

III. Human Rights Situations (Proper Action to take)

In this section, the survey questionnaire probed into the respondents' application of their human rights awareness on real-life situations. Ten situations illustrating problems regarding drug addiction, child labor, agricultural subsidy allowed by the World Trade Organization (WTO), childrens' right to education, right of indigenous peoples, right to peaceful assembly, right of abode, terrorism, theft, and right to fair trial were presented. The respondents were asked to choose from among three options referring to actions that they or the government (and other institutions) could take in the situations presented.

A. Knowledge About Human Rights Situations by Variables

In terms of gender, 87% of the female respondents answered correctly and 84% of the males did the same on **item 1** which asks the question on what the local government should do to suspected drug pushers in the community. They agreed that these people should be "**arrested and put to trial,**" rather than shame them through the media or shoot them if caught.

Respondents from private schools (90%) have higher percentage of correct responses than those from the public schools (83%). 89% of the Christian respondents answered correctly while 76% of the Muslim respondents did the same. 88% of the urban respondents gave correct responses while 83% of the partially urban respondents did the same. By region, respondents from region VII scored highest with 95% of correct answers, followed by NCR (89%), Region IV (84%) and ARMM (76%).

When asked about **item 2** regarding 12-year old children being employed as workers by a cement factory, percentage of correct responses across gender, type of school, ethnicity, geographic location and regions went down. The correct response, that is, **the factory should hire the parents instead of the children,** only ranged from 38 - 50%. All respondents gave more wrong answers than correct ones, with Region VII getting 50% correct while all others scored below 50%. The low percentage of correct responses may indicate several possible explanations: that at this age level, the respondents could be unexposed to the situation, or were too young to think about work and the protection or welfare of child laborers, or unaware of the law on child labor.

The respondents also obtained low scores regarding the WTO allowing developed countries to continue giving subsidy/financial support to their agricultural industry that gives them advantage over developing countries (**Item 3**). The percentage of correct response (**no, because it is unfair to developing countries**) ranged only from 32 - 51% across all variables with Region VII getting 51% correct and Region IV, the lowest with 32%. One possible explanation could be their lack of familiarity with the WTO and the lack of knowledge on the continuing dominance of developed countries over the developing ones.

When asked about right to education (**Item 4**), the scores across variables went higher with the private schools registering 80% correct responses (**a child should be allowed to enroll even without a birth certificate**). The range of correct responses was between 61 - 80%. It can be surmised that the respondents are aware of their right to education and possibly could identify with the child from a poor family illustrated by the given situation.

A relatively high percentage of correct answers came up on Item 5 about illegal logging in the ancestral land of an indigenous/tribal community. Most gave the correct answer that the **"government should respect the right of the community to their ancestral land by stopping illegal logging."** The correct responses across variables ranged from 79 - 96%. The respondents' awareness of illegal logging may have been obtained through the media, or their own actual experiences, or the school. The concept of ancestral land of indigenous communities may not however be as familiar to the respondents as illegal logging (and the destruction of the environment that results from it). There is a possibility therefore that the respondents, in giving the correct answer in this item, might not necessarily be respecting the ancestral land of the indigenous peoples but were conscious of the right to safe and balanced ecology.

In a situation where a rally is held to protest electricity fee increase and the consequent slowing down of the traffic (**Item 6**), 79-93% believed that the police should either disperse the rally or tell the group to hold its rally elsewhere. A very low percentage of correct answer (**the police should allow the group to continue with the rally**), ranging from 7-21%, showed students' very low awareness of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association (Article 19), and the right to freedom of opinion and expression without interference (Article 20) of the UDHR. Could this be caused by lack of experience in joining rallies or witnessing them in their respective areas?

It seems that respondents were not sympathetic to squatters living along the routes that important foreign guests and dignitaries pass. They view their houses as eyesores that give a bad impression of the country to foreign visitors. This links to the earlier question on giving privileges to the "haves" and the powerful at the expense of the rights of those who are weak. It is also possible that the respondents do not live in squatters' areas hence their unsympathetic attitude. It can also be attributed to lack of awareness of Article 25 of the UDHR on the right to standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of the family, including housing. These reasons may explain why majority (73-85%) of the respondents agreed that the squatters' houses should be either demolished because they are eyesores or relocated temporarily while the foreign visitor is still in the country (**Item 7**). Only 15-27% of the respondents said they should be left as they are. They may not be aware that demolishing peoples' homes and relocating them temporarily may actually violate right to housing.

Is the government decision to put up road checkpoints for its "anti-terrorism" and "peace and order program" (Item 8) correct? Only 7-13% perceived the government was correct because rights could be limited by threats to peace. Most of them (87-93%) answered that the government was right because it is for the protection of the people. It appears that most respondents do not mind restricting their rights if this means protection from terrorism and disorder.

A high percentage of the respondents (83-95%) were very much aware of what the police should do if they catch someone running away with goods taken from a store (**Item 9**). Most of them answered that **the police should bring the person to the police station for questioning**, rather than beat the person right there and then or let the person go free after receiving bribe money. This perception may mean that respondents know that stealing is as bad as bribery and doing physical harm on persons caught stealing. It is noteworthy that while bribery and violence are almost ordinary occurrences, respondents did not condone these acts and insisted on having the person caught in the act of stealing properly investigated. Although they might not be even aware of Article 5 (UDHR) on cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, respondents perceived that people should be brought to court for a fair hearing on any charge against them (Article 10).

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

Space for Table 20 Continued

When asked whether or not a suspected terrorist has the right to be presumed innocent of a crime (**item 10**), respondents' percentage of correct answer of **yes** fell below 50%. The correct answers ranged from 29-48%, which mean that majority of the respondents did not think that suspected terrorists enjoy this right. This may mean that the respondents were not familiar with the principle of presumption of innocence stated in the UDHR, and the necessity of proving the crime in open court. Would their answer be different if the person involved was not a "suspected terrorist"? Could it be that they were not taught about the rights of suspects or those who are criminally charged, which exist regardless of the crime involved? Or could it be that the word "terrorist" is feared so much that made them think that anyone suspected of being a terrorist has no right to be presumed innocent? The same observation may explain the answer of the majority of the respondents in Item 8 about restricting rights due to terrorism.

There seems to be a trend in the way the respondents applied their knowledge on human rights to real life situations. When situations are within the purview of their personal and immediate community life, or are familiar because of newspapers and other forms of media, respondents tend to get more correct answers. However, when the situations involve broader concepts related to human rights and affect a broader mass of people (such as peace, labor rights, economics, standard of living, acts of protest and terrorism), the respondents' reaction seemed **to be based on very narrow perspective**. This may have led to low percentages of correct answers. (see Table 20)

IV. Knowledge of Human Rights Violations

Section IV is a 9-item test measuring the respondents' knowledge of human rights violations. The respondents were asked to identify whether the situations constitute violations 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:

Statements	Correct Response
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, as gleaned in Table 21, the respondents 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.

By gender variable, similar to the results obtained in Section II, there is a very minimal difference between the mean percent scores of the males and the females, 0.45% to be exact. However, the groupings in other variables show relatively significant differences in their mean percent scores. For instance, the Christian-respondents obtained at least 65% of correct responses, while their counterparts got at least 53%; the urban and the private school respondents also obtained higher mean percent scores than their counterparts. Among the regions, Region VII got the highest mean percent score of 68.44%, followed closely by NCR (67.33%), then by Region IV (60%) and ARMM (52%).

Noteworthy is the fact that the groupings with better performance under each variable in Section II (i.e., Christians, urban, private school and Region VII respondents) are also the same groupings that scored higher in Section IV. Thus, there is consistency in the performance of the groupings across variables in both tests (Section II and IV).

Table 21. Descriptive Statistics for Knowledge on Human Rights Violations by Variables

Variables	N	Mean Score	Mean % Score	SD
Gender				
Male	805	5.59	62.11	2.06
Female	1160	5.63	62.56	2.07
Ethnicity				
Christian	1505	5.88	65.33	2.09
Muslim	496	4.78	53.11	1.83
Geographic Classification				
Urban	1115	5.95	66.11	2.82
Partially Urban	886	5.17	57.44	2.55
Type of School				
Public	1215	5.38	59.78	2.77
Private	786	5.95	66.11	2.68
Region				
NCR	715	6.06	67.33	2.87
IV	548	5.40	60.00	2.62

VII	317	6.16	68.44	2.29
ARMM	421	4.68	52.00	2.61
Overall	2001	5.60	62.22	2.08

No. of Items: 9

By item and across variables, in **item 1 (a person is kept in jail for a long period without trial)**, the correct response percentages ranged from 57-81%. This means that more than half of the respondents were able to identify the situation described in the item as a human right violation, particularly of the right not to be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile (Article 9 of the UDHR).

In terms of gender, the males (72%) and the females (71%) clearly did not differ in their performance. However, in terms of the other variables, the Muslims, partially urban and public students scored lower than their counterparts. Among the regions, Region VII scored the highest (81%), while ARMM performed the poorest (57%).

For **item 2 (people in a country die because they have no money to buy food)**, the percentage of correct responses across all variables went down, with a range of 43-49%. This means that a little more than half of the respondents did not consider the depicted situation a violation of human rights. On one hand, respondents might have thought that each person has the obligation to take care of her/himself. Failure to fulfill this obligation is their own fault. On the other hand, the situation presented could also be interpreted as a result of a system affected by corruption and discrimination by government officials or by government policies that affect employment opportunities and social security of the people. In this sense, the resulting death due to poverty becomes a human right violation. This latter interpretation might not have been thought of by many respondents.

At least 63% of the respondents across all variables were able to identify the situation in **item 3 (a person is jailed for criticizing the government)** as a violation of human rights, with Region VII scoring the highest (68%) across variables.

In **item 4 (only one political party is allowed to participate in the elections)**, by geographic classification, the urban respondents scored higher (66%) than the partially urban respondents (58%). Responses of the other groupings combined across the variables is 62.5%. Could the responses of the partially urban students be reflective of the partially urban situations where one political party always wins the elections, despite participation of other political parties?

On the case of children not being able to go to school because they have to earn a living (**item 5**), the percentage of correct responses ranged from 41-80%. A large disparity was noted across variables except for gender.

In terms of geographic classification, respondents from the urban areas performed better (71%) than the partially urban respondents (54%). While 58% of the public school respondents were able to identify the situation as a violation, 72% of the respondents from private schools gave the correct answer. Percentages of correct responses below 50% were obtained among Muslim and ARMM respondents. The responses which support the view that the situation did not constitute a human rights violation raise questions. Could this mean that they consider earning a livelihood, which is also a right, of higher importance than right to education? Could it be that they consider the situation normal or unavoidable, and thus acceptable? Considering the poverty situation in partially urban and rural areas, there is a high probability that people view child labor, even if recognized as adversely affecting children, as a necessity. These findings call for a more focused study of Article 26, on the right to education, and a more thorough discussion of child labor, in schools particularly public schools in partially urban areas. It is at the same time noted that the **item 5** situation is not an easy one.

The respondents' knowledge of the right specified in Article 5 of UDHR (no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment) seemed to be high as percentages of correct responses across variables in **item 6 (teachers beat the children because they are quarrelsome)** were fairly high (at least 63%). But the fact remains that a significant number of respondents in different variables (averaging 35% to 45%) support corporal punishment. This indicates the need for more discussion on at least the application of concept of cruel treatment to the situation of children and the CRC provision on the right of children not to be subjected to any physical or mental violence, injury or abuse. Indeed, these matters must be looked into by the local authorities.

Gender inequality is clearly an issue in **item 7 (women are not given jobs because they are for men)**. Across all variables, the percentages of correct answers ranged from 40% to 78%. The below 50% percentages from Muslim and ARMM respondents have to be probed further. Could there be cultural explanation for the responses from the Muslim and ARMM respondents? Are there jobs that are considered exclusively for males and thus cannot be given to women? On the other hand, the statement can be interpreted in a general sense, that women are not given jobs because of their gender, not so much because the jobs are only for men. The latter case supports the view that the statement is discriminatory against women and thus a human rights violation.

For **item 8 (a house-owner refuses to rent the house to a family from another province/region/country)**, the percentages of correct response went down, 62% being the highest. Respondents who answered that there is no human rights violation involved may have thought that this is a simple case of a property owner exercising a right (not to rent out) regarding the property. They may not be

aware that the case may involve prejudice against people who come from another place (within the country or outside).

It can be surmised that the respondents' idea of discrimination may be confined with identity, religion/ethnicity, gender, and race-based discrimination and not on other social discrimination such as class and place of origin.

Finally, for **item 9 (wages are kept low to encourage foreign investments)**, the same trend in item 8 was detected, with 63% as the highest percentage of correct response. But in terms of region as variable, ARMM posted the highest percentage. Muslim and the partially urban respondents scored higher than their counterparts. It is necessary to note that some respondents (at least 30%) viewed the situation as not violative of human rights. They could have thought of foreign investment in terms of job opportunities, giving more weight to getting employed with a meager income than having no job at all. (see Table 22)

Table 22. Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Correct Answers on Human Rights Violations

Situations	Region				Gender		Ethnicity		Geo Class		School	
	NCR	IV	VII	ARMM	M	F	Chris	Mu s	Urban	P Urban	Pub	Pri
1. A person is kept in jail for a long period without any trial.	78	67	81	57	72	71	75	57	77	63	68	75
2. People in a country die because they have no money to buy food.	49	45	47	43	46	47	47	44	48	45	46	46
3. A person is jailed for criticizing the government.	63	64	68	64	64	65	64	65	64	65	64	64
4. Only one political party is allowed to participate in the elections.	69	59	72	50	63	62	73	50	66	58	60	67
5. A large number of children cannot go to school because they have to earn their livelihood.	73	59	80	41	64	63	70	43	71	54	58	72
6. Teachers beat the children because they are quarrelsome.	81	70	81	55	71	73	78	57	80	63	69	78

Table 22 (cont.)

Situations	Region				Gender		Ethnicity		Geo Class		School	
	NCR	IV	VII	ARMM	M	F	Chris	Mu s	Urban	P Urban	Pub	Pri
7. Women are not given jobs because they are for men.	72	60	78	40	64	63	71	40	70	55	57	73
8. A house-owner refuses to rent the house to a family from another province / region / country.	62	55	49	55	54	59	56	59	59	53	57	56
9. Wages are kept low to encourage foreign investments.	59	61	60	62	61	60	60	63	59	62	58	64

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

What is being described as follows are the processes, materials and methodologies which make up the experiences of teachers in teaching human rights and of students in learning human rights. The data also provide the overall orientation of schools comprising their ethos, culture, and ideology relative to human rights.

Table 23 shows the following patterns:

Majority of the respondents across the four regions surveyed regardless of their gender, ethnicity, geographic location, and type of school were taught human rights in school. Region VII registered the most number of respondents who were taught human rights in school with 99.05% while Region IV recorded the least with 92.15%.

Table 23. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Whether They are Taught Human Rights in School by Variables

Variables	Response							
	Yes		No		NA		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region								
NCR	668	93.43	34	4.76	13	1.82	715	100
IV	505	92.15	34	6.20	9	1.64	548	100
VII	314	99.05	2	0.63	1	0.32	317	100
ARMM	396	94.06	24	5.70	1	0.24	421	100
Gender								
Male	741	92.05	53	6.58	11	1.37	805	100
Female	1112	95.86	41	3.53	7	0.60	1160	100
Ethnicity								
Christian	1414	93.95	68	4.52	23	1.53	1505	100
Muslim	469	94.56	26	5.24	1	0.20	496	100
Geographic Classification								
Urban	1044	93.63	52	4.66	19	1.70	1115	100
Partially Urban	839	94.70	42	4.74	5	0.56	886	100
Type of School								
Public	1154	94.98	47	3.87	14	1.15	1215	100
Private	729	92.75	47	5.98	10	1.27	786	100

Table 24 shows that 13.42% of the respondents said that they were taught human rights as a separate subject. Majority of them were Muslims, males, from ARMM, partially urban area, and public school. Focus group discussion with the respondents clarified their concept of separate subject as similar to a separate topic taught within a subject. 69.1% of the respondents said they were taught human rights as part of their subjects. Human rights, in this case, were integrated in the different lessons within different subjects. Of those who learned human rights as part of the subjects, majority of them were Christians, females, from Region VII, urban area, and private school. 17.11% of the respondents were taught human rights as part of extra/co-curricular activities. Majority of them were Muslims, males, from ARMM, partially urban area, and public school. From these results, the teaching of human rights in the Philippines appears to be dominated by the integration approach where human rights concepts are integrated in identified entry points in the curriculum. In this approach, the human rights concepts and values to be integrated are determined by the specific subjects or lessons where these are to be integrated.

Table 24. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to How Human Rights are Taught in School by Variables

Variables	Response									
	As a separate subject		As part of Subjects		As part of extra curricular activities		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	62	9.28	503	75.30	103	15.42	0	0.00	668	100
IV	72	14.26	345	68.32	85	16.83	3	0.59	505	100
VII	18	5.73	258	82.17	36	11.46	2	0.64	314	100
ARMM	96	24.24	214	54.04	84	21.21	2	0.51	396	100
Gender										
Male	107	14.44	479	64.64	153	20.65	2	0.27	741	100
Female	138	12.41	818	73.56	151	13.58	5	0.45	1112	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	128	9.05	1072	75.81	209	14.78	5	0.35	1414	100
Muslim	120	25.59	248	52.88	99	21.11	2	0.43	469	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	101	9.67	792	75.86	149	14.27	2	0.19	1044	100
Partially Urban	147	17.52	528	62.93	159	18.95	5	0.60	839	100
Type of School										
Public	192	16.64	754	65.34	204	17.68	4	0.35	1154	100
Private	56	7.68	566	77.64	104	14.27	3	0.41	729	100

It can be surmised from Table 25 A-D that majority of the respondents were taught human rights across the four regions surveyed regardless of gender and geographic classification in subjects such as Social Studies, History, English and others such as Values Education and Filipino. Majority of Christian respondents were taught human rights in Social Studies, History, English, and other courses such as Values Education and Filipino while majority of Muslim respondents were taught human rights in English, Social Studies, History, and Music, Art, Physical Education (PE). Values Education is often perceived as oriented to Christian values while Filipino is considered a second language among Muslim Filipinos. This could explain why Muslim respondents as revealed in the FGD did not consider being taught human rights much in these subjects.

Human rights are taught minimally in Mathematics compared to other subjects in public schools while private schools do not teach human rights much in technical

and skills subjects such as Science, Mathematics, and Music, Arts, PE. It can be gleaned that public schools integrate human rights in almost all subjects whenever possible while private schools are more focused on few subjects.

Table 25-A. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Subjects in which Teaching of Human Rights is Included and by Gender

Subjects	Gender					
	Male (n=479)		Female (n=818)		Total (n=1297)	
	F	%	f	%	f	%
English	109	22.76	231	28.24	340	26.21
Science	57	11.90	129	15.77	186	9.47
Mathematics	37	7.72	51	6.23	88	4.48
Social studies	403	84.13	650	79.46	1053	53.59
Music, Arts, PE	76	15.87	174	21.27	250	12.72
History	177	36.95	315	38.51	492	25.04
Others	116	24.22	235	28.73	351	17.86

Table 25-B. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Subjects in which Teaching of Human Rights is Included and by Type of School

Subjects	Type of School					
	Public (n=754)		Private (n=566)		Total (n=1320)	
	F	%	f	%	f	%
English	249	33.02	99	17.49	348	26.36
Science	155	20.56	37	6.54	192	14.55
Mathematics	67	8.89	23	4.06	90	6.82
Social studies	577	76.53	487	86.04	1064	80.61
Music, Arts, PE	210	27.85	45	7.95	255	19.32
History	249	33.02	207	36.57	456	34.55
Others	182	24.14	177	31.27	359	27.20

Table 25-C. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Subjects in which Teaching of Human Rights is Included and by Ethnicity

Subjects	Ethnicity					
	Christian (n=1072)		Muslim (n=248)		Total (n=1320)	
	F	%	f	%	f	%
English	256	23.88	192	77.42	448	33.94
Science	118	11.01	74	29.84	192	14.55
Mathematics	56	5.22	34	13.71	90	6.82
Social studies	940	87.69	124	50.00	1064	80.61
Music, Arts, PE	157	14.65	98	39.52	255	19.32
History	392	36.57	109	43.95	501	37.95
Others	329	30.69	30	12.10	359	27.20

Table 25-D. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Subjects in which Teaching of Human Rights is Included and by Geographic Classification

Subjects	Geographic Classification					
	Urban (n=792)		Partially Urban (n=528)		Total (n=1320)	
	F	%	f	%	f	%
English	203	25.63	145	27.46	348	26.36
Science	100	12.63	92	17.42	192	14.55
Mathematics	50	6.31	40	7.58	90	6.82
Social studies	688	86.87	376	71.21	1064	80.61
Music, Arts, PE	123	15.53	132	25.00	255	19.32
History	306	38.64	195	36.93	501	37.95
Others	230	29.04	129	24.43	359	27.20

Majority of the respondents regardless of region, gender, ethnicity, geographic location, and type of school said that they were taught human rights "frequently". Table 26 shows that majority of respondents from NCR (51.33%) and Region VII (60.87%), while a significant number from Region IV and ARMM, were taught human rights "frequently". However, in the "very frequently" response category, 40% of the ARMM students chose this. The armed conflict situation in ARMM might have provided the impetus for a more frequent exposure of students to human rights lessons. It is also surprising that there were more students in NCR (35.04%) who said they were taught "occasionally", than region VII (28.62%). Why is it that NCR which has more access to resources on human rights education, has also a lower percentage of respondents saying human rights are taught "frequently" (51.33%) than Region VII (60.87%)? Further studies on the human rights education program in Region VII may be conducted to identify best practices.

Table 26. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to How Often Human Rights are Taught by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Occasionally		Frequently		Very frequently		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	198	35.04	290	51.33	73	12.92	4	0.71	565	100
IV	144	34.53	185	44.36	84	20.14	4	0.96	417	100
VII	79	28.62	168	60.87	29	10.51	0	0.00	276	100
ARMM	54	17.42	128	41.29	124	40.00	4	1.29	310	100
Gender										
Male	198	33.79	289	49.32	94	16.04	5	0.85	586	100
Female	271	28.35	469	49.06	210	21.97	6	0.63	956	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	408	34.00	620	51.67	164	13.67	8	0.67	1200	100
Muslim	67	18.21	151	41.03	146	39.67	4	1.09	368	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	304	34.04	455	50.95	129	14.45	5	0.56	893	100
Partially Urban	171	25.33	316	46.81	181	26.81	7	1.04	675	100
Type of School										
Public	205	21.67	476	50.32	257	27.17	8	0.85	946	100
Private	270	43.41	295	47.43	53	8.52	4	0.64	622	100

Majority of the respondents listed debate, discussion with resource persons, group work, project, and library work as activities used in school to teach human rights. Gender was not an issue in the selection of activities in teaching human rights. Christians would most likely be taught human rights through debate while Muslims would most likely be taught human rights through group work and discussion with resource persons. Respondents from both urban and partially urban areas and from private and public schools were most likely taught human rights through debate, group work, and discussion with resource persons.

Majority of the respondents across variables as shown in Table 27 A-D, except the Muslims, identified debate as the top learning activity for human rights education.

Majority of Muslim respondents were exposed the most to group work and discussion with resource persons, and less likely engaged in debate, in learning about human rights. In the focus group discussion among respondents and teachers, they explained that debate among students was not used often as a

teaching strategy to avoid conflict between Christians and Muslims on one hand, and among Muslims on the other. They fear that the tension brought by debate may inadvertently extend outside the classroom.

Table 27-A. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Activities Engaged in When Taught Human Rights and by Gender

Activities	Gender					
	Male (n=741)		Female (n=1112)		Total (n=1853)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Debates	408	55.06	626	56.29	1034	55.80
Group work	375	50.61	528	47.48	903	48.73
Project	225	30.36	319	28.69	544	29.36
Discussion with resource person	352	47.50	548	49.28	900	48.57
Research/library work	249	33.60	349	31.38	598	32.27
Games	139	18.76	233	20.95	372	20.08
Project development	154	20.78	211	18.97	365	19.70
Others	61	8.23	90	8.09	151	8.15

Table 27-B. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Activities Engaged in When Taught Human Rights and Type of School

Activities	Type of School					
	Public (n=1154)		Private (n=729)		Total (n=1883)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Debates	617	53.47	430	58.98	1047	55.60
Group work	620	53.73	294	40.33	914	48.54
Project	340	29.46	212	29.08	552	29.31
Discussion with resource person	577	50.00	333	45.68	910	48.33
Research/library work	375	32.50	229	31.41	604	32.08
Games	261	22.62	116	15.91	377	20.02
Project development	258	22.36	112	15.36	370	19.65
Others	92	7.97	63	8.64	155	8.23

Table 27-C. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Activities Engaged in When Taught Human Rights and Ethnicity

Activities	Ethnicity					
	Christian (n=1414)		Muslim (n=469)		Total (n=1883)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Debates	887	62.73	160	34.12	1047	55.60
Group work	684	48.37	230	49.04	914	48.54
Project	369	26.10	183	39.02	552	29.31
Discussion with resource person	701	49.58	209	44.56	910	48.33
Research/library work	416	29.42	188	40.09	604	32.08
Games	236	16.69	141	30.06	377	20.02
Project development	229	16.20	141	30.06	370	19.65
Others	108	7.64	47	10.02	155	8.23

Table 27-D. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Activities Engaged in When Taught Human Rights and Geographic Classification

Activities	Geographic Classification					
	Urban (n=1044)		Partially Urban (n=839)		Total (n=1883)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Debates	673	64.46	374	44.58	1047	55.60
Group work	547	52.39	367	43.74	914	48.54
Project	271	25.96	281	33.49	552	29.31
Discussion with resource person	511	48.95	399	47.56	910	48.33
Research/library work	325	31.13	279	33.25	604	32.08
Games	187	17.91	190	22.65	377	20.02
Project development	184	17.62	186	22.17	370	19.65
Others	80	7.66	75	8.94	155	8.23

Tables 28 A-D indicate the following:

Both male and female respondents regardless of ethnicity and geographic classification were frequently taught human rights using textbooks, newspaper clippings, and published articles/stories. However, those in private schools used textbooks the most while those in the public frequently used newspaper clippings, magazines, and articles. In the focus group discussion, teachers in the public schools admitted that they had to be creative amidst the utter lack of materials and facilities in public schools. This reflects the lack of textbooks as the perennial problem in the public school system.

Table 28-A. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Materials Used When Taught Human Rights and by Gender

Materials	Gender					
	Male (n=479)		Female (n=818)		Total (n=1297)	
	F	%	f	%	f	%
Textbooks	294	61.38	505	61.74	799	61.60
Copies of Laws	139	17.27	197	16.98	336	17.10
UN documents	46	5.71	55	4.74	101	5.14
Audio/visual aids	126	15.65	172	14.83	298	15.17

Table 28-A. (cont.)

Materials	Gender					
	Male (n=479)		Female (n=818)		Total (n=1297)	
	F	%	f	%	f	%
Newspaper clippings, magazines	231	28.70	414	35.69	645	32.82
Articles/stories	227	28.20	424	36.55	651	33.13

Table 28-B. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Materials Used When Taught Human Rights and Type of School

Materials	Type of School					
	Public (n=754)		Private (n=566)		Total(n=1320)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Textbooks	339	44.96	472	83.39	811	61.44
Copies of Laws	143	18.97	196	34.63	339	25.68
UN documents	67	8.89	34	6.01	101	7.65
Audio/visual aids	164	21.75	136	24.03	300	22.73
Newspaper clippings, magazines	395	52.39	259	45.76	654	49.55
Articles/stories	367	48.67	294	51.94	661	50.08

Table 28-C. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Materials Used When Taught Human Rights and Ethnicity

Materials	Ethnicity					
	Christian (n=1072)		Muslim (n=248)		Total(n=1320)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Textbooks	646	60.26	165	66.53	811	61.44
Copies of Laws	266	24.81	73	29.44	339	25.68
UN documents	70	6.53	31	12.50	101	7.65
Audio/visual aids	276	25.75	24	9.68	300	22.73
Newspaper clippings, magazines	524	48.88	130	52.42	654	49.55
Articles/stories	571	53.26	90	36.29	661	50.08

Table 28-D. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Materials Used When Taught Human Rights and Geographic Classification

Materials	Geographic Classification					
	Urban (n=792)		Partially Urban (n=528)		Total (n=1320)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Textbooks	493	62.25	318	60.23	811	61.44
Copies of Laws	185	23.36	154	29.17	339	25.68
UN documents	64	8.08	37	7.01	101	7.65
Audio/visual aids	218	27.53	82	15.53	300	22.73
Newspaper clippings, magazines	420	53.03	234	44.32	654	49.55
Articles/stories	446	56.31	215	40.72	661	50.08

Tables 29 A-D reveal that community work, making pamphlets and newsletters, and celebration of human rights week were the top off-classroom activities related to human rights for the majority of respondents across variables. Rallies for human rights are least participated in by most respondents. An average of 30.56% of the students across gender, 30.28% across type of school, ethnicity and geographic classification, engaged in the three top off-classroom activities. Only an average of 17.91% of the students across variables participated in rallies for human rights.

Majority of the Muslim respondents participated in all activities listed including rallies for human rights. Majority of Christian respondents participated the least in rallies for human rights and human rights club. Male respondents outnumbered female respondents in participating in almost all off-classroom activities mentioned except in community fieldwork.

Majority of respondents from urban and partially urban areas participated the most in community fieldwork and the least in rallies for human rights. Majority of respondents from public and private schools participated the most in community fieldwork. Those in the public schools participated the least in rallies for human rights while those in the private school participated the least in joining human rights club and rallies for human rights.

It can be surmised from the foregoing that participating in rallies for human rights was not a popular human rights activity except among the Muslim respondents. Rallies seemed to be perceived in a negative light. Private schools were not also inclined to encourage students to organize and join human rights organizations. These organizations as reflected in the FGDs were perceived to be haven for student activism which could threaten the business aspect of the existence of private schools.

Table 29-A. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Activities Participated in Regarding Human Rights and by Gender

Activities	Gender					
	Male (n=805)		Female (n=1160)		Total (n=1965)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community field work	269	33.42	420	36.21	689	35.06
Rallies for human rights	170	21.12	181	15.60	351	17.86
Making newsletters, pamphlets	233	28.94	297	25.60	530	26.97
Celebration of human rights week	268	33.29	315	27.16	583	29.67
Joining human rights club	202	25.09	235	20.26	437	22.24
Others	64	7.95	81	6.98	145	7.38

Table 29-B. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Activities Participated in Regarding Human Rights and Type of School

Activities	Type of School					
	Public (n=1215)		Private (n=786)		Total (n=2001)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community field work	469	38.60	226	28.75	695	34.73
Rallies for human rights	256	21.07	103	13.10	359	17.94
Making newsletters, pamphlets	386	31.77	151	19.21	537	26.84
Celebration of human rights week	389	32.02	197	25.06	586	29.29
Joining human rights club	359	29.55	81	10.31	440	21.99
Others	101	8.31	49	6.23	150	7.50

Table 29-C. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Activities Participated in Regarding Human Rights and Ethnicity

Activities	Ethnicity					
	Christian (n=1505)		Muslim (n=496)		Total (n=2001)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community field work	489	32.49	206	41.53	695	34.73
Rallies for human rights	195	12.96	164	33.06	359	17.94
Making newsletters,	379	25.18	158	31.85	537	26.84

pamphlets						
Celebration of human rights week	422	28.04	164	33.06	586	29.29
Joining human rights club	253	16.81	187	37.70	440	21.99
Others	97	6.45	53	10.69	150	7.50

Table 29-D. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Activities Participated in Regarding Human Rights and Geographic Classification

Activities	Geographic Location					
	Urban (n=1115)		Partially Urban (n=886)		Total (n=2001)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community field work	364	32.65	331	37.36	695	34.73
Rallies for human rights	163	14.62	196	22.12	359	17.94
Making newsletters, pamphlets	298	26.73	239	26.98	537	26.84
Celebration of human rights week	358	32.11	228	25.73	586	29.29
Joining human rights club	200	17.94	240	27.09	440	21.99
Others	82	7.35	68	7.67	150	7.50

Table 30 shows that majority of respondents in NCR, Region IV, and VII participated "once in while" in human rights activities, while respondents from ARMM participated often. This contradicts the data in Table 26 when respondents from all the regions claimed they were "frequently" taught human rights. There seems to be discrepancy between frequency of teaching and actual participation. Majority of male and female respondents in urban and partially urban areas regardless of type of school participated "once in a while" in human rights activities. Majority of Christian respondents participated "once in while" in human rights activities while Muslim respondents participated "often". This can be explained by the perception during the FGD that Muslims would most likely experience human rights violations for belonging to marginalized group and also the conflict situation in the area thus, participation among Muslims in human rights activities is most likely to be stronger.

Relating these results to the data on teaching human rights, it can be inferred that knowledge of human rights does not automatically translate into participation in human rights activities. Region VII and NCR both scored highly on the exposure to and knowledge of human rights and yet the participation in human rights activities is generally "once in a while". On the other hand, while respondents

from ARMM scored the lowest on knowledge of human rights they participate "often" in human rights activities.

Table 31 shows that majority of respondents across variables believed that their school sometimes accepts that students may hold views that are different from those of school authorities. There were more respondents from private schools, however, who believed that their school sometimes accepts that students may hold views that are different from those of school authorities. Among the few who answered "never", respondents from private schools have the least number.

It appears that schools are generally inconsistent when they do not fully respect freedom of expression among students and yet allow the teaching of human rights. This also runs contrary to the earlier findings that teachers expose students to the CRC which promotes the right of children to participate in matters affecting them. This situation shows a gap between theory and practice. Private schools, however, manifest more openness.

Majority of the respondents (around 55%) across variables as shown in Table 32 perceived that teaching students about human rights will "sometimes" make them activists. Among the remaining respondents, a considerable number (27-32%) believed that teaching human rights will "often" make the students activists.

These results show quite a strong identification of human rights with activism. The focus group discussion conducted among teachers showed that teachers were ambivalent about teaching their students about human rights. On one hand, they wanted the students to know human rights for their protection against abuse. On the other hand, they feared that their students would embrace ideologies which might make them more militant and vigilant. This in turn would increase the possibility that they would defy authority and rebel against the government. Moreover, teachers believed that their young minds might not be able to fully grasp the complexity of power relations in society.

Table 30. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Frequency of Participation in Human Rights Activities by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Once in a while		Often		Always		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	370	51.75	216	30.21	54	7.55	75	10.49	715	100
IV	236	43.07	174	31.75	73	13.32	65	11.86	548	100
VII	172	54.26	81	25.55	21	6.62	43	13.56	317	100
ARMM	128	30.40	140	33.25	103	24.47	50	11.88	421	100
Gender										
Male	374	46.46	267	33.17	87	10.81	77	9.57	805	100
Female	518	44.66	338	29.14	158	13.62	146	12.59	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	755	50.17	438	29.10	131	8.70	181	12.03	1505	100
Muslim	151	30.44	173	34.88	120	24.19	52	10.48	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	577	51.75	337	30.22	97	8.70	104	9.33	1115	100
P Urban	329	37.13	274	30.93	154	17.38	129	14.56	886	100
Type of School										
Public	475	39.09	408	33.58	223	18.35	109	8.97	1215	100
Private	431	54.83	203	25.83	28	3.56	124	15.78	786	100

Table 31. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Perception on Whether their School Accepts Students Holding Human Rights Views Different from School Authorities by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	65	9.09	521	72.87	114	15.94	15	2.10	715	100
IV	40	7.30	428	78.10	69	12.59	11	2.01	548	100
VII	61	19.24	216	68.14	36	11.36	4	1.26	317	100
ARMM	62	14.73	294	69.83	56	13.30	9	2.14	421	100

Gender										
Male	90	11.18	580	72.05	122	15.16	13	1.61	805	100
Female	132	11.38	860	74.14	149	12.84	19	1.64	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	157	10.43	1111	73.82	208	13.82	29	1.93	1505	100
Muslim	71	14.31	348	70.16	67	13.51	10	2.02	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	107	9.60	829	74.35	163	14.62	16	1.43	1115	100
Partially Urban	121	13.66	630	71.11	112	12.64	23	2.60	886	100
Type of School										
Public	161	13.25	868	71.44	167	13.74	19	1.56	1215	100
Private	67	8.52	591	75.19	108	13.74	20	2.54	786	100

Table 32. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Perception of Students Becoming Activists When Taught Human Rights by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	117	16.36	397	55.52	190	26.57	11	1.54	715	100
IV	66	12.04	303	55.29	169	30.84	10	1.82	548	100
VII	14	4.42	176	55.52	125	39.43	2	0.63	317	100
ARMM	52	12.35	232	55.11	130	30.88	7	1.66	421	100

Table 32 (cont.)

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Gender										
Male	108	13.42	442	54.91	246	30.56	9	1.12	805	100
Female	138	11.90	650	56.03	360	31.03	12	1.03	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	180	11.96	844	56.08	459	30.50	22	1.46	1505	100
Muslim	69	13.91	264	53.23	155	31.25	8	1.61	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	159	14.26	619	55.52	324	29.06	13	1.17	1115	100
Partially Urban	90	10.16	489	55.19	290	32.73	17	1.92	886	100
Type of School										
Public	156	12.84	646	53.17	397	32.67	16	1.32	1215	100
Private	93	11.83	462	58.78	217	27.61	14	1.78	786	100

Table 33 shows that a significant number of respondents NCR and Region VII (45% for NCR and 48% for Region VII) believed that teaching teachers and students about human rights would "often" result to a decrease in human rights violations, while a significant number of respondents from Region IV and ARMM (45% for ARMM and 47% for Region IV) perceived that it would "sometimes" result to decrease in human rights violations. A considerable number of respondents (26%) from ARMM believed that it would never result to decrease in human rights violations. This cynical view may be a result of continuing armed conflict situation in ARMM. A significant number of female and male respondents (41-42%) perceived that teaching of human rights would "sometimes" lead to a decrease in human rights violations. But an equal number of female respondents believed that it would "often" lead to a decrease in human rights violations. Christian respondents and those in the urban area as well as those in the public schools were more positive than the Muslim respondents and those in the partially urban area and private schools in believing that human rights would "often" lead to a decrease in human rights violations. Combining the percentages of "sometimes" and "often" responses, there is a general perception that the teaching of human rights could lead to decrease in human rights violations.

Evidently, the teaching of human rights is not only influenced by how much knowledge teachers know about human rights but equally by the teachers' ideology or belief system, value orientation, and ethos. The disparity of students' responses on how they are taught human rights, the frequency of

human rights teaching, the activities they engaged in, seem to indicate the ambivalent attitude of teachers in teaching human rights.

Table 33. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Perception on the Decrease of Human Rights Violations as a Result of Teaching Human Rights to Teachers and Students by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	100	13.99	263	36.78	344	48.11	8	1.12	715	100
IV	86	15.69	257	46.90	193	35.22	12	2.19	548	100
VII	44	13.88	127	40.06	145	45.74	1	0.32	317	100
ARMM	108	25.65	191	45.37	115	27.32	7	1.66	421	100
Gender										
Male	139	17.27	345	42.86	311	38.63	10	1.24	805	100
Female	192	16.55	479	41.29	479	41.29	10	0.86	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	209	13.89	616	40.93	659	43.79	21	1.40	1505	100
Muslim	129	26.01	222	44.76	138	27.82	7	1.41	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	152	13.63	446	40.00	507	45.47	10	0.90	1115	100
Partially Urban	186	20.99	392	44.24	290	32.73	18	2.03	886	100
Type of School										
Public	245	20.16	476	39.18	484	39.84	10	0.82	1215	100
Private	93	11.83	362	46.06	313	39.82	18	2.29	786	100

Table 34 reveals that majority of respondents across variables believed that everyone in school "sometimes" work together to ensure that students understand their human rights and the responsibilities that go with them. A significant percentage of the respondents (ranging from 28-37%) said everyone "often" work together.

Table 35 shows that majority of respondents across variables believed that students could "sometimes" openly express their views about human rights in school. This relates to the majority of respondents in Table 31 saying that their school "sometimes" accepts some students holding views different from the school authorities. The "sometimes" answer of majority of the respondents in Tables 31 and 35 may indicate some restriction on the exercise of right to free expression in school. Could this mean that schools are less interested in making students become action-oriented about human rights? Could it be that the schools prefer conceptual rather than experiential learning on human rights? Are teachers as revealed by the FGD contented with students having knowledge and yet afraid that they would act upon them? Knowledge as a result is retained as theory rather than practice.

In Tables 36 and 37, majority of the respondents across variables believed that

- students in their school "sometimes" respect human rights, and
- the rights of students are "sometimes" respected in their school.

Table 38 reveals that almost a majority of the respondents across variables believed that their school rules "sometimes" promote human rights.

The results in Tables 36, 37, and 38 show that the teaching of human rights has not completely evolved into school practice that consistently respects human rights. It can also be surmised that the teaching of human rights remains as a set of concepts rather than a standard of conduct. The gap between theory and practice can be deduced.

Table 34. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Perception on Whether Everyone in School Work Together for Better Understanding of HR and Responsibilities by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	44	6.15	399	55.80	263	36.78	9	1.26	715	100
IV	42	7.66	332	60.58	163	29.74	11	2.01	548	100
VII	24	7.57	187	58.99	106	33.44	0	0.00	317	100
ARMM	31	7.36	244	57.96	142	33.73	4	0.95	421	100
Gender										
Male	70	8.70	465	57.76	262	32.55	8	0.99	805	100
Female	67	5.78	680	58.62	405	34.91	8	0.69	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	100	6.64	870	57.81	515	34.22	20	1.33	1505	100
Muslim	41	8.27	292	58.87	159	32.06	4	0.81	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	76	6.82	629	56.41	400	35.87	10	0.90	1115	100
P Urban	65	7.34	533	60.16	274	30.93	14	1.58	886	100
Type of Sch										
Public	76	6.26	675	55.56	457	37.61	7	0.58	1215	100
Private	65	8.27	487	61.96	217	27.61	17	2.16	786	100

Table 35. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Perception on Students being Able to Express Openly in School Human Rights Views by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	55	7.69	409	57.20	244	34.13	7	0.98	715	100
IV	53	9.67	347	63.32	141	25.73	7	1.28	548	100
VII	13	4.10	213	67.19	91	28.71	0	0.00	317	100
ARMM	48	11.40	273	64.85	94	22.33	6	1.43	421	100
Gender										
Male	73	9.07	498	61.86	226	28.07	8	0.99	805	100
Female	90	7.76	724	62.41	340	29.31	6	0.52	1160	100

Table 35 (cont.)

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Ethnicity										
Christian	102	6.78	935	62.13	454	30.17	14	0.93	1505	100
Muslim	67	13.51	307	61.90	116	23.39	6	1.21	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	87	7.80	675	60.54	344	30.85	9	0.81	1115	100
P Urban	82	9.26	567	64.00	226	25.51	11	1.24	886	100
Type of Sch										
Public	109	8.97	740	60.91	356	29.30	10	0.82	1215	100
Private	60	7.63	502	63.87	214	27.23	10	1.27	786	100

Table 36. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Perception on Students Respecting HR by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	40	5.59	459	64.20	209	29.23	7	0.98	715	100
IV	34	6.20	347	63.32	161	29.38	6	1.09	548	100
VII	8	2.52	219	69.09	90	28.39	0	0.00	317	100
ARMM	27	6.41	219	52.02	168	39.90	7	1.66	421	100
Gender										
Male	67	8.32	501	62.24	229	28.45	8	0.99	805	100
Female	40	3.45	723	62.33	392	33.79	5	0.43	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	69	4.58	981	65.18	442	29.37	13	0.86	1505	100
Muslim	40	8.06	263	53.02	186	37.50	7	1.41	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	61	5.47	739	66.28	306	27.44	9	0.81	1115	100
P Urban	48	5.42	505	57.00	322	36.34	11	1.24	886	100
Type of Sch										
Public	66	5.43	726	59.75	412	33.91	11	0.91	1215	100
Private	43	5.47	518	65.90	216	27.48	9	1.15	786	100

Table 37. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Perception on the Rights of Students Being Respected in School by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	39	5.45	402	56.22	264	36.92	10	1.40	715	100
IV	37	6.75	319	58.21	186	33.94	6	1.09	548	100
VII	10	3.15	190	59.94	117	36.91	0	0.00	317	100
ARMM	27	6.41	218	51.78	170	40.38	6	1.43	421	100
Gender										
Male	65	8.07	447	55.53	281	34.91	12	1.49	805	100
Female	47	4.05	662	57.07	447	38.53	4	0.34	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	74	4.92	864	57.41	551	36.61	16	1.06	1505	100
Muslim	39	7.86	265	53.43	186	37.50	6	1.21	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	61	5.47	660	59.19	382	34.26	12	1.08	1115	100
P Urban	52	5.87	469	52.93	355	40.07	10	1.13	886	100
Type of Sch										
Public	69	5.68	684	56.30	450	37.04	12	0.99	1215	100
Private	44	5.60	445	56.62	287	36.51	10	1.27	786	100

Table 38. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Whether School Rules Promote Human Rights by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	39	5.45	363	50.77	302	42.24	11	1.54	715	100
IV	43	7.85	296	54.01	201	36.68	8	1.46	548	100
VII	15	4.73	153	48.26	148	46.69	1	0.32	317	100
ARMM	68	16.15	201	47.74	144	34.20	8	1.90	421	100
Gender										
Male	90	11.18	400	49.69	306	38.01	9	1.12	805	100
Female	70	6.03	599	51.64	478	41.21	13	1.12	1160	100

Table 38 (cont.)

Variables	Response									
	Never		Sometimes		Often		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Ethnicity										
Christian	82	5.45	770	51.16	633	42.06	20	1.33	1505	100
Muslim	83	16.73	243	48.99	162	32.66	8	1.61	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	65	5.83	571	51.21	467	41.88	12	1.08	1115	100
Partially Urban	100	11.29	442	49.89	328	37.02	16	1.81	886	100
Type of School										
Public	131	10.78	584	48.07	485	39.92	15	1.23	1215	100
Private	34	4.33	429	54.58	310	39.44	13	1.65	786	100

Majority of the respondents across variables revealed that acts of indiscipline were dealt with either by discussion with students or discussion with parents. Discussion with students has a higher percentage of responses across variables than discussion with parents. In Region VII, however, a considerable number of respondents (23%) said that students are punished. The data show a pattern that supports human rights practice. However, how such discussions with students were held needs to be further investigated. (Table 39)

Table 40 reveals that most of the respondents across variables believed that problems among students were resolved by teachers talking to students to settle the problems. Further, there were more respondents in NCR and Region VII who replied that their school conducts investigation and punishes those who caused the problems. However, there were more respondents in ARMM and Region IV who answered that students resolve problems among themselves.

There were also more respondents in urban area, in private school and who were Christians, who replied that their school conducts investigation and punishes those who caused the problems. There were also more respondents in partially urban area, public school, and were Muslims who replied that students resolve problems among themselves.

It appears that there are formal and informal means to resolve problems in schools. The presence of formal mechanism in school to resolve problems is one way of institutionalizing human rights standards in the school and making processes more predictable. While informal means can be less tedious, the application of human rights as a set of rules cannot be readily monitored and evaluated. Informal means of resolving problems are often unpredictable and

vulnerable to power relations. Tables 39 and 40 indicate the employment of both formal and informal mechanisms of resolving problems in school.

Table 39. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to How Acts of Indiscipline are Dealt with by Teachers by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Discussion with students		Discussion with parents		Punishing the students		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	356	49.79	271	37.90	80	11.19	8	1.12	715	100
IV	310	56.57	153	27.92	75	13.69	10	1.82	548	100
VII	159	50.16	81	25.55	73	23.03	4	1.26	317	100
ARMM	185	43.94	162	38.48	67	15.91	7	1.66	421	100
Gender										
Male	382	47.45	302	37.52	110	13.66	11	1.37	805	100
Female	614	52.93	352	30.34	182	15.69	12	1.03	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	800	53.16	468	31.10	215	14.29	22	1.46	1505	100
Muslim	210	42.34	199	40.12	80	16.13	7	1.41	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	555	49.78	402	36.05	147	13.18	11	0.99	1115	100
Partially Urban	455	51.35	265	29.91	148	16.70	18	2.03	886	100
Type of School										
Public	596	49.05	421	34.65	185	15.23	13	1.07	1215	100
Private	414	52.67	246	31.30	110	13.99	16	2.04	786	100

Table 40. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to How Problems Among Students are Resolved by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Students resolve problems among themselves		Teachers talk to students to settle the problems		School conducts investigation & punishes those who caused the problem		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	85	11.89	502	70.21	119	16.64	9	1.26	715	100
IV	94	17.15	364	66.42	83	15.15	7	1.28	548	100
VII	33	10.41	222	70.03	62	19.56	0	0.00	317	100
ARMM	74	17.58	285	67.70	55	13.06	7	1.66	421	100
Gender										
Male	114	14.16	549	68.20	134	16.65	8	0.99	805	100
Female	166	14.31	805	69.40	180	15.52	9	0.78	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	198	13.16	1049	69.70	242	16.08	16	1.06	1505	100
Muslim	88	17.74	324	65.32	77	15.52	7	1.41	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	151	13.54	763	68.43	190	17.04	11	0.99	1115	100
P Urban	135	15.24	610	68.85	129	14.56	12	1.35	886	100
Type of School										
Public	192	15.80	837	68.89	173	14.24	13	1.07	1215	100
Private	94	11.96	536	68.19	146	18.58	10	1.27	786	100

Most of the respondents (Table 41) across variables said that they would exercise their rights and responsibilities when taught about human rights. A considerable number of them replied that they would invoke their rights to defend themselves. These results show a very positive attitude on the part of the respondents about the value of human rights, and indicate resolve to use them in their lives. They also show support for the importance of human rights education.

Table 41. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Perception on What Happens to Students When Taught HR by Variables

	Response
--	----------

Variables	Response									
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	186	26.01	66	9.23	454	63.50	9	1.26	715	100
Variables	152	27.74	67	12.23	322	58.76	7	1.28	548	100
VII	109	34.38	22	6.94	186	58.68	0	0.00	317	100
ARMM	135	32.07	55	13.06	227	53.92	4	0.95	421	100
Gender										
Male	237	29.44	121	15.03	440	54.66	7	0.87	805	100
Female	336	28.97	84	7.24	733	63.19	7	0.60	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	421	27.97	145	9.63	923	61.33	16	1.06	1505	100
Muslim	161	32.46	65	13.10	266	53.63	4	0.81	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	303	27.17	106	9.51	696	62.42	10	0.90	1115	100
P Urban	279	31.49	104	11.74	493	55.64	10	1.13	886	100
Type of Sch.										
Public	374	30.78	126	10.37	705	58.02	10	0.82	1215	100
Private	208	26.46	84	10.69	484	61.58	10	1.27	786	100

Many respondents from NCR and Region VII as shown in Table 42 would like their school to integrate human rights in all subjects to help young people understand their rights and responsibilities. Majority of respondents in Region IV want either a separate human rights subject or all subjects discussing human rights. Majority of those in ARMM want either their school become a human rights education laboratory or a separate human rights subject. By gender, geographical classification, and type of school variables, 30-40% of the respondents chose either integration of human rights into all subjects or a separate human rights subject. But by ethnicity variable, almost 60% of the Christian respondents want a separate subject, and only 8% agree to integrate them in all subjects. For the Muslim respondents, their preferences are spread over their school becoming a human rights education laboratory (37%) or having a separate human rights subject (33%).

Table 42. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to What Schools can Do to Help Youngsters Understand their HR and Responsibilities by Variables

Variables	Response									
	Integrate HR teaching in all subjects		Make HR a separate subject		Make the school a HRE laboratory		No answer		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Region										
NCR	360	50.35	197	27.55	146	20.42	12	1.68	715	100
IV	219	39.96	229	41.79	95	17.34	5	0.91	548	100
VII	144	45.43	118	37.22	54	17.03	1	0.32	317	100
ARMM	122	28.98	140	33.25	155	36.82	4	0.95	421	100
Gender										
Male	335	41.61	290	36.02	173	21.49	7	0.87	805	100
Female	501	43.19	382	32.93	268	23.10	9	0.78	1160	100
Ethnicity										
Christian	69	7.89	522	59.66	266	30.40	18	2.06	875	100
Muslim	146	29.44	162	32.66	184	37.10	4	0.81	496	100
Geographic Classification										
Urban	533	47.80	352	31.57	217	19.46	13	1.17	1115	100
P Urban	312	35.21	332	37.47	233	26.30	9	1.02	886	100
Type of Sch.										
Public	496	40.82	397	32.67	311	25.60	11	0.91	1215	100
Private	349	44.40	287	36.51	139	17.68	11	1.40	786	100

It can be deduced that respondents generally accept all three approaches to human rights education. The lack of overwhelming majority choice of approach probably reflects the current situation where human rights education comes mainly by integration of human rights in various subjects, and secondly through extra-curricular activities - as shown in Table 24. But while Table 24 shows that a few respondents said that there is a separate human rights subject (which may actually mean separate topic within subjects, and thus a variety of integration of human rights into the subjects), Table 42 shows that there is a significant number of respondents suggesting a separate human rights subject. This is probably an important result as it indicates a view that emphasizes human rights education more, or probably make it more visible because it is a separate subject.

It would seem from the preceding discussions that the teaching of human rights is influenced by both the official and hidden curriculums (the unintended lessons learned in the classroom and in school as a whole emanating from the day-to-

day expressions of the belief systems, value systems, rules, and cultural practices by the different actors). All these comprise the over-all educative experience of students. Officially, human rights are being taught. It can be gleaned from the data that human rights are integrated in certain subject areas in the curriculum. Textbooks and newspaper clippings were frequently used to teach human rights and this is strengthened by debates, lectures, and other human rights activities employed by the teachers. Unfortunately, teachers said that they were not adequately trained to execute the official curriculum.

What is learned inside the classroom is either reinforced or contradicted by the hidden curriculum and other unplanned and informal learning experiences which students consciously or unconsciously imbibe because of their exposure to media, the school's practices and culture, the teachers' and their classmates' beliefs and value system, their parents' and other significant others' value orientations. It would seem that the integration approach provides very limited learning episodes to have deep learning of human rights compared to what is offered to them by the hidden curriculum and other learning episodes outside of the classroom.

Students, apart from being taught by inadequately trained teachers, were scantily exposed to human rights ideology which oftentimes runs counter to the dominant ideology outside of the classroom. The result as can be gleaned from the preceding discussion is an incomplete if not compartmentalized view of human rights.

It would seem that the teaching of human rights to be effective has to likewise examine the school ideology and practices in the light of human rights standards and principles and not only confine it to the actual teaching of concepts inside the classroom.

REFERENCES

- Anastasi, Anne. 1988. *Psychological Testing* (Sixth edition). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Asian Regional Resource Center for Human Rights Education. 1995. *Human Rights Education - A Survey of Ongoing Initiatives in the Asia Pacific Region*. Bangkok: Asian Regional Resource Center for Human Rights Education.
- Asia Pacific Human Rights Information Center. 1998. *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*. Osaka: Asia Pacific Human Rights Information Center.
- Ateneo Human Rights Center, Ateneo de Manila University, <http://www.codewan.com.ph/hrnow/>
- Arcilla, Jose S. 1994. *An Introduction to Philippine History*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Cabanatan, Priscilla. 1999. *The Tao Project (Teacher Amelioration for Optimum Welfare) Document Actions*, International Institute for Communication and Development (IICD) in www.icconnectonline.org/Stories/Story.import4111/view?searchterm=Project%20Teacher%20Amelioration%20for%20Optimum%20Welfare
- CHED Memorandum No. 31. Series of 1996. *Promotion of Human Rights Education (HRE)*. Pasig city: Commission on Higher Education.
- CHR-DECS Joint Declaration of Undertaking, 18 October 1996.
- Claude, Richard Pierre. 1996. *Educating for Human Rights: The Philippines and Beyond*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Commission on Human Rights. <http://www.chr.gov.ph>
- _____. 1995. *Human Rights Kit*. Pasig City: Commission on Human Rights.
- Commission on Human Rights. *Educator's Human Rights Handbook*. Pasig City: Commission on Human Rights.
- Council for the Welfare of Children, *Philippine National Strategic Framework Plan for Development for Children (Child 21)* in www.cwc.gov.ph/child21.html
- Country Report on ECCD: Republic of the Philippines* in www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user_upload/aims/7th_TWG_Meeting/Phil_Report_ECCE.pdf
- Department of Education, Culture and Sports. 1987. DECS Order No. 61, s. 1987. *Inclusion of the Study of Human Rights and Accompanying Responsibilities in the School Curricula*. Pasig city: Department of Education, Culture and Sports.
- _____. 1998. DECS Memorandum No. 180, s. 1998. *Prototype Materials for the Integration of Human Rights Concepts in Teacher Education Courses*. Pasig city: Department of Education, Culture and Sports.
- Diokno, Maria Serena I and Villegas Ramon N. 1998. Editors. "Life in the Colony" in *Kasaysayan - Story of the Filipino People*. Volume 4. Manila: Asia Publishing Company Limited.
- Executive Order No. 27. 1986. *Education to Maximize Respect for Human Rights*. Manila: Malacanang.
- Jose, Ricardo T. 1998. "Japanese Occupation" in *Kasaysayan - The Story of the Filipino People*. Volume 7. Manila: Asia Publishing Company, Ltd.

- Losaria, Nerissa L. 2004. *Summary of Activities Conducted by the Department of Education on Human Rights Education from 1989 to Present*. Pasig City: Department of Education.
- _____. 1998. "The HRE Program of the DECS of the Philippines" in *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*. Volume 7. Osaka: Asia Pacific Human Rights Information Center. Also available in www.hurights.or.jp/hreas/1/16.htm accessed on July 7, 2005.
- Lumbera, Bienvenido. 2000. *Between Two Mountains Colliding*, in www.up.edu.ph/forum/2000/02/28/two.html&w=history+philippine+education+system&d=EXl1w0DMAkB&icp=1&intl=us
- Memorandum of Agreement Between and Among Commission on Human Rights, Department of Education, Culture and Sports, Amnesty International Pilipinas and Commission on Higher Education. 1996.
- Miranda, Noel and Echano, Corazon. 2003. "Integrating Human Rights Concepts into the School Curriculum: The Philippine Experience" in *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*. Volume 7. Osaka: Asia Pacific Human Rights Information Center). Also in www.hurights.or.jp/hreas/7/03/Philippine.htm
- Miriam College. www.mc.ed.ph/wagi-main.htm
- National Economic Development Authority. 2004. *Medium Term Philippine Development Plan - 2004-2010*. Manila: National Economic Development Authority.
- National Statistical Coordination Board in <http://www.nscb.gov.ph/activestats/psgc/default.asp>
- Patawaran, Milrose C. 2002. "Paglinang at Pagpapatibay ng Instrumentong Panukat sa Kamalayan sa Karapatan ng mga Batang Mag-aaral sa Ika-anim na Baitang". Unpublished Masteral Thesis. Philippine Normal University, Manila.
- Plantilla, Jefferson R. 2002. *Human Rights Education: An Overview*. Paper presented at the Seminar-Workshop on Peace and Human Rights in Mindanao. Manila: National Commission of the Philippines for UNESCO.
- Proclamation No. 1139. Declaring 1998 as "Human Rights Year in the Philippines" and the Years 1998-2007 as "Human Rights Education Decade". Manila: Malacanang.
- Quijano, Yolanda S. 2004. *Supporting Indigenous People's Education: The DepEd-TEEP Experience*. Pasig: Department of Education.
- Rabeje Jr., Pedro A. 2003. "The Development and Validation of Human Rights Awareness Scale for High School Students". Unpublished Masteral Thesis. Manila: Philippine Normal University.
- Research Center. 1989. "Human Rights Awareness Scale. Manila: Philippine Normal University.
- Romero, Rene C. 2002. "Human Rights Education in Selected UNESCO Associated Schools in the Philippines" in *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*. Volume 5. Osaka: Asia Pacific Human Rights Information Center.
- Seminar-Workshop on Human Rights for Regional and Division Supervisors. July 16-18, 1996 and July 24-26, 1996, Cebu and Davao City. Pasig city: National Educators Academy of the Philippines (NEAP).
- Sison, Marites, *Scrounging Funds to Finance Public Schools in the Philippines* in www.unesco.org/education/efa/know_sharing/grassroots_stories/philippines.shtml
- Third Elementary Education Project (TEEP) in www.projectmaps-worldbank.org.ph/Projects1-TEEP.htm

UNESCO Bangkok. 2005. *Report on National Seminar on Early Childhood Care and Education*. in www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user_upload/appeal/ECCE/reports_and_publications/Report_-_Phil._ECCE_workshop.pdf

United Nations. 2000. *Basic Facts About the United Nations*. New York: United Nations.

_____. 1948. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, UNGA Resolution 217 A (III). Paris: United Nations.

University of the Philippines Law Center Institute of Human Rights.
www.hrnow.org/about/a000216-au-hr.htm

Woman and Gender Institute-Miriam College. 2004. "Gender Socialization in the Philippine Child-Friendly Schools" in *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*. Volume 7. Osaka: Asia Pacific Human Rights Information Center. Also available in www.hurights.or.jp/hreas/7/13GenderSocialization.htm

World Bank, *Early Childhood Development* in www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1998/02/27/000009265_3980429110746/Rendered/INDEX/multi0page.txt

Yeban, Felicia I. et al. 2003. *Human Rights Education Pack*. New edition. Bangkok: Asian Regional Resource Center for Human Rights Education.