within and outside government enable the work and enhance the motivation of awardees.	1, 2, 3, 4
	Recognition systems have positive effects in furthering the commitment and motivation of civil servants.	1, 2, 3, 4
	Availability and access to resources within and outside government enable civil servants to perform better.	1, 2, 4
	Continuous learning opportunities in government service motivate civil servants.	1, 2, 3, 4
Other inputs from the informants	Introducing means to assess values, commitment and disposition towards work, and behavior	1, 2, 4
	Introducing ways of filtering excellent applicants/employees from the rest	1, 2

a. Personal Attributes of the Civil Servant

Right from the start of the initiative, the authors acknowledged that the information generated from the PDS will not give sufficient insight with regard to the personal attributes (i.e., attitudes, behavior, and disposition and preferences) of the civil servants, which, leadership and management literature point to as one crucial reference as to the effectiveness and quality of performance of individuals-at-work. In this sense, an exploration of the personal attributes of the civil servant is incorporated into the group discussions, both for the awardees and non-awardees.

The succeeding bullet points give a discussion of the themes that emerged from the discussions.

- ***The awardees have strong, positive familial and religious values that affect their work ethics.***

A major observation from the SGDs is that awardees have strong, positive familial and religious values that shape their work ethics. In all the SGDs with the awardees (Sessions 1-3), when asked about “how they were able to do what they were able to do (as awardees)”, values consistent with work productivity and commitment were almost instinctively provided by the participants. Examples are:

- *Values imparted by parents/relatives*
 - “My parents always exerted [the effort] to push me to do my best.” (Session 1)
 - “My father taught us the values. He taught us to live a simple life... [My parents taught me] to give our best in everything that we do.” (Session 3)
- *Religious values*
 - “[I’m] doing [my] best for the greater glory of God.” (Session 1)
 - “[I have a] religious fellowship [and that became] part of my encouragement. I have my core values when I entered government... My sense of self is there. I knew what I wanted to do... If you have your core values, you know what is right from wrong.” (Session 1)
 - “It’s my goal to be an instrument of justice and social change... I get enlightenment and strength from God. I serve the people through God... It’s my commitment to God. Whenever I serve God, I serve mankind...Feeling ko I’m being used by God.” (Session 2)
- *Values emerging from difficult experiences in life*

- One participant related the story that she entered the particular office where she is currently because when she was younger, her family experienced a very difficult situation, and the office helped them get through. (Session 2)
- Another participant said that when he was a “struggling student”, it was his teacher who helped him in various ways so he can graduate. This he said made him realize the value of the teacher in concretely helping students. (Session 3)

On the other hand, the non-awardees (in session 4) were asked about “why are they working in government”, most of the answers, while values-oriented, are not contributory to a productive and effective work disposition. Some examples are:

- *Government work as a sustainable and secure means to earn:*
 - “First is economic reason. [Working in government gives security.]”
 - “[This is my] bread and butter.”
 - “During first five years after graduating [from college], I was trying to get a job in the private sector but I couldn’t find one... At first I was trying to find work which is near where I live... I needed work. [And eventually found a job in government.]”
- *Government work allows them to have time for non-work-related activities (i.e., family, self):*
 - “Working in government gives me more time for my family.”
 - “Government work is not that demanding [compared to jobs in other sectors].”

While these themes emerged from the answers from the non-awardees, because most of the participants were teachers, the idea of “imparting their knowledge to the youth” appeared a number of times. However, such statement pertains to the notion of “why work as a teacher” rather than “why work as a government employee”.

- ***The civil servants have had mentors/role models that affected their disposition and motivation to be excellent at work for the awardees, or to work in government for the non-awardees.***

The discussions surfaced that the presence of role models in the lives of the participants has an effect on their disposition towards working excellently (in the case of the awardees), and working in the government in the first place (in the case of the non-awardees). These role models may be individuals who influenced the participants prior to them working in government (i.e., parents who also worked in government), or persons who set an example for them while already working in government (i.e., a supportive boss). Examples of these are:

- **Awardees:**
 - “I was mentored by my boss.” (Session 1)
 - [Respondent from the military] “My grandfather is [a retired General]... He had a clean record; no corruption. He inspired me that I should not do anything that will tarnish the name of my grandfather. I need to excel and honor my family name.” (Session 2)
 - “We are a family of public servants... [From my parents] I acquired the work commitment that expects nothing from the people you serve.” (Session 3)
- **Non-awardees:**
 - “Maybe [working in government] was influenced by my relatives who are also working in government.”
 - “My mother provided informal teaching to children while my aunts were public school teachers... I was not convinced that working around 12 hours a day only

merited the value of cow's milk... But my mom dictates what courses we should take, and I ended up in BS Education [and eventually teaching in public school as well]."

The SGDs were not able to sufficiently pursue the differences between the qualities of the role models of the awardees versus those of the non-awardees due to constraints in managing the four sessions in one day. But as per the statements of the participants in the discussion, the initial insight is that the models that influenced the awardees showed excellence and commitment to their work, while those who influenced the non-awardees to work in government did not sufficiently (or did not, at all) provide an example that would have inspired the non-awardees to excel in their work.

- ***The awardees have a strong sense of grasping the significance of their work to the achievement of larger goals in the institution, and how their personal skills and attributes contribute to such goals.***

A crucial observation made through the discussions is that the awardees possess certain awareness that their work has significance in achieving the greater goals of their institution, and that they possess some capacity to contribute to such goals. Examples of statements showing such disposition are the following:

- "I understand the role and appreciate the role [of all employees]... All employees are part of the strategic initiatives of the office, [hence that must be emphasized]." (Session 1)
- "I believe that I owe my work to the Filipino people... I know that I have the opportunity, [as part of] my institution to prove my worth which is why I have to do my best all the time." (Session 3)
- "Because I want to have tasks done efficiently, I simplify the processes for all employees to understand what we need to do... When I want to see change happen, I modify processes as much as I can." (Session 3)

However, this kind of sensibility seems to be generally weaker from the way non-awardees understand their work in the context of the larger whole. Among the participants in Session 4, those who show a strong sense of their role in achieving institutional and societal goals are teachers, because they say it is "inherent" in the work of a teacher. For those in various government offices and units, however, the understanding of the system seems to need addressing. The answers suggest that the lack of understanding of the role of the employee affects the performance. This can be seen in the following examples from Session 4:

- "Nobody explained my work's relevance to the entire government system. Someone should explain each employee's role and contribution to the system from the start... There should be follow-through on this also you can be constantly reminded of your importance."
 - "We need to know what we are doing."
- ***The awardees have innate passion to help, care and respect for other people.***

When asked why they entered government service, the awardees provided the following reasons:

- "Respect for people (people of all levels)" (Session 1)
- "I have the passion to serve" (Session 1)
- "Ang tao dapat may initiative to help people" (Session 1)

- “Yung may passion and faith, yung innate sa pagkatao ang patulong sa tao without anybody asking for help” (Session 1)
- “What I learned could help more people in my office” (Session 1)
- “Ako po ay makatao, ayaw ko na naghihirap ang tao, naluluha ako pag may nakikita akong naghihirap, maawin ako sa tao” (Session 1)
- “Work for people, make a difference” (Session 2)
- “Ito yung binigay sa akin ng Diyos na responsibilidad at pribilehiyo. Kailangan naman ibalik ko ito sa mga tao.” (Session 2)
- “We were taught to help other people, to always do good to others” (Session 3)
- “As a public servant, you should be accessible to the public” (Session 3)

For the non-awardees, the sense of serving its specific client also surfaced as part of the responsibility accompanied by their position/profession:

- Kasiyahan na makita na nakapagturo sa bata (Session 4)
- Gusto kong maglingkod sa bayan sa pagdagdag ng kaalaman ng kabataan (Session 4)

b. Enabling Factors Within the Government System

The discussions also explored factors within the government system that enable civil servants to work better and enhance their commitment and motivation. The succeeding discussion presents major themes that emerged from the SGDs. In processing the answers of the participants, it was noted that the enabling factors pointed out by the awardees and non-awardees are almost the same.

- ***Partnerships with willing and able partners from within and outside government enable the work and enhance the motivation of awardees.***

The discussions surfaced that collaborating with colleagues (inter-office and/or intra-office) and partners outside of government enhances both motivation and quality of work of civil servants. Examples of statements showing this idea are the following:

- “To make sure that operations are focused, I encouraged multi-divisional collaboration. That model brought people together to a common direction... [We worked towards] internal and external collaboration.” (Session 1)
- “I coordinate with other agencies to come up with projects to help inmates and transform them.” (Session 3)

In support of this idea, additional important points that came out of the discussion are noted here:

- The inclusion of civil servants in planning and decision-making processes enhances their commitment and motivation to their work. They seek for and affirm the importance of participatory processes within government to affirm their role (which relates to a point discussed in an earlier section) and enable them to feel a sense of ownership of the greater work being done. Example:
 - “We have no way of interacting with each other within the institute. What happens is that planning and decisions are made from the top level... We should be involved; the process must be bottom-up.” (Session 1)
- The participants maintain that their capacity to collaborate with partners outside of government is highly affected by the credibility and public image of the office (and the head of the office) wherein they work. This comes out of the discussion that low public approval on some units of government hinder the civil servants from expanding their network and getting

partners to trust that their office can deliver partnership counterparts. This idea was surfaced in discussions with both awardees and non-awardees.

- ***Recognition systems have positive effects in furthering the commitment and motivation of civil servants.***

The factor of getting recognition to the good works of the civil servants is a major theme that emerged from the discussions. “Recognition” is mentioned many times over in all the sessions conducted.

Awardees and non-awardees alike, the SGD participants yearn for various means of recognition for their work, which they say has positive effects in their motivation to work, building the credibility of their office and work in general, and exerting positive pressure to continue (or start) working more excellently in their work.

Other notable discussion points regarding this matter are as follows:

- Both awardees and non-awardees prefer that excellent performances of civil servants are shown in mainstream media so that the message is delivered to a greater audience.
- While recognition for officers in the police and military are preferred, there is difficulty with regard to the internal culture of the officers wherein the more senior officers should not be outshined by younger officers. This way of thinking, according to the awardees from the police and military, also has profound effects on the difficulty of relating with their superiors when they are awarded by the CSC.
- Non-awardees in Session 4 pointed out the difficulty about the self-nomination process in order to vie for recognition opportunities such as the civil service awardees. The notion of “*pagbubuhatangbangko*” or self-aggrandisement is frowned upon by their superiors and colleagues, and in Filipino culture as a whole. They suggest that seeking for opportunities for recognition must be a function of a person/office, so that they would not have to forward their own nomination.
- ***Availability and access to resources within and outside government enable civil servants to perform better.***

A theme that emerged from the discussions is that the availability of resources (of various kinds) to civil servants encourages and enables them to perform better. The kinds of resources that were identified from the sessions are as follows:

- *Provisions at work (i.e., quality of the work place, benefits, better compensation, better HR policies, among others), for example:*
 - “Demoralization [of employees] sometimes comes from physical things, like having broken comfort rooms in the office... It is then dependent on the person’s [values] foundation [whether they will continue or not despite those kinds of difficulties].” (Session 1)
 - “While [we are] doing our work, the government should be doing something for us as well... Commitment can be developed over time... The weakness in Human Resources on security of employment [must be addressed].” (Session 4)
- *Fund allocations for the projects and activities that the employees want to do at work, for example:*
 - “In research, money is scarce so we look for other resources, initiatives, and linkages with international and national institutions.” (Session 1)

- “The staff work goes beyond office hours even without additional incentives... So to motivate [my employees] I show an example... I sacrifice in my work and give them incentives like trainings and team-building [activities]... I shoulder part of the expense.” (Session 1)
- “We had no equipment in the office but we found our way... We had a goal that we want to achieve... We needed to be resourceful just so we can achieve our goal.” (Session 1)
- “I do not focus on the fact that I lack five airplanes. I just think that at least I have one.” (Session 2)
- *Access to information to complement their work and enhance their skills, including “best practices” that they may apply to their work¹⁴*

It must be noted that the difference between the awardees and non-awardees is that the former (as discussed earlier) have a certain understanding of their work context and takes on the task of building partnerships. It was observed that the participants in Session 4 were more passive with regard to this matter; their discussions stay at hoping to be provided for.

- ***Continuous learning opportunities in government service motivate civil servants.***

Another major point raised by the civil servants (from all SGD sessions) is that motivation and quality of work improves when opportunities for continued learning are made available to them. Their answers cover the following areas:

- Capacity-building on:
 - Skills training to complement the requirements for their work, and as needed for getting promoted to higher positions; and,
 - Scholarships for graduate studies;
- Peer support systems:
 - The presence of and access to a community of excellent civil servants that can serve as a space for mentoring and sharing experiences and practices that may be replicated by others; and,
 - Team-building activities for units and offices so that the employees may be able to work together more cohesively.

It was observed in the discussions that as a result of being awarded, the participants from Sessions 1-3 have better access to the opportunities outlined above. There is initial insight that the awardees may be better motivated in their work currently because of opportunities for continuous learning. They also find themselves empowered to *create* opportunities to make the activities available to their own unit/office employees. On the other hand, since the opportunities are perceived as less available by the non-awardees, they are at the ‘demanding’ end, such that they are actively seeking for such activities to be made available to them.

c. Other inputs from the participants

In the course of gathering the inputs from the SGD participants, some areas of note also emerged. These discussion points are separated from the sections above because these deal with employee development issues that are not directly addressed by the questions posed, or the categories that emerged as discussed.

¹⁴This is related to the next discussion point on continuous learning opportunities for civil servants.

- ***Introducing means to assess values, commitment and disposition towards work, and behavior***

The discussions have shown (particularly in Session 2) that the PDS and hiring processes have no space for assessment of the values, commitment, and disposition of employees towards their work – prior to and about public service in general. While these may be addressed through the feedback of superiors on their employees, the participants express that values towards work must have concrete repercussions with regard to hiring, promotions, and working assignments. It is not only skills and competencies of the employees that must be matched with the job assignment, but also leadership and values.

- ***Introducing ways of filtering excellent applicants/employees from the rest***

Related to the previous point, the SGD participants surfaced some issues and suggestions with regard to filtering excellent applicants and employees from the rest of under-performers, and having concrete institutional responses to non-performance. For example, the idea of subcontracting work to test applicants' performance first before issuing contracts and assignments was mentioned and supported by the participants in Session 2. Meanwhile, in session 4, the non-awardees discussed how politicians' recommendations on applicants (for hiring) and employees (for promotion) has a negative effect both on the other applicants/employees and the work in general because the persons who are given opportunities to work and advance in public service are not necessarily those who deserve such prioritization.

In the government, there are standard selection and promotion procedures. Heads of agencies also have discretion on whom to appoint, provided that the appointee meet the qualification standards of the position. The CSC also implements programs to improve and monitor government HR systems. For one, it has introduced the Program to Institutionalize Meritocracy and Excellence in Human Resource Management (PRIME-HRM), which is a mechanism that empowers government agencies by developing their human resource management competencies, systems, and practices toward HR excellence and professionalism.

F. CONCLUDING NOTES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a perceived difference ***between the “common” and the “exemplary” civil servants in terms of personal attributes of the civil servant.*** Differences in motives among the 2 groups and the way they look at the bigger context are also observed.

The exploratory study showed the following behavioural traits of the the exemplary (awardees) which set them apart from common (non-awardees):

1. The awardees have strong, positive familial and religious values, as well as a general “drive” that greatly influences their work ethics and behaviors;
2. The awardees have a strong sense of grasping the significance of their work as it contributes and impacts to the achievement of larger goals of the institution they serve, and how their personal skills and attributes contribute to such goals; and
3. The awardees have innate passion to help, care and respect for other people.

4. Although both types of civil servants have had mentors/role models that shepherded and guided the direction of their disposition and motivation, they serve different goals - to be excellent at work for the awardees and to work in government for the non-awardees.

Inputs gathered from the presentation of the results of the study:

Inputs to the study were gathered during its presentation to the stakeholders on December 6, 2013, namely, selected CSC Regional and Directors, and Human Resource Management Officers representing government agencies in NCR that have produced HAP awardees. Important inputs raised are as follows:

- There is a correlation between educational attainment and the drive to excel.
- Criteria for selection of personnel should be competency-based. However, a servant hero has added value like years of practice, the drive for education.
- Superior performance are complemented with the values of the organization that promote excellence, the proactive involvement of the Program on Rewards, awards and Incentives for Service Excellence (PRAISE) Committee in each agency, and the values of the different agencies that are adopted by the civil servants.

On January 10, 2014, the findings of the study were presented to the Lingkod Bayani Network (LBNet) composed of past awardees of HAP. Hereunder inputs were gathered:

- The LBNet members see the importance of the Servant Hero Profiling in increasing the tribe of Lingkod Bayanis, creating more heroes and sustaining heroism and high level of performance. Data generated from the study could be used as criteria for recruitment and basis for HR interventions. Modelling and replicating best practices may be anchored on the findings of the exploratory study.

The results of the study were also presented to the CSC Multi-Sector Advisory Council on June 4, 2014. The inputs given were as follows:

- Success profile of awardees should be looked at; identify the heroic acts and cull the profile based on them
- The key profile of the awardees is “caring for people they serve” which is the core characteristic of being a public servant
- Profiling should focus on people who work well; a hero is defined as “doing ordinary work in extra-ordinary manner”
- HAP awardees should have an alliance (i.e. with religious groups, CSOs, business sector) to support/help upright civil servants; the government should expand ways of helping the upright in the government
- The profile should identify who are the good guys in the government and how they will be known based on standard qualities

The findings gathered from the study and presentations to different audiences now provide bases to consider in answering the the following discussion points raised in this exploratory study:

1. How can the HAP be strengthened using the information on the perceived difference between common and exemplary civil servants?

To address this perceived “lack of distinction”, the Honor Awards Program may be strengthened by first mainstreaming the “positive values” being portrayed and exemplified by these civil servant models in the whole process of the Program. This means embedding this very foundational element in the different levels and stages of nomination, selection, validation and conferment of HAP, ensuring that this basic conceptual parameter is adequately positioned and fundamentally anchored on the program.

HAP is also challenged to be more explicit and pro-active in looking for the traits during the validation interview of the nominees. When vetting nominees, HAP should be able to pinpoint what drove them to do what they do or what inspired them. There has to be an active way of seeking personal values in the nominees. Strong values for family, religion, personal life story jive with leadership literature.

On-going focus-group discussions with HAP awardees may also be done to complement this mainstreaming effort.

Current Selection Process

Based on current practice, selection of exemplary civil servants under HAP starts with the submission of the prescribed HAP nomination form detailing the nominees’ accomplishments and relevant impact to the organization, the society or the nation as a whole. Documentary requirements to support character and credibility of the nominees, such as: Clearances from Pending Administrative Cases issued by the Office of the Ombudsman (OMB) and CSC; Clearance from derogatory record from the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI); Certification of No Unliquidated Cash Advances and Disallowances from the Commission on Audit (COA), among others. The nomination is then screened and evaluated by the Committees on Awards.

Once the semi-finalists are selected, they undergo unannounced validation of the veracity of the information provided in the nomination especially on their accomplishments and impact. Also part of this process is the background investigation of the semi-finalists. The validation / background investigations are undertaken by seasoned validators/ background investigators (BIs) of CSC, COA and OMB. The HAP Secretariat also publishes the list of semi-finalists in top two broadsheets with nationwide circulation to encourage the public to provide feedback on the formers’ character and work ethics. Negative feedback is included in the validation task of the BIs. Based on the findings, the Committee will select the winners. There was no face-to-face interaction between the Committee and the semi-finalists.

In 2013, an additional component to the screening and selection process is the conduct of a five-minute impromptu video interview of the semi-finalists to answer the question “What did you do differently and why?” The inclusion of this component helped the Committee in deciding desirable semi-finalists.

In the succeeding annual search for outstanding public officials and employees, there is a need to validate if HAP nominees possess the traits of an exemplary civil servant: strong familial, care for others and religious values, ability to relate performance to the larger goals of their institution and the society and the strong motivation to achieve the goal of being excellent at work.

At the start of the nomination, nominees should already be required to submit an essay on “what drives them to excel?” A further validation of what is written in the HAP nominee’s essay may be

conducted thru interview with the Committee during the deliberation process. The nominee has to be explicit in answering the question “what drives them to do what they do and excel?”

Among the enabling factors within the government system that could fuel and enhance the motivation towards exemplary performance is through partnership and networking. In the selection of exemplary performers, HAP should try to elicit if the nominees made a point of seeking out partnership in their networking. Are the role models and motivation derived from the networking?

On the the difficulty of the self-nomination process in order to vie for recognition opportunities raised by the non-awardees, the Search should re-emphasize the important role of the agencies’ committee on Program on Rewards, Awards and Incentives for Service Excellence in identifying and recommending its awardees to the national search. Giving of awards and recognitions does not stop at the agency level but instead, it should be a passport for higher recognition which is the HAP.

2. What kinds of program support and other interventions can be provided to the “common” civil servants so that they become more of the “exemplars”?

The challenge for the CSC is to come up with a literature of the traits of exemplary performers gathered from the study, future interviews, surveys, FGDs and other modes as support mechanism to its mission “*Gawing lingkod bayani ang bawat kawani*”. There should be a program that elicits from ordinary civil servants the drivers for professional growth. Why am I in public service? Leadership question: why do I do what I do?

From this literature, the CSC shall be able to come up with learning and development program applicable for all agencies wherein each government employee should understand not only his/her job description, but most importantly, be able to explain the context of the job and how it relates to the larger goals of the institution. The CSC should craft a training module focused on the transformation of every government employees to “*Lingkod Bayani*” or servant-heroes.

It is suggested that the training “*Lingkod Bayani Culture: Preparing New Employees for the Transformation*” be initiated which aims to relate individual work to organizational output and finally to social outcomes. The value of each employee’s work to the overall service chain should be appreciated, and must be a crystal clear from the very start of one’s employment in the public sector.

Further, the HR intervention initiative may also contain a two-day immersion program for new/selected employees to the basic sector that his/her agency is delivering its major final output under the “*Pakikipamuhay Program*.” may be made mandatory. Through this immersion, the employee would obtain a direct and personal experience in engaging with this basic sector or constituents and feel their needs, aspirations and collective views on how government service must function and serve the people.

The CSC should also capacitate the Human Resource Management Officer of each government agency who will serve as the direct implementers of the orientation and related interventions for this purpose. As champions in their respective agencies, HRMOs play a crucial role in initiating and implementing programs that will help in the formation of a new generation of army of public exemplars right from the very backyard of their organizations.

Further research on the different behavioural dimensions cited in this paper, e.g. motives for working in public service, is recommended. Another focus of potential study is to assess the current

efforts of government agencies, to promote public service or to attract potential civil servants. The role of Human Resource and the Committee on Program on Rewards, Awards and Incentives for Service Excellence (PRAISE) in developing and motivating excellent performers in the public service.

A theoretical framework on Superior Performance in Public Administration may be drawn from these suggested research studies.

3. How can the communication strategies of the CSC be enhanced (i.e. description of and variables) that make the “exemplary” civil servants?

Why be in public service? There should be a shift of perception on government service from the traditional outlook as a source of income to an opportunity to perform excellently and be able to contribute in the achievement of the organization and societal goals.

There should also be formal and non-formal learning and development programs that would elicit from ordinary servants the drivers for professional growth. It must be inculcated in them the value of why they are in the public service. While for new entrants in the government service, orientation must not only be focused on job descriptions, equally important also is to explain to them how their job outputs relate to the organization and societal goals. Organization goals output should be strengthened and linked to social outcome.

The qualities of exemplary civil servants must be intensified through the use of the quad-media and dissemination of creative and insightful information materials on HAP. Aside from the usual publications like the quarterly issue of CSC publication “The Reporter” and monthly e-newsletters published at the CSC website, there is also an annual publication on the winners of HAP, the “Far from Ordinary”.

Other means of disseminating information about the HAP have to be experimented, utilized, adopted and if funds permit, propagated massively throughout the country and bureaucracy. The current technological advances provide numerous opportunities for HAP to be more imaginative, resourceful and ingenious in tapping these IT platforms to further propagate the thrusts and directions of the program.

Production of video materials featuring government service exemplars will be created. The message will be focused on best practices that employees could emulate to be able to become effective in their jobs. These AVPs will be shown during CSC-facilitated functions such as trainings, workshops and conferences of government employees. Airing of the materials in partnership with government agencies and the media will also be done.

Policy Recommendation

The study suggests enhancement to existing human resource policies of each government agency, particularly on the four components of strategic human resource, *namely*, recruitment, retention, rewards and retirement, thereby complementing and supplementing the CSC’s mission of “*Gawing Bayani ang Bawat Kawani*”.

a. Recruitment. Each position in the government has prescribed qualification standards and competencies to ensure that appointees are hired based on merit.

Behavioral assessment anchored on the initially identified Lingkod *Bayani* traits shall be included in the selection criteria: strong familial and religious values, strong sense of grasping the significance of work to the institution and society, innate passion to help, care and respect for

other people and having mentors/role models that shepherded and guided the direction of their disposition and motivation to be excellent at work. Preference shall be made on those who possess these traits.

However, applicants who do not possess these traits but met the qualification standards, exceeded the competency assessment and excelled in the competitive exam and interview may be selected. Once hired, these *Lingkod Bayani* traits will be included in their respective individual development plan.

b. Retention. Government agencies shall craft human resource interventions focused on the *Lingkod Bayani* values for its incumbent employees. An assessment on whether or not the employees possess the *Lingkod Bayani* traits shall be done to determine the needed intervention. Agencies shall implement a continual learning and development program to hone its employees towards the *Lingkod Bayani* tenet.

c. Reward. It must be a policy of the agency to implement the PRAISE or its equivalent in every government agency. Winners of the agency PRAISE shall be nominated to the annual national search for outstanding public officials and employees or the Honor Awards Program. Every year, each government agency shall have at least one nomination to HAP.

d. Retirement. From the initially identified *Lingkod Bayani* traits, government agencies shall create a knowledge base of accounts or experiences of their retirees on how they have practiced these traits and other behavioural traits that they think must be included in the literature of *Lingkod Bayani* traits. Prior to retirement, employees shall undergo a process of an exit interview focused on *Lingkod Bayani* traits and their accounts or experiences that the employees, as *Lingkod Bayanis*, must emulate while in active government service.

From the knowledge base, the agency shall create documentaries or short AVPs of these traits based on accounts of the retirees, to be shown during agencies' events, orientation for new employees, and their respective websites. Through this, the retirees shall still feel their value to the organization even if they are no longer in the service.

Policy formulation on the *Lingkod Bayani* retirees' role in providing inspiration for the employees may be a good subject for further study.

G. REFERENCES

Ahmad, Mazlan, "*Public Service Management: Achieving Quality Performance in the 21st Century*", National Institute of Public Administration (INTAN) Public Service Department, Malaysia, 1998.

Tuazon, Leila Santiago, "*Organizational Climate and Job Performance in a Public Sector Agency*", University of the Philippines School of Labor and Industrial Relations, October 1994.

An Act Declaring the Bar and Board Examinations as Civil Service Examinations. (1954, June 15).

Retrieved March 18, 2013, from Civil Service Commission:

<http://excell.csc.gov.ph/ELIGSPECIAL/ra1080.pdf>

Bernan, E. (2011). *Public administration in Southeast Asia: Thailand, Philippines, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and Macao*. Boca Raton Florida: CRC Press.

Civil Service Commission. (1998). *Philippine Civil Service : employee handbook*. Quezon City: Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission. (1998). *Tracing a new path: innovations for improved productivity in government*. Quezon City: Civil Service Commission.

Civil Service Commission. (1999). *Uniform rules on administrative cases in the civil service*. Quezon City: Civil Service Commission.

De Leon, C. A. (n.d.). *Reforms in the Civil Service: The Philippine Experience*. Retrieved March 17, 2013, from UNPAN1.UN.ORG:
<http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan007437.pdf>

Dela Goza, R. (1991). *History of the Philippine civil service*. Manila: Rex.

Hodder, R. (2010). Informality in the Philippine Civil Service. *Asian Studies Review* 34(2) , 231-251.

Del Rosario, Jonilo et.al., "Advancing the Implementation of the Performance Evaluation Incentive System in the Government Corporate Sector: Some Policy Reforms and Design Options", Policy Paper for PA 248 (Workshop in Policy Analysis), March 1995.

Hechanova, Regina et.al., "Who is the Filipino Worker", *Psyke 2: The Way We Work: Research and Best Practices in Philippine Organization*, edited by Hechanova, Ma. Regina M. and Franco, Edna P., Ateneo De Manila University Press, 2005.

Hodder, R. (2009). Political interference in the Philippine civil service. *Government & Policy* 27(5) , 766-782.

Leveriza, J. (1995). *Personnel administration in the government*. Manila: National Book Store.

Mangahas, J. V., & Sonco, J. O. (2011). Civil Service System in the Philippines. *Public Administration and Public Policy* Vol. 159 , 423-462.

Monsod, Toby C., "The Philippine Bureaucracy: Incentive structures and implications for performance", HDN Discussion Paper Series, PHDR Issue 2008/2009.

Muhammad Rais bin Abdul Karim and Norman bte Mansor, "Wrapping-up session on Public Service Management: Achieving Quality Performance in the 21st Century", 17th EROPA Conference, 1998.

Pascua, Ma. Valerie Vanessa Claudio, "Are there Generational Differences in Work Values?", *Psyke* 2.

Personnel Officers Association of the Philippines. (1993). *The Civil service law and rules*. Quezon City: Personnel Officers Association of the Philippines.

Republic Act 6713: Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees. (1989, February 20). Retrieved March 17, 2013, from Civil Service Commission:
<http://excell.csc.gov.ph/cscweb/RA6713.html>

Villareal, E. (2008). Authentic Superior Accountability in the Civil Service: "Command Responsibility" as a Key to Economic Development. *Ateneo Law Journal*, 53(1) , 242-260.

Worcester, D. (2006). *CHAPTER XIII: The Philippine Civil Service*. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from EBSCOHost: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lfh&AN=34325858>

Yao, Karen, et.al. "Rewards that Matter: What motivates the Filipino Employee?", *Psyke 2: The Way We Work: Research and Best Practices in Philippine Organization*, edited by Hechanova, Ma. Regina M. and Franco, Edna P., Ateneo De Manila University Press, 2005.

ANNEXES

- A. Codebook for PDS Profiling
- B. SPSS Output 1. Descriptives of PDS Profiling
- C. SPSS Output 2. Chi Square Analysis of PDS Profiling
- D. List of Participants and Notes from February 6, 2013 Focus Group Discussion
- E. Highlights of December 6 Consultation Meeting with Stakeholders
- F. Notes from January 10 Meeting with Lingkod Bayani Network Core Members
- G. Notes from June 4 CSC Multi-sector advisory Council

ANNEX A: Codebook for PDS Profiling

****if no data is available, indicate “not applicable” or code it as 0 or 99.***

Awardee

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	1	Yes		
	2	No		

Awardcategory

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	DNB	1		
	Not appl	4		
	PAG	2		
	PLB	3		

Age

		Value	Count	Percent
Labeled Values	1	20-30		
	2	31-40		
	3	41-50		
	4	51-60		
	5	61-70		
	6	71-80		

Gender

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	1	Male		
	2	Female		

Civilstat

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	1	Single		
	2	Married		
	3	Annulled		
	4	Widowed		
	5	Separated		
	6	Others		

Employmentspouse

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	None		
	1	Local, Government		
	2	Local, Private		
	3	OFW		
	4	Seasonal Worker		
	5	Self-employed		
Missing Values	6	Unemployed		
	9	Not applicable		

Numberofchildren

		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	No children		
	1	1		
	2	2-4		

3	5-7		
4	8-9		
5	10 or more		
9	Not applicable		

Highesteducational

	Value	Count	Percent
0	Not applicable		
1	Elementary		
2	Secondary		
3	Vocational Course		
4	Bachelor Undergraduate		
5	Bachelor Degree		
6	Masteral Degree		
7	Doctoral Degree		

Academichonors

	Value	Count	Percent
1	Elementary		
2	High School		
3	College		
4	Post-graduate		
5	None		
6	Not applicable		

Careerserviceeligibility

	Value	Count	Percent
0	Not applicable		
1	Special Eligibility		
2	CS Sub Professional		
3	CS Professional		
4	CES Eligibility		
5	RA 1080		
6	None		

Withworkexperienceinprivate

	Value	Count	Percent
0	Not applicable		
1	Yes		
2	No		

Yearsinprivate

	Value	Count	Percent
1	Did not work in the private sector		
2	1 to 3 years		
3	4 to 6 years		
4	7 to 9 years		
5	10 years and above		

Ageenteredgovservice

	Value	Count	Percent
1	19 and below		
2	20 to 30 years old		
3	31 to 40 years old		
4	41 to 50 years old		
5	51 to 60 years old		

Yearsofgovservice

	Value	Count	Percent
1	Less than 5 years		
2	6 to 10 years		
3	11 to 20 years		
4	21 to 30 years		
5	31 to 40 years		
6	41 to 50 years		

Agencytimeofaward (Actual based on Profile)

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	85IB, 2I		
	AFP COMM		
	AFP-GSQ		
	AFP-PHIL		
	BANGKO S		
	BSP		
	BSP-Dept		
	COA		
	COMMISSI		
	DILG-BJM		
	DILG-BRG		
	DIVISION		
	DOLE		
	DOLE-Phi		
	DOST-PCI		
	DOST-PTR		
	DTI		
	NHQ-PNP		
	OFFICE O		
	PADRE M.		
	PCHRD-DO		
	PHILIPPI		
	PHIVOLCS		
PNP			
PNRI			
Supreme			
UNIVERSI			
UP DILIM			

Agencycategory

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	1	Human Development	
	2	Military	
	3	LGUs	
	4	Finance, Trade and Commerce	
	5	Science and Technology	
	6	Judiciary	

Position

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	Not applicable	
	1	Staff	
	2	Non-supervisory	
	3	Supervisory (up to Division Chief)	
	4	Executive/ Managerial	

Salary

	Value	Count	Percent
Labeled Values	1	Php1 to 100,000	
	2	Php100,001 to 500,000	
	3	Php500,001 to 1,000,000	
	4	Php1,000,001 and above	
	5	Not available	

Natureofwork

	Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	1	Administrative	
	2	Highly Specialized	
	3	Elective Official	
	4	Education	
	5	Military/ Uniform	

	0	Not applicable		
Voluntarywork				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	Not applicable		
	1	Yes		
	2	None		
Hoursofskilltraining and hoursofbehavioraltraining (2)				
		Value	Count	Percent
Labeled Values	1	None		
	2	1 to 100 hours		
	3	101 to 500 hours		
	4	501 to 1000 hours		
	5	1000 hours and above		
Specialskillshobby				
		Value	Count	Percent
Labeled Values	1	Yes		
	2	No		
Nonacademicdistinction				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0			
	1	Agency or office-wide		
	2	Local/Community		
	3	Sectoral		
	4	National		
	5	None		
Membershipinorg				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	Not applicable		
	1	Yes		
	2	None		
Relatedbyaffinity				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0			
	1	Yes		
	2	No		
Awardeecharged				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	Not applicable		
	1	Yes		
	2	No		
Awardeeguiltyofadmin				
		Value	Count	Percent
Labeled Values	1	Yes		
	2	No		
Awardeeconvinced				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	Not applicable		
	1	Yes		
	2	No		
Awardeeseperatedfromservice				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	Not applicable		
	1	Yes		
	2	No		
Awardeecandidate				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	Not applicable		
	1	Yes		

	2	No		
Members of special group				
		Value	Count	Percent
Valid Values	0	Not applicable		
	1	None		
	2	Indigenous people		
	3	Differently-abled		
	4	Solo parent		

ANNEX B. SPSS Output 1. Descriptives of PDS Profiling

The data has been categorized into Awardee Type (Individual, Group or Non-awardee). There are a total of 411 profiles coded with the following breakdown: 17 individual awardees, 50 group awardees, and 344 non-awardees.

The variables which these profiles were analysed from included: age, gender, civil status, employment of spouse, number of children, highest educational attainment, academic honors received, career service eligibility, work experience in private sector, years of work in private sector, age entered government service, years of government service, agency category, agency at the time of award, position, salary, nature of work, voluntary work, hours of skills training, hours of behavioural training, special skills/hobbies, non-academic distinctions/recognitions, membership in organizations, relationship/affinity with authority in work, whether awardee was charged, whether awardee was guilty of administrative charges, whether awardee was convicted, whether awardee separated from service/AWOL, whether awardee was a candidate for office, and whether awardee is a member of a special group. The coding for the following variables can be found in the attachments (insert coding sheet).

A summary of the descriptives data can be found in the table below:

	Individual	Group	Non-awardee
Age	51-60		Varied
Gender	Male	Female	Varied
Year when PDS was accomplished	2010	2008 & 2010	Not valid
Civil Status	Married		
Employment of Spouse	Local, Govt	Local, Private	Varied
Number of Children	2-4 children		
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctoral (47%)	Masteral (68%)	Masteral (45%)/Bachelors (41%)
Academic honors received	None (47%, 50%, 37%)		
Eligibility	RA1080 (41.2%) No eligibility (29.4%)	RA1080 (60%)	RA1080 (39%) CS Professional (37.8%)
Years in private sector	Majority did not work in private sector		
Age entered gov	Majority: 20-30 y/o		
Agency category	Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other 53%	Banking & Finance 25%	Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other 34%
Position	Non supervisory 41%	Supervisory 56%	Varied
Salary	Php100,000-500,001 annual		
Nature of work	Highly Specialized 41%	Admin & Highly Specialized 25%	Administrative 63%
Hours of training	101-500 hours		
Hours of behavioural training	None		Not valid
Non-academic distinctions/ recognition	Not valid but high in Local/Community 41%	Local/Community 42%	None 45%
Affinity to authority	No	No	Has relative (low .9%)
Formally charged	No	No	Yes (2.3%)
Convicted of crime or violation	No	No	Yes (4.1%)

AWOL	No	Presence of Yes (10%)	Presence of Yes (18.6%)
Candidate in election	No	Presence of Yes (2%)	Presence of Yes (16.3%)
Member of special group	None (88%)	IP (50%)	None (69%)

Frequencies

The following is a detailed set of the descriptives output for the variables stated above:

Awardee

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Yes	17	100.0	100.0	100.0
Group	Valid	Yes	50	100.0	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	No	344	100.0	100.0	100.0

Year When PDS was accomplished

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	2008	2	11.8	11.8	11.8
		2009	4	23.5	23.5	35.3
		2010	7	41.2	41.2	76.5
		2012	4	23.5	23.5	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	2008	15	30.0	30.0	30.0
		2010	15	30.0	30.0	60.0
		2011	6	12.0	12.0	72.0
		2012	14	28.0	28.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	2007	1	.3	.3	.3
		2008	16	4.7	4.7	4.9
		2009	5	1.5	1.5	6.4
		2010	22	6.4	6.4	12.8
		2011	6	1.7	1.7	14.5
		2012	15	4.4	4.4	18.9
		Not applicable/No data	279	81.1	81.1	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Age actual in profile

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	31-40	2	11.8	11.8	11.8
		41-50	7	41.2	41.2	52.9
		51-60	6	35.3	35.3	88.2
		61-70	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
		71-80	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	20-30	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
		31-40	8	16.0	16.0	18.0
		41-50	13	26.0	26.0	44.0
		51-60	25	50.0	50.0	94.0
		61-70	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Non-awardee	Valid	20-30	53	15.4	15.4	15.4
		31-40	84	24.4	24.4	39.8
		41-50	94	27.3	27.3	67.2
		51-60	97	28.2	28.2	95.3
		61-70	13	3.8	3.8	99.1
		71-80	1	.3	.3	99.4
		Not applicable/No data	2	.6	.6	100.0
Total		344	100.0	100.0		

Gender

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Individual	Valid	Male	12	70.6	70.6	70.6
		Female	5	29.4	29.4	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Male	18	36.0	36.0	36.0
		Female	32	64.0	64.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Male	166	48.3	48.3	48.3
		Female	178	51.7	51.7	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Civil Status

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Individual	Valid	Single	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
		Married	16	94.1	94.1	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Single	10	20.0	20.0	20.0
		Married	35	70.0	70.0	90.0
		Widowed	3	6.0	6.0	96.0
		Separated	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Single	107	31.1	31.1	31.1
		Married	224	65.1	65.1	96.2
		Annulled	1	.3	.3	96.5
		Widowed	7	2.0	2.0	98.5
		Separated	4	1.2	1.2	99.7
		Not applicable/No data	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total		344	100.0	100.0		

Employment of Spouse

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Individual	Valid	Local, Government	6	35.3	37.5	37.5
		Local, Private	5	29.4	31.3	68.8
		Unemployed	5	29.4	31.3	100.0
		Total	16	94.1	100.0	
	Missing	Not applicable/No data	1	5.9		
Total		17	100.0			
Group	Valid	Local, Government	9	18.0	26.5	26.5
		Local, Private	14	28.0	41.2	67.6
		OFW	2	4.0	5.9	73.5
		Self-employed	2	4.0	5.9	79.4
		Unemployed	7	14.0	20.6	100.0
	Total	34	68.0	100.0		
Missing	Not applicable/No data	16	32.0			

	Total		50	100.0		
Non-awardee	Valid	Local, Government	68	19.8	31.6	31.6
		Local, Private	59	17.2	27.4	59.1
		OFW	13	3.8	6.0	65.1
		Seasonal Worker	2	.6	.9	66.0
		Self-employed	25	7.3	11.6	77.7
		Unemployed	48	14.0	22.3	100.0
		Total	215	62.5	100.0	
	Missing	Not applicable/No data	129	37.5		
Total		344	100.0			

Number of Children (current in profile)

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	No children	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
		1	3	17.6	17.6	23.5
		2-4	6	35.3	35.3	58.8
		5-7	5	29.4	29.4	88.2
		8-9	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
		Total				
Group	Valid	No children	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
		1	7	14.0	14.0	16.0
		2-4	12	24.0	24.0	40.0
		5-7	8	16.0	16.0	56.0
		8-9	6	12.0	12.0	68.0
		10 or more	5	10.0	10.0	78.0
		Not applicable/No data	11	22.0	22.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Total						
Non-awardee	Valid	No children	39	11.3	11.3	11.3
		1	52	15.1	15.1	26.5
		2-4	133	38.7	38.7	65.1
		5-7	29	8.4	8.4	73.5
		8-9	3	.9	.9	74.4
		10 or more	3	.9	.9	75.3
		Not applicable/No data	85	24.7	24.7	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	
Total						

Highest Education attained

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Bachelor Degree	4	23.5	23.5	23.5
		Masteral Degree	5	29.4	29.4	52.9
		Doctoral Degree	8	47.1	47.1	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Vocational Course	2	4.0	4.0	4.0
		Bachelor Undergraduate	2	4.0	4.0	8.0
		Bachelor Degree	12	24.0	24.0	32.0
		Masteral Degree	34	68.0	68.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Secondary	4	1.2	1.2	1.2
		Vocational Course	9	2.6	2.6	3.8
		Bachelor Undergraduate	6	1.7	1.7	5.5
		Bachelor Degree	143	41.6	41.6	47.1
		Masteral Degree	155	45.1	45.1	92.2
		Doctoral Degree	25	7.3	7.3	99.4
		Not applicable/No data	2	.6	.6	100.0
Total	344	100.0	100.0			
Total						

Academic honors received

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
---	--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Individual	Valid	High School	3	17.6	17.6	17.6
		College	1	5.9	5.9	23.5
		Post-graduate	4	23.5	23.5	47.1
		None	8	47.1	47.1	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	High School	6	12.0	12.0	12.0
		College	9	18.0	18.0	30.0
		Post-graduate	9	18.0	18.0	48.0
		None	25	50.0	50.0	98.0
		Not applicable/No data	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Elementary	34	9.9	9.9	9.9
		High School	41	11.9	11.9	21.8
		College	52	15.1	15.1	36.9
		Post-graduate	34	9.9	9.9	46.8
		None	126	36.6	36.6	83.4
		Not applicable/No data	57	16.6	16.6	100.0
Total	344	100.0	100.0			

Career Service Eligibility

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Individual	Valid	CS Professional	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
		CES Eligibility	4	23.5	23.5	29.4
		RA 1080	7	41.2	41.2	70.6
		None	5	29.4	29.4	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	CS Professional	17	34.0	34.0	34.0
		CES Eligibility	2	4.0	4.0	38.0
		RA 1080	30	60.0	60.0	98.0
		None	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	0	9	2.6	2.6	2.6
		Special Eligibility	19	5.5	5.5	8.1
		CS Sub Professional	21	6.1	6.1	14.2
		CS Professional	130	37.8	37.8	52.0
		CES Eligibility	28	8.1	8.1	60.2
		RA 1080	134	39.0	39.0	99.1
		None	3	.9	.9	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

With work experience in private sector

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Yes	6	35.3	35.3
		No	11	64.7	64.7
		Total	17	100.0	100.0
Group	Valid	Yes	21	42.0	42.0
		No	28	56.0	56.0
		Not applicable/No data	1	2.0	2.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	167	48.5	48.5
		No	162	47.1	47.1
		Not applicable/No data	15	4.4	4.4
		Total	344	100.0	100.0

Years in the private sector (actual in profile)

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Did not work in the private sector	11	64.7	64.7

		1 to 3 years	2	11.8	11.8	76.5
		4 to 6 years	2	11.8	11.8	88.2
		7 to 9 years	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
		10 years and above	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Did not work in the private sector	28	56.0	56.0	56.0
		1 to 3 years	10	20.0	20.0	76.0
		4 to 6 years	7	14.0	14.0	90.0
		7 to 9 years	4	8.0	8.0	98.0
		Not applicable/No data	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Did not work in the private sector	177	51.5	51.5	51.5
		1 to 3 years	74	21.5	21.5	73.0
		4 to 6 years	29	8.4	8.4	81.4
		7 to 9 years	22	6.4	6.4	87.8
		10 years and above	27	7.8	7.8	95.6
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Age entered Government Service

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Individual	Valid	19 and below	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
		20 to 30 years old	13	76.5	76.5	82.4
		31 to 40 years old	2	11.8	11.8	94.1
		41 to 50 years old	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	19 and below	2	4.0	4.1	4.1
		20 to 30 years old	42	84.0	85.7	89.8
		31 to 40 years old	4	8.0	8.2	98.0
		41 to 50 years old	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
		Total	49	98.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	2.0		
Total		50	100.0			
Non-awardee	Valid	19 and below	11	3.2	3.2	3.2
		20 to 30 years old	248	72.1	72.3	75.5
		31 to 40 years old	55	16.0	16.0	91.5
		41 to 50 years old	8	2.3	2.3	93.9
		51 to 60 years old	1	.3	.3	94.2
		Not applicable/No data	19	5.5	5.5	99.7
	23	1	.3	.3	100.0	
Total	343	99.7	100.0			
Missing	System	1	.3			
Total		344	100.0			

Years of govt service at the time of award (actual on profile)

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Individual	Valid	11 to 20 years	5	29.4	29.4	29.4
		21 to 30 years	10	58.8	58.8	88.2
		31 to 40 years	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
		51 to 60 years	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	6 to 10 years	6	12.0	12.0	12.0
		11 to 20 years	6	12.0	12.0	24.0
		21 to 30 years	25	50.0	50.0	74.0
		31 to 40 years	11	22.0	22.0	96.0
		41 to 50 years	1	2.0	2.0	98.0
		Not applicable/No data	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0			
Non-awardee	Valid	Less than 5 years	88	25.6	25.6	25.6

		6 to 10 years	35	10.2	10.2	35.8
		11 to 20 years	75	21.8	21.8	57.6
		21 to 30 years	83	24.1	24.1	81.7
		31 to 40 years	49	14.2	14.2	95.9
		41 to 50 years	2	.6	.6	96.5
		Not applicable/No data	12	3.5	3.5	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Agency Category

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Individual	Valid	Human Development	3	17.6	17.6	17.6
		Science and Technology	3	17.6	17.6	35.3
		Agri-Industry, Agriculture, Agrarian, Trade & Industry	1	5.9	5.9	41.2
		Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other	9	52.9	52.9	94.1
		Banking & Finance; Statistics	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Science and Technology	7	14.0	14.0	14.0
		Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other	18	36.0	36.0	50.0
		Banking & Finance; Statistics	25	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Human Development	58	16.9	16.9	16.9
		Science and Technology	22	6.4	6.4	23.3
		Environment and Natural Resources	9	2.6	2.6	25.9
		Agri-Industry, Agriculture, Agrarian, Trade & Industry	39	11.3	11.3	37.2
		Transportation/communication; Water Development; Power; Energy; Irrigation	73	21.2	21.2	58.4
		Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other	117	34.0	34.0	92.4
		Banking & Finance; Statistics	26	7.6	7.6	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Position (actual on profile)

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Individual	Valid	Staff	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
		Non-supervisory	7	41.2	41.2	47.1
		Supervisory (up to Division Chief)	3	17.6	17.6	64.7
		Executive/ Managerial	6	35.3	35.3	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Staff	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
		Non-supervisory	7	14.0	14.0	16.0
		Supervisory (up to Division Chief)	28	56.0	56.0	72.0
		Executive/ Managerial	14	28.0	28.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Staff	73	21.2	21.2	21.2
		Non-supervisory	118	34.3	34.3	55.5

		Supervisory (up to Division Chief)	78	22.7	22.7	78.2
		Executive/ Managerial	40	11.6	11.6	89.8
		Not applicable/No data	35	10.2	10.2	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Salary (actual on profile/annual)

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Php100,001 to 500,000	9	52.9	52.9	52.9
		Php500,001 to 1,000,000	1	5.9	5.9	58.8
		Not applicable/No data	7	41.2	41.2	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Php100,001 to 500,000	24	48.0	48.0	48.0
		Php500,001 to 1,000,000	8	16.0	16.0	64.0
		Php1,000,001 and above	15	30.0	30.0	94.0
		Not applicable/No data	3	6.0	6.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Php1 to 100,000	16	4.7	4.7	4.7
		Php100,001 to 500,000	211	61.3	61.3	66.0
		Php500,001 to 1,000,000	41	11.9	11.9	77.9
		Php1,000,001 and above	9	2.6	2.6	80.5
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Nature of work

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Highly Specialized	7	41.2	41.2	41.2
		Elective Official	1	5.9	5.9	47.1
		Education	2	11.8	11.8	58.8
		Military/ Uniform	5	29.4	29.4	88.2
		Legal Related	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
Group	Valid	Administrative	25	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Highly Specialized	25	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Administrative	218	63.4	63.4	63.4
		Highly Specialized	30	8.7	8.7	72.1
		Elective Official	2	.6	.6	72.7
		Education	3	.9	.9	73.5
		Military/ Uniform	23	6.7	6.7	80.2
		Legal Related	21	6.1	6.1	86.3
		Medical Related	29	8.4	8.4	94.8
		Not applicable/No data	18	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	344	100.0	100.0			

Voluntary work or Involvement in Civil Non-government / People Voluntary Organization

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Yes	8	47.1	47.1	47.1
		None	8	47.1	47.1	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Yes	13	26.0	26.0	26.0
		None	37	74.0	74.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	112	32.6	32.6	32.6
		None	153	44.5	44.5	77.0
		Not applicable/No data	79	23.0	23.0	100.0

		Total	344	100.0	100.0	
--	--	-------	-----	-------	-------	--

Hours of relevant skills training (actual on profile)

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	None	3	17.6	17.6
		1 to 100 hours	4	23.5	23.5
		101 to 500 hours	5	29.4	29.4
		501 to 1000 hours	1	5.9	5.9
		1000 hours and above	1	5.9	5.9
		Not applicable/No data	3	17.6	17.6
		Total	17	100.0	100.0
Group	Valid	None	2	4.0	4.0
		1 to 100 hours	6	12.0	12.0
		101 to 500 hours	31	62.0	62.0
		501 to 1000 hours	11	22.0	22.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	None	52	15.1	15.1
		1 to 100 hours	131	38.1	38.1
		101 to 500 hours	116	33.7	33.7
		501 to 1000 hours	22	6.4	6.4
		1000 hours and above	10	2.9	2.9
		Not applicable/No data	13	3.8	3.8
		Total	344	100.0	100.0

Hours of relevant behavioral training (Actual on profile)

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	None	12	70.6	70.6
		1 to 100 hours	1	5.9	5.9
		Not applicable/No data	4	23.5	23.5
		Total	17	100.0	100.0
Group	Valid	None	44	88.0	88.0
		1 to 100 hours	1	2.0	2.0
		Not applicable/No data	5	10.0	10.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	None	60	17.4	17.4
		101 to 500 hours	1	.3	.3
		Not applicable/No data	283	82.3	82.3
		Total	344	100.0	100.0

Special skills/ hobby

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Yes	9	52.9	52.9
		No	7	41.2	41.2
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9
		Total	17	100.0	100.0
Group	Valid	Yes	37	74.0	74.0
		No	12	24.0	24.0
		Not applicable/No data	1	2.0	2.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	268	77.9	77.9
		No	66	19.2	19.2
		Not applicable/No data	10	2.9	2.9
		Total	344	100.0	100.0

Non-academic distinctions/ Recognition

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Agency or office-wide	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
		Local/Community	7	41.2	41.2	47.1
		Not applicable/No data	9	52.9	52.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Agency or office-wide	12	24.0	24.0	24.0
		Local/Community	21	42.0	42.0	66.0
		National	2	4.0	4.0	70.0
		None	10	20.0	20.0	90.0
		Not applicable/No data	5	10.0	10.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	Agency or office-wide	94	27.3	27.3	27.3
		Local/Community	32	9.3	9.3	36.6
		Sectoral	1	.3	.3	36.9
		National	6	1.7	1.7	38.7
		None	156	45.3	45.3	84.0
		Not applicable/No data	55	16.0	16.0	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Membership in organization/ association

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	Yes	10	58.8	58.8	58.8
		None	6	35.3	35.3	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Yes	31	62.0	62.0	62.0
		None	19	38.0	38.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	163	47.4	47.4	47.4
		None	150	43.6	43.6	91.0
		Not applicable/No data	31	9.0	9.0	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Related by consanguinity or affinity to appointing authority or recommending authority where awardee was appointed

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	No	16	94.1	94.1	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	No	50	100.0	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	3	.9	.9	.9
		No	327	95.1	95.1	95.9
		Not applicable/No data	14	4.1	4.1	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Awardee has been formally charged

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	No	16	94.1	94.1	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	No	50	100.0	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	8	2.3	2.3	2.3
		No	323	93.9	93.9	96.2
		Not applicable/No data	13	3.8	3.8	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Awardee has been found guilty of administrative offense

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	No	16	94.1	94.1	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	No	50	100.0	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	3	.9	.9	.9
		No	329	95.6	95.6	96.5
		Not applicable/No data	12	3.5	3.5	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Awardee has been convicted of any crime or violation of any law by any court or tribunal

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	No	16	94.1	94.1	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	No	50	100.0	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	14	4.1	4.1	4.1
		No	315	91.6	91.6	95.6
		Not applicable/No data	15	4.4	4.4	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Awardee has been separated from the service due to separation, retirement, dropped from the rolls, dismissal, end of term, termination, finished contract, AWOL or phased out in the public or private sector

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	No	16	94.1	94.1	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Yes	5	10.0	10.0	10.0
		No	45	90.0	90.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	64	18.6	18.6	18.6
		No	266	77.3	77.3	95.9
		Not applicable/No data	14	4.1	4.1	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Awardee has been a candidate in a national or local election (except Barangay election)

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	No	16	94.1	94.1	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Yes	1	2.0	2.0	2.0
		No	49	98.0	98.0	100.0
		Total	50	100.0	100.0	
Non-awardee	Valid	Yes	56	16.3	16.3	16.3
		No	272	79.1	79.1	95.3
		Not applicable/No data	16	4.7	4.7	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

Member of Special Group

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Individual	Valid	None	15	88.2	88.2	88.2
		Indigenous people	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
		Not applicable/No data	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
		Total	17	100.0	100.0	
Group	Valid	Indigenous people	50	100.0	100.0	100.0
Non-awardee	Valid	None	239	69.5	69.5	69.5
		Indigenous people	81	23.5	23.5	93.0
		Differently-abled	1	.3	.3	93.3
		Solo parent	4	1.2	1.2	94.5
		Not applicable/No data	19	5.5	5.5	100.0
		Total	344	100.0	100.0	

ANNEX C. SPSS Output 2. Chi Square Analysis of PDS Profiling

This section elaborates on the variables derived from the descriptive outputs which may have significant relationships/association with other variables. Since most variables are nominal (and some ordinal), chi-square analysis was used to determine whether there was a significant relationship between variables. Likewise, phi and lambda were also utilized to determine the strength of the association between them.

In this analysis, two main variables were looked at: gender and eligibility. The relationship and association of these variables will be tested and further examined with other important variables.

Gender Section

GENDER SECTION

gender + position

gender + nature of work

gender + eligibility

gender + agency category

gender + educational attainment

Variables	Awardee Type	Chi Square	Significance	Phi & Cramer's V	Remarks
Gender & Position	Individual	2.321	.509	.369	Not significant
	Group	4.892	.180	.313	Not significant
	Non-awardee	3.363	.499	.099	Not significant
Gender & Nature of Work	Individual	6.336	.275	.610	Not significant
	Group	.347	.556	.083	Not significant
	Non-awardee	11.347	.124	.182	Not significant
Gender & Eligibility	Individual	4.339	.227	.505	Not significant
	Group	8.325	.040	.408	Significant & moderately weak association
	Non-awardee	39.712	.000	.340	Significant & moderately weak association
Gender & Agency Category	Individual	6.296	.178	.609	Not significant
	Group	6.907	.032	.372	Significant & weakly/moderately associated
	Non-awardee	164.318	.000	.691	Significant & strongly associated
Gender & Educational Attainment	Individual	.503	.778	.172	Not significant
	Group	.385	.943	.088	Not significant
	Non-awardee	11.885	.065	.186	Not significant

Analysis:

Only the variables gender and career service eligibility are significant for group awardees and non-awardees. With a chi square of 8.325 and a significance value of .408, gender and eligibility in group awardees have a moderately weak association. This means that the two variables can be related (and further examined) and that gender has a significant impact on the career service eligibility of the individual awardee. Likewise, in non-awardees, the relationship is significant and is also moderately weakly associated at .340. This could mean that being male or female affects the eligibility level of the awardee.

The variables Gender and agency category are also significant for group awardees and non-awardees at .032 and .000 respectively. For group awardees, gender and agency category have a weak to moderate association. For non-awardees, gender and agency category are strongly associated at .691. This means that gender has an impact on the kind of agency that they are in could be because majority of the males or females belong to the particular institution).

Eligibility Section

- eligibility + position
- eligibility + nature of work
- eligibility + Highest Educational Attainment
- eligibility + agency category

Variables	Awardee Type	Chi Square	Significance	Phi & Cramer's V	Remarks
Eligibility & Position	Individual	7.251	.611	.653	Not significant
	Group	10.679	.298	.377	Not significant
	Non-awardee	35.873	.056	.323	Not significant
Eligibility & Nature of Work	Individual	8.722	.892	.716; .414	Not significant
	Group	2.063	.559	.203	Not significant
	Non-awardee	59.099	.042	.414, .169	Significant & moderately weak association (Phi)
Eligibility & Agency Category	Individual	16.325	.177	.177	Not significant
	Group	9.324	.156	.156	Not significant
	Non-awardee	57.058	.014	.407; .166	Significant & moderately weak association (Phi)
Eligibility & Educational Attainment	Individual	4.329	.632	.505; .357	Not significant
	Group	14.395	.109	.536; .310	Not significant
	Non-awardee	38.573	.354	.335; .137	Not significant

Analysis:

Eligibility & Position. No significant relationship.

Eligibility & Nature of Work. Out of the three awardee types, only the non-awardees can be seen having a significant relationship between their eligibility and nature of work (.042). The variables also possess a moderately weak association (phi= .414; weak for Cramer's V at .169. Majority of the non-awardees is working in administrative positions (63%).

Eligibility and Agency Category. Only the non-awardees have a significant relationship between their eligibility and agency category at .014, with a moderately weak association at .407 (phi). Non-awardees have a varied agency category (i.e. 34% are in Constitutional, Military/Police, Judiciary, LGU, Fire Protection, Cultural Community, Jail Mgt., Executive & Other 34%), and this reflects their eligibility level (39% RA1080 and 37% CS Professional).

Eligibility and Educational Attainment. No significance

Frequencies: Chi-Square SPSS Runs

Gender Section

Gender & Position

Chi-Square Tests

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	2.321 ^a	3	.509
	Likelihood Ratio	3.398	3	.334
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.951
	N of Valid Cases	17		
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	4.892 ^b	3	.180
	Likelihood Ratio	5.169	3	.160
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.563	1	.453
	N of Valid Cases	50		
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	3.363 ^c	4	.499
	Likelihood Ratio	3.387	4	.495
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.914
	N of Valid Cases	344		
a. 8 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .29.				
b. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .36.				
c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.89.				

Symmetric Measures

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.369
		Cramer's V	.369
	N of Valid Cases	17	
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.313
		Cramer's V	.313
	N of Valid Cases	50	
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.099
		Cramer's V	.099
	N of Valid Cases	344	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Gender and Agency Category

Chi-Square Tests

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	6.296 ^a	4	.178
	Likelihood Ratio	8.232	4	.083
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.755	1	.053
	N of Valid Cases	17		
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	6.907 ^b	2	.032
	Likelihood Ratio	7.095	2	.029
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2.474	1	.116
	N of Valid Cases	50		
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	164.318 ^c	6	.000
	Likelihood Ratio	203.945	6	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	31.908	1	.000
	N of Valid Cases	344		
a. 9 cells (90.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .29.				
b. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.52.				
c. 2 cells (14.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.34.				

Symmetric Measures

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.609
		Cramer's V	.609
	N of Valid Cases	17	
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.372
		Cramer's V	.372
	N of Valid Cases	50	
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.691
		Cramer's V	.691
	N of Valid Cases	344	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Gender and Nature of Work

Chi-Square Tests

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	6.335 ^a	5	.275
	Likelihood Ratio	8.264	5	.142
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.705	1	.401
	N of Valid Cases	17		
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	.347 ^b	1	.556
	Continuity Correction ^c	.087	1	.768
	Likelihood Ratio	.348	1	.555
	Fisher's Exact Test			
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.340	1	.560
	N of Valid Cases	50		
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	11.347 ^d	7	.124
	Likelihood Ratio	12.221	7	.094
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.788	1	.181
	N of Valid Cases	344		
12 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .29.a				
0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.00.b				
Computed only for a 2x2 tablec				
4 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .97.d				

Symmetric Measures

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.610	.275
		Cramer's V	.610	.275
	N of Valid Cases	17		
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.083	.556
		Cramer's V	.083	.556
	N of Valid Cases	50		
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.182	.124
		Cramer's V	.182	.124
	N of Valid Cases	344		
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.				
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.				

Gender and Eligibility

Chi-Square Tests

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	4.339 ^a	3	.227
	Likelihood Ratio	5.491	3	.139
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.030	1	.862
	N of Valid Cases	17		
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	8.325 ^b	3	.040
	Likelihood Ratio	9.237	3	.026
	Linear-by-Linear Association	5.009	1	.025
	N of Valid Cases	50		
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	39.712 ^c	6	.000
	Likelihood Ratio	41.978	6	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.160	1	.075
	N of Valid Cases	344		
a. 8 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .29.				
b. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .36.				
c. 4 cells (28.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.45.				

Symmetric Measures

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.505	.227
		Cramer's V	.505	.227
	N of Valid Cases	17		
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.408	.040
		Cramer's V	.408	.040
	N of Valid Cases	50		

Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.340	.000
		Cramer's V	.340	.000
	N of Valid Cases		344	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.				
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.				

Gender and Agency Category

Chi-Square Tests

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	10.176 ^a	5	.070
	Likelihood Ratio	12.279	5	.031
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.970
	N of Valid Cases	17		
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	5.389 ^b	3	.145
	Likelihood Ratio	5.561	3	.135
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	1.000
	N of Valid Cases	50		
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	10.898 ^c	5	.053
	Likelihood Ratio	10.983	5	.052
	Linear-by-Linear Association	3.649	1	.056
	N of Valid Cases	344		
a. 12 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .29.				
b. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .36.				
c. 1 cell (8.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.83.				

Symmetric Measures

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.774
		Cramer's V	.774
	N of Valid Cases		17
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.328
		Cramer's V	.328
	N of Valid Cases		50
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.178
		Cramer's V	.178
	N of Valid Cases		344
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Gender and Highest Educational Attainment

Chi-Square Tests

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	.503 ^a	2	.778
	Likelihood Ratio	.509	2	.775
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.278	1	.598
	N of Valid Cases	17		
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	.385 ^b	3	.943
	Likelihood Ratio	.371	3	.946
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.175	1	.676
	N of Valid Cases	50		
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	11.885 ^c	6	.065
	Likelihood Ratio	12.147	6	.059
	Linear-by-Linear Association	10.170	1	.001
	N of Valid Cases	344		
a. 5 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.18.				
b. 5 cells (62.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .72.				
c. 8 cells (57.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .97.				

Symmetric Measures

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.172
			.778

		Cramer's V	.172	.778
	N of Valid Cases		17	
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.088	.943
		Cramer's V	.088	.943
	N of Valid Cases		50	
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.186	.065
		Cramer's V	.186	.065
	N of Valid Cases		344	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.				
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.				

Eligibility Section Eligibility and Position

Chi-Square Tests

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	7.251 ^a	9	.611
	Likelihood Ratio	8.747	9	.461
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.250	1	.617
	N of Valid Cases		17	
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	10.679 ^b	9	.298
	Likelihood Ratio	11.562	9	.239
	Linear-by-Linear Association	7.839	1	.005
	N of Valid Cases		50	
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	35.873 ^c	24	.056
	Likelihood Ratio	32.883	24	.107
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4.750	1	.029
	N of Valid Cases		344	
a. 16 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.				
b. 13 cells (81.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.				
c. 20 cells (57.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .31.				

Symmetric Measures

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.653
		Cramer's V	.377
	N of Valid Cases		17
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.462
		Cramer's V	.267
	N of Valid Cases		50
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.323
		Cramer's V	.161
	N of Valid Cases		344
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Eligibility and Nature of Work

Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	8.722 ^a	15	.892
	Likelihood Ratio	9.655	15	.841
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.980
	N of Valid Cases		17	
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	2.063 ^b	3	.559
	Likelihood Ratio	2.453	3	.484
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.527	1	.468
	N of Valid Cases		50	
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	59.099 ^c	42	.042
	Likelihood Ratio	45.674	42	.322
	Linear-by-Linear Association	2.338	1	.126
	N of Valid Cases		344	
a. 24 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.				
b. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .50.				
c. 40 cells (71.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.				

Symmetric Measures				
Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.716	.892
		Cramer's V	.414	.892
	N of Valid Cases		17	
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.203	.559
		Cramer's V	.203	.559
	N of Valid Cases		50	
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.414	.042
		Cramer's V	.169	.042
	N of Valid Cases		344	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.				
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.				

Eligibility and Agency Category

Chi-Square Tests				
Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	16.325 ^a	12	.177
	Likelihood Ratio	17.400	12	.135
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.054	1	.305
	N of Valid Cases		17	
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	9.324 ^b	6	.156
	Likelihood Ratio	7.478	6	.279
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.915	1	.339
	N of Valid Cases		50	
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	57.058 ^c	36	.014
	Likelihood Ratio	60.606	36	.006
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.996	1	.158
	N of Valid Cases		344	
a. 20 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.				
b. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.				
c. 33 cells (67.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .08.				

Symmetric Measures				
Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.980	.177
		Cramer's V	.566	.177
	N of Valid Cases		17	
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.432	.156
		Cramer's V	.305	.156
	N of Valid Cases		50	
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.407	.014
		Cramer's V	.166	.014
	N of Valid Cases		344	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.				
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.				

Eligibility and Highest Educational Attainment

Chi-Square Tests				
Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Individual	Pearson Chi-Square	4.329 ^a	6	.632
	Likelihood Ratio	4.673	6	.586
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.855	1	.355
	N of Valid Cases		17	
Group	Pearson Chi-Square	14.385 ^b	9	.109
	Likelihood Ratio	9.654	9	.379
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.073	1	.787
	N of Valid Cases		50	
Non-awardee	Pearson Chi-Square	38.573 ^c	36	.354
	Likelihood Ratio	36.268	36	.456
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.752	1	.186

	N of Valid Cases	344		
a. 12 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.				
b. 13 cells (81.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.				
c. 37 cells (75.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.				

Symmetric Measures				
Awardee Type (Individual, Group, Non-Awardee)			Value	Approx. Sig.
Individual	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.505	.632
		Cramer's V	.357	.632
	N of Valid Cases			17
Group	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.536	.109
		Cramer's V	.310	.109
	N of Valid Cases			50
Non-awardee	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.335	.354
		Cramer's V	.137	.354
	N of Valid Cases			344
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.				
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.				

ANNEX D. List of Participants and Notes from February 6, 2013 Focus Group Discussion

SERVANT HERO PROFILING

Focus Group Discussion

CSC Function Room, February 6, 8am to 5pm

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Awardees

DR. LUCILLE ABAD 2007 Dangal ng Bayan	PHILIPPINE NUCLEAR RESEARCH INSTITUTE	Invented a wound dressing called the sterile hydrogen made form a seaweed called carrageenan and polyvinyl pyrrolidone processed through radiation technology, proven to be more effective in reducing pain and scar formation.
DIRECTOR RENATO SOLIDUM 2010 Presidential Lingkod Bayan	PHIVOLCS	He initiated and spearheaded a nationwide mapping program that generated new information on tsunami-prone areas, this also made possible the compilation of available historical tsunami information shown in the form of hazard maps. This hazard maps are used mostly by local government units in risk-sensitive development planning and disaster preparedness.
MS. RITA DELFIN 2011 Pagasa Award (Group)	PHILIPPINE TEXTILE RESEARCH INSTITUTE	By developing Philippine Tropical Fabrics made of pineapple, banana and abaca, the team was able to maximize abundant local produce, to promote use of domestic textiles over imported and smuggled products, and to help the Philippine textile industry find a niche in the global market. Raw materials previously considered as agricultural wastes are now used in making fabrics, thus lessening pollution. The team also aided the passage of a law that guaranteed a demand for the fabrics and benefited local fiber farmers and textile mills

DIRECTOR BELLA SANTOS 2012 Presidential Lingkod Bayan (Group)	BANGKO SENTRAL NG PILIPINAS	For providing a faster, safer, and cheaper alternative to sending remittances. PhilPaSS Remit System has actualized the advocacy to help overseas Filipinos particularly in sending their hard-earned money to relatives in the country through formal banking channels. The System has benefited hundreds of thousands of overseas Filipinos, built trust and confidence and encouraged other banks to be part of the system. The ASEAN Economic Community 2015 has recognized and recommended the system as a model to other ASEAN Economies in the use of formal banking channels for remittances of migrant workers.
MR. OCTAVIANO ROSAURO, 2012 Presidential Lingkod Bayn (Group)	DOLE-Philippine Overseas Labor Office Philippine Embassy Libya	For gallantly carrying out the task of repatriating thousands of Overseas Filipino Workers (OFW) from Libya at the outbreak of hostilities against ruler Muammar Gaddafi, unmindful of the danger and risks involved. Among those they assisted were two Filipino household helps employed by the Gaddafi's in Tripoli who were safely brought to the base in Tunisia after setting up decoys and eluding numerous checkpoints.
UNDERSECRETARY ARTURO CACDAC 2012 Presidential Lingkod Bayan (now Director General of PDEA)	Agency Accomplishments: NHQ-PNP	His innovative contributions, pioneering and high-impact projects that transformed the Philippine National Police (PNP), made his mark in the institution as the "Father of the Modern PNP Crime Laboratory" for modernizing the crime laboratory operations and upgrading the skills and competencies of its forensic experts such as the e-blotter, the computerization of firearms order of payment system that increased collection to P100 million; and the upgrading of the PNP Crime Laboratory into a world-class facility.
COL GIEMEL ESPINO 2007 Presidential Lingkod Bayan	900th Air Force Weather Group Philippine Air Force Pasay City	Spearheaded the cloud-seeding operations that helped the government save agricultural crops worth PhP 151,789,250.00 – corn production in Region 2, the sugar plantations of Region 6 and the forestlands in Region 7. As head of the 900th Air Force Weather Group, he improved systems and procedures, enhanced maintenance work on equipment to generate savings and established personnel placement and rotation policies that led his to be honored as PAF's Squadron of the Year in 2004.
COL. ERIC NOBLE 2009 Presidential Lingkod Bayan	Accomplishments: Police Superintendent/Chief of Police Sta. Barbara Police Station Philippine National Police Sta. Barbara, Pangasinan	He pushed for the conduct of rehabilitation and re-training programs for erring police dubbed as TABA (Tamad, Abusado, Bastos, at ayaw padisiplina) Police through the Integrated Transportation Program. The Program which aims to build a God-centered, service-oriented and family-based PNP help reinforce values among police officers.

UNDERSECRETARY ZENAIDA C. MAGLAYA 2007 Presidential Lingkod Bayan	Department of Trade and Industry	For steering the retail and market trades into excellence. She actively promoted customer-oriented programs and activities through systematic monitoring of market supply and price stability which ensured customer satisfaction. Her "One Town One Product" (OTOP) Program identified and developed 1,177 products across the country which contributed to the growth and harnessed the capabilities of small and medium enterprises, further spurring job generation in the countryside.
CHIEF PUBLIC ATTORNEY PERSIDA RUEDA-ACOSTA 2004 Presidential Lingkod Bayan 2004	Public Attorney's Office	Recognized as an outstanding public servant in 2004 for her deep commitment to the service that has helped restore people's faith in the Philippine judicial system, she was able to steer the Public Attorney's Office into becoming a more responsive and reliable arm of justice
DR. FE YAP 2010 Presidential Lingkod Bayan (retired from the service before the awards Rites)	COMMISSION ON FILIPINO LANGUAGE	She spearheaded a project aimed at globalizing Philippine Children's literature on the web and globalizing national children's literature through global filipino and Philippine English.
MS. JESUSA ANTIQUIERA 2009 Presidential Lingkod Bayan	PADRE M. GOMEZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STA. CRUZ, MANILA	Her passion for teaching made her aim for extra mile, to not just to teach, but to inspire. She used innovative, creative and up-to-date teaching strategies to foster learning among students resulting to positive effect among the students as they can now formulate better answer to question, solve problems more creatively and quickly analyze concepts.
CHIEF AMELIA RAYANDAYA 2010 Dangal ng Bayan	DILG-BJMP MANILA CITY JAIL FEMALE DORMITORY	A jailwarden who transformed Manila City Jail Female Dormitory into a place that is conducive to living through her resourcefulness and dedication, making it the Best Jail of the Year. Deleting the public perception of jail as dirty, cramped spaced where undesirables are imprisoned. She works with justness and sincerity assisting the paralegal unit towards speedy disposition of cases. Her selfless act of service boosted the morale of the detainees and aided their rehabilitation.
MR. RAULITO DATILES, Former Chairman 2009 Presidential Lingkod Bayan	DILG-BRGY. BAGUMBAYAN	Conceptualize a Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Program that managed both biodegradable and non-biodegradable wastes of the Brgy. Bagumbuhay. Segregation of wastes was implemented and these were brought to ecology center wherein the collected wastes were processed and recycled. The supply of compost fertilizers presented another opportunity, the Bagumbuhay Urban Gardening Project that generated income for the barangay and provided livelihood for the constituents.
ENGR. FROILAN ROQUE 2008 PAGASA AWARD	BANGKO SENTRAL NG PILIPINAS	A medal maker from the Artwork and Medal Subgroup of the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas who designed and fabricated the the Bar Folding Jig and Big Sunburst Fixture which makes his team's work faster and better, making more of the end product in lesser time.

MS. REMEDIOS MACAPINLAC 2012 Presidential Lingkod Bayan (Group)	BANGKO SENTRAL NG PILIPINAS	For providing a faster, safer, and cheaper alternative to sending remittances. PhilPaSS Remit System has actualized the advocacy to help overseas Filipinos particularly in sending their hard-earned money to relatives in the country through formal banking channels. The System has benefited hundreds of thousands of overseas Filipinos, built trust and confidence and encouraged other banks to be part of the system. The ASEAN Economic Community 2015 has recognized and recommended the system as a model to other ASEAN Economies in the use of formal banking channels for remittances of migrant workers.
MS. MA. VICTORIA FRANCISCO 2012 Presidential Lingkod Bayan (Group)	BANGKO SENTRAL NG PILIPINAS	For providing a faster, safer, and cheaper alternative to sending remittances. PhilPaSS Remit System has actualized the advocacy to help overseas Filipinos particularly in sending their hard-earned money to relatives in the country through formal banking channels. The System has benefited hundreds of thousands of overseas Filipinos, built trust and confidence and encouraged other banks to be part of the system. The ASEAN Economic Community 2015 has recognized and recommended the system as a model to other ASEAN Economies in the use of formal banking channels for remittances of migrant workers.

Non-awardees	
MS. ROSALINA DELA PAZ	Chief Administrative Officer, Philippine Army
MS. CORA LLORICO	Supervising Science Research Specialist, Philippine Textile Research Institute
DIR. DIVINA PARTOSA	Director I, PNP Finance Service
MR. EDZEL ALEGRE	Jail Officer I, Bureau of Jail Management and Penology
MS. ILLUMINADA SICAT	Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas
MS. EDITHA RAMIREZ	Government Accountancy sector, Commission on Audit
MS. CANDELARIA ACAS	Chief Language Researcher, Commission on Filipino Language
MS. MERLITA LOBIN	Teacher II, Librada Avelino Elementary School

Notes from the Focus Group Discussion

(Names of participants giving their views were withheld)

Session 1: 8am to 10am

Why do you do what you do?

Awardee:

- not for the awards
- parents exert (pushed us) to do our best
- do your best for the glory of God
- We need to emphasize core values, excellence, public service
- What we do or say are consistent
- Value for people

- Parent both public servants, brought me to their work
- They (parents) remind us to do things well
- Respect for people (people of all levels)
- Advocates for excellence
- (Supervisor) convinced me to work in government, challenged us to do good
- Recruitment, mentoring from superior and learn from staff
- Religious values, faith

Awardee:

- Innate sa tao ang masipag, it goes beyond responsibilities
- Usec Yorobe suggested technology first, then tao involved through commitment, professionalism
- Umpisa pa lang makikita na ang capability
- (Sensing part) makikita sa tao
- Nakita ang involvement ng boss, nakita ang tangible results

Awardee:

- Still in government because of how people appreciate and participate in what we do

Awardee:

- Nasa isipan, within self, I want to do this, so I do this at dapat kong galingan
- Dapat college graduate pa lang meron ng basic core value such as integrity
- Tried teaching, but I realized it is not for me
- Integrity, paid by government no matter how small, so I need to show, do what I need to do
- Nagexcell ako pero hindi naman immediately, because of mentoring
- Religious fellowship part of encouragement
- I have my core values pagpasok (sa government)
- Sense of self is there, alam na kung ano gusting gawin pagpasok
- Mentoring by boss
- Kung may core values ka, alam mo yung tama at hindi
- Pagpasok, dapat may built-in core values na talaga
- Important also is basic recruitment system
- Hiring contractuels doing research so from there makikita ang potential, (through this), we are able to filter applicants

Awardee:

- Who you copy and who copies you is also important

Awardee:

- I have the passion to serve, values, work attitude
- Part of our functions, so we are obliged to do it
- Job description (in the government) ay malawak
- Ang tao dapat may initiative to help people, dapat may values
- Yung may passion and faith, yung innate sa pagkatao ang patulong sa tao without anybody asking for help
- Innate value to help people

There's no instrument to commitment

Awardee:

- Public service is a choice
- What I learned could help more people in my office
- We need people to stay longer in government
- Need to be appreciated by government and people
- Not simply the money (reason why he stays in government)
- Recognition is important

- Lahat ng (nasa) gobyerno, dapat bayani ng gobyerno
- Must be recognized (employees' superior performance)

Awardee:

- Must have instrument to measure behaviour
- Aptitude of applicants are measured, no instrument for behavioural

Awardee:

- Dapat mas higher ang exam, hindi lang yung simple psychology
- Malakas ang interpersonal relationship (Filipino culture)
- Qualifications (in the government) are minimum, basic

Awardee:

- Sometimes HR personnel have limited competence, no background in HR

Awardee:

- Personnel lang, walang HR talaga, admin compliance
- From the very start, Personnel hindi alam ang basic HR

Awardee:

- Understand the role, appreciate the role (of all employees)
- All employees are part of strategic initiatives of the office

Awardee:

- Demoralization sometimes comes from physical things, like sira ang CR
- Nasa foundation (on question why others do things despite the difficulties)

Merong babagay at hindi babagay

Awardee:

- Crucial sa public service ang frontline employees
- Yung may attitude problem ang kadalasan nilalagay sa frontline
- May tao na babagay sa frontline, may hindi

Awardee:

- My parents were government employees
- Public school teachers (parents), so we grew up with our parents
- Poverty pushed me to do good, it is my obligation to my parents to give them better life
- To be the best, (value) instilled in my mind
- To make a difference (her principle on public service)
- Was offered job at BSP and World Bank but I decided to work ingovernment
- Kung lahat ng tao, lalo yung mahuhusay, wala na maiiwan
- Dito na lang ako to make a difference
- Despite criticism, I chose Bangko Sentral

On obstacles

Awardee:

- No equipment (in the office) but we found our way, may goal that we want to achieve, pumapasok ang resourcefulness para lang ma-achieve ang goal

Awardee:

- Each division wants to excel (performance)
- To make sure that operations are focused, I encouraged multi-divisional
- That model brought together to common direction
- Internal collaboration and external collaboration
- Does not want to dictate (on staff), we discuss
- Discernment: work together, work faster, and work together to make an impact

Awardee:

- In research, money is scarce so we look for other resources, initiatives , linkages with international and national institutions

Awardee:

- Think beyond my office, partnering with other organizations/ similar organizations

Awardee:

- Within the institute, ang nangyayari we have no way of interacting with each other, ang nangyari planning an decisions are from top level downward
- Dapat involved lahat, pataas
- In paper ang lahat ng planning, so haphazardly done
- Walang relation ang internal organization (as planning are done only in paper)

Awardee:

- Develop people thru team building, sports activity

Why public service?

Awardee:

- Public service entails a lot of sacrifice but fulfilling
- Work for people, make a difference

Awardee:

- Greatest population in the workforce (government sector)
- When I want something, it should be done properly
- When you get paid for your work, it should be done efficiently

Awardee:

- Ako po ay makatao, ayaw ko na naghihirap ang tao, naluluha ako pag may nakikita akong naghihirap, maawin ako sa tao

Awardee:

- Encouraging the heart, enabling others to act (his principle)
- Mentoring is important

Awardee:

- Staff work from 7am to 7pm, so inculcate the value and desire to serve
- Staff work beyond office hours even without additional incentives
- I have shown example, sacrificed and gave them incentives; Team building outside the office, I shoulder part of the expenses

Awardee:

- Important din ang top level should have proper training in management
- Usually, they (managers) rose from the ranks, kulang ang training nila in leader

Session 2: 10am to 12 noon

Why do you do what you do?

Awardee:

- I get enlightenment and strength from God. I serve the people through God.
- I was awaken by my parents to serve God because they were active sa Church.
- I'm friendly to other religious groups kasi para ka lang nagtatanim, pagdating ng araw alam mong may aanihin ka.

Awardee:

- 3 factors yan. First yung background ko ang tumutulak sa akin. Marami kami sa pamilya kaya gusto ko nakukuha ko atensyon ng tatay ko kaya nageexcel ako sa lahat ng bagay

- Second is yung inspiration. Yung lolo ko, si General Espino, wala siyang bahid ng corruption. Yun yung nag-inspire sa akin na dapat wag mabahiran ng pangit ang malinis na pangalan ng lolo ko.
- Third is challenge. Nakita ko yung mga contemporaries ko sa military na nageexcel din.
- Kung hindi ko gagawin yung trabaho ko, sinong gagawa?

Awardee:

- My mother pressured us to excel.
- Ito yung binigay sa akin ng Diyos na responsibilidad at pribilehiyo. Kailangan naman ibalik ko ito sa mga tao.
- Yung mga younger officers, dapat may nagsset ng example sa kanila.
- Pag naging boss ka ng isang lugar, make the most out of it.
- Yung mga boss ko, magagaling din. So nakakahiya naman kung hindi ko gagalingan.
- Take advantage of the technology now. Kaya ang mga bata ngayon, walang karapatan na hindi matuto at magexcel.

On turning point to go to public service

Awardee:

- When I passed the Bar exams.
- Yung parents ko nagkaroon ng problema dati sa lupa sa Pampanga, ang tumulong sa kanila ay Public Attorney.
- My parents encouraged me to be a Public Attorney dahil kung hindi daw dahil sa PAO, matagal na silang nakakulong
- Pagpasok ko sa PAO, ang naging goal ko is to uplift the quality of service sa PAO

Puro complaint lang ang nakikita ng mga tao

Awardee:

- You should also follow the leader. Pag malinis ang nasa taas, susundan din yun ng mga nasa baba.
- Paano magiging credible ang nasa taas? I-empower mo rin ang nasa baba.
- Hindi ka naglilingkod para sa boss o superior mo lang, naglilingkod ka para sa taumbayan. Pero respeto pa rin sa mga nasa taas.
- Always try to establish your credibility
- Nakakahawa ang paggawa ng mabuti. Nakakahawa ang adbokasya sa serbisyo.

Paano kung ang example na nakikita mo ay negative?

Awardee:

- Naniniwala ako na basta alam mo ang tama, Diyos ang magtatanggol sa'yo.

What made you persist?

Awardee:

- Pag may certain rank ka, dapat may certain accomplishment ka lang
- Naalala ko may tanong minsan yung boss ko, "what is enough?" pero hindi nga madefine ang enough eh. Laging may kulang.
- The culture is you should not outshine your boss pero hindi ko sinunod yun.
- Naniniwala ako na hindi by position ang pag-accomplish. Kahit janitor ka, kung ikaw naman ang pinakamagaling na janitor.

- Dapat di natin isipin kung anong kulang. Isipin natin kung ano ang meron.

Awardee:

- Dapat ikaw mismo ang makakaexperience ng hirap ng trabaho para makita ng mga subordinates mo na kaya mo yung ginagawa nila.
- Importante yung courage mo
- Be an instrument of justice and equality

How do we recruit the right people to join public service?

Awardee:

- Dagdag requirement like mental health kasi yung iba hindi kinakaya ang trabaho, written exam, extensive na BI
- Nag-improve ang sistema dahil sa additional requirements na ito dahil nalalaman kung fit ba talaga siya sa trabaho.

Awardee:

- Tumutulong ba siya sa mga magulang niya? Paano siya makisalamuha sa mga kasamahan niya?
- Extensive advertising, ipalabas ang awarding ceremonies for outstanding public servants sa mainstream TV, paano pinopromote ang mga nanalo. Kunwari bibisita sa Eat Bulaga para ipakilala na ito ang mga model public servants.
- Kailangan malaman ng maraming Pilipino na ganito ang model.

Awardee:

- Provide training in terms of financial intelligence. Paano ka magtatrabaho ng mabuti kung hindi na sapat ang panggastos mo.
- Training them is one way na hindi monetary ang approach.
- Dapat sa pagrerate ng performance, hindi lang yung boss mo. Dapat yung subordinates mo rin magrate sa iyo dahil sila rin ang nakakakita kung effective kang leader.
- Pag sinabi mong totoo, yun dapat. Maging honest.

Ano ang magandang program to bring out the best in them?

Awardee:

- Capacity building every year.

How do you keep the spirit of public service alive?

Awardee:

- Hindi ko dapat biguin ang mga kasama ko sa (agency)
- Hindi ako naiinis pag sinasabi na showbiz daw ako kasi paano naman malalaman yung success stories kung hindi ako pupunta sa tri-media.
- Adaptive ka dapat.
- What is important to a leader is humility. Accessible ka dapat ng public.
- Para di ka mapagod, gawin mong kaligayahan ang pagiging public servant

Awardee:

- Mahilig kasi ako sa social media. May mga small groups ako na nakakaconnect pa rin sila sa akin.
- Isipin mo lang na “in your own little ways, may naitulong ka”
- Mahalin mo ang lugar mo

Paano mo na-spot ang mga taong may sense of mission?

Awardee:

- Pag sumagot sa interview ng “dahil mataas ang sweldo”, bagsak na yun.
- Dapat kabisado ang RRACCS

Session 3: 1pm to 3pm

What motivates you to do what you do?

Awardee:

- You have to love what you do.
- May mabuti akong ama na nag-inspire sa akin.
- My father taught us the values. He taught us to live a simple life
- Tinuruan po kami ng parents ko to give our best in everything that we do

Awardee:

- Family kami ng public servants
- Naacquire ko yung commitment sa trabaho without expecting anything in return sa mga pinaglilingkuran mo
- Work with integrity
- We were taught to help other people, to always do good to others

Awardee:

- Being the eldest of 10 children, I was trained to be a leader and to set an example to my brothers and sisters
- Our parents were our role models of integrity, commitment to work, honesty, so when I went to public service I know that without commitment, I wouldn't be able to do what I have to do

Awardee:

- Hindi ko pinangarap maging public servant
- Three factors: survival, challenges, opportunity
- Survival: The idea is to get education for free kaya nagpursue ako sa PMA
- Nakita ko ang value ng buhay, gift of health
- I am committed kasi inaral ko maging sundalo. Nakataya ang buhay parati. Over the years you develop love for service and country because people die
- Meron kang maayos at marangal na trabaho kahit mababa ang sweldo
- Leadership by example – kung naglalagay ako ng tao sa line of duty dapat andoon din ako kasi ako ang leader
- Challenges: minsan aapihin ka, pero dun ka titibay bilang tao
- Nadedevelop ang strength of character
- Tinatanaw kong utang na loob ito sa mga Pilipino
- Hindi ko tinatanaw na utang na loob ito sa institusyon. Tinatanaw kong utang na loob ito sa mamamayan dahil buwis nila yung buwis nila ang nagpapa-aral sa akin hindi isang individual lang
- Boring ang serbisyo pag walang challenge
- Opportunity: opportunity from the institution to prove my worth kaya dapat galingan ko
- Come up with programs na long-term ang effect
- I think namana ko rin ito sa magulang ko

Awardee:

- My parents worked sa government
- Nakasanayan ko na di naghahanap ng mataas na kita

- Simple lang ang buhay namin, walang luho
- I was exposed to government
- I have this desire to help, the feeling na I have to do something
- Challenged by frustrations.
- I realize that helping people is what makes me happy.
- Help without waiting for anything in return and feel fulfilled about this
- As you try to help more people you innovate, so you do the extra mile, you see that there is still more to do
- This is where management comes in. You motivate people to do more.

Awardee:

- Noong una sabi nila malaki daw sweldo, yun pala hindi. Pero dahil nandito na ako, gagalingan ko na rin.
- Minsan yung katamaran ang ginagawa kong motivation. Dahil gusto mo na matapos agad ang isang gawain, gagawin mong mas simple at mas naiintindihan.
- Passion sa ginagawa mo at pagmamahal sa ginagawa mo
- Naghahanap ka rin ng improvement para sa sarili mo
- Pag may gusto akong pagbabago, minomodify ko
- Pagmamahal sa trabaho, mahal mo ang ginagawa mo kaya gusto mo baguhin
- Support ng boss mo

Saan nanggaling yung pagmamahal/motivation mo sa trabaho?

Awardee:

- Plus factor din talaga yung parents mo ang inspiration mo to excel.
- My father just lived a simple life. Kahit may pera siya, simple lang.
- Inborn po. Nakita ko yung nanay at mga kapatid ko kung paano sila magtrabaho

Awardee:

- It is innate. It is not learned overnight.
- Kami kasi we work 12 hours a day sa office, kung walang commitment hindi namin magagawa yun

Awardee:

- Family factor po. My parents are both public servants. My father follows all rules and he does not use his power so yun yung natutunan ko
- Role modeling

Awardee:

- It came from when I was a young struggling student.
- I admired my teacher. He was patriotic. He had love for language, love for country.
- It motivated me to go to government.
- I encourage ex-government employees to go on working, go beyond the ordinary after the awarding ceremony
- I was wondering if CSC still encourages people after the awarding ceremony to do extraordinary things.
- When you enjoy what you are doing even if you know you may not be recognized
- Love of service, love of work.
- To help the family, earn a living
- Balance between IQ, creativity, drive, motivation and relationship
- Vitality, energy at work

Awardee:

- Desire to excel
- Desire for public service
- Naiisip ko na may mga taong hindi kumakain kaya maswerte ako

- Pinag-aaralan ko kung ano ang mga pwedeng solusyon
- Noong una, akala ko ang nababago ko lang ang anyo ng komunidad. Yun pala, pati ugali ng mga tao nag-iimprove na rin.

Anong mga factors ang nakapagmotivate sa iyo?

Awardee:

- Technical knowledge, job rotation and training.
- May nakikita kang bago kaya nakakapaginnovate ka.
- Iniiimmerse ko yung sarili ko sa trabaho para makita ko yung problema

Awardee:

- May responsibility ka to change the mindset of the Filipinos about the government
- Yung tingin nila sa government ay hindi dapat 8-5 thing lang
- You as a government employee should be proud
- God-fearing ka dapat and may moral values
- Malakas ang pananampalataya
- Love who you serve
- As a leader you should be a servant as well
- As a public servant, you should be accessible to the public

Awardee:

- You are always motivated to come up with innovations to help detainees/inmates
- I coordinate with other agencies to come up with projects to help inmates and transform them

Awardee:

- Nakakamotivate sa akin pag yung students ko dati ay nagiging successful or nageexcel
- I never say no kasi dapat makatulong ako
- Sincere commitment, dedication not only for yourself but also for your school
- Source of motivation is feedback and appreciation by students

Awardee:

- As a group, yun pong collabortative work. We see to it that financially stable ang ating bansa.
- Cooperation
- Kasi yung iba gusto 8 to 5 lang pero dala po ng commitment mo sa trabaho mo na di ka dapat umalis hanggang di tapos ang trabaho mo

Awardee:

- Hindi lang nakafocus sa transaction, nag-iisip ng systems enhancement na makakatulong sa public

How do you spot public service excellence in people who want to excel in government?

Awardee:

- Commitment po. Sinserdad ng isang tao bilang nangangako na isang kandidato

When you hear each other's stories, how does it affect you?

Awardee:

- More challenged, more inspired

Awardee:

- More dedicated

Awardee:

- It's a challenge. Some of those who graduated from public schools excelled in government, hindi naman kailangan graduate ng UP
- The challenge is giving others the opportunity to learn by training them

What can we do to strengthen the people who committed their lives to public service?

Awardee:

- It comes from all sectors.
- Challenge that come from your superior
- Challenge that come from your subordinates/stakeholders.
- Performance-based bonus as a financial incentive to improve performance

Awardee:

- By continuously talking about it to inspire people everyday
- Recognition of efforts as soon as possible

Session 4: 3pm to 5pm

Why did you join the public service?

Non-awardee:

- First is economic reason
- Pero nakita ko ang importance of my work in the total economy and the direct application of my undergraduate studies to my work
- That time, UP students were idealistic, gusting makatulong sa bayan
- Masaya (sa trabaho)

Non-awardee:

- Gusto kong maglingkod sa bayan sa pagdagdag ng kaalaman ng kabataan
- Bread and butter (pertains to her work)
- Ito po anf napupusuan ko, ang maglingkod sa bata, yun ang kayan kong ilingkod sa bayan
- Parents were also public educators

Non-awardee:

- Working in government provides more time for the family
- Hinid ganon katindi ang trabaho

Non-awardee:

- Hindi sumagi sa isip na magwork sa private
- Siguro impluwensya ng mga kamag-anak (who were in the government)
- Kawawa ang mga bata na hindi natuturuan (education was provided to children of privileged families)
- Hindi nakakasihod on time (but still preferred to stay in government)
- Kasiyahan na makita na nakapagturo sa bata
- Awa, saying naman kung hindi ma-impart ang kaalaman ko
- Hindi salary kundi passion na nai-share mo ang iyong expertise

Non-awardee:

- Mother provided informal teaching to children, aunts were public school teachers
- Hindi ako kumbinsido na 12 hours serbisyo eh kapalit ay gatas lang ng kalabaw (referring to incentives received by her mother)
- Nanay noong araw ang nagdidikta sa family (referring to her college degree, BS Education)
- Nakita ko ang hirap ng mga tiyahin ko (referring to the bulk of their work as teachers)
- Mula 1969, pang-araw-araw na ... makapaglingkod

- Dasal ay ilan ang matutulongan...panalangin at mithiin na makapaglingkod, anuman ang tinatanggap ay maibalik so sa mamamayan

Non-awardee:

- (At first) naghanap lang ako ng trabaho kung saan ako malapit... kailangan ko ng trabaho
- First five years, naghahanap ako ng trabaho (sa private) pero hindi ako makapasok
- Na-realize ko na importante pala ang trabaho ko sa gobyerno

Mahalaga ba na maipaliwanag sa bagong pasok ang connection ng trabaho sa ikabubuti o halaga sa bayan

Non-awardee:

- Pag masaya ang tao, I feel fulfilled
- Nasa boss din, leader that showed hoe to improve
- May satisfaction kase nakakatulong

Non-awardee:

- Bata pa lang pangarapna magtrabaho sa gobyerno
- Sa pamilya ko, ako lang ang nagtatrabaho sa gobyerno
- Gusto ko makatulong sa serbisyo sa bayan
- Kinakausap ang mga walang dalaw (jail) para mapasaya at matulungan sila

Ugat ng commitment to public service, ano ba ang appeal?

Non-awardee:

- I feel challenged to make a difference
- Our Director aligns programs to macro-government programs
- Appreciates success stories of their programs
- Fees encouraged, hindi nararamdaman ang awa kase may fulfilment

Nakita ang connection sa higher purpose at ano ang impact

Non-awardee:

- Hindi nabago ang isap ko magtrabaho sa gobyerno
- Ang passion ko na manatili sa gobyerno ay hindi nawala
- Nakikita mo ang impact sa national interest (impact of her work)

Ano ang magandang paraan para ang commitment sa public service ay parating buhay?

Non-awardee:

- Nobody explained your relevance (your role's relevance) to the entire (government) system
- Sa simula dapat may nage-explain kung ano ang role mo, ano ang contribution mo
- Dapat din may follow-through para makita mo ang importansya mo
- Pag may opportunity na palawakin ang kaalaman, lalong maaappreciate mo ang role mo
- Kung fully challenged (sa work), may satisfaction
- Nakita ko yung meaning ko
- My office developed me

What can be done so that commitment will be sustained?

Non-awardee:

- Start from yourself, then makakahawa ka (for others to do the same)
- Dapat alam natin ang gagawin

Non-awardee:

- There should be continuous development
- Malaking fulfilment (in her work), we prepare manual and we educate the people
- Maganda kung lahat mapapaliwanag sa lahat (roles, functions)
- (There should be) continuous learning, continuous education (of employees)

Non-awardee:

- (Because of the lower treatment of civilian personnel) nagiging rason para kaming civilian employees ay mag-aral muli
- Naramdaman naming na part kami ng military organizations
- Hindi ko naramdaman ang paga-alaga ng supervisor ko noon
- (Innovations) Oath taking of recruits in front of the head of office, witnessed by the family...pinapaliwanag ko sa mga anak nila ang trabaho ng parent nila

Non-awardee:

- May mga pulis na wala sa puso ang public service
- Dapat sa orientation pa lang nakikita na ang connection, role sa opisina
- Pag nakapasok ka na dapat pinapakita ang resulta ng ginawa (ng opisina) para ang tao ma-encourage
- Sana bigyan din ng focus ng media ang mga ginagawa naming

Sa simula pa lang dapat maliwanag na, dapat masustain through proper form

Non-awardee:

- Dapat may reward system din tayo, a mere recognition is sufficient
- It will have an impact to the peers, pwedeng pamarisan
- Recognition must be close to the event as possible, it should be given immediately. Importante kasama ang peers, kasama ang pamilya.

Paano ma-sustain, strengthen commitment in a very Filipino way?

Non-awardee:

- (Innovations in the office) Civilian employees pinagkakalooban din ng flag, katibayan na umabot sa 65 years sa service
- Kung ano ang tinatanggap ng military, ganon din anf binibigay sa civilian (workers in PNP)

Non-awardee:

- Pag nanalo sa opisina, dapat sina-submit sa Search ng CSC

Non-awardee:

- There should be feedback to students, civil servants being models of honest action,
- Nakaka-uplift ng moral, nakakatuwa na naa-appreciate

Non-awardee:

- Tao mismo ang nagsa-submit ng nomination (to the CSC Search)

Non-awardee:

- May PRAISE Committee (ang bawat agency), kukuha ng nomination from PRAISE winners, para ang tao hindi nagbubuhay ng bangko
- Hindi credible if you build up yourself, dapat somebody else ang mag-nominate

Non-awardee:

- Kailangan ang buhay ng awardee ipalabas sa TV para Makita ng mga bata

Non-awardee:

- Apart from reward, dapat may penalty

- Nakakasira yung very few na gumagawa ng shenanigans
- May puso ang mga boss, ayaw magtanggap ng poor performers
- Dapat may screening process para tumaas anf image ng gobyerno

Giving more teeth

Non-awardee:

- Kailangan qualified na talaga
- Ang trust and confidence walang sukatan (heads of offices have the discretion to appoint employees)

Non-awardee:

- Improvement of performance being done by the office through counselling, others are reassigned to stations near their families to be effective
- The office is focused on retention and renewing commitment

Non-awardee:

- There should be encouragement to study, so that employees will be motivated

Non-awardee:

- While I'm doing my work, dapat may ginagawa rin and gobyerno for us
- Commitment can be developed over time
- Kahinaan sa HR pag na-permanent na hindi na matanggal
- Task and behavioural assessment dapat

ANNEX E. Highlights of December 6 Consultation Meeting with Stakeholders

On December 6, 2013, the results of the study was presented to selected participants composed of CSC Regional and Field Directors from CSC Regional Office Nos. III, IV and NCR; and Human Resource Officers of government agencies with HAP awardees in Metro Manila. The objective of the meeting was to generate their insights on the results of the study.

Developing the Profile of a Civil Servant: An Exploratory Study of Civil Servants in Metro Manila Consultation Meeting with Stakeholders

Asian Institute of Management, Makati City

6 December 2013, 11:00am-12:00pm

List of Participants:

1. Director IV Judith Dongallo-Chicano, CSCRO IV
2. Director III Ma. Theresa C. Fernandez, PAIO
3. Director III Ma. Victoria M. Salazar, CSC-NCR
4. Director II Lucila Pagdanganan, CSC-DILG FO
5. Director II Felicidad Tesoro, CSC-DND FO
6. Director II Velda Cornello, CSC-PNP FO
7. Ms. Cynthia Rapacon, CSC-NCR
8. Mr. John Homer Alim, CSC RO 4
9. Ms. Cleofe Velasquez Ocampo, Administrative Officer IV, DepEd
10. Dr. Kenneth Ronquillo, Director IV, Health Human Resource Development Bureau, DOH
11. Ms. Edelwina B. Peregrino, Administrative Officer V, DOLE
12. Ms. Veronica Macabate, OIC, Personnel Division, DILG
13. Ms. Joy Sartillo, Administrative Officer II, DOLE
14. Mr. Dick Diola, Chief, Civilian Personnel Division, DND
15. PSSupt Rolando Hinanay, Chief of Moral and Welfare Division, PNP

Project Team

- 16. Director IV Maria Luisa Salonga-Agamata, Ph.D., CESO IV PAIO
- 17. Prof. Jacinto Gavino, DPA, AIM
- 18. Ms. Marcia Czarina Corazon Medina, ADMU
- 19. Ms. Fiaberna Salumbides, PAIO
- 20. Ms. Gen Renella Leaño, PAIO
- 21. Mr. Marco Dominic De Los Reyes, PAIO

Hereunder were the insights gathered from the participants:

TABLE 8: Insights Gathered from Stakeholders

Participants	Insights
PNP	<p>There is correlation between educational attainment and the drive to excel</p> <p>Achievers – mataas ang educational attainment; sa school pa lang, ang attitude ay gustong mag-excel; nadadala ito sa workplace</p> <p>The opportunity to excel depends on the position</p> <p>Character is a basis of going good in one’s performance</p> <p>However, there should be a balance between being an achiever and the relationship with colleagues</p> <p>"Leadership is the potent combination of strategy and character. If you have to go with only one, be without strategy."</p>
DepEd	<p>People put premium on educational attainment</p> <p>It is time to look at criteria of the award</p> <p>We should be asking: Ano ang ambag mo sa mandato ng departamento mo?</p> <p>Induction program for new entrants -- wala na (di ko na nakikita)</p> <p>Tingnan din ang values ng organization.</p> <p>Malinaw dapat kung ano ang gustong gawin</p> <p>Malaki ang bahagi ng leader dahil madadala niya yung tao sa goal.</p>
DILG	<p>Implements team approach in the department</p>
	<p>Each organization has different values</p> <p>We should come up with common criteria on "what is a civil servant?" across agencies</p> <p>Inputs asked by CSC (PDS) are limited</p> <p>"What is the face of a civil servant?"</p>
CSC	<p>Wag muna tingnan ang awardees, pagpasok pa lang sa gobyerno lagyan na ng mukha (traits of a public servant)</p> <p>Minsan depende sa pagpa-package ng nominations</p> <p>Limited agencies producing awardees because they have an office/unit that helps in the packaging of the nominations</p> <p>Ano ba talaga ang hinahanap natin sa civil servant? (not even going to the awardees)</p> <p>Strengthen the PRAISE Committee</p>

Notes from the Discussion:

- 1. There is a correlation between educational attainment and the drive to excel.
- 2. Criteria for selection of personnel should be competency-based. However, a servant hero has added value like years of practice, the drive for education.

3. Superior performance are complemented with the values of the organization that promote excellence, the proactive involvement of the Program on Rewards, awards and Incentives for Service Excellence (PRAISE) Committee in each agency, and the values of the different agencies that are adopted by the civil servants.

ANNEX F. Notes from the January 10 Meeting with Lingkod Bayani Network Core Members

On January 10, 2014, the findings of the study were presented to the Lingkod Bayani Network (LBNet). The LBNet is a group composed of awardees of the Honor Awards Program.

Lingkod Bayani Network Meeting

Date/Time: January 10, 2014 / 8:00am-10:30am

Venue: Local Government Academy, Agustin I Bldg., Ortigas Center, Pasig City

Minutes of the Meeting

ATTENDEES:

PDir ALEX PAUL I. MONTEAGUDO, 1999 Dangal ng Bayan

Undersecretary ZENAIDA CUISON-MAGLAYA, 2009 Presidential *Lingkod Bayan*

Gov. GEORGE E.R. EJERCITO ESTREGAN, 2011 Presidential *Lingkod Bayan*

B.Gen ROMEO T. TANALGO, 2012 Presidential *Lingkod Bayan*

Lt Col HAROLD M. CABUNOC, 2012 Presidential *Lingkod Bayan*

Executive Director MARIVEL C. SACENDONCILLO, 2013 *CSC Pagasa*

Dr. CECILLE NOBLE, Consultant

HAP Secretariat:

Director IV Maria Luisa Salonga – Agamata

Ditta Mae Siena

Lorraine Luna Danipog

Notes on the Civil Servant Profiling

The LBNet members see the importance of the Servant Hero Profiling in increasing the tribe of Lingkod Bayanis, creating more heroes and sustaining heroism and high level of performance. Data generated from the study could be used as criteria for recruitment and basis for HR interventions. Modelling and replicating best practices may be anchored on the findings of the exploratory study.

ANNEX G. Notes from the June 4 CSC Multi-Sector Advisory Council Meeting

Date/Time: June 4, 2014 / 9:00am-11:30am

Venue: CSC Boardroom, Civil Service Commission, Constitution Hills, Diliman, Quezon City

Minutes of the Meeting

ATTENDEES:

Chairman Francisco T. Duque III, CSC

Commission Rober S. Martinez, CSC

Commissioner Nieves L. Osorio, CSC

Asst. Commissioner David E. Cabanag, Jr., CSC

Ms. Milalin Javellana, MSAC Vice Chair

Mr. Ricardo Saludo, MSAC Member

Prof. Solita Monsod, MSAC Member
Dr. Edna Co, MSAC Member
Mr. Gerry Plana, MSAC Member
Other Officials Employees of the CSC

Notes on the Civil Servant Profiling

1. Success profile of awardees should be looked at; identify the heroic acts and cull the profile based on them
2. The key profile of the awardees is “caring for people they serve” which is the core characteristic of being a public servant
3. Profiling should focus on people who work well; a hero is defined as “doing ordinary work in extra-ordinary manner”
4. HAP awardees should have an alliance (i.e. with religious groups, CSOs, business sector) to support/help upright civil servants; the government should expand ways of helping the upright in the government
5. The profile should identify who are the good guys in the government and how they will be known based on standard qualities