

CHAPTER III

SURVEY OF HUMAN RIGHTS AWARENESS AMONG SECONDARY STUDENTS IN SELECTED SCHOOLS

2,001 secondary students from both public and private schools provided an indication of the level and extent of awareness of human rights among Filipino youth at present. Their responses supplied bases for understanding what they know about human rights, and how such knowledge would probably be exercised in the context of the school and their community. They also provided insights on the way human rights are taught, respected or violated in the school and in the community.

This section presents the tabulated and statistically analyzed responses of the students, and the corresponding comments of the authors. The comments refer to the results of the focus group discussions to supplement the statistical data. The survey results reveal many interesting issues that raise questions on the implementation of the education policies discussed in Chapter II. Though the survey has limitations, the results provide significant implications on the implementation of the human rights education in schools program in the Philippines.

I. Knowledge and Application of Human Rights Concepts

Knowledge of Human Rights by Variables

Table 3 shows that at least 93% of the respondents, in all variables (Region, Gender, Ethnicity, Geographic Classification, & Type of School), have heard of or known human rights. All respondents (100%) from Region VII have heard of or known human rights.

It is worth asking why not all the respondents in all variables have heard of or known human rights since they are supposed to be taught in schools. It is particularly puzzling that a few respondents, some of them from areas where armed conflict exists, have not even heard of or known the words "human rights".

Table 3. Percentage of Knowledge of Human Rights by Variables

Variables	N=	YES	NO	NA
Region				
NCR	715	98	1	1
IV	548	95	2	3
VII	317	100	0	0
ARMM	421	93	3	4
Gender				
Male	805	94	3	3
Female	1160	98	1	1
Ethnicity				
Christian	1505	97	1	2
Muslim	496	93	3	4
Geographic Classification				
Urban	1115	97	1	2
Partially Urban	886	95	2	3
Type of School				
Public	1215	95	2	3
Private	786	98	1	1

Legend: NA- No Answer

Sources of Knowledge on Human Rights

The number one source of knowledge of human rights is the School, as opined by 84% of the respondents across all variables (Tables 4, 5 and 6). The other top four sources of knowledge are Television/Radio (82%), Family/Parents (78%), Newspapers/Magazines (64%), and Media (60%). Respondents from the NCR and ARMM however share a similar hierarchy of top answers: Television/Radio (NCR - 85%: ARMM - 82%), Schools (NCR - 83%: ARMM - 82 %), and Family/Parents (NCR - 80%: ARMM - 79%).

Table 4. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Source of Knowledge and Region

Sources	Region				
	NCR (n=699)	IV (n=522)	VII (n=316)	ARMM (n=391)	TOTAL (n=1928)
Family/parents	80	77	76	80	78
Media	71	57	66	42	60
Newspapers, magazines	70	56	70	57	64
Television, radio	85	77	86	79	82
Internet, websites	29	20	18	21	23
Gov't. agencies	23	23	25	36	26
Neighbors	26	25	25	39	28
Schools	83	81	91	82	84
Legal documents	14	9	9	19	13
Others	4	5	3	19	8

In Region VII, a high 91% of the respondents voted School, and 86% likewise learned of human rights through the Television/Radio. These percentages, higher than the summary percentages, may explain why all respondents (100%) in Region VII have heard of or known human rights as compared to the other regions. Do these results indicate that human rights education is more extensively undertaken in Region VII or do the schools in this region use better approach to human rights education?

Table 5. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Source of Knowledge and Gender & Type of School

Sources	Gender			Type of School		
	Male (n=757)	Female (n=1142)	Total n=(1899)	Public (n=1161)	Private (n=767)	Total (n=1928)
Family/parents	77	79	78	80	76	78
Media	62	60	61	59	63	60
Newspapers, magazines	66	62	64	65	62	64
Television, radio	83	81	82	83	79	82
Internet, websites	25	22	23	21	26	23
Gov't. agencies	25	27	26	32	17	26
Neighbors	29	28	28	31	24	28
Schools	84	84	84	86	81	84
Legal documents	13	13	13	16	9	13
Others	7	8	7	10	4	8

Table 5 attests to Schools as the primary source of knowledge on human rights by the male/female and public/private respondents (84%). Television/Radio come as a close second source of knowledge. These figures seem to imply that at

least 80% of the respondents regard Television/Radio to be equally influential and credible as the Schools in knowing human rights.

The Internet/Website, a popular yet unavailable resource in many places and not always affordable, is ranked second from last with 23% of the respondents citing it. Legal Documents rank last with only 13% of the respondents saying they are a source of knowledge of human rights. It can be inferred that teachers generally do not refer to the human rights documents in teaching human rights. Probably, teachers themselves are not familiar with the documents or find them difficult for the students to comprehend.

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Source of Knowledge and Ethnicity & Geographic Classification

Sources	Ethnicity			Geographic Classification		
	Christian (n=1467)	Muslim (n=461)	Total (n=1928)	Urban (n=1082)	Partially Urban (n=846)	Total (n=1928)
Family/parents	78	79	78	80	76	78
Media	67	40	60	67	52	60
Newspapers, magazines	65	59	64	69	57	64
Television, radio	82	82	82	84	78	82
Internet, websites	24	21	23	26	20	23
Gov't. agencies	23	34	26	23	29	26
Neighbors	26	36	28	26	31	28
Schools	84	82	84	85	83	84
Legal documents	11	18	13	12	14	13
Others	4	19	8	4	12	8

Even on ethnicity and geographic classification variables, Schools are ranked consistently by the respondents as the primary source of knowledge (84%), followed by Television/Radio (82%). Understandably, only 78% of the partially urban respondents selected Television/Radio, perhaps due to their limited availability in their areas.

Another consistent finding is the choice of Family/Parents in all variables as the third popular source of knowledge on human rights. This finding underscores the role of the Family/Parents in providing guidance and direction to children.

Most Helpful Source in Understanding Human Rights

The respondents chose Family/Parents (30%) as the most helpful source of knowledge of human rights, followed by the School (28%). (Tables 7, 8 and 9). This pattern of responses is true for all variables except for Region VII where 45%

of the respondents chose School as the most helpful source of knowledge, followed as a far second by Family / Parents with 23%.

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Most Helpful Source of Knowledge and Region

Sources	Region				
	NCR (n=699)	IV (n=522)	VII (n=316)	ARMM (n=391)	Total (n=1928)
Family/parents	29	34	23	30	30
Media	15	7	10	4	10
Newspapers, magazines	7	4	4	4	5
Television, radio	13	17	11	11	13
Internet, websites	2	1	1	0	1
Gov't. agencies	1	2	3	3	2
Neighbors	0	1	0	1	0
Schools	26	25	45	26	29
Legal documents	2	1	1	0	1
Others	1	1	0	0	0

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Most Helpful Source of Knowledge and Gender & Type of School

Sources	Gender			Type of School		
	Male (n=757)	Female (n=1142)	Total (n=1899)	Public (n=1161)	Private (n=767)	Total (n=1928)
Family/parents	31	30	30	30	30	30
Media	10	10	10	11	9	10
Newspapers, magazines	5	5	5	4	6	5
Television, radio	13	13	13	13	14	13
Internet, websites	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gov't. agencies	2	2	2	2	1	2
Neighbors	0	1	0	0	1	0
Schools	31	28	29	28	30	29
Legal documents	1	1	1	1	1	1
Others	0	1	0	0	1	0

Table 9. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Most Helpful Source of Knowledge and Ethnicity & Geographic Classification

Sources	Ethnicity			Geographic Classification		
	Christian (n=1467)	Muslim (n=461)	Total (n=1928)	Urban (n=1082)	Partially Urban (n=846)	Total (n=1928)
Family/ parents	30	30	30	29	30	30
Media	12	5	10	12	7	10
Newspapers, magazines	5	4	5	5	5	5
Television, radio	14	13	13	14	13	13
Internet, websites	1	1	1	1	1	1
Gov't. agencies	2	2	2	1	3	2
Neighbors	0	1	0	0	0	0
Schools	30	25	29	30	28	29
Legal documents	1	0	1	2	0	1
Others	1	0	0	1	0	0

At least one-third of the respondents view the Family/Parents as handy source of human rights knowledge. This may also mean that the Family/Parents are deemed more credible and informative in providing human rights knowledge to their children than the Schools. It would be interesting to find out how human rights are taught or learned at home. Do parents teach human rights consciously or unconsciously?

Knowledge of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Only an average of 30% of the respondents have known or heard of the United Nations' 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (Table 10). Apparently, the high percentage of 93% of the respondents who know human rights (Table 3) does not necessarily mean that such knowledge is associated with the UDHR. If only 30% of the respondents have heard of or known the UDHR, one wonders what exactly do they know about "human rights" in general, what human rights principles do they believe in, and is their knowledge of "human rights" correct. The focus group discussion among teachers of the respondents reveals the lack of formal training on human rights for teachers. The discussion also seems to indicate that teachers view human rights as a set of values rather than as a set of rules as indicated in the UDHR. In this context, it would appear that UDHR is not essential in teaching human rights.

Table 10. Percentage of Knowledge of the UDHR by Variables

Variables	N=	YES	NO	NA
Region				
NCR	715	32	65	2
IV	548	20	78	2
VII	317	23	76	1
ARMM	421	43	53	3
Gender				
Male	805	31	68	1
Female	1160	29	68	2
Ethnicity				
Christian	1503	25	73	2
Muslim	496	46	51	3
Geographic Classification				
Urban	1115	27	71	2
Partially Urban	886	34	63	3
Type of School				
Public	1215	35	62	3
Private	786	22	76	2

Legend: NA- No Answer

Based on regional variable, 43% of the ARMM respondents know UDHR. 46% of the Muslim respondents said they heard of or know the UDHR as compared to 25% of the Christian respondents. While only one out of five respondents (20%) from Region IV have heard of or known the UDHR. This is the lowest percentage of knowledge of UDHR based on regional variable.

More respondents from the partially urban areas (34%), than those from the urban areas (27%), have heard of or known the UDHR. Likewise, more public

school respondents (35%) know about the UDHR than the private school respondents (22%). Given the reputation that urban schools are "more advanced, more updated" than partially urban schools, and that private schools are better schools than public schools, these results are startling. Later findings would show that students from private schools performed better in terms of knowledge and comprehension of human rights.

Source of Knowledge of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

At least one-third of the respondents in each variable knew the UDHR because of Television/Radio, as indicated in the previous question. (Tables 11, 12 and 13) This is the highest percentage of source of knowledge of UDHR.

Table 11. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Source of Knowledge of the UDHR and Region

Sources	Region				
	NCR (n=232)	IV (n=110)	VII (n=74)	ARMM (n=183)	TOTAL (n=599)
Family/parents	10	8	1	4	7
Media	11	4	15	1	7
Newspapers, magazines	9	10	7	3	7
Television, radio	22	38	45	30	30
Internet, websites	3	2	1	0	2
Gov't. agencies	0	0	1	2	1
Neighbors	0	1	0	0	0
Schools	19	12	20	10	15
Legal documents	0	0	0	0	0
Others	0	4	3	2	2

Note: n= indicates number of respondents who have knowledge of the UDHR as indicated in Table 10.

Table 12. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Source of Knowledge of the UDHR and Gender & Type of School

Sources	Gender			Type of School		
	Male (n=249)	Female (n=340)	Total	Public (n=425)	Private (n=174)	Total
Family/parents	8	6	7	5	11	7
Media	5	8	7	7	7	7
Newspapers, magazines	8	6	7	6	10	7
Television, radio	29	32	31	32	27	30
Internet, websites	2	1	2	1	3	2
Gov't. agencies	0	1	1	1	0	1
Neighbors	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schools	18	14	15	13	20	15
Legal documents	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others	1	2	2	2	2	2

Note: n = number of respondents who have knowledge of the UDHR as indicated in Table 10.

Table 13. Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Source of Knowledge of the UDHR and Ethnicity & Geographic Classification

Sources	Ethnicity			Geographic Classification		
	Christian (n=372)	Muslim (n=227)	Total (n=599)	Urban (n=299)	Partially Urban (n=300)	Total (n=599)
Family/parents	7	7	7	9	5	7
Media	10	2	7	10	3	7
Newspapers, magazines	10	3	7	9	6	7
Television, radio	31	29	30	25	36	30
Internet, websites	2	0	2	3	0	2
Gov't. agencies	1	1	1	1	1	1
Neighbors	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schools	19	9	15	20	11	15
Legal documents	0	0	0	0	0	0
Others	2	2	2	1	2	2

Note: n = number of respondents who have knowledge of the UDHR as indicated in Table 10.

Only an average of 15% of the respondents learned about the UDHR through Schools. This low percentage again raises the question of the kind of human rights knowledge that students learn in school. This seems to imply that the UDHR is not at all perceived as a vital document that students in secondary schools must learn about. There is a need to revisit the approach used in the teaching of human rights and the UDHR in schools. Apparently, human rights can be taught and can be learned without referring to this international document.

Observance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

For those who have heard of or known the UDHR, an average of 60% of the respondents in most variables, except those from the private schools (52%), believe that human rights contained therein are to be observed in "all countries". (Table 14) The rest believe that the human rights are to be observed only in "some countries". One out of three respondents considers certain countries as not obliged to observe human rights. Again, these results reflect the possible inaccuracy of human rights knowledge of the respondents, especially since they knew or heard of UDHR through the non-interactive medium of the television/radio. (see Tables 11 to 13)

Table 14. Percentage of Knowledge of How the UDHR is to be Observed by Variables

Variables	N=	Some Countries	All Countries
Region			
NCR	232	35	61
IV	110	37	61
VII	74	34	65
ARMM	183	31	67
Gender			
Male	249	36	63
Female	340	33	63
Ethnicity			
Christian	372	37	60
Muslim	227	29	68

Variables	N=	Some Countries	All Countries
Geographic Classification			
Urban	299	34	63
Partially Urban	300	34	64
Type of School			
Public	425	30	68
Private	174	45	52

Legend: NA - No Answer

Consistent with the data in Table 14 where nearly 60% of the respondents believe that human rights should be observed in "all countries", Table 15 establishes almost the same opinion: that roughly 60% likewise think that "all human beings everywhere in the world" should enjoy human rights. Approximately 20% agree that "Some people in some countries" should enjoy human rights and another 20% attest that "All people in some countries" should enjoy human rights. These results project a foreboding sense that some of the respondents consider some people in some countries unworthy or unable to enjoy human rights. Could it be that this is the result of the lack of understanding or non-teaching of human rights principles like universality, interdependence, and inviolability of human rights? Would this be a reflection of their possible mis-education on human rights?

Table 15. Percentage of Knowledge of How the UDHR is to be Enjoyed by Variables

Variables	N=	Some people in some countries	All people in some countries	All human beings everywhere in the world
Region				
NCR	232	18	16	60
IV	110	23	25	49
VII	74	8	23	69
ARMM	183	17	24	54
Gender				
Male	249	19	24	54
Female	340	16	18	60
Variables	N=	Some people in some countries	All people in some countries	All human beings everywhere in the world
Ethnicity				
Christian	372	18	20	58
Muslim	227	16	23	56
Geographic Classification				
Urban	299	18	20	58
Partially Urban	300	17	22	57
Type of School				
Public	425	17	21	58
Private	174	17	21	56

Note: n= indicates number of respondents who have knowledge of the UDHR as indicated in Table 10.

Knowledge on the Convention on the Rights of the Child

There are more respondents who are aware of the United Nations' Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) than the UDHR (compare Table 10 with Table 16). At least half of the respondents in each variable have knowledge about the CRC. This seems to imply that schools accord more importance/priority to the rights of the child (Table 17). However, only about 3 out of 4 respondents who have knowledge on the rights of the child learned about this in school. The rest obtained their information elsewhere.

Teachers in the focus group discussion conveyed that they were more at ease with the CRC than the UDHR. The CRC is considered to be a “safer” content than the UDHR, which is often deemed as having more “militant” content.

Table 16. Percentage of Knowledge of the CRC by Variables

Variables	N=	YES	NO	NA
Region				
NCR	715	55	42	3
IV	548	51	45	4
VII	317	57	42	1
ARMM	421	67	31	3
Variables				
N=				
YES				
NO				
NA				
Gender				
Male	805	55	42	3
Female	1160	58	40	2
Ethnicity				
Christian	1505	52	45	3
Muslim	496	69	28	2
Geographic Classification				
Urban	1115	55	43	3
Partially Urban	886	59	38	3
Type of School				
Public	1215	64	34	2
Private	786	46	51	3

Legend: NA - No Answer

Table 17. Percentage Distribution of Respondents Who Perceived School as Source of Knowledge on the CRC by Variables

Variables	N=	YES	NO
Region			
NCR	394	77	22
IV	278	77	22
VII	181	90	9
ARMM	281	82	13
Gender			
Male	444	79	19
Female	672	81	17
Ethnicity			
Christian	790	79	20
Muslim	344	84	11
Geographic Classification			
Urban	608	78	20
Partially Urban	526	82	14
Type of School			
Public	775	83	14
Private	359	73	26

Legend: NA - No Answer

II. Knowledge and Comprehension of Human Rights Concepts

Section II of the questionnaire 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 these concepts to real-life situations. The respondents were asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement to the test items.

For reference, below is a complete list of the 21 statements with their corresponding correct responses.

Statements	Correct Response
1. The government gives us our human rights.	Disagree
2. All human beings are born equal.	Agree
3. Children and youth have rights that must be respected.	Agree
4. Human rights should be the concern of all.	Agree
5. By virtue of being human, we have rights.	Agree
6. Men and women are equal.	Agree
7. Only the state or government can protect our human rights.	Disagree
8. Rich people have more rights than the poor.	Disagree
9. If you want your rights respected, you must respect the rights of others.	Disagree
10. The use of force by the police to stop a rally is correct.	Disagree
11. Death penalty is a good way to prevent crime.	Disagree
12. Indigenous peoples/communities should only be governed by their customs and traditions and not by the laws of the state/country.	Disagree
13. Friends and neighbors should do something if they think parents are beating or injuring their children.	Agree
14. Government officials and religious leaders should be given special treatment because of their stature.	Disagree
15. It is acceptable that immigrants and refugees be allowed to become citizens of another country.	Agree
16. Every man and woman should decide whom to marry.	Agree
17. It is the responsibility of the state or government to provide employment.	Agree
18. Killing drug lords and terrorists without being charged in court is necessary to maintain peace and order.	Disagree
19. Failure to respect the rights of the physically disabled and those with intellectual disability is tolerated.	Disagree
20. Human rights means absolute freedom.	Disagree
21. The media should be allowed to make critical statements about the government.	Agree

Table 18 shows the sample's overall performance in the test as well as the average performance per variable. In general, the sample obtained a mean score of 14.26 equivalent to almost 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).

By variable, there is seemingly not much difference between the performance of the males and the females. The former got a mean score of 14.25 corresponding to a mean percent score of 67.86% and a standard deviation of 2.65, while the latter obtained a mean score of 14.34 equivalent to 68.29% with also a standard deviation of 2.65. The difference in their mean percentage scores seems very negligible, less than one percent (1%).

The same does not hold true, however, in the other groupings under the other variables since considerable differences in the mean percent scores were noted, with the highest observed in the variable 'ethnicity'. The computed mean percent scores for this variable indicate that the Christian-respondents performed better than their counterpart, the Muslim-respondents.

In terms of geographic classification, the urban students obtained a higher mean (\bar{x} = 14.77) than those from the partially urban (\bar{x} = 13.61). This means that those who come from the urban areas have better comprehension of human rights concepts than those from the partially urban areas do. This finding contradicts the earlier data that showed more respondents from the partially urban areas know the UDHR than those coming from the urban areas. It can be surmised that knowledge of the legal documents such as the UDHR does not automatically translate to application in human rights situations.

Comparing the private and public schools' average performances, the obtained means showed that the former (\bar{x} = 14.72) scored higher than the latter (\bar{x} = 13.96). This finding contradicts the earlier data that showed more respondents from the public schools know the UDHR than those coming from the private schools. It can be surmised that knowledge of the legal documents such as the UDHR does not automatically translate to application in human rights situations. This has implication on the methodology of the human rights education program being implemented.

Table 18 also reveals that among the regions, Region VII got the highest mean (\bar{x} = 15.27), followed closely by NCR (\bar{x} = 14.73), then Region IV (\bar{x} = 13.91) and ARMM (\bar{x} = 13.15). Statistically speaking, all regions performed well since even the lowest mean is satisfactory. These results show Region VII consistently performing very well and follow the same ranking of results by region on the general human rights knowledge question (Table 3). There seems to be a basis for further study of the human rights education program in Region VII, particularly in terms of content and methodology.

Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for Knowledge on Human Rights Concepts by Variables

Variables	n	Mean Score	Mean % Score	SD
Gender				
Male	805	14.25	67.86	2.65
Female	1160	14.34	68.29	2.65
Ethnicity				
Christian	1505	14.69	69.93	2.68
Muslim	496	12.96	61.69	2.59
Geographic Classification				
Urban	1115	14.77	70.32	2.82
Partially Urban	886	13.61	64.83	2.55
Type of School				
Public	1215	13.96	66.47	2.77
Private	786	14.72	70.07	2.68
Region				
NCR	715	14.73	70.12	2.87
IV	548	13.91	66.23	2.62
VII	317	15.27	72.72	2.29
ARMM	421	13.15	62.61	2.61
Overall	2001	14.26	67.90	2.76

No. of Items: 21

Looking closely into the performance of the sample by item across variables, Table 19 shows that in item 1 (**the government gives us our human rights**), percentages of correct responses are very low, ranging only from 20-27%, across all variables. This clearly indicates that a big majority of the respondents failed to recognize human rights as inherent in the person. It cannot be concluded, however, that the respondents lack awareness or understanding of Article 1 (all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights) of the UDHR because this conflicts with the findings for item 2 (**all human beings are born equal**). The respondents may have learned more about the power of government, and less about their own inherent rights and their (rights) relation to the government. They may have not learned about the obligation of the government to promote, protect and realize human rights.

In item 2 (**all human beings are born equal**), the correct response percentages are much higher, ranging from 62-78%. There is no significant difference between the correct response percentages of the males and the females, with 74% of the former providing correct response to the item and 71% of the latter having done the same. However, the differences in the correct response percentages between public and private students, between Christians and Muslims, between urban and partially urban respondents and among the regions seem to be significant, with private, Christian and urban respondents scoring higher than their

counterparts and with NCR respondents obtaining the highest correct response percentage (78%) among the regions, followed by Region VII (76%), then Region IV (70%) and ARMM (62%). Despite the disparity between groupings, the data still reveal that at least 62% of the sample showed knowledge and comprehension of Article 1 of the UHDR, which is about equality in dignity and rights among all the members of the human family.

Results for item 3 (**children and youths have rights that must be respected**) show very high correct response percentages (91% up) across all variables. This means that almost all of the respondents were completely aware that they, as young people, do not only have rights but that their rights must also be respected. Their knowledge of the CRC, with at least half of the respondents in each variable having knowledge about it (see Table 16), certainly contributed to their outstanding performance in this item.

Items 4 (**human rights should be the concern of all**) and 5 (**by virtue of being human, we have rights**) also obtained very high correct response percentages in all variables, with a general average of 91-92% per group. Results from ARMM have lower percentages compared to other regions, but still very high statistically speaking.

Table 19 is in a separate file “Chapter III – Tables19-20”

Space for Table 19 continued

Item 6 (**men and women are equal**) results seem to substantiate gender inequality in the Philippines. The percentages of correct responses by region ranged from 49% to 86%, geographical classification variable has 65% for partially urban and 81% for urban responses, and the ethnicity variable has Christians with 81% and Muslims with 53%. The gender variable has not much difference of 74% for males and 75% for females. The percentages of correct responses in all variables seem to suggest that a significant number of young people do not see equality between men and women. It could also be that their responses were meant to state what they see in society rather a statement of whether they believe in the principle or not.

In item 7, at least 80% of the respondents in each grouping across almost all the variables were correct by disagreeing to the statement that "**only the state or government can protect our human rights.**" This implies that the respondents are aware of the existence of other institutions protecting the human rights of the people.

In item 8, more than 81% of the respondents in each grouping across variables were correct by disagreeing that "**rich people have more rights than the poor.**" This evidently shows that most of the respondents believed in the equality of rights regardless of one's economic status in life.

For item 9 (**if you want your rights respected, you must respect the rights of others**), the correct response percentages across variable are very low, ranging from 0 - 7%, with Region VII surprisingly posting 0% correct answer considering that it is the region with 100% of the respondents having heard of or known human rights. Respecting rights is a proper behavior. However, the respondents seem to think that it should be a give-and-take arrangement. Human rights deserve respect from all and to all regardless of background or relationship. It would be necessary to emphasize in school the intrinsic value of human rights to every human being, regardless of relationships involved.

Noticeably, the percentage of correct response declined slightly for items 10 (**the use of force by the police to stop a rally is correct**), 11 (**death penalty is a good deterrent to crime**) and 12 (**indigenous peoples/tribes should only be governed by their customs and traditions and not by the laws of the country**). In item 10, the highest correct response percentage is only 70% posted by the urban students. Noteworthy is that, in this item, all the regions scored below 50%, a similar 33% for each region, the lowest across variables. These results indicate low awareness among respondents of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association (Article 19), and of the right to freedom of opinion and expression without interference (Article 20), as provided in the UDHR.

In item 11, the scores across variables range from 59% to 75%. This means that many respondents (25% to 40%) still see death penalty simply as deterrence to

crime, contrary to the United Nations view of putting premium to saving the life of people who commit serious crimes. Death penalty is seen internationally as a cruel and inhuman punishment. It is not considered to be an effective deterrent to crimes. It seems that the schools need to further emphasize Article 3 of the UDHR, which speaks about the right to life, liberty and security of a person, as well as Article 5 on rights against cruel and inhuman punishment, in addressing the issue of death penalty.

On item 12 about indigenous peoples, the respondents seem to display insufficient knowledge, with low correct scores ranging from 48% to 68% across variables. The lowest percentage of correct responses comes from Muslim- and ARMM-respondents, who probably put more weight on the right to self-determination. Admittedly, this item can be seen as a conflict of rights case if analyzed without a well-defined context.

Item 13 (**friends and neighbors should do something if they think parents are beating or injuring their children**) obtained a relatively high percentage of correct responses. The correct responses range from 78-93%, with NCR posting the highest percentage of 93. This data clearly support the results gathered for item 3 (**children and youth have rights that must be respected**). However, more respondents from private schools correctly agree to the item than those from public schools as reflected in their scores of 91% and 84%, respectively. The Christian respondents (90%) scored higher than their Muslim counterparts (79%), and those in urban areas (91%) have higher score over the partially urban respondents (82%).

The responses for items 14 (**government officials and religious leaders should be given special treatment because of their stature**) and 15 (**it is acceptable that immigrants and refugees be allowed to become citizens of another country**) reveal a similar trend of low scores as in items 10, 11, and 12 discussed above. For item 14, correct scores ranged from 48-73%, and 51-61% for item 15. The highest score is only 73% (for Region VII in item 14). The respondents' performance in item 14 was possibly influenced by the events they see and experience in their own localities. They seem to view power as an important consideration in human rights. They seem inclined to accept that those who are powerful have certain privileges at the expense of the human rights of those who are weak. Item 15 presents a complex issue. It relates to Article 13 of the UDHR on freedom of movement, Article 14 on the right to seek and enjoy asylum in other countries, as well to Article 15 on the right to a nationality. The question is, should immigrants and refugees be allowed to become citizens of their adopted country? In order to fully protect the rights involved it would be appropriate to allow them to opt for citizenship. But many of the respondents tend to disagree with this view.

For items 16 (**every man and woman should decide whom to marry**) and 17 (**it is the responsibility of the state or government to provide employment**), 82%

and above of the respondents, across variables, got these items correctly. Noteworthy is the 82% and 86% correct percentages for the Muslim and ARMM respondents in item 16 regarding freedom to marry one's choice although the other groupings have 89% and above correct responses. While the correct responses are generally high, there is probably still a need to further understand the reason(s) behind these responses.

On "**killing drug lords and terrorists without being charged in court as necessary to maintain peace and order**" (item 18), the correct answers ranged from 52-71%. Considering however that the statement is a very clear violation of human rights, with very grave consequence (death), it is significant that a big number of respondents agree to it. Could this be reflective of the current situation of the country where suspected criminals are liable to be killed without due process? Or is this a case of ignorance of specific human rights principles such as due process, and presumption of innocence? Or is this indicative of the problem of seeing human rights as values, rather than rules that require strict adherence? The same trend is seen in item 19 (**failure to respect the rights of the physically disabled and those with intellectual disability is tolerated**) where, at most, only 75% of the respondents provided correct answers. Could this again be a case of ignorance of the principle of equality and non-discrimination applied to a particular set of people?

Item 20 (**human rights means absolute freedom**) is another item with very low correct responses. The highest correct response percentage is only 50%, noted with Region VII. Clearly, this is an indication of insufficient knowledge of Article 29 (2) of UDHR on the limitation of the exercise of rights and freedom. It would seem that students equate human rights with license to do whatever one pleases. This view seems to contradict what the respondents generally agreed to in item 9 (**if you want your rights respected, you must respect the rights of others**). On one hand, rights are seen as dependent on reciprocity, while on the other hand they are freedom not hindered by anything. These are two misconceptions occupying the opposite sides of the pendulum. This is one area that teachers need to clarify with the students.

Finally, in item 21 (**the media should be allowed to make critical statements about the government**), the respondents across variables got relatively higher correct response percentages, ranging from 58-70%. Muslim respondents scored higher (69%) than their Christian counterparts (63%) while ARMM got the highest percentage (69%) score by region. The usually high scoring Region VII obtained the lowest score (58%). This may mean that the Muslim and ARMM respondents are more aware of the right to freedom of opinion and expression as articulated in Article 19 of the UDHR. This may also mean that they are influenced by the prevailing armed conflict situation in their region, with the government having a part in the problem.