

# Human Rights Awareness of Secondary School Students in the Philippines: A Sample Survey

LOLITA H. NAVA, MA. CARMELA T. MANCAO,  
MA. VICTORIA C. HERMOSISIMA, and FELICIA I. YEBAN

The Center for Research and Development in Education of the Philippine Normal University surveyed a sample of secondary school students in the Philippines to measure and analyze their human rights awareness. The survey is part of a multi-country research project organized by the Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center (HURIGHTS OSAKA). The project,<sup>1</sup> launched in 2003, generally aims to provide an independent and critical review of the state of existing human rights education in schools programs in several Asian countries. Aside from the Philippines, the research project covers India, Sri Lanka, and Japan. These countries have human rights education in schools programs that have been implemented for a significant period of time now.

This is a partial report on the results of the survey on the human rights awareness of secondary school students in the Philippines undertaken by the Center for Research and Development in Education during the 2003-2004 period.

## Philippine Survey

The survey in the Philippines involves 2,001 secondary school students (second year students) who individually answered a survey questionnaire, while 10 teachers and 50 students took part in the focus group discussions held immediately after administering the survey questionnaire.

The survey questionnaire has 69 items divided into the following:

1. General sources of knowledge on human rights – 3 items

2. Knowledge of human rights documents – 6 items
3. General human rights principles and issues – 21 items
4. Human rights situations (Proper action to take) – 10 items
5. Human rights situations (Classified into human rights violations and non-violations) – 9 items
6. Process of learning, materials and school ethos – 20 items

For the focus group discussions (FGD), the questions are divided into the following:

- a. FGD questions for teachers – 5 items
  1. Law/policy support for human rights education
  2. Support system for teaching human rights
  3. Problems encountered

4. Views on value of human rights education
  5. Suggestions for improvement.
- b. FGD questions for students – 9 items
1. Feelings and personal effect of human rights
  2. Views and observance of human rights in schools
  3. Factors that help and inhibit exercise of human rights in classrooms/schools
  4. Respect for human rights
  5. Teaching of human rights and recommendations.

The survey questionnaire was administered in 26 schools in 4 regions of the country (National Capital Region [NCR], Regions IV and VII and the Autonomous Region for Muslim Mindanao [ARMM]) in February – March 2003, and August 2004. The survey questionnaire has the following variables and their samples:

1. Gender: male – 805; female – 1,160
2. Type of school: public – 1,215; private – 786
3. Ethnicity: Christian – 1,505; Moslem – 496
4. Geographic location: urban – 1,115; rurban<sup>2</sup> – 886
5. Region: NCR – 715; IV – 548; VII – 317; ARMM – 421

Overall analysis as well as analysis per variable were done to allow comparisons and find out differences, if any, exist among and between them.

### Analysis of Results

#### I. Knowledge and Application of Human Rights Concepts

On questions under “Knowledge and Application of Human Rights Concepts”, an average of 96% of the respondents, in all vari-

ables (gender, ethnicity, type of school, geographic classification and region) have heard or known human rights (Table 1). In Region VII all respondents (100%) have heard or known human rights.

Using other variables, the respondents’ answers show that female, urban, and private school respondents have higher averages than the general average of 96.5% as shown in Table 2.

Most respondents identified the school (84%, in all variables) as the source of knowledge on human rights. The sources of such knowledge are ranked as follows:

**TABLE 1. Percentage of Knowledge of Human Rights by Region**

	<i>N</i> =	YES	NO	NA
NCR	715	98	1	1
IV	548	95	2	3
VII	317	100	0	0
ARMM	421	93	3	4
Average		96.5	1.5	2

Legend: NA- No Answer

**TABLE 2. Percentage of Knowledge of Human Rights by Other Variables**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>N</i> =	YES	NO	NA
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	805	94	3	3
Female	1,160	98	1	1
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
Christian	1,505	97	1	2
Moslem	496	93	3	4
<i>Geographic Classification</i>				
Urban	1,115	97	1	2
Rurban	886	95	2	3
<i>Type of School</i>				
Public	1,215	95	2	3
Private	786	98	1	1

Legend: NA- No Answer

1. School – 84%
2. Other top sources
  - television/radio (82%)
  - family/parents (78%)
  - newspapers/magazines (64%)
  - other media (60%).

In response to the question “What is the most helpful source in understanding human rights?” the following responses came out: (Table 3)

1. Family/Parents – 30% across all variables.
2. School – 28% across all variables.

But in Region VII, 45% of the respondents chose school, and 23% chose family/parents as the most helpful sources of understanding human rights.

On the knowledge about a particular human rights instrument – the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) – an average of 30% of the respondents have known or heard of it. In ARMM, 43% of all respondents have known or heard of it, and among its Moslem respondents, 46%. In Region IV, on the other hand, 20% of the respondents gave such answer.

At least one-third of the respondents in each variable derive their knowledge on the UDHR from television/radio. Only an average of 15%

of the respondents learned about UDHR through schools.

On questions about the observance of UDHR, 60% in most variables thought that human rights contained in UDHR should be observed by all countries. Among respondents from private schools, 52% answered that UDHR should be observed by all countries; while 45% said it should be observed by some countries.

Table 4 shows that an average of nearly 60% of the respondents answered that human rights contained in UDHR should be enjoyed by “all human beings in the world.” An average of 20% of the respondents thought that they are to be enjoyed by some people in some countries, while another 20% said that they are to be enjoyed by all people in some countries.

**TABLE 4. Percentage of Knowledge of How the UDHR is to be Enjoyed by Region**

<i>Region</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Some people in some countries</i>	<i>All people in some countries</i>	<i>All human being everywhere in the world</i>
NCR	232	18	16	60
IV		23	25	49
VII	74	8	23	69
ARMM	183	17	24	54

**TABLE 3. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Most Helpful Source of Knowledge and Variables**

<i>Sources</i>	<i>Region</i>					<i>Gender</i>			<i>Type of School</i>			<i>Ethnicity</i>			<i>Geographical Location</i>		
	<i>NCR (n=232)</i>	<i>IV (n=110)</i>	<i>VII (n=74)</i>	<i>ARMM (n=183)</i>	<i>Total (n=599)</i>	<i>Male (n=249)</i>	<i>Female (n=340)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Public (n=425)</i>	<i>Private (n=174)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Christian (n=372)</i>	<i>Moslem (n=227)</i>	<i>Total (n=599)</i>	<i>Urban (n=299)</i>	<i>Rurban (n=300)</i>	<i>Total (n=599)</i>
Family/ parents	29	34	23	30	30	31	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	30	30
Other Media	15	7	10	4	10	10	10	10	11	9	10	12	5	10	12	7	10
Newspapers, magazines	7	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	6	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
Television, radio	13	17	11	11	13	13	13	13	13	14	13	14	13	13	14	13	13
Internet, websites	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gov't. agencies	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	3	2
Neighbors	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Schools	26	25	45	26	29	31	28	29	28	30	29	30	25	29	30	28	29
Legal documents	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	1
Others	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

Table 5 shows the percentage of knowledge of how UDHR is to be enjoyed by other variables. On knowledge of another human rights instrument – the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) – an average of 50% know it across all variables. In ARMM, 67% know it. While among the Moslem respondents in ARMM, 69% know it. 46% of respondents from private schools know it.

<i>Variables</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>Some people in some countries</i>	<i>All people in some countries</i>	<i>All human being everywhere in the world</i>
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	249	19	24	54
Female	340	16	18	60
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
Christian	372	18	20	58
Moslem	227	16	23	56
<i>Geographic Classification</i>				
Urban	299	18	20	58
Rurban	300	17	22	57
<i>Type of School</i>				
Public	425	17	21	58
Private	174	17	21	56

Table 6 shows that 80% of the respondents answered that schools are source of knowledge of CRC. In Region VII, 90% of the respondents said that the schools are the source of their knowledge of CRC. Table 7 shows the results using other variables.

<i>Variables</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>
<i>Region</i>			
NCR	394	77	22
IV	278	77	22
VII	181	90	9
ARMM	281	82	13

**TABLE 7. Table on School as Source of Knowledge on CRC by Other Variables**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>N=</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>
<i>Gender</i>			
Male	444	79	19
Female	672	81	17
<i>Ethnicity</i>			
Christian	790	79	20
Moslem	344	84	11
<i>Geographic Classification</i>			
Urban	608	78	20
Rurban	526	82	14
<i>Type of School</i>			
Public	775	83	14
Private	359	73	26

From the data gathered, the following salient points are noted:

1. More than 95% of the respondents across all variables (gender, ethnicity, type of school, geographical classification and region) are aware of “human rights”. A very minimal percentage of respondents indicated that they absolutely do not have any knowledge on human rights.
2. Respondents from Region VII have the highest percentage of knowledge of human rights. This may indicate better human rights education in Region VII schools.
3. The primary source of knowledge on human rights is the school, followed by television/radio, and family/parents. However, family/parents are regarded as the most helpful source of knowledge on human rights.
4. Only 30% of the respondents have heard of or known the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR). Apparently, the UDHR is not perceived as a priority document to be taught to sophomore students in secondary schools.
5. The stark contrast of such percentage turn-out of 30% in Salient Point #4, as compared to the 95% percentage turn-out in Salient Point #1 implies the incongru-

ence between what the respondents know as human rights and what they know about UDHR.

6. More respondents have heard of or known the CRC than the UDHR. This implies that between the two documents, the CRC is considered more significant to be taught to the sophomore students.

## II. Knowledge and Comprehension of Human Rights Concepts

This section is a 21-item test measuring the respondents' knowledge and comprehension of human rights concepts. Specifically, it aims to determine whether or not the respondents would be able to apply their comprehension of human rights concepts in hypothetical, yet close to real-life, situations. The respondents were asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement to the test items.

In general, the sample obtained a mean score of 14.26 (out of 21 items) equivalent to about 68% of the test. This is already considered satisfactory from a psychometric point of view as it is more than above a mean score of 50% correct items (Anastasi, 1988).

Items with 80% or more correct responses:

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Questionnaire Statement</i>
3	Children and youths have rights that must be respected.
4	Human rights should be the concern of all.
5	By virtue of being human, we have rights.
7	Only the state or government can protect our human rights.
8	Rich people have more rights than the poor.
13	Friends and neighbors should do something if they think parents are beating or injuring their children.
16	Every man and woman should decide whom to marry.
17	It is the responsibility of the state or government to provide employment.

Items with very low percentage of correct responses:

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Questionnaire Statement</i>
1	The government gives us our human rights.
9	If you want your rights respected, you must respect the rights of others.
20	Human rights means absolute freedom.

A one-way analysis of variance for the variable "region" has the following results:

- The test for differences among the means of the four regions shows that the F value (50.214) is significant. This result indicates that the regions differ from each other in their performance.
- Duncan Test reveals that Region VII has a significantly higher mean than all the other regions, NCR has a significantly higher mean than Region IV and ARMM, and Region IV has a significantly higher mean than ARMM.

From the responses, the following salient points are noted:

### *On Performance:*

1. In terms of gender, the male respondents performed comparably with the females. Thus, gender is not a factor influencing the respondents' application of their knowledge of human rights concepts on hypothetical, though depicting real-life, situations.
2. Type of school is a significant factor in the respondents' performance. Between public and private high schools, the latter significantly performed better in the test than the former.
3. Ethnicity also significantly affected the sample's scores, with the Christian-respondents scoring significantly higher than the Moslem-respondents.

4. Between respondents from the urban and rural areas, the former significantly performed better than the latter. Hence, this makes geographical location also a factor of performance.
5. Among the regions, Region VII significantly has the highest performance, followed by NCR, then Region IV and last by ARMM. Region is found to be a variable explaining the significant differences in the scores of the respondents.

*On Concepts:*

1. The students demonstrated high knowledge of human rights concepts relating to children and people in general. But when the items center on specific people (e.g., tribal communities/indigenous people, government officials), the respondents showed seemingly moderate knowledge.
2. Among the items, the respondents generally have lower scores across variables in items 1, 9 and 20. This shows that the respondents do not recognize human rights as inherent in the person, and consequently consider human rights in the context of give-and-take relationship between and among human beings. The students also evidently lack knowledge on the responsibility that goes with the exercise of one's rights. Thus, they misconstrue human rights as absolute freedom.
3. Based on the responses to items about cultural practices in relation to human rights awareness, the former sometimes comes stronger than the latter.

### III. Human Rights Situations (Proper action to take)

This section measures the respondents' awareness of human rights in relation to their reactions to certain real-life situations. Their awareness is indicated by their knowledge of what is true or correct, what is the right thing to do, or the appropriate actuation or behav-

ior when one encounters such situations. This awareness is also exhibited when they have the correct notions of what the government, persons in authority and other organizations should do faced with certain situations involving human rights.

There are 10 situations with three options to choose from (for the correct notion, action or behavior). The situations illustrate problems in drug addiction, child labor, subsidy allowed by World Trade Organization (WTO), children's right to education, rights of indigenous people, right to peaceful assembly, right of abode, terrorism, theft and right to fair trial. The range of the percentage of correct responses was taken as measure of students' knowledge.

Percentage of correct responses for item 1 (What the local government should do with suspected drug pushers) range from 76% to 95% across all variables which show awareness of what to do in the situation cited (see Table 8). Correct responses however, went down to 38%-50% in item 2 (A problem about a cement factory employing 12-year old children as workers) across variables which can be a demonstration of lack of knowledge of child labor and rights. The same trend is noted in item 3 with 32%-51% correct responses (WTO allowing rich countries to subsidize their agricultural industry) and students' lack of awareness of it. However, the right to education demonstrated in item 4 (A school refusing to accept a child because of lack of birth certificate), clearly showed correct response ranging from 59% to 80%. The same trend is noted in item 5 (Illegal logging in the ancestral land of tribal community and the community asking the government's help) with correct responses ranging from 79-96%. Rallies and what to do with squatter's shanties and terrorism seemed not within the grasp of students' knowledge as they score low in items 6 (what to do with a rallying group); 7 (what should be done with shanties along the route of a visiting dignitary); 8 (the government putting up road check-

points); and 10 (presumption of innocence of a suspected terrorist). The percentage of correct responses range from: 7%-21% (item 6), 15%-27% (item 7), 7%-13% (Item 8), and 29%-48% (item 10). This is probably because these

situations are not within their experience. They have knowledge however on what to do with a person caught in the act of committing a crime and the sense of justice in item 9 (83%-95% correct).

**TABLE 8. Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Correct Responses According to Knowledge about Human Rights Situations by Variables**

Situations	Region				Gender		Ethnicity		Geo. Class.		School	
	NCR	IV	VII	ARMM	M	F	Chris	Mosl	Urban	Rural	Pub	Pri
1. There are suspected drug pushers in the community, what should the local government do?	89	84	95	76	84	87	89	76	88	83	83	90
2. A cement factory is employing 12-year old children as workers. What should be done about this?	39	38	50	41	39	43	42	40	41	42	38	46
3. The World Trade Organization should allow rich countries to continue giving subsidy/financial support to their agricultural industry that gives them advantage over the developing countries.	44	32	51	40	41	41	42	40	43	39	40	43
4. A poor family would like to enroll a child in school. The school refuses to accept the child because of lack of birth registration in the government. What should be done?	79	74	77	59	74	73	77	61	79	66	69	80
5. A logging company started cutting down trees in the ancestral land of an indigenous/tribal community without its consent. The community asked the government to stop the logging. What should the government do?	86	88	96	84	84	91	91	79	88	88	86	90
6. A group stages a rally in front of a government-owned corporation to protest an electricity fee increase. The rally is slowing down traffic. A police squad arrived. What should the police do?	9	8	7	21	13	9	8	19	8	15	12	10
7. Squatters' shanties/homeless people's tents are along the route that an important foreign guest (President of another country) will pass. What should be done with the shanties/tents?	15	18	18	27	21	18	17	25	15	23	20	16
8. The government decided to put up road checkpoints for its "anti-terrorism and peace and order program." Is the government right?	8	11	7	12	13	8	9	13	9	11	10	9
9. A police caught someone running away with goods taken from a store. What should the police do?	89	89	95	86	89	90	91	83	89	89	88	90
10. O is a suspected terrorist. Does she/he have the right to be presumed innocent of a crime?	48	33	46	29	45	36	43	31	45	33	41	39

From these data, the following salient points are noted:

1. Students' personal and local community experiences, and media exposures seem to be factors in their knowledge on how to react to certain situations involving human rights.
  - 1.1 When situations are within the purview of their personal and immediate community life or through exposures to different forms of media, students tend to get correct answers (e.g., right to education, ancestral land, protection from punishment, and fair trial)
  - 1.2 When situations call for broader conceptualization of human rights as a set of rules and situations affecting people outside of their own community, students seem to have very narrow knowledge/perception on how to react to such situations (e.g., economic rights and international relations, freedom of peaceful assembly, labor laws and child rights, limitations of rights that threatens peace, and presumption of innocence until proven guilty).
2. Among the variables studied, in terms of average performance, it is only in gender where there is no significant difference. Male students performed just as well with the female students in all situations given.
3. Significant differences across items are found among the other variables studied (type of school, ethnicity, geographic location and region)
  - 3.1 In terms of Ethnicity, Christian students have more correct answers than the Moslem students.
  - 3.2 In terms of Geographical Classification, those from the urban areas scored better than those from the rural areas.
  - 3.3 In terms of Type of School, private school students performed better than students from the public schools.

3.4 In terms of the Regions, Region VII has the highest scores followed by NCR, ARMM and Region IV.

#### IV. Knowledge of human rights violations

This section is a 9-item test measuring the respondents' knowledge on human rights violations. Situations were given and the respondents were asked to identify if the situations constitute a violation of human rights or not by choosing between yes and no options: *yes* for *violation* and *no* for *not a violation*. The specific item statements and their corresponding correct responses are as follows:

<i>Statements</i>	<i>Correct Response</i>
1. A person is kept in jail for a long period without any trial.	Yes
2. People in a country die because they have no money to buy food.	Yes
3. A person is jailed for criticizing the government.	Yes
4. Only one political party is allowed to participate in the elections.	Yes
5. A large number of children do not go to school because they have to earn their livelihood.	Yes
6. Teachers beat the children because they are quarrelsome.	Yes
7. Women are not given jobs because they are for men.	Yes
8. A house-owner refuses to rent the house to a family from another province/region/country.	Yes
9. Wages are kept low to encourage foreign investments.	Yes

Generally, the sample performed satisfactorily in this test, with an average score of 5.60 corresponding to a mean percent score of 62.22%. This means that a big majority of the respondents could identify which situations represent violations of human rights.

Correct responses in item 1 ranged from 57% to 81%. Males and females did not differ but



there were differences across the other variables (type of school, ethnicity, geographic location and region). The range of correct response in item 2 went down to 43%-49%. The respondents showed weak understanding of their economic-social-cultural rights. At least 63% of the respondents were able to identify situation in item 3, while in item 4, 50% of ARMM and Moslem respondents deemed the situation not a violation of human rights. In item 5, the percentage of responses ranged from 41% to 80%, and it can be inferred that Moslem and ARMM students did not view child labor as human rights issue. Responses in item 6 were fairly high. In item 7 (clearly about gender inequality), urban, private schools, and Region VII scored higher than their counterparts. For item 8, percentage of correct responses went down, 62% being the

**TABLE 9. Percentage of Correct Responses by Region**

Item #	Region			
	NCR	IV	VII	ARMM
1	78	67	81	57
2	49	45	47	43
3	63	64	68	64
4	69	59	72	50
5	73	59	80	41
6	81	70	81	55
7	72	60	78	40
8	62	55	49	55
9	59	61	60	62

highest and 49% the lowest. The same trend is shown in item 9 with 64% as the highest and 58% the lowest.

No significant difference in the means of the males and females appeared. In terms of ethnicity, Christian respondents have significant higher mean than Moslem respondents.

The same is true with urban respondents doing better than the rural, private higher than public school students, and Region VII having highest performance.

One-way analysis of variance for the variable “region” has the following results:

- The F-value of 52.754 indicates that the mean difference between the regions is significant.
- Duncan test results showed that:
  - a. Region VII and NCR did not significantly differ in their performance and that they had significantly higher mean than the two remaining regions;
  - b. Region IV significantly had a higher mean than ARMM.

From these data, the following salient points are noted:

*On Performance:*

1. In terms of gender, the male respondents performed comparably with the females. Thus, gender is not a factor influencing

**TABLE 10. Percentage of Correct Responses by Other Variables**

Item #	Gender		Type of school		Ethnicity		Geo Class	
	M	F	Public	Private	Christian	Moslem	Ur	Rur
1	72	71	68	75	75	57	77	63
2	46	47	46	46	47	44	48	45
3	64	65	64	64	64	65	64	65
4	63	62	60	67	73	50	66	58
5	64	63	58	72	70	43	71	54
6	71	73	69	78	78	57	80	63
7	64	63	57	73	71	40	70	55
8	54	59	57	56	56	59	59	53
9	61	60	58	64	60	63	59	62

the respondents' application of their knowledge on human rights violations.

2. Type of school is a significant factor in the respondents' performance. Between public and private high schools, the latter significantly performed better in the test than the former.
3. Ethnicity also significantly affected the sample's scores, with the Christian-respondents scoring significantly higher than the Moslem-respondents.
4. Between respondents from the urban and rural areas, the former significantly performed better than the latter. Hence, this makes geographical location also a factor of performance.
5. Among the regions, Region VII and NCR, which performed the highest, did not significantly differ in their scores for this test. Region IV came next and then ARMM. Thus, region is also found to be a variable explaining the significant differences in the scores of the respondents.

#### *On Concepts:*

1. Among the items, it is in item 2 that the students across all variables scored the lowest. It seems that students lack enough exposure to realize the important role governments play in the economic lives of its constituents.
2. The Moslem- and ARMM-respondents scored very poorly (below 50%) in items 5 and 7. This calls for an enhanced teaching of child rights and gender equality.
3. The responses indicate that cultural practices seem to be functioning alongside human rights awareness, with the former stronger than the latter.

#### V. Process of Teaching Learning, Materials and School Ethos

This section deals with the processes, materials and methodologies which make up the

experiences of teachers in teaching, and of students in learning, human rights. The responses under this section can also provide the overall orientation of schools comprising their ethos, culture, and ideology relative to human rights.

The analysis of the answers of the respondents shows the following:

1. Majority of the respondents across the four regions surveyed regardless of their gender, ethnicity, geographic location, type of school and region were taught human rights.
2. 13.42% of those who were taught in school learned human rights as a separate subject, but their concept of teaching is similar to a separate topic taught within the subjects such as Social Studies, History, English, Values Education and Filipino.
3. Majority of the respondents from ARMM and Region VI were taught human rights frequently while in others only occasionally.
4. Debate is the top learning activity except in ARMM. Community work, making pamphlets and newsletters and celebration of human rights week are the top off-classroom activities, while participation in rallies is least cited.
5. Majority of the respondents in NCR, Region IV and VII participated once in a while in human rights activities, with ARMM participating often.
6. Schools sometimes accept that students may hold views different from those of school authorities, but the majority believed that teaching students about human rights will sometimes make them become activists. They thought, however, that human rights education would often result in decrease in human rights violations.
7. Majority believed that students sometimes work together to ensure understanding of human rights; students could sometimes express their views openly in school; students sometimes respect human rights; the

rights of students are sometimes respected, and school rules sometimes promote human rights.

8. Acts of indiscipline were dealt with through discussion with students, and teachers resolved problems among students by talking to them.
9. Majority perceived that they would exercise their rights and would like their school to integrate human rights in all subjects to help young people understand their rights and responsibilities.

From these data, the following salient points are noted:

1. The integration of human rights in certain subjects seems to be the dominant approach in the teaching of human rights in schools.
2. A variety of classroom activities are used in teaching human rights with ARMM avoiding the use of debate while NCR and Region VII using debate in the classroom frequently.
3. The teaching of human rights does not automatically translate to participation in human rights activities. There seems to be more emphasis on teaching human rights as a set of concepts rather than as a practice. This means, the learning is limited to understanding the concepts per se and not as applied in their daily lives.
4. Teachers are generally not trained to teach human rights.
5. There is ambivalence in teaching students about human rights because it is often equated with activism, which is viewed negatively.
6. The school is often not consistent with its human rights practice. When school authority is placed in peril by the students' practice of human rights, the school would opt to further limit the students' rights thereby creating a perception that human rights are those that the authority gives to the people.

## Recommendations

Considering the results of the survey and their analysis, the following are the recommendations for the improvement of human rights education in schools in the Philippines.

### I. Knowledge and Application of Human Rights Concepts

1. A more aggressive and effective human rights education program is necessary to ensure the proper dissemination and education of human rights among second year high school students. This includes the commitment of school officials to propagate and espouse the principles of UDHR, and making sure that they are taught during the school year.
2. Training of teachers in handling human rights discussions, including making them understand the importance of human rights education in maintaining quality life, is necessary. Teaching methods should emphasize the application/relevance of human rights to daily life as lived by the respondents in their respective milieus.

### II. Knowledge and Comprehension of Human Rights Concepts

1. The teaching of human rights, to be more meaningful, should take into consideration the profile of students such as ethnicity and geographical location. This would also minimize misconception/misinterpretation of human rights brought about by such variables.
2. Human rights concepts that the students lack knowledge of should be given more emphasis. These are concepts on the inherent quality of human rights and on the responsibility that goes with the exercise of one's rights, among others.
3. A more dynamic human rights education should be implemented in ARMM, pub-

lic schools, rural areas and among Muslims since the survey results consistently show lower performance of students.

### III. Human Rights Situations (Proper action to take)

1. In teaching human rights, the rights enunciated in the UDHR should be emphasized not only as values, but also as a set of rules.
2. The significant differences among regions calls for a re-examination of how human rights education programs in schools are being implemented.
3. The good performance of Region VII calls for a study on how the implementation of its human rights education program differs from the others. Lessons can be learned or a model program can be drawn from this study.
4. Situational tests using real-life situations can be further explored as a means to enrich students' knowledge on how to correctly react to human rights situations.

### IV. Knowledge of human rights violations

1. The teaching of human rights, to be more meaningful, should take into consideration the profile of students such as ethnicity and geographical location.
2. A more dynamic human rights education should be implemented in ARMM, public schools, rural areas and among Muslims since the survey results consistently show lower performance of students.
3. The teaching of economic, social, cultural and gender rights should be enhanced.

### V. Process of Teaching Learning, Materials and School Ethos

1. The curriculum should be reviewed to identify the strength and weaknesses of

the integration of human rights concepts and each subject area.

2. Further studies on human rights education program in Region VII maybe conducted to identify best practices.
3. The seeming lack of materials for teaching human rights specifically in public schools should be resolved. Teaching materials such as textbooks, copies of laws, UN documents, lesson plans, and learning standards should be provided to the teachers.
4. Since knowledge of human rights does not automatically translate into participation in human rights activities and practice, school policies and gaps between theory and practice should be reviewed and evaluated.
5. The ambivalence of teachers in teaching human rights should be looked into. Intensive teacher training together with clear policies and administrative support should be put in place.

### Reference

Anastasi, A., 1988. *Psychological Testing* (Sixth edition). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

### Endnotes

1. The project has two components – analysis of the educational laws and policies in relation to human rights education, and survey of the human rights awareness of students. This report presents only the field survey results.

2. Rural areas – these are areas classified as towns by the Philippine National Statistical Coordination Board. Urban areas are cities, while rural areas are those outside towns and cities. This survey covers only areas classified as urban and rural.