

# Youth & Society

<http://yas.sagepub.com>

---

## **Self-Reported Delinquency of High School Students in Metro Manila: Gender and Social Class**

Filomin C. Gutierrez and Donald J. Shoemaker

*Youth Society* 2008; 40; 55 originally published online Dec 21, 2007;

DOI: 10.1177/0044118X07309986

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://yas.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/40/1/55>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *Youth & Society* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://yas.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://yas.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations** <http://yas.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/40/1/55>

# Self-Reported Delinquency of High School Students in Metro Manila

## Gender and Social Class

Filomin C. Gutierrez

*University of the Philippines, Diliman*

Donald J. Shoemaker

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg*

Self-report data were gathered from 633 students from public and private schools in metro Manila, Philippines. The study finds overall delinquency prevalence to be higher among males than females but not significantly different from one socioeconomic class to another. Gender and class differentials, however, are found for different types of delinquency (overt property, covert property, theft, swindling, vandalism, drug abuse, alcohol and cigarettes, and status offenses). Violent offenses and more public forms of delinquency are found to be high among lower-class boys, whereas covert types of delinquency are high among the middle- and upper-class students. Of interest, among females, upper-class girls consistently have the highest self-reported delinquency rates.

**Keywords:** *delinquency; Manila; social class; gender*

Although juvenile delinquency is a well-researched topic in developed countries, only a limited number of studies have been published in the Philippines. Estefania Aldaba-Lim's (1969) pioneering book, *Toward Understanding the Juvenile Delinquent*, compared matched samples of institutionalized juvenile delinquents and in-school nondelinquents in metro Manila. Aldaba-Lim found that delinquency is more related to social than to psychological factors, among them less stable family and home structures,

---

**Authors' Note:** This article was revised from a paper read at the annual meetings of the American Society of Criminology, Toronto, November 1999. The authors would like to thank Ricardo Zarco, Michael Hughes, Jason Milne, and several anonymous reviewers for helpful comments and suggestions on previous drafts of this article. This project was supported by a research grant from the University of the Philippines, Diliman, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Development.

lack of parental guidance, distant or aggressive relationships with siblings, and more bonding with peers. Juvenile delinquents received inconsistent methods of parental discipline, disliked schooling, and lacked parental guidance, particularly on schooling. There were no significant differences between the samples on intelligence and most personality (psychological) characteristics.

A. Carlota (1982-1983) compared institutionalized and nondelinquent girls and found lack of family support, running away from home, and the influence of the *barkada* (peer group) as common factors present among the girls in the institution in contrast to the control group. The author noted that the peer group replaces the family in terms of socioemotional support.

S. Carlota and Carlota (1989) analyzed court records and interviews with court judges and compared male and female delinquents and nondelinquents on psychological tests. Using matched samples of delinquents in institutions and in-school nondelinquents, their study found lower intelligence, personality flaws, emotional inadequacies, conflicted family life, peer involvement, and poor school attendance, performance, and attitude among the delinquents.

Studies in the Philippines have sought the difference between delinquent youth and nondelinquent ones by focusing on institutionalized youth (Aldaba-Lim, 1969; National Coordinating Center for the Study and Development of Filipino Children and Youth, 1967) or youth with offense records (S. Carlota & Carlota, 1989). In-school youth were enlisted as control group members with the assumption that they were not engaged in delinquent activities. However, using youth with court records and institutionalized youth as the operational definition of delinquents biased these studies toward youth from the lower class.

In a self-report survey of delinquency in the Philippines, Shoemaker (1994) surveyed 663 first- to fourth-year high school students and college freshmen in Cagayan de Oro City in the southern Philippines. Shoemaker's study found that males were twice as delinquent as the female respondents and that higher-status boys were more delinquent than lower-status boys. Peer relations and attitudinal constructs were significantly associated with delinquency for boys. Among girls, however, independent variables were not found to have an influence on delinquency.

In their review of the literature, S. Carlota and Carlota (1989) showed that numerous unpublished graduate theses were produced on the topic since the early 1900s, demonstrating the enormous interest in studying delinquency. But to build a more extensive body of research on the topic in the Philippines, this interest needs to be translated into more concrete research and publication. Self-reporting as a means of studying delinquency broadens and allows new directions in looking at delinquency from the perspectives of gender and social class.

## The Filipino Youth

As of 1995, the Philippine youth population aged 15 to 19 years old composed 11% of more than 68 million Filipinos. Approximately 14% of this age group lived in metro Manila. Demographers project that the youth population will continue to grow in the next decades, before reaching its peak in 2025 (Raymundo & Xenos, 1999, p. 6). Filipino youth are undergoing changes in many respects, including the area of education. School enrollment for young people aged 15 to 19 rose from 27% for males and 25% for females in 1960 to 40% and 37%, respectively, in 1990 (Raymundo & Xenos, 1999, p. 7). In 2003, 74% of school-age youth in metro Manila and 65% of school-age youth from the rest of the Philippines attended high school (National Statistics Office, 2003).

The government and the public in general hold a protective regard for the Filipino youth. The Child and Youth Welfare Code defines the rights and protections for the well-being of Filipino children. There is concern over youths' exposure to risks and delinquency given "massive changes in the country's socioeconomic environment, many of which pose challenges to some dearly-held customs and traditions" (Raymundo, Xenos, & Domingo, 1999, p. ix). Filipinos are generally doting toward children (Scott, 1994); on the other hand, children are expected to express respect toward their parents, elders, and authority figures, particularly teachers. Filipino youth today are perceived as targets of currents of change that threaten the traditional values. Forces of modernization, popular culture, the "loosening of traditional values," and the migration of Filipino workers (parents) abroad are deemed to affect Filipino families and their youth (Lanuza, 2004).

The colonial rules of Spain from 1521 to 1898 and the United States from 1899 to 1946 over the Philippines influenced its religious and political structures. Because the nation is predominantly Catholic (through Spanish colonization), Filipinos perceive their society as conservative, and subjects such as delinquency and sexuality are deemed sensitive topics in public discussion, much more so in scientific research. With the Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study, a nationwide self-report survey started in 1994 by the UP Population Institute, these barriers began to slowly be transcended (e.g., Raymundo & Xenos, 1999).

## Theorizing Philippine Social Issues

Social scientific studies in the Philippines have long used theoretical frameworks generated in Western societies. Filipino sociologists critiqued that local studies have depended mostly on foreign theories in illuminating

local issues (Abad & Eviota, 1982; Bautista, 1998), including studies on the youth (Lanuza, 2004). Indigenous theorizing of Philippine social phenomena was pursued in *sikolohiyang Pilipino* (Filipino psychology), which adopted a postcolonial critique of Western-transplanted theories (e.g., Enriquez, 1990). The perspective took on a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) in understanding psychological and social phenomena and utilized qualitative research methods deemed attuned to the local research setting. In resolving the dilemma over the use of foreign theories and methods, scholars have suggested that they can be used as starting points but that studies should be sensitive to and reflect Philippine cultural nuances (Lanuza, 2004). Although the concepts discussed below were mostly drawn from the Western experience, they were chosen because they sensitize the study to key social class and gender dimensions. The analysis will evaluate their suitability to the Philippine context and suggest emerging and more applicable concepts.

## Explanations of Delinquency

Over the years, a wide variety of explanations of delinquency were offered. Early theories, including ones applied on delinquency and criminality in the Philippines, focused on the individual, that is, biological and psychological characteristics (Gutierrez, 2006; Shoemaker, 2005). Later theories proposed more environmental or social explanations (Shoemaker, 2005). Gender and social class are two important social categories linked to social behavior, including delinquency. A common assumption is that response to demands and expectations of conformist behavior is connected to one's gender and class.

Female delinquency is generally assessed to be less prevalent and serious than male offending. Authors have further argued that the divergence in social roles prescribed for males and females accounts for the variation in their delinquency (e.g., Cavan & Ferdinand, 1975; Klein, 1979; Pollak, 1950; Smart, 1977). Some studies on women's crimes linked female deviance to the emancipation or liberation of women in society (Adler, 1975; Simon, 1975). Moreover, the feminist perspective views female crime and delinquency in the context of women's experience of gender inequality (e.g., Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004, pp. 128-129; Leonard, 1982). Some have called for a consideration of the intersection of gender and class, and race, for a clearer understanding of criminality (Messerschmidt, 1997). The overrepresentation of males in delinquency may come from androcentric theorizing and/or the bias that comes with official sources of information on delinquency, such as arrest and court records.

However, self-report assessments of delinquency often conclude that females are as involved with status offending and drug use, especially alcohol use, as are males (Canter, 1982; Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004, pp. 10-14). The reconciliation of official data and self-report data on delinquency, relative to gender, is still a task facing criminologists today. This reconciliation is particularly important in developing countries, where self-report studies of delinquency are relatively new and infrequent.

Traditionally, explanations of delinquency and social class or socioeconomic status (SES) have focused on youth from lower-class backgrounds; this is particularly true for studies using official estimates and studies of youth gangs. For example, Albert Cohen (1955) asserted that frustration resulting from failure of lower-class youth to achieve middle-class standards of behavior imposed by formal institutions such as the school leads to delinquency, especially gang delinquency. Walter Miller (1958) suggested that lower-class culture promotes focal concerns that relate to delinquent attitudes and that in seeking to affirm identities in one-sex peer groups, lower-class males are led to delinquency. In addition, Wolfgang and Feracutti (1977) argued that because of a subculture of violence, violence is predicted to be greater in lower-class groups in Western and developing countries. Robert Merton's (1957) well-known strain, or anomie, theory of crime and deviance suggests that crime and delinquency are more prevalent within lower-class settings than elsewhere in society. Also, Jeffrey Reiman (2001) presented considerable evidence that lower-class citizens are overrepresented in crime and delinquency statistics, from arrest through incarceration.

Self-report studies of delinquency give a less clear picture of class patterns. For example, in a national sample of youth in the United States, Elliott and Huizinga (1983) concluded that for prevalence figures, there was little correlation between delinquency and social class. However, this study also concluded that youth from lower-class backgrounds were more involved in more serious forms of crime, such as violent crimes, and that incidence measures also reflected significant class differences (also see Elliott & Ageton, 1980).

More literature concluded that social class has little, if anything, to do with crime and delinquency (Jensen & Thompson, 1990; Tittle & Meier, 1990, 1991; Tittle, Villemez, & Smith, 1978). Scholars have increasingly established that middle-class youngsters have committed considerable amounts of delinquency that has not been captured in either official or self-report studies of delinquency (Vaz, 1967; Wooden & Blazak, 2001).

Comparisons of the impact of gender and social class on delinquency in the United States and Great Britain conclude that there is little difference in the relationship between social class and delinquency when accounting for

gender (Akers, 1964; Elliott, 1988, pp. 48-49, 106-109). However, the literature in this area of inquiry remains in further need of investigation.

Other studies of delinquency in southeastern Asian countries, such as Tanioka and Glaser's (1991) research in Japan, have examined self-report measures, but consideration of gender and social-class effects on delinquency in these studies has been rare. Studies of Asian gangs, such as Chin's research on Chinese gangs in America (Chin, 1990), have also shed light on Asian patterns of delinquency, but these studies reflected cross-cultural conflicts and accommodations more so than gender and social class patterns of delinquency.

## Research Objectives

The discussion above suggests that there is still considerable debate relative to the effect of gender and social class on delinquency. Existing data suggest that males are more involved in delinquent acts than are females, but these differences seem greater when measuring with official estimates from police or court records. In addition, self-report measures suggest that differences between males and females are smaller for status offenses and for some kinds of drug offenses. Data also indicate that lower-class youngsters appear in official records of delinquency more often than middle-class youth. Also, the data suggest that lower-class youth tend to commit acts of delinquency more often and ones that are more serious than do other young people. However, studies of delinquency using self-report measures are still relatively absent in developing countries, and our knowledge of self-report patterns of delinquency in these areas is still limited, particularly with respect to gender and social class.

This study aims to contribute to the analysis of delinquent behavior of in-school youth in a developing country. It seeks to determine the rates of delinquency of high school youth in metro Manila and to evaluate the data in terms of certain social correlates. It examines the distribution of delinquency, and specific types of delinquent acts, in relation to gender and social class characteristics. The study specifically examines (a) the relationship between gender and types of delinquency, (b) the relationship between social class and types of delinquency, (c) the relationship between social class and the types of delinquency of boys, and (d) the relationship between social class and the types of delinquency of girls. The *working hypotheses* of the study are (a) that rates of self-reported delinquency will be higher among males, compared to females, and (b) that rates of self-reported delinquency will be

higher among lower-class respondents, compared to middle- and upper-class youth. However, this study will also examine the relationships among delinquency, gender, and social class.

## Method

### Survey Sampling

Self-report data were gathered from student respondents from nine public and private schools in metro Manila, the largest metropolitan complex in the Philippines, from July 1998 to March 1999. The participants were between the ages of 12 and 17 years. Filipino children who enter high school are expected to be 13 years old within the school year, which typically runs from June to March. The study adopted a multistage cluster sampling. First, from a complete list of high schools in metro Manila, schools were selected to represent public and private schools. To ensure the participation of respondents from different socioeconomic groups and different types of high schools, the study adopted a purposive sampling scheme. Schools deemed typical of their category in terms of size of student population, sex exclusiveness (all boys or all girls) or coeducation (mixed sex), and reputed SES of students were selected from the list.<sup>1</sup> Schools that represented upper-class private schools for boys, upper-class private schools for girls, middle-class private schools for boys, middle-class private schools for girls, middle-class coeducational schools, and public schools were identified from the list. This qualification was mainly applied to schools from the middle class because they were more numerous and varied in features. In the upper-class category, however, options were fewer. In metro Manila, practically all public schools are coeducational, some private schools considered middle class are sex exclusive, and most upper-class private schools are sex exclusive. Second, a class section from each of the four year levels was randomly selected from a number of class sections. Finally, from a typical class section size of 30 to 70 students, 20 were randomly selected to participate. A list of the distribution of school types that were included in the sample is presented in Appendix A. The final sample consisted of 633 student respondents from private and coeducational high schools in three major cities of metro Manila. The sample consisted of 51% male and 49% female respondents.

Self-administered questionnaires were distributed as a group activity to the randomly selected students for each class section for most schools. One private school for girls, however, opted that their students gather in a large hall

to answer the survey at the same time. In public schools, it was relatively easier to facilitate the substitution of selected students who were absent for the day or declined to participate than in private schools.

The respondents were allowed to decline participation, given privacy in answering the questionnaire, and assured anonymity by not asking for their names. Schools were also protected by obscuring their identities. Only less than 1% of the students openly declined to participate. Others, mostly from private schools, did not show up for the survey or were absent for the day. One upper-class private school, run by a religious order, declined because its guidance counselor believed the questions were “too sensitive.” Another school administrator of an upper-class private school delayed the decision to participate. Some middle-class private schools also declined participation without stating their reasons; others delayed their decisions for a long time. Public schools were the most cooperative, owing perhaps to their compliance with the endorsement of the Department of Education to accommodate the survey.

## Research Instrument

The questions in the survey were based on a questionnaire developed by Hartjen and Kethineni (1996) for their study of youth delinquency in India and the United States. The delinquent acts in the list, in turn, were mainly derived from the National Youth Survey conducted in the United States in the late 1970s (see Elliott, Ageton, Huizinga, Knowles, & Canter, 1983). To suit the Filipino cultural context, the instrument was adjusted to accommodate delinquent activities common to Filipino youth and to exclude ones that are culturally inapplicable. The instrument was translated to Filipino, a Tagalog-based language that incorporates words from other Philippine languages and is widely spoken in metro Manila. It was further revised after a pretest was conducted in one high school.

## Variables and Measures

*Delinquency.* In this study, “delinquent acts” refers to a wide range of acts from minor misbehavior or status offenses such as skipping school and cheating on exams to violent personal offenses and other serious crimes. Delinquency rates and similar quantifications of delinquency in this report pertain to the delinquent acts that the respondents admitted to having committed.

*Offense types.* Delinquent acts in this study were classified as property, violent, status, and drug offenses. The category, property offense, covers a wide range of acts that are similar to yet different from each other. Theft, for example, is a covert, nonconfrontational form of stealing, whereas robbery, or the use of strong-arm methods to divest a person of things, involves confrontational verbal and/or physical aggression. In the Philippines, robbery is typically classified as a property crime, not a violent crime. For the purposes of this analysis, however, robbery is classified as a violent crime.

*Property offenses.* Property offenses are further classified as overt property, covert property, swindling, and vandalism. An *overt property* offense is committed through the use of overt, forceful methods, committed with a heightened sense of daring (*lakas ng loob*) and in public view or with the risk of being in public view.<sup>2</sup> A *covert property* offense involves stealing in the absence, or without the knowledge, of the victim and in which the act is hidden from public view. *Swindling* is acquiring property by means of trickery, often through verbal machinations and false pretenses. *Vandalism* involves the destruction of property but not acquisition and is an expression of aggressive behavior.

*Violence.* Acts were considered to be violent when they involved physical or verbal aggression and preparation for or anticipation of physical confrontation. These acts are often committed with *lakas ng loob*. Violent offenses include robbery, hitting someone, involvement in a group fight, throwing objects at houses or people, carrying a hidden weapon, and shouting profanities at parents and teachers. The last offense, though not a physical act, that typifies commonly known violent behavior is qualified as violence because it is confrontational, is aggressive, seeks to damage emotionally, expresses open defiance, and can provoke a physical encounter.

*Drug, cigarette, and alcohol use.* Consumption of cigarettes, alcohol, and drugs may normally be grouped under substance abuse. The more serious nature of drug abuse, compared to cigarette and alcohol use, is considered. The use of the latter two substances, in fact, is often regarded as a status offense. However, in this study, alcohol and cigarette use is a separate category from drug abuse and from status offenses.

*Status.* Status offenses include activities such as cheating, sneaking out from home, truancy, lying about one's age, running away from home, smoking, and making threatening phone calls.

The state policies of the Philippines are generally protective toward youth, particularly from activities deemed harmful to them. The Child and Youth Welfare Code (Presidential Decree 603) makes parents responsible for keeping children from “becoming addicted to intoxicating drinks, narcotics drugs, smoking, gambling, and other vices or harmful practices.” City and municipal ordinances prohibit business establishments from selling intoxicating drinks to minors younger than 18 years of age. Minors are banned from entering night clubs and disco houses, sauna baths, massage clinics, health studios, and similar establishments, and laws restrict the entry of minors to certain films in movie theaters. Some ordinances order liquor-dispensing establishments to keep a distance from schools (Compilation of Ordinances, City of Manila, 1955). Republic Act 9211, or the Tobacco Regulation Act of 2003, also prohibits the sale of tobacco products to minors. A few cities and municipalities in the Philippines have prescribed curfews (11 p.m. to 4 a.m.) for their youth. But in metro Manila, this proposed regulation did not seem to find much support.

Studies have shown that many of these policies have been ignored by the young. The 1998 Survey on the Situation of the Filipino Youth reported that among Filipinos aged 15 to 30, 20% currently smoke and 19% drink at least several times a month (Sandoval, Mangahas, & Guerrero, 1998, p. 5). The Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study III also reported that 46.5% of youth aged 15 to 19 have tried smoking and 21% are currently smoking. Drinking alcohol is more common than smoking, as 63% have tried drinking and 56% are currently drinking among the same age group (Cruz & Berja, 2004, p. 53).

*Gender and social class.* In sampling the respondents, primary consideration was given to the gender and SES variables. Gender is categorized as male or female. It is recognized that gender is a social construct that involves masculinity and femininity. However, in this study the self-designation of one as male or female is used as a proxy for gender.

A 3-point scale was used to assess the SES of students, whether they belong to the upper, middle, or lower social classes. To form a composite status reflecting income, reputation (status), and access to power or influence, social class was measured using a combination of four indicators: (a) father's occupation, (b) mother's occupation, (c) description of residence, and (d) the socioeconomic reputation of the youth's school. A Weberian concept of stratification that considers, in addition to class, status (prestige) and power was adopted.<sup>3</sup> It also adopts residence description as an indicator

based on the widely used ABCDE Market Research System developed to measure the SES of households in the Philippines (Arroyo, 1990). This composite scheme of measurement was deemed to reflect the Filipino cultural classification of one's economic status as *mahirap* (poor), *katamtaman* (moderate or middle), or *mayaman* (rich). Compared to Western notions of upper class, *mayaman* extends beyond the small, exclusive, elite group at the top of the stratification system to include families involved in highly paid professions recognized to be prestigious in the country. This is a departure from Western class divisions, in which the upper class is limited to a very small, exclusive, elite portion of the population.<sup>4</sup> Appendix B presents specific examples from the survey data of how classifications were made based on the indicators (see Table 1).

## Findings

### Overall Delinquency

The findings demonstrate that delinquency prevalence varies for males and females and for youth from the different socioeconomic backgrounds. In these analyses, prevalence is based on individual cases, not aggregated summaries or clustered averages. Prevalence reflects the existence of delinquency, or the percentage of respondents who have committed delinquency at least once, not the number of times delinquent acts have been committed. The total number of delinquent acts is the basis for the measure of delinquency incidence in this study.

Data in Table 1 list the frequencies and prevalence figures of specific offenses to which respondents admitted having committed at least once within a year of the survey.

Many students admit to status offenses and to similar misbehaviors associated with young persons such as cheating in school exams (63.0%), truancy (42.0%), lying about one's age (29.0%), and sneaking out of one's home without parents' knowledge (23.0%). Around 7.0% report running away from home. More than one third of the respondents admit to drinking alcohol (43.0%) and smoking (39.0%).

Of all property offenses, vandalism (purposely damaging other people's property) is most common at 42.0%, and 6.0% admit to purposely damaging motor vehicles. Property offenses such as petty theft (15.0%; worth less than P50) moderate theft (8.0%; worth less than P100), and grand theft (3.0%; worth more than P500) are less prevalent. Relatively higher rates are observed

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of Admitted Acts**

Offense	<i>n</i>	%
Overt property offense		
1. Forcibly opened a parked motor vehicle	10	1.6
2. Stole objects or parts from a parked vehicle such as a car, motorcycle, tricycle, and others	7	1.1
3. Broke (or tried breaking) into a house or building to steal something or just to look around	31	4.9
4. Stolen (or tried to steal) a motor vehicle	8	1.3
Covert property offense		
5. Stolen (or tried to steal) something worth less than P50	97	15.3
6. Stolen (or tried to steal) things worth less than P100	49	7.7
7. Stolen (or tried to steal) things worth over P500	20	3.2
8. Stolen money from family members	115	18.2
9. Bought, sold, or held stolen goods (or tried to do any of these things)	176	27.8
Swindling		
10. Through deceit and artifice, tricked a student out of his or her money	70	11.1
11. Through deceit and artifice, tricked a teacher or other adult at school out of his or her money	15	2.4
12. Through deceit and artifice, tricked other people (not students or teachers) out of their money	51	8.1
13. Avoided paying for such things as food, movies, or bus, train, jeepney, or tricycle rides	160	25.3
14. Begged for money or things from strangers	36	5.7
Vandalism		
15. Purposely damaged or destroyed property	264	41.7
16. Purposely damaged a motor vehicle	38	6.0
Violence		
17. Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing him/her	14	2.2
18. Been involved in a group fight	132	20.9
19. Threw objects (such as rocks, bottles) at houses, schoolhouses, buildings, cars, or people	176	27.8
20. Hit (or threatened to hit) a teacher or other adults at school	33	5.2
21. Hit (or threatened to hit) a parent	27	4.3
22. Hit (or threatened to hit) other students	249	39.3
23. Used force (using strong-arm methods) to get money or things from other students	18	2.8
24. Used force (using strong-arm methods) to get money or things from a teacher or other adult at school	3	0.5
25. Used force (using strong-arm methods) to get money or things from other people (not students or teachers)	21	3.3

**Table 1 (continued)**

Offense	<i>n</i>	%
26. Carried a hidden weapon	71	11.2
27. Shouted profanities at a parent	132	20.9
28. Shouted profanities at a teacher or other adult at school	127	20.1
Drug use and selling (drugs)		
29. Used drugs such as marijuana, glue ( <i>rugby</i> ), cough syrup, and other soft drugs	36	5.7
30. Used drugs such as methamphetamine ( <i>shabu</i> ), cocaine, tablets, and other hard drugs	16	2.5
31. Sold marijuana, glue ( <i>rugby</i> ), cough syrup, or other soft drugs	3	0.5
32. Sold drugs such as methamphetamine ( <i>shabu</i> ), cocaine, tablets, and other hard drugs	4	0.6
Cigarette and alcohol use		
33. Smoked cigarettes	183	38.9
34. Drank alcoholic beverages such as beer, wine, whisky, and other similar drinks	273	43.1
35. Been drunk in a public place	72	11.4
Status offense		
36. Cheated on school tests	400	63.2
37. Sneaked out (or tried to sneak out) of home without parents' knowledge	148	23.4
38. Skipped school without a legitimate reason	263	41.5
39. Lied about age	182	28.8
40. Ran away from home	45	7.1
41. Made threatening phone calls	68	10.7

for avoiding payment for such things as food, movies, and bus, train, *jeepney*, or tricycle fares (25.0%) and for stealing money from family members (18.0%). Lower rates are observed for swindling or obtaining things or money through trickery or artifice from students (11.0%), teachers (2.0%), and other people outside the school (8.0%). Lowest prevalence rates are observed for serious theft such as motor vehicle theft (1.3%) and forcibly opening a car (1.6%). Stealing from teachers or other adults *in* school is much less prevalent than stealing from students and other people *outside* the school.

For violent offenses, rates are lowest when aggression is directed at authority figures, for example, hitting or threatening to hit parents (4.0%) or teachers (5.0%). Acts involving serious violence are likewise less prevalent, such as assaulting or attacking someone with intent to seriously harm or kill (2.0%). On the other hand, prevalence rates are high when aggression is aimed at peers, for example, hitting or threatening to hit other students (39.0%) and

**Table 2**  
**Male and Female Delinquency Prevalence Figures**

Sex	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>
Male	6.5	4.9	322
Female	5.1	4.6	309
Total	5.8	4.8	631

Note: Difference of means test (*t* test),  $t = 3.7$ , significant at .001.

participation in group fights (21.0%).<sup>5</sup> This figure on *group* fights is much higher compared to rates of *gang* fights in surveys in other countries. But the difference may be attributed to variation in the meaning of the terms used (*gang fights* is the term used in foreign surveys, a term that has no exact equivalent in Filipino). Because this survey used the term *grupo-grupong away* in lieu of *gang fight*, the difference may be attributed to the distinction of the concept. However, such differences may also be reflective of the differences in cultural notions regarding physical confrontation between conflicting groups.

Although, as stated earlier, a substantial portion of respondents admitted to drinking alcohol and smoking cigarettes, fewer students admitted to using “soft drugs” such as marijuana and solvent glue or *rugby* (6.0%), and an even smaller number admitted to using hard drugs such as methamphetamines (*shabu*), cocaine, tablets, and so on (2.5%).

## Gender Patterns

The figures in Table 2 show that females have lower prevalence rates compared to males. The data in Table 3a further demonstrate the differences by gender per type of offense.

The findings of the study confirm the results of previous studies in the Philippines and in other countries that female delinquency is significantly lower than male delinquency (Canter, 1982; Hartjen & Kethineni, 1996, 1999; Hartjen & Priyadarsini, 2003; Hindelang, Hirschi, & Weis, 1981; Shoemaker, 1994). The mean male–female difference in this study is about 1.27, or a ratio of nearly 4 males for every 3 females who admitted it. Although significant, this ratio shows less gender disparity compared to a ratio of 2 to 1 (2 male admissions for every 1 female admission) in the Cagayan de Oro City survey of Shoemaker (1994).

The prevalence rates in Table 3a indicate that males participated more in every category of delinquency than females. The data in Table 3b show

**Table 3a**  
**Male and Female Prevalence by Offense Type**

Offense Type		Gender		Difference of Means
		Male	Female	<i>t</i>
Overt property offense	<i>M</i>	0.13	0.005	
	<i>SD</i>	0.47	0.25	2.43*
Covert property offense	<i>M</i>	0.47	0.42	
	<i>SD</i>	0.84	0.82	0.67
Vandalism	<i>M</i>	0.86	0.66	
	<i>SD</i>	0.87	0.82	2.86**
Swindling	<i>M</i>	0.59	0.34	
	<i>SD</i>	0.85	0.65	4.20***
Violence	<i>M</i>	1.46	0.88	
	<i>SD</i>	1.43	1.21	5.54***
Drugs	<i>M</i>	0.13	0.05	
	<i>SD</i>	0.41	0.28	2.52*
Cigarette or alcohol use	<i>M</i>	0.80	0.65	
	<i>SD</i>	0.83	0.81	2.37*
Status	<i>M</i>	2.62	2.31	
	<i>SD</i>	1.83	1.96	2.06*

\**t* test significant at .05. \*\**t* test significant at .01. \*\*\**t* test significant at .001.

incidence figures and generally sustain the gender differences found with prevalence rates. However, for two offenses, swindling and covert property offenses, the incidence figures are higher for *females* than for males, and, for swindling, the difference is statistically significant.

## Social Class

The upper-class members of this sample have the *highest* average prevalence of offense admissions, with a mean of 6.4 (Table 4). The figures in Table 4 also indicate that middle-class respondents have the *lowest* average prevalence admissions of the three groups.

An analysis of variance test, however, did not yield a significant difference among the groups. The present findings that youth from the lower class are, statistically speaking, no more delinquent than youth from the middle and upper income groups and that upper-status youth have the highest admitted prevalence rates seem to contradict the emphasis on lower-class delinquency in classical criminological literature.

**Table 3b**  
**Male and Female Incidence Figures by Offense Type**

Offense Type		Gender		Difference of Means
		Male	Female	<i>t</i>
Overt property offense	<i>M</i>	0.18	0.15	0.33
	<i>SD</i>	0.83	0.90	
Covert property offense	<i>M</i>	0.95	0.98	-0.18
	<i>SD</i>	2.16	2.28	
Vandalism	<i>M</i>	1.09	0.88	1.71
	<i>SD</i>	1.63	1.45	
Swindling	<i>M</i>	1.29	2.29	3.02**
	<i>SD</i>	0.78	1.93	
Violence	<i>M</i>	4.39	2.90	3.88***
	<i>SD</i>	5.21	4.37	
Drugs	<i>M</i>	0.33	0.14	2.14*
	<i>SD</i>	1.31	0.76	
Cigarette or alcohol use	<i>M</i>	2.89	2.28	2.02*
	<i>SD</i>	3.88	3.68	
Status	<i>M</i>	5.02	4.65	0.95
	<i>SD</i>	4.83	4.87	

\**t* test significant at .05. \*\**t* test significant at .01. \*\*\**t* test significant at .001.

**Table 4**  
**Delinquency Prevalence by Social Class**

Prevalence Rests	Social Class			Total
	Lower	Middle	Upper	
<i>M</i>	6.2	5.5	6.4	5.8
<i>SD</i>	5.0	4.7	4.8	4.8

Note: Analysis of variance *F* ratio = 1.7, not significant at .05.

### Male Delinquency by Social Class

Differences in delinquency prevalence and incidence across gender and class can be better appreciated when these are considered by types of offense (Table 5a).

The prevalence data in Table 5a indicate that lower-class boys tend to participate in violent and publicly overt forms of delinquency. The figures become more evenly divided by social class for covert property offenses, drugs, cigarette and alcohol offenses, and status offenses.

**Table 5a**  
**Prevalence Figures for Male Respondents by Social Class and Offense Type**

Offense		Social Class			Tests	
		Lower	Middle	Upper	Ratio and Coefficient	
Overt property	<i>M</i>	0.23	0.09	0.09	<i>F</i> ratio	2.84
	<i>SD</i>	0.70	0.36	0.28	<i>r</i>	-.12*
Covert property	<i>M</i>	0.48	0.47	0.52	<i>F</i> ratio	0.08
	<i>SD</i>	0.90	0.83	0.81	<i>r</i>	.01
Vandalism	<i>M</i>	1.12	0.81	0.54	<i>F</i> ratio	7.71***
	<i>SD</i>	0.97	0.83	0.66	<i>r</i>	-.22***
Swindling	<i>M</i>	0.73	0.63	0.30	<i>F</i> ratio	3.93*
	<i>SD</i>	0.84	0.91	0.59	<i>r</i>	-.14**
Violence	<i>M</i>	1.84	1.41	1.09	<i>F</i> ratio	4.98**
	<i>SD</i>	1.75	1.29	1.03	<i>r</i>	-.18***
Drugs	<i>M</i>	0.12	0.13	0.11	<i>F</i> ratio	0.09
	<i>SD</i>	0.39	0.40	0.38	<i>r</i>	-.01
Cigarette or alcohol use	<i>M</i>	0.67	0.85	0.89	<i>F</i> ratio	1.64
	<i>SD</i>	0.81	0.84	0.80	<i>r</i>	.10*
Status	<i>M</i>	2.84	2.54	2.57	<i>F</i> ratio	0.86
	<i>SD</i>	1.97	1.80	1.75	<i>r</i>	-.06

\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .05. \*\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .01. \*\*\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .001.

The strongest significant negative associations are found between social class and the dependent variables of vandalism and violence among boys. Prevalence rates for these offenses are highest among lower-class youth. Slightly significant negative associations are also found between social class and swindling and overt property offenses. A slight positive relationship is reported between social class and cigarette and alcohol use. This relationship may be attributed to an economic factor; that is, males from the higher-income groups can afford to spend money on these goods. However, the mean prevalence figures across social class categories are almost the same, so it is difficult to attribute the slightly higher figures for the middle and upper classes solely to an economic explanation.

Incidence figures shown in Table 5b reveal similar trends to those found for prevalence rates. However, a stronger positive association between social class and cigarette and alcohol use is shown. Slight significant associations between social class and swindling and overt property offenses are maintained. Significant differences for vandalism and violence offenses still

**Table 5b**  
**Incidence Figures for Male Respondents by**  
**Social Class and Offense Type**

Offense		Social Class			Tests	
		Lower	Middle	Upper	Ratio and Coefficient	
Overt property	<i>M</i>	0.33	0.12	0.00	<i>F</i>	2.51
	<i>SD</i>	1.30	0.57	0.21	<i>r</i>	-.12*
Covert property	<i>M</i>	1.15	0.85	1.02	<i>F</i>	0.60
	<i>SD</i>	2.85	1.79	1.92	<i>r</i>	-.034
Vandalism	<i>M</i>	1.29	1.05	0.93	<i>F</i>	0.95
	<i>SD</i>	1.72	1.59	1.60	<i>r</i>	.08
Swindling	<i>M</i>	1.65	1.27	0.76	<i>F</i>	2.36
	<i>SD</i>	2.71	2.18	1.73	<i>r</i>	-.12*
Violence	<i>M</i>	4.99	4.49	3.33	<i>F</i>	1.51
	<i>SD</i>	6.30	4.98	3.60	<i>r</i>	-.09
Drugs	<i>M</i>	0.27	0.31	0.33	<i>F</i>	0.05
	<i>SD</i>	1.21	1.22	1.15	<i>r</i>	.02
Cigarette or alcohol use	<i>M</i>	1.80	3.19	3.96	<i>F</i>	6.02**
	<i>SD</i>	3.01	4.03	4.35	<i>r</i>	.191**
Status	<i>M</i>	5.46	5.00	4.38	<i>F</i>	0.762
	<i>SD</i>	5.40	4.71	4.38	<i>r</i>	-.07

\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .05. \*\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .01. \*\*\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .001.

reflect greater figures for lower-status males, but the differences are not statistically significant. Overall, the incidence figures preserve the trend that lower-class boys report the highest admissions of delinquency, although significant differences in the rates are not always established.

As indicated earlier, violent delinquent acts have been linked to lower-class settings, especially among males. A closer examination of the data discloses that admission rates among the respondents in this sample vary by the target of the aggression (Table 6).

The data in Table 6 show that middle- and upper-class males have lower prevalence rates when aggressive behavior is directed toward authority figures, such as parents and teachers. Moreover, an analysis of variance indicates that a significant difference among the groups occurs when the offenses are directed at teachers. The direction of this relationship suggests that lower-class males are particularly more likely to attack a teacher than are males from middle-class or upper-class homes. The same relationship also applies to parents, although the difference is not as statistically significant.

**Table 6**  
**Prevalence of Male Violent Offenses Directed at Teachers,  
 Peers, or Parents, by Social Class**

Directed at		Lower	Middle	Upper	<i>F</i> Ratio
Peers	<i>M</i>	0.65	0.82	0.63	2.18
	<i>SD</i>	0.67	0.77	0.77	
Parents	<i>M</i>	0.32	0.19	0.17	2.77
	<i>SD</i>	0.55	0.4	0.38	
Teachers	<i>M</i>	0.42	0.31	0.15	3.01*
	<i>SD</i>	0.8	0.56	0.26	

\*Analysis of variance *F* ratio is significant at .05.

### Female Delinquency by Social Class

Survey results from female respondents present a different picture. Upper-class females consistently register the *highest* prevalence rates for all types of offenses, compared to lower- and middle-class females, and most of the differences are statistically significant (Table 7a).

Analysis of variance tests yield significant *F* ratios in five out of the eight offense categories. These data suggest that prevalence rates of upper-class girls are significantly higher than rates of middle- and lower-class girls for overt and covert property offenses, violence, cigarette and alcohol use, and status offenses. No significant differences are observed among the social class groups for vandalism, swindling, or drugs. Girls from all classes are equally as likely to admit having committed these offenses.

Incidence figures in Table 7b confirm the observation that upper-class girls have the highest participation in all offense types except for vandalism, where lower-class girls have a slightly higher participation. Higher incidence figures are also found for overt and covert property offenses and for cigarette and alcohol use. The positive association between status delinquency and social class is somewhat weakened in incidence reports. Also, although upper-class girls as a group still had the highest participation in violence, a statistically significant link between social class and violence is not observed.

The figures for upper-class females have high standard deviations, indicating a wide range in terms of admissions. In addition, they hold particularly higher admission averages in overt and covert property offenses and smoking and drinking. The middle class ranks low in violence and vandalism. Moreover, upper-class females have higher prevalence rates than do their male counterparts in every offense category except drugs, where the rates are nearly the

**Table 7a**  
**Prevalence Figures for Female Respondents, by Offense Type and Social Class**

Offense		Social Class			Tests	
		Lower	Middle	Upper	Ratio and Coefficient	
Overt property	<i>M</i>	0.03	0.03	0.20	<i>F</i> ratio	8.16***
	<i>SD</i>	0.17	0.17	0.52	<i>r</i>	.16**
Covert property	<i>M</i>	0.32	0.41	0.73	<i>F</i> ratio	3.50*
	<i>SD</i>	0.57	0.87	1.04	<i>r</i>	.147*
Vandalism	<i>M</i>	0.74	0.59	0.78	<i>F</i> ratio	1.43
	<i>SD</i>	0.85	0.75	0.92	<i>r</i>	-.02
Swindling	<i>M</i>	0.31	0.34	0.45	<i>F</i> ratio	0.64
	<i>SD</i>	0.53	0.70	0.71	<i>r</i>	.06
Violence	<i>M</i>	0.94	0.76	1.28	<i>F</i> ratio	3.11*
	<i>SD</i>	1.10	1.14	1.63	<i>r</i>	.04
Drugs	<i>M</i>	0.01	0.07	0.10	<i>F</i> ratio	2.10
	<i>SD</i>	0.10	0.27	0.44	<i>r</i>	.12*
Cigarette or alcohol use	<i>M</i>	0.53	0.60	1.10	<i>F</i> ratio	7.77***
	<i>SD</i>	0.77	0.80	0.84	<i>r</i>	.18***
Status	<i>M</i>	2.28	2.12	3.15	<i>F</i> ratio	4.61**
	<i>SD</i>	1.76	1.99	2.12	<i>r</i>	.095*

\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .05. \*\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .01. \*\*\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .001.

same. In addition, incidence rates for upper-status females are higher than those for upper-status males in every offense category except vandalism and drugs, where, again, the rates are very similar. Upper-class girls are set apart as the most delinquent among all the girls, whereas the lower-class females appear to be the most conformist. Thus, despite some relatively high standard deviations, differences in reported delinquency among females across social class categories are evident and, in several cases, statistically significant.

## Conclusions and Discussion

### Overall Delinquency

Youth in this sample of students from metro Manila admit to mostly status delinquencies and minor offenses such as skipping school and cheating. There is also a high prevalence of drinking, smoking, and status offending in

**Table 7b**  
**Incidence Figures for Female Respondents by**  
**Social Class and Offense Type**

Offense		Social Class			Tests	
		Lower	Middle	Upper	Ratio and Coefficient	
Overt property	<i>M</i>	0.10	0.01	0.60	<i>F</i>	5.61**
	<i>SD</i>	0.40	0.33	2.32	<i>r</i>	.128*
Covert property	<i>M</i>	0.75	0.86	2.08	<i>F</i>	5.42**
	<i>SD</i>	1.74	2.10	3.63	<i>r</i>	.149**
Vandalism	<i>M</i>	0.93	0.85	0.90	<i>F</i>	0.80
	<i>SD</i>	1.46	1.44	1.52	<i>r</i>	-.01
Swindling	<i>M</i>	0.51	0.89	1.08	<i>F</i>	1.64
	<i>SD</i>	0.96	2.28	2.18	<i>r</i>	.10
Violence	<i>M</i>	2.67	2.68	4.33	<i>F</i>	2.46
	<i>SD</i>	3.82	4.38	5.48	<i>r</i>	.093
Drugs	<i>M</i>	0.02	0.18	0.23	<i>F</i>	1.7
	<i>SD</i>	0.20	0.80	1.14	<i>r</i>	.118*
Cigarette or alcohol use	<i>M</i>	1.28	2.27	4.53	<i>F</i>	11.9***
	<i>SD</i>	2.45	3.82	4.41	<i>r</i>	.259***
Status	<i>M</i>	4.15	4.53	6.25	<i>F</i>	2.76
	<i>SD</i>	3.85	5.12	5.68	<i>r</i>	.12*

\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .05. \*\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .01. \*\*\*Analysis of variance, *F* ratio, Pearson's *r* significant at .001.

general, similar to other in-school youth surveys, in developing countries such as India (Hartjen & Kethineni, 1996, pp. 98-104) and in self-report studies of delinquency in European societies (Junger-Tas, Marshall, & Ribeaud, 2003). Although a substantial number of youth in this sample admit to vandalism, the indication seems to be that the property damage is not serious, and damage to vehicles, a more serious form of destruction, is less prevalent. Theft tends to be confined to intimate circles, in which stealing from family members is more common than theft outside the family. In addition, theft is likely to be committed in a group context or situation, such as skipping payment for food, movies, and fares. Although violence against peers is frequent, aggression toward authority figures, serious assault, and drug abuse are not common, with the limited exception of youth from lower-class settings.

### Gender and Social Class

The lower delinquency of females compared to males found in this survey affirms the findings of almost all self-report studies of delinquency

anywhere in the world (Hartjen & Kethineni, 1996, p. 104; Junger-Tas et al., 2003, p. 92). Social expectations emphasize the aggressive behavior of boys and conformist behavior of girls. Some authors extend this premise to point out that certain types of delinquency correlate with expectations of masculinity and femininity (George Grosser, cited in Reiss, 1960; also see Gibbons, 1981). In this survey, boys are found to have higher rates of self-reported delinquency in all offenses except covert property offenses, in which prevalence and incidence figures are nearly equal, and swindling, in which female incidence figures are significantly higher than those for males. Gender differences are pronounced when it comes to physically aggressive or destructive offenses, such as violent acts and vandalism. Shoemaker's (1994) study in Cagayan de Oro City in the southern Philippines also found lower male-female ratios for property and status offenses compared to violence and serious offenses.

That girls are as likely as boys to admit to theft recalls notions of the economic rationality theory (Heindensohn, 1989, p. 109), which argues that the pull to fulfill economic needs (or wants) is as strong for females as for males. This finding also suggests that girls are involved in covert types of delinquency. The notion of hidden deviance seems compatible with social expectations on gender roles. Socialization into the feminine role emphasizes a much higher degree of social conformity than does the masculine role (Heindensohn, 1989, p. 110). Recent literature, however, points out increasing female participation in more overt delinquencies such as violence, although girls still lag behind boys in violent and aggressive acts of crime (Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004, pp. 35-39).

Although there is a significant prevalence difference between males and females, the 4 to 3 gender ratio (4 males for every 3 females) indicates a closer gap compared to ratios found in other surveys. The urban setting in metro Manila and the relatively rural atmosphere of the southern city of Cagayan de Oro may account for the difference. Girls in an urbanized setting are exposed to greater opportunities for delinquency and tend to possess a less conformist disposition.

Female emancipation theory (Adler, 1975; Simon, 1975) attributes delinquency participation to the elevation of female status. The narrower gender gap in delinquency rates suggests the emancipation of females as they become exposed to opportunities to deviate and move on to masculine roles and positions.

Despite the inconsistencies with research concerning the validity of the female emancipation explanation of female delinquency in Western countries (Shoemaker, 2005, chap. 11), literature on gender in the Philippines reports

that women were accorded economic, political, and legal rights similar to those of men prior to Spanish colonization.<sup>6</sup> Autonomy, access to property and inheritance, shared duties, and rights and authority over family and household were held by men and women in indigenous Philippines. Women contributed significantly to the household's resources and had control over them. Women also occupied important positions in the religious and social lives of the community (Infante, 1969; Mananzan, 1987; Mendoza-Guazon, 1928; Scott, 1994). It has been argued, on the other hand, that the entrenchment of the Spanish way of life into the local culture during the colonial period may have demoted women's social position (Mananzan, 1987). However, it would seem that Filipino women and girls are accorded higher status than are women in other developing countries, such as India (Hartjen & Kethineni, 1996, pp. 146-151). For example, arranged marriages for girls and young women are not as typical in the Philippines as in India.

Although overall data on girls in the present study show consistency with notions of feminine conformity, upper-class girls are an exception. Their delinquency defies class and gender stereotypes. Upper-class girls are empowered by way of their SES, bestowing them more opportunities, both deviant and conventional. Their social class standing possibly grants them a sense of entitlement or privilege, an attitude of confidence, and, perhaps, an attitude of daring. Shoemaker's (1994) analysis of delinquency in the Philippines also found significant evidence of delinquency committed by upper-status youth, although in that study the upper social statuses were not as clearly drawn as in the present investigation. Furthermore, in the Cagayan de Oro study, it was upper-middle-class *males* who were more delinquent rather than upper-status females. Shoemaker also concluded that one important reason for higher rates of minor forms of delinquency among middle- to upper-status youth was a sense of privilege and entitlement shared by youngsters from wealthier and more influential families. This concept of presumed power and privilege in Philippine society is echoed by social commentators, and it is often connected with avoidance of responsibility for delinquency and criminal actions of the socially privileged (Machado, 1983; Silliman, 1983). In some ways, this sense of class entitlement is responsible for the documented incidences of interfraternity conflicts on the campus of a prestigious university in metro Manila. For some of these youth, expectations for long-lasting social consequences for such behavior seem remote. Some even feel what they are doing is politically "normal" (Zarco & Shoemaker, 1995). Again, in this situation, it is middle- and upper-status males who are doing the fighting.

The present study found that overall delinquency rates have no statistically significant difference among all classes, and this conclusion is consistent with other research, as indicated earlier (e.g., Hartjen & Kethineni, 1996, pp. 97-98; Hartjen & Priyadarsini, 1984, pp. 196-197; Wright et al., 1999). In fact, Wright et al. (1999) offer an interesting explanation for the low overall correlation between SES and delinquency; that is, lower-status youth are more likely to participate in more serious and often more visible acts of crime and delinquency, whereas upper-status juveniles tend to commit less serious forms of delinquency, such as status offenses. Consequently, the two associations are cancelled out when an overall rate of delinquency is calculated. That seems to be exactly what is happening with this study. However, one major difference between the current study and other research is that in metro Manila it is the upper-status *females* who are the most delinquent among all girls, even when compared to upper-status males. With regard to violent behavior, although higher status boys defer from being aggressive to authority figures, they are as aggressive toward their peers as are the boys from lower-class backgrounds. By distancing themselves from overt delinquencies and/or from challenging authority figures, the middle- and upper-class boys in this sample respond to class expectations of conformist, rational, and controlled demeanor but default from the gender expectation of masculine behavior. Instead, they tend to commit covert delinquencies associated with females.

Still, social class differences do exist in this sample of youth, especially among females. Although some may contend that social class makes no difference in the explanation of delinquency, the results of the present study suggest that class does matter, but it matters by context. In addition, as Hagan (1992) has noted, the significance of social class as an explanation of delinquency may also differ by the ways in which class is measured. The measure of social class in this study was based on high school classifications. Measuring social class by individual identifications might produce different results. However, earlier studies of delinquency in the Philippines, using self-identified measures of social class, also revealed high rates of delinquency among upper-status youth, albeit male youth.

One possible explanation for the high rate of delinquency among the upper-status females in this study is power-control theory's view on female delinquency (Hagan, Simpson, & Gillis, 1987). The theory argues that girls reared in homes in which the mother and father share equal levels of power and authority in the workplace (i.e., *egalitarian* households) are more likely to engage in routine or "common" patterns of delinquency because their

parents either excuse delinquency or encourage risk-taking behaviors among their children. It is further assumed that mothers are primary socializers of females, and because mothers in egalitarian households exercise authority in the workplace, they are likely to exercise authority in the home, which, again, leads to increased delinquency among females reared in such households. Although tests of power-control theory in the United States do not uniformly support its propositions (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004, pp. 153-154; Singer & Levine, 1988), its assumptions offer valuable insight into the explanation of female delinquency in the Philippines. Unfortunately, data for the present study are insufficient to further examine power-control theory, but future studies in the Philippines should consider variables that measure the concepts of this theory.

Overall, the results of this study are consistent with many other studies of male and female delinquency in developing countries, including India and the Philippines. However, the relatively high rates of delinquency by upper-status females are inconsistent with previous research. In part, this finding is consistent with sociocultural observations of crime and social responsibility in the Philippines. However, these comments and studies pertain to upper-status males. That it is the upper-status females who are most delinquent among all females, even compared to upper-status males, is the surprising result of this study. Although more detailed analyses of potential contributive factors to this situation are not possible within the scope of this article, one possible scenario involves a sense of privilege and entitlement upper-class individuals, including juvenile females, may feel in Philippine society. In addition, future analyses will address other contributive factors to delinquency, such as family status and peer associations, and how these factors influence gender and class patterns observed in the present study. It is also recognized that better understanding of these issues will result from in-depth, qualitative studies of the lives of girls and boys and their contextual settings, as suggested by others (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2004, chaps. 5 and 6; Messerschmidt, 1997, pp. 115-116).

For the present, it seems clear that although students of delinquency are developing better understandings of the etiology of delinquency, conditions that affect delinquency in developing countries, particularly involving gender and social class comparisons and understandings, are in need of additional study and reflection.

## Appendix A

### List of School Types Included in the Sample

School Type and Class	No. of Schools	Total Respondents
Private, upper class		
All boys school	1	59
All girls school	1	65
Private middle class		
All boys school	1	66
All girls school	1	57
Coed	1	84
Public, all coed		
School 1	1	80
School 2	1	80
School 3	1	80
School 4	1	63
Total	9	633

## Appendix B

### Examples of Socioeconomic Status (SES) Classifications

SES	Father's occupation	Mother's Occupation	Residence Description	School
Upper class	City mayor, president of company, businessman (business specified)	Physician, lawyer, businesswoman (business specified)	AB: House is made of heavy, high-quality materials, well maintained, not in need of repair, well painted, has a big lawn or garden, expensive furnishings, located in exclusive subdivision, house stands out if in mixed neighborhood.	St. John High School, one of the few private, exclusive schools in the country, reputed to be <i>pangmayaman</i> (for the rich) and to have the most expensive tuition fees of all high schools in the country.

## Appendix B (continued)

SES	Father's occupation	Mother's Occupation	Residence Description	School
Middle class	Engineer, school teacher, government employee	School principal, overseas contract worker (nurse), company secretary	C: House is made of mixed heavy and light materials, well maintained, may or may not have a lawn or yard, adequate furnishings, in mixed neighborhood or middle-class subdivision.	Santa Clara High School, one of the many private high schools known to have moderately affordable tuition fees.
Lower class	Tricycle driver, carpenter, <i>jueteng</i> (local lottery) bet collector	Laundrywoman, market vendor, bus conductor	D: House is made of light, cheap materials, shabby in appearance, no lawn or yard, scanty furnishings, crowded neighborhood. E: House is small, in need of repair, a <i>barong-barong</i> , crowded neighborhood, located in slum or squatters area.	Rodriguez Memorial High School, one of the many public high schools with no tuition fees, known to be <i>pangmasa</i> (for the masses).

Note: Fictitious names are used to protect the privacy of schools.

## Notes

1. The notion of *typical* was drawn from the concept of the "ideal type" developed by Max Weber (Gerth & Mills, 1992). An analytic construct, the "ideal typical" embodies the essential traits or meaningful features of a subject. Schools included in the sample were assessed to possess traits or features common to a school of that category, such as size of student population, sex exclusiveness (all boys or all girls) or coeducation (mixed sex), and reputed socio-economic status.

2. In Filipino, *lakas ng loob*, translates as "strength of will." It can indicate a range of attitude and comportment from courage or faith to fearlessness and audacity.

3. As discussed in *Wirtschaft and Gessellschaft*, reprinted in Gerth and Mills (1992).
4. Estimated to compose only 3% to 5% of the population in the United States, as discussed in Thio (1996).
5. The term *group fight* was used (in Filipino, *grupo-grupong away*) as a term distinct from *gang fight*. A *gang* as a term has no equivalent in Filipino. The English word has the connotation of exclusive organization of peers, which is roughly equivalent to *barkada*, the Filipino term for casual friendship groups.
6. Spanish colonization in the Philippines took place for more than three centuries, from the early 16th century until Philippine independence in 1898.

## References

- Abad, R., & Eviota, E. (1982). Philippine sociology in the seventies: Trends and prospects. *Philippine Sociological Review*, 20, 131-150.
- Adler, F. (1975). *Sisters in crime*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Akers, R. L. (1964). Socio-economic status and delinquent behavior: A re-test. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 1, 38-46.
- Aldaba-Lim, E. (1969). *Toward understanding the juvenile delinquent*. Quezon City, the Philippines: Bustamante Press.
- Arroyo, D. M. (1990, June). The usefulness of the ABCDE market research system: A means to check social welfare and class attributes. *Social Weather Bulletin*, 90, 11-12.
- Bautista, M. C. R. (1998). Sociology and sciences in the Philippines: Developments and prospects. *Philippine Sociological Review*, 46, 66-75.
- Canter, R. (1982). Sex differences in self-reported delinquency. *Criminology*, 20, 373-393.
- Carlota, A. (1982-1983). Filipino female juvenile delinquents: An exploratory study of their level of intelligence, personality, and attitudes towards self and selected social figures. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 15-16, 3-27.
- Carlota, S., & Carlota, A. (1989). *Legal and psychological perspectives on juvenile delinquency*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Cavan, R. S., & Ferdinand, T. (1975). *Juvenile delinquency* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1989). Girls, crime and woman's place: Toward a feminist model of delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35, 5-29.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (2004). *The female offender: Girls, women, and crime* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Shelden, R. (2004). *Girls, delinquency and juvenile justice* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.
- Chin, K.-L. (1990). *Chinese subculture and criminality: Non-traditional crime groups in America*. New York: Greenwood.
- City of Manila. (1955). *Compilation of ordinances of the city of Manila*. Manila, Philippines: Author.
- Cohen, A. (1955). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang*. New York: Free Press.
- Cruz, G., & Berja, C. (2004). Non-sexual risk behaviors. In *Youth sex and risk behaviors in the Philippines: A report on the Nationwide Study 2002 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study* (pp. 50-69). Quezon City: University of the Philippines, Population Institute.
- Elliott, D. (1988). *Gender, delinquency and society: A comparative study of male and female offenders and juvenile justice in Britain*. Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

- Elliott, D. S., & Ageton, S. S. (1980). Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, *45*, 95-110.
- Elliott, D. S., Ageton, S. S., Huizinga, D., Knowles, B. A., & Canter, R. (1983). *The prevalence and incidence of delinquent behavior*. Boulder, CO: Behavior Research Institute.
- Elliott, D. S., & Huizinga, D. (1983). Social class and delinquent behavior in a national youth panel, 1976-1980. *Criminology*, *21*, 149-177.
- Enriquez, V. G. (1990). Cross-indigenous methods and perspectives. In V. Enriquez (Ed.), *Indigenous psychology: A book of readings* (pp. 57-64). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Gerth, H. G., & Mills, C. W. (Eds. & Trans.). (1992). *Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gibbons, D. (1981). *Delinquent behavior* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gutierrez, F. (2006). *Intersections of gender and social status: Exploring records and documents on criminality in the Philippines*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Hagan, J. (1992). The poverty of a classless criminology—The American Society of Criminology 1991 presidential address. *Criminology*, *30*, 1-19.
- Hagan, J. A., Simpson, J., & Gillis, A. R. (1987). Class in the household: A power-control theory of gender and delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology*, *92*, 788-816.
- Hartjen, C., & Kethineni, S. (1996). *Comparative delinquency: India and the United States*. New York: Garland.
- Hartjen, C., & Kethineni, S. (1999). Exploring the etiology of delinquency across country and gender. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, *22*, 55-90.
- Hartjen, C. A., & Priyadarsini, S. (1984). *Delinquency in India: A comparative analysis*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hartjen, C. A., & Priyadarsini, S. (2003). Gender, peers, and delinquency: A study of boys and girls in rural France. *Youth & Society*, *34*, 387-414.
- Heindensohn, F. (1989). *Crime and society*. Hampshire, UK: Macmillan.
- Hindelang, M., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J. (1981). *Measuring delinquency*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Infante, T. (1969). *The woman in early Philippines and among the cultural minorities*. Manila, the Philippines: Unitas, University of Santo Tomas.
- Jensen, G. F., & Thompson, K. (1990). What's class got to do with it? A further examination of power-control theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *95*, 1009-1023.
- Junger-Tas, J., Marshall, I. H., & Ribeaud, D. (2003). *Delinquency in international perspective: The International Self-Reported Delinquency Study*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Klein, D. (1979). The etiology of female crime: A review of literature. In F. Adler & R. Simons (Eds.), *The criminology of deviant women* (pp. 58-81). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lanuza, G. (2004). The theoretical state of Philippine youth studies: Current trends and future directions. *Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research*, *12*, 357-376.
- Leonard, E. (1982). *Women, crime and society*. New York: Longman.
- Machado, K. G. (1983). Law and society in rural Philippines. *Solidarity*, *3*, 13-20.
- Mananzan, M. J. (1987). *The Filipino woman: Before and after the Spanish conquest of the Philippines: Essays on Filipino women*. Manila, the Philippines: St. Scholastica's College.
- Mendoza-Guazon, M. P. (1928). *The development and progress of the Filipino women*. Manila, the Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure* (Rev. ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (1997). *Crime as structured action: Gender, race, class, and crime in the making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, W. B. (1958). Lower-class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues*, *14*, 5-19.

- National Coordinating Center for the Study and Development of Filipino Children and Youth. (1967). *Facts about juvenile delinquency*. Quezon City, the Philippines: Author.
- National Statistics Office. (2003). *Functional literacy, education and mass media survey*. Manila, the Philippines: Author.
- Pollak, O. (1950). *The criminality of women*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Raymundo, C. M., & Xenos, P. (1999). The modern profile of Filipino youth. In C. M. Raymundo, P. Xenos, & L. J. Domingo (Eds.), *Adolescent sexuality in the Philippines* (Monograph Series 1-6, pp. 6-18). Quezon City: University of the Philippines, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Development.
- Raymundo, C. M., Xenos, P., & Domingo, L. J. (Eds.). (1999). *Adolescent sexuality in the Philippines* (Monograph Series 1-6). Quezon City: University of the Philippines, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Development.
- Reiman, J. (2001). *The rich get richer and the poor get prison: Ideology, class, and criminal justice* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Reiss, A. (1960). Sex offenses: The marginal status of the adolescent. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 25, 309-333.
- Sandoval, G., Mangahas, M., & Guerrero, L. L. (1998). *The situation of the Filipino youth: A national survey*. Quezon City, the Philippines: Social Weather Stations.
- Scott, W. H. (1994). *Barangay: Sixteenth-century Philippine culture and society*. Quezon City, the Philippines: Ateneo De Manila University Press
- Shoemaker, D. J. (1994). Male-female delinquency in the Philippines: A comparative analysis. *Youth & Society*, 25, 299-329.
- Shoemaker, D. J. (2005). *Theories of delinquency: An examination of explanations of delinquent behavior* (5th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Silliman, G. S. (1983). The Cebuano Filipino's concept of justice. *Solidarity*, 3, 212-228.
- Simon, R. (1975). *The contemporary woman and crime*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Singer, S. I., & Levine, M. (1988). Power-control theory, gender, and delinquency: A partial replication with additional evidence on the effects of peers. *Criminology*, 26, 627-647.
- Smart, C. (1977). *Women, crime and criminology: A feminist critique*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tanioka, I., & Glaser, D. (1991). School uniforms, routine activities, and the social control of delinquency in Japan. *Youth & Society*, 23, 50-75.
- Thio, A. (1996). *Sociology* (4th ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Tittle, C. R., & Meier, R. F. (1990). Specifying the SES/delinquency relationship. *Criminology*, 28, 271-299.
- Tittle, C. R., & Meier, R. F. (1991). Specifying the SES/delinquency relationship by characteristics of contexts. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 28, 430-455.
- Tittle, C. R., Villemez, W. J., & Smith, D. A. (1978). The myth of social class and delinquency: An empirical assessment of the empirical evidence. *American Sociological Review*, 43, 643-656.
- Vaz, E. W. (Ed.). (1967). *Middle-class juvenile delinquency*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wolfgang, M., & Feracutti, F. (1977). *The subculture of violence*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wooden, W. S., & Blazak, R. (2001). *Renegade kids, suburban outlaws: From youth culture to delinquency* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wright, B., Entner, R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T., Miech, R., & Silva, P. (1999). Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation. *Criminology*, 37, 175-194.

Zarco, R. M., & Shoemaker, D. J. (1995). Student organizations as conflict gangs, University of the Philippines, Diliman. *Philippine Sociological Review*, 43, 69-84.

**Filomin C. Gutierrez** is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of the Philippines in Diliman, Quezon City, and she teaches courses in sociology of deviant behavior, criminology, and research methods. She finished her PhD in sociology at the University of the Philippines, Diliman in 2006. Her research includes studies on sexual victimization, crimes in the late Spanish and early American periods, criminology and criminal justice in the Philippines, and crimes of women.

**Donald J. Shoemaker** has conducted international research, particularly in the Philippines, and has published on the topics of juvenile delinquency theory and juvenile justice for more than 30 years. His recent publications include *Theories of Delinquency: An Examination of Explanations of Delinquent Behavior* (fifth edition) and *Juvenile Justice: A Reference Handbook* (with Timothy Wolfe). His current related research interests include studies of delinquency in Turkey and studies of terrorism.