

DELINQUENCY IN THE PHILIPPINES: A DESCRIPTION¹

Donald J. Shoemaker

Self-report surveys of attitudes and behaviors were completed by high school, college, and school drop-out Filipinos. Data analysis reveals the extent of self-reported delinquency to be low. Statistical comparisons indicate the overall frequency of delinquency is significantly associated with gender, year in school, attachment to parents, attachment to peers, commitment, and SES (middle-class youth being more delinquent than lower-class respondents). Multivariate analysis reveals that several attitudinal factors, including peer attachments are significantly associated with delinquency, in support of social bond theory. The results are discussed relative to ideas concerning delinquency and modernization.

The subject of Filipino juvenile delinquency, or misbehavior in general, has received scant attention in the past generation. Carlota (1982-83) lists several studies of delinquency in the Philippines, but most of the references are unpublished theses and dissertations. Moreover, of the 44 citations to any kind of analysis of delinquency listed by Carlota, only two were produced after 1972.² Carlota's study and one other (Esguerra 1979) represent the only two published reports of Philippine delinquency in the past 10 years located by the author, and both of these articles were based on official data.

Carlota compared several psychological characteristics of 31 institutionalized female delinquents with a sample of 31 "non-delinquents," who were matched with the delinquents relative to "age,

sex, and socio-economic status" (Carlota, p.6). In general she concluded Filipina delinquents were significantly less intelligent, more emotionally deprived, and less attached to their families than were the non-delinquents. Also, more delinquents than non-delinquents came from broken homes. In addition, Carlota observed that Filipina delinquents were frequently absent from school, were unsure of themselves scholastically, and had lower educational aspirations than their non-delinquent counterparts.

Esguerra's paper (1979) is basically a review of "descriptive studies" of delinquency, studies conducted by practitioners and social scientists, all of which were published before 1972. He concludes that delinquency rates are higher in Manila than in other parts of the

country, although research outside the Metropolitan area of Manila is rare. In addition, Esguerra characterizes the Filipino delinquent as a male, 13-18 years of age (typically between 13 and 16).

In another comparative study, Aldaba-Lim (1969) examined the personal and social characteristics of 50 institutionalized male delinquents and those of a matched sample of 50 male "non-delinquents" in Metro Manila. In general, Aldaba-Lim found more social than personal differences between the two samples. In particular, she concluded that the delinquents had poorer school records and came from less supportive family background than did the non-delinquents. In addition, the delinquents interacted with, and were influenced more by delinquent peers (the "barkada") than the non-delinquents. Overall, the characteristics of delinquents indicate they have poor social skills, tend to come from family backgrounds in which positive feedback and reinforcement are lacking, do not perform well in school, and develop relationships with peers who are similarly socially disadvantaged.

Official characteristics of delinquents, however, do not always match profiles obtained from other, largely self-report, studies (see Thornton et al. 1987). This paper presents a social profile of delinquency in the Philippines, administered to Filipino students using a self-report delinquency scale. No claims are made however to extend this description to all of the country's youth. The description though provides another source of information on delinquency other than those given nearly a genera-

tion earlier, and using only juveniles who were arrested, referred to the courts and/or institutionalized.

Methods

The data for this study were gathered from selected samples of male and female students at public and private schools in Cagayan de Oro City in January to February 1987. Students were selected from the first through the fourth year high school classes of these schools and from the college freshmen English classes of Xavier University in Cagayan de Oro. The sampling procedure was purposive and not random. Thus, generalizations of the findings beyond the present sample are not warranted.

The survey instrument was based largely on one used by Gardner (1984), in a study of delinquency in Virginia. The measurement of delinquency in that study was, in turn, based upon earlier self-report investigations of delinquency, including Hirschi (1969), Nye and Short (1957), Dentler and Monroe (1961), Gibson (1971), Reichel (1975), and Elliott and Ageton (1980). The American version of the instrument was altered to correspond with Philippine culture. The Filipino version of the instrument was also given to a group of young people who had dropped out of school and were currently enrolled in a jobs program which emphasized training for skilled labor. These respondents are referred to in the present analysis as "out-of-school youth."

Appointments were made with appropriate school or program officials for the purpose of distributing the surveys. Students were given the instrument in

group settings. In the private high schools (one all male, the other all female) and in the University freshmen English classes (co-ed), the respondents were allowed to remain together in their class group. In the public high school, and with the out-of-school youth, subjects were assembled in one common meeting area. Excellent cooperation was received from both students and school administrators. There was genuine interest in the study expressed by the students who responded to the questionnaire, and by those administering the survey instrument.

The survey instrument comprised of several delinquency items further divided into some four subscales pertain-

ing to various forms of status, property, violence, and drug offenses (see Appendix). Items on these four subscales are summated to produce a total delinquency scale. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had committed any of these acts. Responses were coded as follows: never = 0; once or twice = 1; several times = 2. Altogether, there were 24 offenses listed, so the range of scores for the total delinquency scale was 0 to 48.

The Alpha coefficients of reliability (standardized) for the instrument are as follows: status = .66; property = .77; violent = .36; drug = .76; and total = .84. The analyses of delinquency in this paper utilizes the total delinquency scale.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by School and Year in School

ITEM	NUMBER	PER CENT
School		
Xavier University (co-ed private)	178	23.3
Xavier High School (all male private)	200	26.1
Lourdes High School (all female private)	108	14.1
Misamis Oriental General	198	25.9
Comprehensive High School (co-ed public)		
Out-of-School Youth	78	10.2
No Response	3	0.4
Year in School		
College (freshmen, sophomore)	160	20.0
1st Year High School	127	16.6
2nd Year High School	126	16.5
3rd Year High School	125	16.3
4th Year High School	127	16.6
Out-of-School	78	10.2
No Response	22	2.9
Total	765	100.0

RESULTS

A. *Sample Characteristics*

A total of 765 people answered the questionnaire. Table 1 which presents the distribution of the respondents by school and year in school shows the out-

considered largely a male problem in the country, the larger number of males is unlikely to underestimate the extent of self-report misbehavior in the present sample. Furthermore, the number of females in the sample (283, or 37%) is large enough to allow meaningful statisti-

Table 2. Delinquency and Year in School - ANOVA

<i>YEAR IN SCHOOL</i>	<i>MEAN</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
First Year High School	3.14	2.89	107
Second Year High School	2.93	3.92	109
Third Year High School	3.18	3.72	110
Fourth Year High School	4.13	4.33	105
Freshmen and Sophomores in College	4.21	3.71	133
Out-of-School Youth	3.61	4.49	41
Totals	3.55	3.82	605

$F = 2.35. 5$ and 599 d. f., $p \leq 0.04$

of-school youth a minority of the sample, as they also constitute a small portion of youth in the province, according to local sources. The other schools are fairly evenly represented, with the exception of the all female private high school. The distribution of the sample by year in school is also evenly divided, the only exception again being the category of out-of-school youth.

The ages of the respondents range from 11 to 40. Some of the out-of-school "youth" are no longer youth, and some of those in freshmen English classes are also well beyond adolescence. The bulk of the respondents (nearly 85%) are between 13 and 18 years of age, and less than 6% are over 21.

Most of the respondents are male (62.6%). However, since delinquency is

cal calculations and interpretations.

b. *Extent of Delinquent Behavior*

The figures in Table 2 indicate slight significant differences in total delinquency by year in school. The mean levels of delinquency are lower among out-of-school youth than among fourth year high school and the college students in the sample.

However, the out-of-school youth are older than the others in the sample, and questions concerning attitudes toward family and school matters may not be as relevant to them as these issues would be to younger youth. For these reasons, the out-of-school youth are not included in further analyses of the data.

Frequencies and percentages of admission of delinquent behavior among

Table 3. Frequency and Percent of Admitted Delinquent Acts

<i>OFFENCE TYPE</i>	<i>ONCE OR TWICE</i>		<i>SEVERAL TIMES</i>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Status				
Marking up property	194	29.2	57	8.6
Making anonymous phone calls	114	17.1	26	3.9
Drinking alcoholic beverages	155	23.3	82	12.3
Skipping school	169	25.4	39	5.9
Defying parents	146	22.0	18	2.7
Running away	41	6.2	8	1.2
Property				
Breaking windows	55	8.3	5	0.8
Letting air from tires	60	9.0	16	2.4
Taking things of value less than 50 pesos	135	20.3	23	3.5
Taking things of value from 50-500 pesos	19	2.9	7	1.1
Taking things of value over 500 pesos	7	1.1	2	0.3
Breaking into a building	19	2.9	2	0.3
Stealing a car	21	3.2	6	0.9
Banging up others' properties	72	10.8	4	0.6
Breaking down property	114	17.1	12	1.8
Violent				
Hitting someone	208	31.3	29	4.4
High on cough syrup	22	3.3	6	0.9
High on glue	16	2.4	3	0.5
High on toothpaste covered cigarettes	8	1.2	2	0.3
Beating up someone and breaking bones or causing disfigurement	65	9.8	7	1.1
Robbery	17	2.6	2	0.3
Drug Possession or Use				
Marijuana	35	5.3	10	1.5
Drugs (heroin, cocaine)	6	0.9	3	0.5
Amphetamines	13	2.0	3	0.5
High on cough syrup	22	3.3	6	0.5
High on glue	16	2.4	3	0.5
High on toothpaste covered cigarettes	8	1.2	2	0.3

the respondents are presented in Table 3. Overall, the youth in the present sample are a fairly law-abiding group. Most indicate never having committed a delinquent act, with varying percentages admitting to specific illegal activities. For the most part, very few respondents admit to committing an offense several times. Offenses for which the sample collectively acknowledge rather frequent involvement include skipping school, defying parents (but, interestingly, *not* running away), drinking alcoholic beverages, stealing items worth less than 50 pesos, marking up property, and hitting someone. Thefts involving items worth modest or large amounts of money, extreme violence, robbery, burglary, and drug use (other than alcohol) are admitted to by a relatively small percentage of the respondents. The total delinquency mean is 3.67, on a scale ranging from 0 to 48.

Compared to self-report studies of delinquency in America, delinquency in this sample of Filipino youth is particularly low. Surveys of high school students in the United States indicate that around 90 per cent of juveniles commit some kind of delinquent acts, and that offense rates are especially high for minor offenses and drug offenses (Thornton et al. 1987). To some extent, furthermore, the estimates of delinquency in the present sample of Filipino youth allows for relatively high rates to be reported, since the respondents were asked to indicate offenses ever committed.

These figures are also lower than those reported by the previously mentioned Virginia sample of juvenile, in which essentially the same definition of

delinquency was utilized (Gardner 1984). In that study, the overall rate of delinquency was 8.68, again on a scale ranging from 0 to 48. In addition, the Virginia sample admitted to more delinquent activity than the Filipino youth for every act of delinquency except letting air out of tires and running away, for which reported instances were nearly equal.

On the other hand, the present results are similar to those found in studies of delinquency in India (Hartjen and Priyadarsini 1984) and Korea (Shim 1987). Of course, the current study and those conducted in India and Korea are not directly comparable, but it is interesting to note the similarities in the findings of relatively low frequencies of delinquency in all three countries. In addition, the results of the present investigation are consistent with available statistical information on crime rates in the Philippines in general. Archer and Fartner's (1984) comparative analysis reports relatively low rates of serious criminal activity in the Philippines, especially when compared to the United States. The Philippine rates presented in these comparisons, however, are based on data gathered before 1972 and from Metropolitan Manila.

c. *Variations in Delinquency*

While the overall frequency of delinquency in the sample is low, variations were observed. This section presents an analysis of variations in delinquency, particularly in terms of those factors identified as related to official rates of delinquency in the country. Again, comparisons should be interpreted cautiously since official estimates are usually based

on data gathered several years ago and collected in and around Manila.

A finding which is consistent with earlier studies of official delinquency in the Philippines (Aldaba-Lim 1969;

tween total delinquency and age (Table 5). This finding is not consistent with the previously discussed association between delinquency and year in school. Although the data indicate that mean rates

Table 4. Delinquency by Gender - ANOVA

<i>Gender</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Male	3.91	4.00	327
Female	2.02	2.92	240
Totals	3.11	3.70	567

F = 38.49, 1 and 565 d. f., p ≤ 0.001

Esguerra 1979) is that delinquency in the present sample is largely a male phenomenon. Table 4 shows that the mean level of delinquency among males is almost twice that of females. This difference is statistically significant beyond the .001 level.

Previous research on delinquency in the Philippines also indicate that the "typical" offender is around 15 or 16 years of age. In the present sample, there is no significant relationship be-

of delinquency increase with age, the differences are statistically small. The overall lack of a significant association between age and delinquency is a little surprising, particularly in view of the documented connection between the two variables in previous Filipino research. Perhaps the lack of any significant age differences in self-reported delinquency in this sample is an anomaly, or maybe it is the pattern in the Philippines and deserves further attention.

Table 5. Delinquency by Age-ANOVA

<i>Age</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
11 - 13	3.16	2.81	94
14 - 15	3.26	4.35	202
16 - 17	3.94	3.99	205
18 and over	4.09	4.27	58
Totals	3.58	3.99	559

F = 165, 3 and 555 d.f., n.s.

Another potential source of delinquency in Philippine society, according to previous analyses, is family structure. The broken home has been identified as a significant source of both male and female delinquents (Aldaba-Lim 1969; Carlota 1982-83). In the present sample, however, the variance in family structure is quite restrictive. Over 75 per cent of the respondents report living with both parents. An additional 10 per cent are living with a guardian, which does not necessarily imply a broken home. Many students live with relatives, or friends, while they attend school. This arrangement does not always mean that the youth are alienated from their parents, for they might still communicate with

their parents and visit them whenever possible.

Because of this restricted variance in living arrangements, the respondents are divided into two categories, living with both parents and other (which includes living with guardians). This forced division is compared with delinquency. The results indicate no significant difference between living arrangement and delinquency (Table 6), due in part to the lack of variance in living arrangement. However, it is possible that broken homes do contribute to delinquent activity in the Philippines, but the lack of large numbers of youth from broken homes in the present sample masks the existence of such effects.

Table 6. Delinquency by Family Factors- ANOVA

<i>ITEMS</i>	<i>MEAN</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Living Arrangement			
Both parents	3.53	3.88	435
Others	3.72	4.39	120
Totals	3.57	3.72	555
F = 0.20, 1 and 553 d.f., n.s.			
Father Employed			
No	2.83	3.38	84
Yes	3.73	4.08	447
Totals	3.59	3.99	531
F = 3.63, 1 and 529 d.f., n.s.			
Mother Employed			
No	3.24	3.91	267
Yes	3.84	3.99	283
Totals	3.55	3.95	550
F = 3.26, 1 and 548 d.f., n.s.			

An additional indication of family togetherness is the working status of the father or mother. An important consideration is the kind of supervision arrangement(s) which have been provided in the absence of the mother (Hirschi 1985 and Thornton et al. 1987). The absence of a mother, or father, because of working conditions may not mean less supervision because of the presence of maids and/or relatives in the home. However, a working parent may lead to problems with a child, in that an authority figure is not always present.

An examination of working parents in the present sample indicates no relationship with total delinquency. In this case, parents are reported as working or not working. There is no significant relationship between delinquency and fathers or mothers working (Table 6). Thus, it would seem that working parents do not contribute greatly to delinquency among this sample of Philippine youth.³

Another measure of family life used in this study is an attitudinal scale named "attachment to parents." This scale was developed in accordance with the social bond theory proposed by Hirschi (1969), which predicts an inverse association between delinquency and the social bond. Elements of the bond include attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief. Attachment entails attitudes toward law and conventional authority, and toward those who enforce laws. Involvement refers to activities connected with an institutional setting, such as the school. Commitment represents the rational, goal-oriented component of the bond. The measurements of these scales were derived from those used in the pre-

viously discussed study of self-report delinquency in Virginia (Gardner 1984).

The attachment to parents scale is composed of nine items, which are listed in the appendix. All responses are scored low to high and summated.

The standardized alpha coefficient of reliability for this scale is 0.74. Correlational analysis between delinquency and attachment to parents reveals a significant association ($r = -0.15, p \leq 001$), with the direction of the correlation indicating more delinquency committed among youth expressing low levels of attachment to parents.

Overall, it would seem from the results of this analysis that structural family factors, such as living arrangements and working parents have little to do with delinquency in this sample. It is interesting to note that these results are consistent with other studies, which often conclude that there is no association between broken homes and self-report delinquency. However, these investigations usually find significant relationships between self-report delinquency and family-oriented attitudinal constructs, such as attachment to parents (Shoemaker 1984 and Thornton et al. 1987), and this conclusion is consistent with the results of the present analysis.

Yet another factor identified by previous Filipino research as contributing to delinquency is adjustment to school (Aldaba-Lim 1969; Carlota 1982-83), and this observation has been observed in research conducted in America (see, for example, Polk and Shafer 1972; Empey 1982:271-272; Elliott and Voss 1974; Phillips and Kelly 1979; Mann 1981; and Thornton et al. 1987:217-222),

as well as in the Netherlands (Nijbuer and Dijksterhuis 1983).

In the present research, school adjustment is approximated by three attitudinal scales derived from social bond theory, attachment to teachers, involvement, and commitment. Attachment to teachers is also listed in the appendix. Again, all responses are scored low to high. The standardized alpha reliability coefficient of this scale is 0.60.

Involvement in school includes the number of hours per week spent on school-related activities (other than homework), the number of hours per day spent on homework, and the number of school-related activities participated in by the respondent. The standardized alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is 0.37.

Commitment to school is operationalized by a six-item scale which includes the following items: "in comparison with other students in your school, how would you rate yourself in school ability?" (scored as among the best, above average, average, below average, among the worst); "I try hard in school;" "I dislike school;" "the things I do in school seem worthwhile and meaningful to me;" "getting good grades is important to me;" "school attendance is important to me" (these last five items are scored as

never, sometimes, usually, always). The standardized alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is 0.60.

As the correlations in Table 7 indicate, delinquency is not associated with attachment to school. However, there are significant relationships between delinquency and involvement in school (positive) and, especially, commitment to school. For the most part, the commitment scale utilized in this study measures the respondents' attitudes toward academic performance. Although the items in the commitment scale are not direct indicators of grades in school, or academic achievement, they represent approximations of such activity. It would seem from the results in Table 7, therefore, that academic performance, or more accurately, attitudes relative to academics, is a stronger determinant of delinquency than are attitudes toward teachers or hours spent on homework or school activities in general.

Since the attitudinal constructs display some significant association with delinquency among those in the sample, a fuller analysis of these variables is presented. This analysis involves multiple regression, in which total delinquency is regressed (stepwise) on several attitudinal scales. These scales reflect the four components of the social bond, at-

Table 7. Correlations Between Delinquency and School Adjustment Scales

<i>SCALES</i>	<i>CORRELATION (SIGNIFICANCE)</i>		<i>N</i>
Attachment to School	-0.03	(0.239)	488
Involvement in School	0.11	(0.007)	488
Commitment to School	-0.25	(0.001)	488

tachment, involvement, commitment, and belief, as mentioned earlier.

In the bivariate analyses discussed above, significant relationships were found between delinquency and attachment to parents, commitment to school, and involvement in school (although the relationship here was in the opposite direction of that predicted by social bond theory). In the multivariate analysis, all of the bonding scales, including attachments to peers, are considered together, to measure their simultaneous connection with delinquency. Moreover, in the multiple regression, the involvement and commitment scales include relationships with school and church settings. On all scales, coding is from low to high. The specific items for each of these scales are listed in the appendix. Alpha coefficients of reliabilities (standardized) for these scales are as follows: attachment to parents (0.74); attachment to teacher (0.60); attachment to peers

(0.79); attachment to *conventional* peers (0.68); attachment to *conventional* parents (0.53); attachment to church people (0.77); involvement (0.48), commitment (0.68); and belief (0.38).

The results of the regression analysis are presented in Table 8. The standardized regression coefficients in that table indicate that the attitude scale with the strongest comparative relationship with delinquency is commitment. In addition, these beta weights suggest that peer associations are also significantly associated with delinquency, and both measures of peer relations are related to delinquency in the predicted directions (attachment to peers would be predicted to have a positive connection with delinquency; attachment to *conventional* peers would be expected to have an inverse relationship with delinquency).

Overall, the figures in Table 8 indicate that several dimensions of the social

Table 8. Total Delinquency Scale Regressed on Social Bond Scales (N = 459)

<i>SOCIAL BOND SCALES</i>	<i>BETA WEIGHTS</i>	<i>SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL</i>
Attachment to Peers	0.219	≤ 0.001
Involvement	0.166	≤ 0.001
Commitment	-0.278	≤ 0.001
Attachment to Conventional Peers	-0.194	≤ 0.001
Attachment to Parents	-0.124	≤ 0.010
R ² (adjusted) = .169		
Variables Not Entered		
Attachment to Teacher		
Attachment to Church		
Belief		
Attachment to Conventional Parents		

bond are significantly associated with delinquency. A total explained variance of 17 per cent (adjusted R^2), however, suggests that many other factors are responsible for the admitted acts of delinquency among this sample.

It is also worthy to note that attachment to teachers drops out of the analysis presented in Table 8. Again, it is observed that what these youth *feel* teachers think of them, or do with them, has little connection with their self-reported commission of delinquent activity.

A final comment on the data in Table 8 concerns the scale of involvement. It displayed the only relationship with delinquency which was significant, but in the opposite direction of that which was predicted. The same pattern was observed in Table 7. In the Virginia

study referred to earlier, in which the measures of delinquency and attitudes were similar to those of the present research, involvement was also positively associated with delinquency (Gardner 1984; Gardner and Shoemaker 1989). Apparently, this scale, as constructed, is tapping some dimension or pattern not anticipated by the social bond theory. Those youth who are *more* involved in community, school, and church activities are *more* delinquent. The interpretation of this relationship is unclear and should be addressed with additional observations and information.

Previous studies of officially labeled delinquents in the Philippines indicate that most of these juveniles are from the lower social classes. In the present sample, an approximation of social class is provided by the educational and occupational backgrounds of a youth's

Table 9. Delinquency by Educational Status of Father and Mother - ANOVA

<i>EDUCATION</i>	<i>MEAN</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Father			
Low	2.90	3.82	110
Middle	3.09	3.87	134
High	3.91	3.92	299
Totals	3.50	3.89	543
F = 3.72, 2 and 540 d.f., p ≤ .03			
Mother			
Low	2.74	3.64	109
Middle	3.06	3.76	133
High	4.07	4.08	304
Totals	3.56	3.95	546
F = 6.01, 2 and 543 d.f., p ≤ .003			

parents. Educational background of parents ranged from no formal schooling to advanced graduate work. However, the distribution is heavily skewed toward the higher education end of the spectrum. Over one-third of both fathers and mothers are reported to have earned a college degree, nearly 17 per cent of the fathers have post-graduate education, and 14 per cent of the mothers have post-graduate education.

A comparison of delinquency by educational status of parents is presented in Table 9. The educational categories collapse several lower level educational divisions in order to provide as balanced a distribution as possible. Specifically, no schooling through some high school is coded as low, high school graduate and some college are named middle, and college graduate and beyond are categorized as high. Nonetheless, over half of the fathers and mothers are placed in the highest educational category.

The statistics presented in Table 9 reveals a significant association between delinquency and educational background of parents, but the direction is *opposite* that of previous studies in the Philippines. In the present sample, *middle-class* are the *most* delinquent.

The relationship between delinquency and social class is also examined by comparing delinquency with the occupational status of the respondents' parents. For purposes of the parent analysis, occupational position is divided into four categories: upper middle, middle, working and lower, and unemployed. The specific occupations which fit into each of these categories were sorted in accordance with the pres-

tige rankings offered by Voth (1970) and Trieman (1977), and then cross-checked for accuracy by faculty members of the Department of Sociology at Xavier University. In addition, these classifications were cross-tabulated with father's and mother's education, and the two variables were highly associated. Over half of the fathers are classified in middle or upper-middle class occupations. Approximately 46 per cent of the mothers are placed into middle or upper-middle class occupations. However, nearly half of the mothers are unemployed, compared to about 17 per cent of the fathers.

The results of the comparisons of delinquency by parental occupation are presented in Table 10. As was the case with delinquency and parental education, there is a significant relationship between delinquency and parental occupation, but, again, it is the children of *higher* status parents who are most delinquent.

With both measures of social class used in this study, the results are consistent and rather striking; middle-class children are more delinquent than the sons and daughters of working and lower class parents. These results need to be explained, for they are contrary to official data. Perhaps these statistics merely reflect the sample's imbalance of higher social status backgrounds. To some extent, this may be the case. The probability levels of significance in Table 9, however, are too large to be solely reflective of a skewed distribution, particularly when each educational category contains over 100 cases. The occupational categories in Table 10 are also skewed in the direction of middle class status, but, again, the level of probability is too high

Table 10. Delinquency by Father's and Mother's Occupation -ANOVA

<i>OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION</i>	<i>MEAN</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Father			
Upper Middle	4.04	4.18	189
Middle	3.88	3.87	116
Working and Lower	2.84	3.85	103
Unemployed	2.87	3.36	84
Totals	3.55	3.91	492
F = 3.25. 3 and 488 d.f., p < .02			
Mother			
Upper Middle	4.55	4.66	60
Middle	3.75	3.89	184
Working and Lower	1.38	1.72	21
Unemployed	3.27	3.92	263
Totals	3.51	3.94	582
F = 3.99. 3 and 524 d.f., p < .008			

to be completely affected by sample distributions.

Working status of parents has already been analyzed in this sample, however, and was found to be negligibly related to delinquency.

Some studies suggest that self-reported middle-class delinquency is largely a collection of drug, status, and property offenses (Vaz 1967; Elliott and Ageton 1980; Shoemaker 1984). To examine this possibility in the present sample, parental education and occupation are compared with the four delinquency subscales identified in the appendix. The results indicate significantly

higher mean levels of delinquency among middle-class youth with respect to all subscales, *except* drug offenses (although, again, admitted incidences of drug use are very low). In particular, the differences are most striking for property offenses and somewhat less significant for violent and status acts. These results suggest that the greater participation in delinquent activity among middle-class youth is *not* attributable to their disproportionate involvement in status and drug offenses, as compared to property and violent delinquent behavior.

It is possible that the lower-status youth are not as truthfully responding to this type of survey as are middle-class

students. Furthermore, perhaps many delinquent youth, especially lower-class juveniles, are not in school, and thus would not be reflected in present figures. For that matter, it is possible that the delinquency scale used is not adequately consonant with Filipino culture and customs, and this does not reflect the fuller range of delinquent activity among this sample. Such a situation, however, would seem to apply to all youth and thus would not affect the relationship between delinquency and social class. Still, it must be considered that, compared to young people from middle-class backgrounds, lower-class youth may be more likely to drop out of school, or not completely answer questions concerning delinquency, and, therefore, reflect a seemingly lower rate of delinquency.

Another interpretation of the present results is that the associations are real and attributable to qualitative differences in the lives of middle-class, versus lower-class, young people. Perhaps there are attitudinal differences between middle and lower-class juveniles which may help to explain the higher levels of delinquency among middle-class youth. These youth may be pampered, to the point that they may feel themselves to be above the law in many cases.⁴

Conclusion

Delinquency in the Philippines is a reality, but the scope and gravity of such behavior appears to be less than in other countries, such as the United States.

In addition, the results of the present analysis indicate commonalities and differences with previous studies of delinquency in the Philippines. Consis-

tent with earlier investigations, for example, the present results indicate delinquency to be a male phenomenon.

Contrary to other research, delinquency in this sample is concentrated among the older youth of the present sample, although differences by age are not significant for all delinquent acts combined. Previous studies of delinquency in the Philippines, based upon official data, indicate the "typical" delinquent to be 15-16 years of age. The age categories of highest delinquency involvement in the present sample are 16-17 and 18 and over. It should be remembered, however, that the measure of delinquency in this study spanned a juvenile's lifetime, thus allowing for the possibility of higher levels of involvement among older youth.

Also, broken homes have been connected with studies of delinquent populations in previous investigations of delinquency in the Philippines, but no such association is found in this study. Rather, parental *attachment* is significantly related to delinquency, and strongly so.

An examination of school-related factors yields no significant association between delinquency and attachment to school. This finding is not consistent with previous research on delinquency in the Philippines. However, the present analysis does show a highly significant association between delinquency and commitment to school.

A multivariate analysis indicates that several attitudinal variables are significantly associated with delinquency. Noteworthy among these factors are commitment (to school and church ac-

tivities), attachments to peers, and attachment to parents. These associations, furthermore, are supportive of Hirschi's social bond theory, which predicts an inverse relationship between these attitudes and delinquency.

A significant departure from official reports of delinquency in the Philippines is the positive relationship between delinquency and social class, as measured by educational and occupational status. Significantly higher levels of delinquency among children of more highly educated parents occurred for property and violent crimes, less so for status offenses, and not at all for drug use.

Overall, the data in this study reveals a relatively low, and mild, level of delinquency among the sample. This result may be affected by the middle-class bias which the sample reflects. However, the middle-class youth are the *most* delinquent, according to their self-report responses. If these juveniles were removed from the analysis, the level of delinquency would decline.

Although the reported amounts of delinquency in this sample are low, this finding is consistent with studies of delinquency in other developing countries, and with comparative criminal statistics using official data from the Philippines and other societies.

Many commentators have noted, or predicted, an increase in crime and delinquency in societies which experience industrial growth and modernization (Cavan and Cavan 1968; Clinard and Abbott 1973; Shelley 1981; Hartjen and Priyadarsini 1984). Several reasons are offered for this observation, such as

an increase in competing value systems; an increase in personal alienation from society; increases in technological capacities to detect criminality; expansion of specialized facilities to imprison or rehabilitate offenders; and specialization of social services to deal formally with criminals, delinquents, and others exhibiting deviant behavior. Such trends, however, are not automatic (Adler 1983). For example, the relationship between modernization and criminality may be altered by age distributions, economic patterns, and criminal justice procedures (Steffensmeir et al. 1989).

A rather common theme in this literature is the identification of a breakdown in the traditional functions of basic institutions, especially the family, in the socialization and control of members of society, particularly juveniles, as growth and modernization occur. Typically, the extended family gives way to a smaller, nuclear family structure and socialization and personal care functions of the family become assumed by agencies and organizations that lie outside the family network (see, Cavan and Cavan 1968; Shelley 1981; Adler 1983; also, Parsons 1966 for a general discussion on the connection between societal development and family structure).

So important is a strong family unit to the Filipino people that the preservation of the family, and care for its members, was embodied in the new constitution of the country, which was ratified in February 1987. A further indication of this value is the lack of any appreciable degree of parental separation among the youth in the present sample. Given this fact, it is not surprising to see that "broken homes" is not related to delin-

quency. Even among youth where mothers are employed outside the home, there is no significant difference in delinquency, perhaps because other family members, or adult supervisors such as maids, are still present in the home.

It may be the case, therefore, that this strong family system is significantly associated with the relatively low rate of delinquency reported in this study. Since little information, official or otherwise, on delinquency in the Philippines exist especially since the early 1970s, it is not possible to establish any trend in the relationship between delinquency, modernization and family structure in this study.

Future research, however, may be able to address these issues, especially if better monitoring of delinquent (and criminal) behavior is accomplished. It is possible that, despite the country's commitment to a strong family system, the forces of modernization will begin to alter the family structure, and other institutions as well, in the Philippines. As this occurs, an increase in the rate of delinquency is expected, but accurate observations of juvenile criminality are necessary in order for such a connection to be established.

APPENDIX

DELINQUENT SCALE COMPONENTS

Status: marking up property; making anonymous phone calls; drinking wine, beer, or liquor; skipping school; defying parents; and running away from home.

Property: breaking windows; letting air out of tires; taking things of value less than 50 pesos; taking things of value up to 500 pesos; taking things of value over 500 pesos; breaking into a building; stealing a car; banging up others' property; breaking down property.

Violent: hitting someone; beating up someone and breaking bones or causing disfigurement; robbing someone.

Drug: been in possession of marijuana, amphetamines, heroin or cocaine; been high on cough syrup, glue (rugby) or toothpaste covered cigarettes.

SOCIAL BOND SCALES

Attachment to Parents: would you like to be the kind of person your parents are (in every way, in most ways, in some ways, in a few ways, not at all); my family knows *where* I am when I am away from home; my family knows *who* I am with when I am away from home; my family wants to help me when I have a problem; my family knows what is best for me; my family and I talk over my future plans; my family explains why they feel the way they do; I can share my thoughts and feelings with my family; when my family makes a rule I don't understand, they will explain the reason (never, sometimes, usually, always).

Attachment to Teachers: would you like to be the kind of person your teachers are (in every way, in most ways, in some ways, in a few ways, not at all); I care what my teachers

think of me; my teachers know what is best for me; my teachers want to help me when I have problems; I share my thoughts and feelings with my teachers (never, sometimes, usually, always).

Attachment to Peers: would you like to be the kind of person your friends are (in every way, in most ways, in some ways, not at all); my friends understand my needs and problems; my friends would stick with me if I really got myself into trouble; I can share my thoughts and feelings with my friends; my friends want to help me when I have problems (never, sometimes, usually, always).

Attachment to Church: the people in my church want to help me when I have problems; I can share my thoughts and feelings with the people in my church (never, sometimes, usually, always).

Involvement: how often do you attend meetings of organizations and groups outside of your school (never, less than once a month, once a month, twice or three times a month, once a week or more); in which of the following school-related activities do you participate (none, one, two, three to five, six or more); approximately how many *hours per day* do you spend on homework (none at all, less than one hour, one to two hours, three to five hours, more than five hours); approximately how many *hours per week* do you spend in *school-related activities* other than homework and attending classes (none at all, less than one hour, one to two hours, three to five hours, more than five

hours); how often do you attend religious services (never, only on important holidays, sometimes, as often as I can).

Commitment: in comparison with other students in your school, how would you rate yourself in school ability (among the best, above average, average, below average, among the worst); I try hard in school; I dislike school; the things I do in school seem worthwhile and meaningful to me; getting good grades is important to me; school attendance is important to me; whatever my goals, I try hard to achieve them; the things I do in church seem meaningful and worthwhile to me; regular church attendance is important to me (never, sometimes, usually, always).

Belief: it is all right to get around the law if you get away with it; to get ahead, you have to do some things which are not right; I have a lot of respect for the barangay (police) officials; police try to give all kids a break (another chance); I can't seem to stay out of trouble no matter how hard I try; suckers deserve to be taken advantage of; most things people call "getting into trouble" don't really hurt anyone (never, sometimes, usually, always).

Attachment to Conventional Peers: are your friends active in school activities (very active, somewhat active, not very active, not active at all); my close friends respect the barangay officials; my friends tend to get into trouble with their parents; my friends respect their teachers; my friends tend to get into trouble in school; my friends try to follow the

rules and stay out of trouble; my friends respect their parents (never, sometimes, usually, always).

Attachment to Conventional Parents: my parents respect the barangay officials; regular church attendance is important to my family; my family tries to obey the law and stay out of trouble (never, sometimes, usually, always).

NOTES

¹Revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Montreal, Quebec, November 11-14, 1987.

²Aldaba-Lim (1978) and Esguerra (1979) note that separate procedures for handling most juvenile offenders were established by Presidential Decree Number 603, in 1974. However, the provisions for implementing these procedures were rarely supplied, especially in the provinces.

³The employed-unemployed distinction utilized in the questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate the main occupation, or the job, of the working parent. Discussions with Filipino colleagues (Imelda G. Pagtolun-an and Gloria D. Benigno) suggest that in some cases this type of question may not yield consistent answers for working mothers, because if the mother is working at a variety of odd jobs, such as house cleaning, tutoring, vending, and so on, the children may not consider her "employed" because she has no permanent, full-time job. That this indeed may be the case is reflected in the high percentage of "unemployed" mothers

reported in the sample. Thus, some of the unemployed mothers may actually be working, and therefore away from the home for extended periods of time. This situation should be remembered when interpreting the relationship between working status of mothers and delinquency.

⁴This interpretation was offered in a personal communication by Father Francis Madigan, S.J., former chair of the Department of Sociology and Director of the Research Institute for Mindanao Culture, Xavier University.

References Cited

- Adler, Freda
1983 *Nations Not Obsessed With Crime*. Littleton, Colorado: Fred B. Rothman & Co.
- Agnew, Robert
1985 Social control theory and delinquency: A longitudinal test. *Criminology* 23:47-61.
- Aldaba-Lim, Estefania
1969 *Toward understanding the Filipino juvenile delinquent*. Quezon City: Bustamante Press, Inc.
- 1978 Care of the juvenile offenders in the Philippines. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 22:239-243.
- Archer, Dane and Rosemary Gartner
1984 *Violence and crime in cross-national perspective*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Carlota, Annadaisy J.
1982-83 Filipino female juvenile delinquents: an exploratory study of their level of intelligence, per-

- sonality, and attitudes towards the self and selected social figures. *Philippine Journal of Psychology* 15-16:3-27.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle and Jordan T. Cavan
1968 *Delinquency and crime: Cross-cultural perspectives*. New York: Lippincott.
- Clinard, Marshall B. and Daniel J. Abbott
1973 *Crime in developing countries: A comparative perspective*. New York: Wiley.
- Dentler, Robert S. and Lawrence J. Monroe
1961 Social correlates of early adolescent theft. *American Sociological Review* 26:733-743.
- Elliott, Delbert S. and Suzane S. Ageton
1980 Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. *American Sociological Review* 45:95-110.
- Elliott, Delbert S. and Harwin L. Voss
1974 *Delinquency and dropout*. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath.
- Empey, LaMar T.
1982 *American delinquency*, second edition. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey.
- Esguerra, Ramon S.
1979 The youthful offender before the juvenile courts. *Philippine Law Journal* 54:45-62.
- Gardner, LeGrande
1984 Social bonding and delinquency: A multivariate analysis. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Blacksburg, Virginia: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Gardner, LeGrande and Donald J. Shoemaker
1989 Social bonding and delinquency: A comparative analysis. *The Sociological Quarterly* 30:481-500.
- Gibson, Harold B.
1971 Factorial structure of juvenile delinquency: A study of self-reported acts. *British Journal of Clinical and Social Psychology* 10:1-9.
- Hartjen, Clayton A. and S. Priyadarsini
1984 *Delinquency in India: A comparative analysis*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Hindelang, Michael J.
1973 Causes of delinquency: A partial replication and extension. *Social Problems* 20:471-487.
- Hirschi, Travis
1969 *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
1985 Crime and family policy. Pp. 53-67 in *Juvenile delinquency: A justice perspective*. (Edited by Ralph A. Weisheit and Robert G. Culbertson). Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Mann, David W.
1981 Age and differential predictability of delinquent behavior. *Social Forces* 60:97-113.
- Massey, James L. and Marvin D. Krohn
1986 A longitudinal examination of an integrated social process model of

- deviant behavior. *Social Forces* 65:106-134.
- Nijbuur, J.A. and F. P. H. Dijksterhuis.
1983 *Education and delinquency: The relationship between performance at school and delinquency*. Translated and reprinted in *International Summaries*, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
- Nye, F. Ivan and James F. Short, Jr.
1957 Scaling delinquent behavior. *American Sociological Review* 22: 326-331.
- Parsons, Talcott
1966 *Societies: Evolutionary and comparative perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Phillips, John C. and Delos H. Kelly
1979 School failure and delinquency: Which causes which *Criminology* 17:194-207.
- Polk, Kenneth and Walter B. Schafer (eds.)
1972 *School and delinquency*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Rankin, Joseph H.
1977 Investigating the interrelations among social control variables and conformity. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 67:470-480.
- Reichel, Phillip L.
1975 Classroom uses of a criminal activities checklist. *Teaching Sociology* 3:81-86.
- Shelley, Louise I.
1981 *Crime and modernization: The impact of industrialization and urbanization on crime*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Shim, Young-Hee.
1987 Hidden delinquency in Korea. *Crime and Delinquency* 33:425-32.
- Shoemaker, Donald J.
1984 *Theories of delinquency: An examination of explanations of delinquent behavior*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steffensmeier, Donald J., Emilie Anderson Allen, Miles D. Harer, and Cathy Streifel.
1989 Age and the distribution of crime. *American Journal of Sociology* 94:803-31.
- Thornberry, Terance P.
1987 Toward an interactional theory of delinquency. *Criminology* 25:863-891.
- Thornton, William E. Jr., Lydia Voigt, and William G. Doerner
1987 *Delinquency and justice*. Second edition. New York: Random House.
- Treiman, Donald J.
1977 *Occupational prestige in comparative perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Vaz, Edmund W.
1967 Juvenile delinquency in the middle-class youth culture. Pp. 131-147 in *Middle-class delinquency*. (Edited by Edmund W. Vaz). New York: Harper & Row.
- Voth, Donald E.
1970 Occupation and occupational prestige in the Philippines. *Philippine Sociological Review* 18:39-64.