



EAST-WEST CENTER

Population Series

No. 94, October 1997

The Social Mapping of Asian Youth at Risk: An Example from the Philippines

Peter Xenos and Corazon M. Raymundo

Peter Xenos is a Senior Fellow in the Program on Population at the East-West Center. Corazon M. Raymundo is the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the University of the Philippines in Diliman and Professor of Demography at the University of the Philippines Population Institute.

East-West Center Working Papers: Population Series are an unreviewed and unedited prepublication series reporting on research in progress. Please direct orders and requests to the East-West Center's Publication Sales Office. The price for Working Papers is \$3.00 each plus postage. For surface mail, add \$3.00 for the first title plus \$0.75 for each additional title or copy sent in the same shipment. For airmail within the U.S. and its territories, add \$4.00 for the first title plus \$0.75 for each additional title or copy in the same shipment. For airmail elsewhere, add \$7.00 for the first title plus \$4.00 for each additional title or copy in the same shipment. Readers in developing countries may request single copies on a complimentary basis.

Established in 1969 as a unit of the East-West Center, the Program on Population conducts research and offers professional education focusing on population issues, with emphasis on the analysis of demographic and human-resource trends, their social and economic causes and consequences, and their policy implications in Asia, the Pacific, and the United States.

The Office of Population of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) provided support for this publication under a cooperative agreement with the Program on Population of the East-West Center.

Address correspondence to: Dr. Peter Xenos, Program on Population, East-West Center, 1601 East-West Road, Honolulu, HI 96848, USA; Tel: (1-808) 944-7410; Fax: (1-808) 944-7490; E-mail: xenosp@hawaii.edu

Abstract. In modern times the social demography of Filipino youth has been transformed. Among the forces at work are delayed marriage and rising percentages single, extended schooling and rising school enrollment rates, and declining labor force participation rates. The interplay of these trends has produced rapid change in the numbers of youth in various social categories, such as married youth or single and out-of-school youth. Drawing on data from the Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Survey of 1994 (YAFS-II), this paper examines two dimensions of these compositional changes in the Filipino youth population. One is the compositional importance of various kinds of risk-taking behavior, including substance abuse (smoking, drinking, drug use) and sexual risk-taking (premarital sex without protection of condoms, commercial sex) as well as risk-enhancing background (deceased parents, living away from parents, living alone, living in dormitories). The other dimension is modes of societal influence upon youth, including schools, the mass media, and the churches. Youth exposure to these "adult world" influences is measured through behavioral information on school enrollment, media exposure, and religious participation. A cross-tabulation of categories of risk-taking behavior against modes of influence indicates relative numbers of youth engaged in particular forms of risk-taking, according to the modes by which these youth might be influenced.

The Social Mapping of Asian Youth at Risk: An Example from the Philippines

I. Introduction

In 1990 the Asian region contained 64.3 percent of the world's youth and 70.0 percent of the global increase in the number of youth experienced since the middle of this century.¹ In the second half of this century the proportion of total population in the youth age range (ages 15 through 24) has been slightly higher in Asia than for the world as a whole. The Asian youth share peaked around 1990 at 20.4 percent. Population projections indicate that the Asian youth share will decline hereafter, but that the absolute number of Asian youth will expand until late in the 21st century.

Beyond absolute numbers such as these is a more essential reality: Asian youth long have been at the turbulent center of virtually every social, cultural, and economic change; every major societal transformation presses especially heavily upon the young. The consequences of this are wide-ranging, some hidden until later in life, and others readily apparent in contemporary statistical descriptions of youth populations.

Elsewhere one of the authors has presented in graphical form an overview of some prominent demographic or compositional changes among Asian youth (Xenos 1997). This paper focuses on the Philippines. First, we review the "social topography" of Philippine youth to highlight major demographic categories within the youth population, and especially the social categories that are expanding most rapidly and in which behavioral risk-taking may be especially common. Then we utilize behavioral data from the Philippines Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Survey of 1994 (YAFS-II)² to establish recent levels of various "risky" behaviors and risk-enhancing

¹Our definition of youth is, quite arbitrarily but very conveniently, the age group 15 through 24. The numbers in this section for 1990 and onward are from the World Bank's national and regional population projections (Bos, Vu, Massiah and Bulatao 1994), and the estimates for the period from 1950 through 1980 were compiled by the United Nations Population Division (United Nations 1994).

²This survey was funded primarily by the UNFPA, with additional support from USAID. The survey was carried out by the University of the Philippines Population Institute (Corazon Raymundo, Principal Investigator) with the collaboration of the East-West Center, Honolulu,

circumstances in these social groups. This analysis of the Philippines is intended to stimulate a comparative examination of where risky behavior is located across the social landscape and how at-risk youth can be reached. We seek to demonstrate that large-scale survey data on youth populations can inform the effort.

The remainder of the paper is in five sections. The next section comments briefly on the changing social demography of Filipino youth. Then we explore the social map of risky behavior and risk-enhancing circumstances among Filipino youth. A final substantive section illustrates the utility of this kind of social mapping by relating risky behavior and circumstances to certain avenues of influence upon youth that are prominent in the Philippines: the schools, the churches and the mass media. This approach identifies specific risk groups of youth according to the means of reaching them most likely to be successful, and also identifies a sub-group of youth which seems unlikely to be reached by any of the three communication channels.

II. **The Changing Social Demography of Filipino Youth**

We now focus briefly on changes in a few indicators of youth composition over the last two decades, summarized in Table 1. The major compositional changes are similar to those discussed by Xenos (1997) for other Asian societies. With the long-term rise in the mean age at marriage (Xenos, Sarmiento and Gultiano 1990) the percentage of youth at each age who are still single has risen dramatically. Between 1950 and 1990 the percents single at ages 20-24 for males and females rose by 8 and 14 points, respectively. Even at ages 15-19, where over 80 percent of each sex were single in 1950, the percentages single rose to 97 and 90 percent.

School enrollment rates shifted upward even more dramatically during the period. The rate for males 15-19 went from 18 to 58 percent, and the rate for females moved further still, from 4 to 59 percent. The pattern is the same at ages 20-24: the female rate rose from 1 to 25 percent, and the male rate went from 6 to 23 percent. Female enrollment rates rose more rapidly than male enrollment rates and slightly exceeded the male rates by 1990.

Labor force participation rates have shifted differently for young men and women, and for youth in the younger and older age groups. For men aged 15-19, these rates have declined steadily, by a

Hawaii.

Xenos and Raymundo. The Social Mapping of Asian Youth at Risk (draft of Oct. 10, 1997)

total of 17 points to 42 percent by 1990. For the same age group of women, the rates rose from 24 to 31 percent. Among the older group of women the rates also rose sharply while the corresponding male rates declined somewhat.

More difficult to document is a dramatic change in the living arrangements of young people. We lack evidence for earlier decades, but it is generally believed that leaving home prior to marriage is much more common now than in the past, and that this gives rise to a variety of living arrangements. We want to highlight just certain aspects of this transformation of living arrangements. One is the urbanward shift in the residences of youth, and especially of young women, particularly young single women. Eviota and Smith (1984), for example, report sex ratios among urban migrants that clearly indicate this. Another phenomenon worthy of note is the tendency of young people to gravitate toward one another, forming relatively large, multiple-youth households. The YAFS-II survey, for example, indicates that 45 percent of households contain no youth, while 30 percent of households contain two or more youth and 5 percent contain four or more youth. The experience of young people is dramatically affected by this. Out of the total YAFS-II sample, a true national cross-section of persons aged 15-24 living in households, 20 percent were living in a household containing four or more youth.³ This certainly reflects considerable redistribution of the youth population.

Clearly, the social landscape of youth is complex and deserves a more detailed examination. For the present purpose we attend primarily to the marital status, education and urban-rural residential dimensions of this social landscape.

III. The Topography of Risk: Indicators from YAFS-II

The YAFS-II survey questioned young people about several kinds of behavior considered by most to be "risky" in nature. These fall into two broad categories, risks related to substance abuse, and sexual risks. Concerning the use or abuse of substances, youth were asked about their experience of smoking, drinking (of alcohol), and drug use. They were asked whether they had ever engaged in each behavior, at what age they first did so, and whether they are currently doing so. For the present purpose we consider the lifetime experience with each substance as an indicator of risk,

³Unpublished YAFS-II tabulations. The true overall experience of multiple-youth living is somewhat greater and includes youth excluded from the sample because they were living in institutions such as dormitories too large and formally organized to be considered households.

and particularly whether that experience began at an early age, specifically before age 16. Sexual risk-taking is assessed by questions on lifetime experience of sexual intercourse while still single, of pre-marital sex without the protection of a condom, and, for males, of engaging a commercial sex worker (CSW) or prostitute.⁴

A third category of risk is examined, a set of family or residential background situations generally thought to be risk-enhancing. The risk-enhancing backgrounds assessed include being a "loner,"⁵ having only one surviving parent, living away from parents, living in a dormitory situation, currently living in a dormitory, and living neither with parents or in a dormitory.

The survey provides information therefore on certain categories of substance abuse, several kinds of sexual risk, and several kinds of risk-enhancing background. In column 1 of Tables 2 and 3 the reported prevalences of these kinds of risk are presented for young men and women. About 60 percent of male youth reported lifetime smoking experience, 74 percent reported lifetime drinking experience, and 11 percent lifetime experience with drugs. In contrast, the corresponding risk levels among females are markedly lower at 16, 36 and 1 percent, respectively. Smoking is comparatively unlikely among females (though this behavior is on the rise), while substantial percentages report drinking and drug use. The overall level of substance abuse ("any substance abuse") is 77 percent among males versus 39 percent among females.

Sexual risk-taking is also more common among males than females, though here we must suspect under reporting on the part of females (Xenos, Raymundo and Lusterio 1997). Premarital sex is reported by 26 percent of male youth, including 20 percent who report premarital sex without the protection of a condom, while 8 percent of young men report engaging a CSW. Among females 10 percent report premarital sex, virtually all without the protection of a condom. The survey did not examine commercial sexual experience among females.

The information on risk-enhancing background situations indicates that being a loner (or at least reporting this) is exceedingly rare among Filipino young men, and family division due to mortality is uncommon, as is the experience of living away from parents. But lifetime dormitory experience

⁴A full discussion of the survey questions on sexuality is provided in Xenos, Raymundo and Lusterio (1997).

⁵Defined as a person who reports no "close friends," nor persons with whom the respondent associates "more or less regularly."

is much more common at 25 percent, and 13 percent of young men report that presently they are living neither with their parents or in a dormitory. Combined, 42 percent of the male respondents reported at least one of these risk-enhancing situations in their backgrounds. The information on female youth offers an interesting reversal of the usual female-male differentials. While being a loner is also very uncommon among young women, and having a deceased parent is, as expected, at the same level as for males, a much higher percentage of females have lived away from parents (22 percent), and a remarkable 41 percent report dormitory experience at some time in their lives. Finally, a higher percentage of females (17 percent) report living neither with their parents or in a dormitory. Compared with 42 percent among young men, 56 percent of young women reported one or another kind of risk-enhancing circumstance in their backgrounds.

The same information is presented for the youth of Metropolitan Manila in Tables 4 and 5. In general, the risk levels are somewhat higher among Metropolitan young men than among men nationwide. This includes all the forms of substance abuse and sexual risk-taking. The former risks are only marginally higher among Metropolitan young men, while the levels of sexual risk are markedly higher. Risks among females are also higher in the Metropolitan area. This is especially true of drinking and smoking but is not at all true of sexual risk-taking (though, again, incomplete reporting may be distorting the results). Among females, Metropolitan residents are much more likely to live away from their parents, though not in dormitories. At the same time, Metropolitan young women are much more likely to be in a dormitory presently.

The overall comparison of males and females presents an interest pattern. Young women report lower risk levels than men on both the substance abuse and sexual fronts, yet young women also report higher levels on many of the background circumstances thought to be risk-enhancing. This pattern clearly warrants further examination, but here we put that paradox aside to focus on information from the survey on some available modes for reaching youth at risk with messages of warning or encouragement.

IV. On Reaching Youth at Risk

A. Channels of Influence

The survey provides limited but useful information depicting available avenues, through which messages might be delivered and youth influenced. Three of these avenues are examined here to illustrate the interplay of the social landscape of risk and the pattern of young people's

Xenos and Raymundo, *The Social Mapping of Asian Youth at Risk* (draft: Sept. 1997)

connections with the non-youth world. The three adult-world institutions considered here are the schools, the churches and the media. Each is of considerable importance in Philippine society.⁶

The Schools. Schools have been identified as a powerful means for reaching young people. Enrollment rates have increased dramatically in developing countries generally and certainly across most of Asia.⁷ In the Philippines about 58 percent of males and females ages 15-19 were enrolled in 1990 (cf Table 1).

That children's health can be promoted effectively through the schools is widely recognized by such agencies as UNESCO, UNICEF and the WHO. Beyond that, there is ample evidence that remaining in school for additional years brings dramatic benefits, particularly for girls. Among the benefits can be improvements in reproductive health and health-related behavior. The schools are a cost-effective mode of investment in reproductive health (World Bank 1993), and other health risks can be focused upon as well. Moreover, many youth initiate one or more risk behaviors while they are still in school. Others postpone such risks, sometimes forever, on the basis of attitudes and information acquired while in school.

The Churches. The religious institutions are in position to deliver messages very broadly across the society. In the Philippines, where the majority of the population is Christian, predominantly Roman Catholic, recent data indicate that participation in religious rituals on a regular basis remains an important part of the lives of most young people (Mangahas and Guerrero 1992; Abad 1995). The YAFS-II survey also indicates very high levels of religious participation among youth.

The Mass Media. The mass media are relatively well developed and lively in the Philippines, and the basic literacy and reading and listening skills required for access to the media are found across

⁶A significant shortcoming of this analysis is the absence of indicators of young people's connections to peer groups. It has been shown time and again that peer group influences are complex and powerful. The messages emanating from the schools and churches will be mediated through the filter of peer group opinion and reaction, and peers define which mass media (and perhaps which messages) are the ones to listen to. The YAFS-II survey provides some information on peers and their influences which is still being explored.

⁷The global effort to raise enrollment rates has its ideological foundations in the post-war, post-colonial era (Meyer, Ramirez and Soysal 1992), but has taken on the character of a true international effort with the United Nations' Education for All campaign, endorsed by 155 nations. See Xenos (1997) for enrollment data historically for most Asian societies.

much of the population of all ages. Television and radio are common recreations of young people, and substantial percentages of youth report that they read magazines of various kinds. Serialized "comiks" are also very popular.

The risk groups described in the preceding section are shown again in Tables 6 and 7, this time to indicate the percentages of these risk groups who reported being linked in a substantial way with one or more of three adult-world institutions: the schools, the media and the churches. First we should note from the bottom row of Tables 6 and 7 that among young males in the YAFS-II sample 44 percent were enrolled in school, 67 percent utilized the mass media regularly, and 48 percent took part in religious services regularly. Among females the enrollment level was essentially the same, while media use was slightly higher than for males and religious participation was more than 15 percentage points higher.

Considering these as modes or channels of communication with youth, 53 percent of males and 64 percent of females can be reached by more than one of these modes of communication. It is also significant that those enrolled in school are in most cases also connected to either the churches or the media; only 6 percent of males and 4 percent of females can be reached by the schools alone. Some 8-9 percent of males and females can be reached by the churches alone. These are young people who have left school, report little connection to the mass media, but regular participation in religious services. Clearly the mass media have the broadest reach among the three communication modes examined here. Not only is overall participation in the mass media higher than in religious or educational institutions, but from 15 to 20 percent of youth can be reached effectively only by the mass media among the modes of influence we are able to consider. Finally, the survey reveals that 13 percent of male youth and 8 percent of female youth have a low likelihood of being reached by any of the three institutions.

The reach of the schools and the churches is marginally better in Metropolitan Manila than in the country as a whole, while the reach of the media is substantially better (Tables 8 and 9). The media reach 67 percent of male youth nationwide but 83 percent of male youth in Manila, and the female levels are slightly higher still. And, higher percentages of Manila youth can be reached by multiple-channels, while only a very small percentage seem to be unconnected in terms of the communication channels defined here.

We have also examined patterns in other sub-groups of youth. Detailed results are not shown here, but the general pattern is worth noting. The more geographically remote or low in the socio-

economic hierarchy young people are, the less they are connected or reached by the three communication channels. For example, about 26 percent of the sample lives in rural areas relatively remote from the national capital region. Among males in such areas, schools have somewhat less reach (39 percent versus 44 percent nationwide), the churches have less influence (41 versus 48 percent nationally), and the mass media have considerably less influence (55 percent versus 67 percent nationwide). And, 19 percent of males in such areas not linked to any of the communication channels, compared with 13 percent over the whole country. The pattern for females is similar, except that the connection to the churches remains high at 61 percent, compared with 63 percent nationally, and 13 percent cannot be reached by any channel, compared with 8 percent nationally.

B. Reaching Specific Groups at Risk

We now consider channels of influence for specific risk groups, starting with the sexual risk-takers (cf Tables 2 and 3). Overall 26 percent of male youth reported themselves to be sexual risk-takers as defined here. Among the subgroups of males reached by the various communication channels, sexual risk-taking is least prevalent (11 percent) among those enrolled in school but not connected to churches or the media, and most prevalent (39 percent) among those who are linked to the media but not the churches or the schools. The pattern for females is very similar. Sexual risk-taking is negligible (about 2 percent) among those only enrolled in school, and is highest among those reached only by the media (22 percent) or by none of the communication channels (19 percent). These results highlight the potential power of mass media efforts, but also indicate that a small segment of the youth population is not easily approachable by any of the channels we are considering.

Even a much more common risk-behavior such as smoking displays a similar pattern though in muted form. Among males for example, smoking is reported by 60 percent, but only by 44 percent of those enrolled in school (reflecting their younger ages), but smoking is reported by 76 percent of young men who can be reached easily only by the mass media. The level of smoking is also relatively high (71 percent) among males who cannot be reached by any of the three communication channels.

V. Concluding Observations

In the design of programs It is important to know the relative numbers of youth in various

demographic sub-groups or "market segments," to recognize how dramatically this composition has been changing, and to assess how the available channels of communication do or do not reach these segments of the youth population. This paper offers an initial attempt to derive such information from a national survey of youth. The number of such surveys in developing countries is growing, and thus the opportunity for supporting program planning with this kind of information.

The results of the analysis reported here carry practical messages for those who manage information campaigns designed to reach youth: about the demographic diversity of the youth population; about the high and nevertheless variable levels of risk across the main demographic groups; and, about the existence of sub-groups which are within the reach of multiple messages, as well as a small subgroup that seems unlikely to be reached, as least directly, by any of the institutions we have examined.

References

- Abad, Ricardo G. 1995. Varieties of Filipino Religiosity. Social Weather Station Occasional Paper, March
- Bos, Eduard, My T. Vu, Ernest Massiah and Rodolfo A. Bulatao. 1994. World Population Projections 1994-5 Edition. Estimates and Projections with Related Demographic Statistics. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press
- Eviota, Elizabeth U. and Peter C. Smith. 1984. The Migration of Women in the Philippines. Pp. 165-190 in: James t. Fawcett, Siew-Ean Khoo and Peter C. Smith, eds. Women in the Cities of Asia: Migration and Urban Adaptation. Boulder Co.: Westview Press
- Mangahas, Mahar and Linda Luz Guerrero. 1992. Religion in the Philippines: the 1991 ISSP Survey. Social Weather Station Occasional Paper, May
- Meyer, John W. Francisco O. Ramirez and Yasemin Neholgu Soysal. 1992. World Expansion of Mass Education, 1870-1980. Sociology of Education 65(2):128-149
- United Nations. 1994. The Sex and Age Distribution of the World Populations: The 1994 Revision. New York: United Nations, Population Division, Dept. For Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis
- World Bank. 1993. World Development Report. New York: Oxford University Press
- Xenos, Peter. Youth, Sexuality and Public Policy in Asia: A Research Perspective. 1990. Chapter 14 in Stella R. Quah (ed.), The Family as an Asset: An International Perspective on Marriage, Parenthood and Social Policy. Singapore: Times Academic Press
- Xenos, Peter. 1997. The Demographic Transformation of Asian Youth: A Graphical Overview. Presentation for the Workshop on Youth Across Asia, Kathmandu, Nepal, 23-25 September
- Xenos, Peter Eileen Sarmiento and Socorro A. Gultiano. 1990. Philippine Nuptiality in the 1970s: Estimates for Provinces by Urban and Rural Areas. Unpublished report to USAID on Cooperative
- Xenos and Raymundo, *The Social Mapping of Asian Youth at Risk* (draft: Sept. 1997)

Agreement DPE-3046-A-00-8050-00

Xenos, Peter Corazon M. Raymundo and Clarinda R. Lusterio. 1997. Casual, Commercial and Committed: An Assessment and Typology of Premarital Sex in the Philippines. Unpublished paper

Xenos and Raymundo, *The Social Mapping of Asian Youth at Risk* (draft: Sept. 1997)

**Table 1. Indicators of Changing Youth Demography by Age Group and Sex:
Philippines 1950-1990**

| Age group, Sex and Indicator | 1950 | 1970 | 1990 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|
| 15-19 | | | |
| Male | | | |
| % Single | 97.0 | 97.6 | 97.0 |
| % in School | 13.0 | 27.9 | 39.9 |
| % in the Labor Force | 87.0 | 60.0 | 47.0 |
| Female | | | |
| % Single | 86.9 | 89.2 | 89.5 |
| % in School | 24.8 | 24.9 | 37.3 |
| % in the Labor Force | 61.0 | 39.0 | 31.0 |
| 20-24 | | | |
| Male | | | |
| % Single | 65.4 | 69.3 | 73.2 |
| % in School | 5.0 | 15.1 | 22.0 |
| % in the Labor Force | 95.0 | 83.0 | 78.0 |
| Female | | | |
| % Single | 43.7 | 50.3 | 56.7 |
| % in School | 16.1 | 17.0 | 31.8 |
| % in the Labor Force | 53.0 | 46.0 | 42.0 |

Source: Xenos, 1998.

Table 2. Percentage of Males in Each Risk Group, by Available Modes of Influence

| Risk Category | All Males | Mode of Influence | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | | Schools | Media | Churches | 2 or 3 Modes | Schools only | Media only | Churches only | None |
| Substance Abusers | | | | | | | | | |
| Smokers | 60.1 | 43.9 | 61.4 | 56.0 | 52.7 | 41.1 | 75.9 | 68.0 | 71.3 |
| Early Smokers ¹ | 21.8 | 20.3 | 22.7 | 19.9 | 20.7 | 17.6 | 26.0 | 21.1 | 22.7 |
| Drinkers | 73.6 | 60.7 | 76.0 | 70.3 | 68.5 | 54.7 | 86.4 | 76.1 | 82.6 |
| Early Drinkers ¹ | 24.4 | 26.8 | 25.6 | 22.0 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 25.5 | 20.2 | 23.4 |
| Drug Users | 10.9 | 6.1 | 12.1 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 6.3 | 18.9 | 6.2 | 13.0 |
| Early Drug Users ¹ | 2.6 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 2.8 |
| Any Substance Abuse | 77.2 | 64.9 | 79.7 | 74.3 | 72.4 | 58.8 | 90.1 | 80.2 | 84.8 |
| Sexual Risk-takers | | | | | | | | | |
| Premarital Sex (PMS) | 26.1 | 15.4 | 29.0 | 25.1 | 23.4 | 10.4 | 38.2 | 24.7 | 27.3 |
| PMS without condom | 19.7 | 11.7 | 21.4 | 19.0 | 13.8 | 7.0 | 28.0 | 21.4 | 22.0 |
| Commercial Sex Clients | 7.6 | 4.6 | 9.3 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 3.7 | 11.6 | 4.4 | 6.1 |
| Any Sexual Risk-Taking | 26.5 | 15.5 | 29.4 | 25.4 | 23.6 | 10.7 | 38.9 | 24.9 | 28.0 |
| Family and Residential | | | | | | | | | |
| Loner ² | 0.1 | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| One parent deceased | 13.2 | 9.8 | 12.4 | 12.3 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 14.4 | 13.9 | 19.1 |
| Lives away from parents | 15.7 | 16.3 | 15.6 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 14.5 | 15.0 | 16.4 | 14.1 |
| Dormitory Experience | 25.0 | 17.8 | 24.8 | 26.3 | 22.6 | 19.2 | 28.3 | 33.5 | 27.2 |
| Currently in dorm ³ | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Not with parents or in dorm | 12.9 | 13.6 | 13.0 | 13.4 | 13.5 | 11.9 | 12.2 | 13.1 | 11.1 |
| Any Risk-Enhancing Background | 41.5 | 33.6 | 40.7 | 42.1 | 38.5 | 34.1 | 44.9 | 50.0 | 46.9 |

¹ Before age 16

² Reports no friends

³ Among the single only

* Less than 50 cases

** Less than 30 cases

Table 3. Percentage of Females in Each Risk Group, by Available Modes of Influence

| Risk Category | All Females | Mode of Influence | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | | Schools | Media | Churches | 2 or 3 Modes | Schools only | Media only | Churches only | None |
| Substance Abusers | | | | | | | | | |
| Smokers | 16.5 | 13.6 | 18.5 | 14.8 | 15.7 | 8.5 | 25.2 | 15.0 | 12.4 |
| Early Smokers ¹ | 4.7 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 2.4 | 3.2 |
| Drinkers | 36.5 | 31.0 | 39.7 | 35.0 | 35.7 | 24.3 | 47.4 | 32.3 | 32.7 |
| Early Drinkers ¹ | 7.9 | 10.8 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 9.2 | 10.3 | 6.1 | 3.0 | 5.4 |
| Drug Users | 1.0 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 1.7 |
| Early Drug Users ¹ | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| Any Substance Abuse | 39.0 | 33.1 | 42.4 | 37.3 | 38.2 | 24.6 | 50.6 | 35.7 | 34.7 |
| Sexual Risk-takers | | | | | | | | | |
| Premarital Sex (PMS) | 10.1 | 1.8 | 9.9 | 8.1 | 6.3 | 1.4 | 21.6 | 14.3 | 18.7 |
| PMS without condom | 10.0 | 1.8 | 9.8 | 8.0 | 6.2 | 1.4 | 21.2 | 14.2 | 18.3 |
| Any Sexual Risk-Taking | 10.1 | 1.8 | 9.9 | 8.1 | 6.3 | 1.4 | 21.6 | 14.3 | 18.7 |
| Family and Residential | | | | | | | | | |
| Loner ^{2*} | 0.2 | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| One parent deceased | 14.4 | 10.3 | 13.4 | 14.0 | 12.3 | 11.6 | 17.8 | 21.0 | 18.4 |
| Lives away from parents | 22.2 | 18.8 | 20.7 | 21.5 | 19.7 | 26.2 | 26.9 | 31.8 | 30.0 |
| Dormitory Experience | 41.2 | 21.6 | 40.6 | 39.6 | 33.8 | 16.3 | 59.7 | 56.1 | 60.4 |
| Currently in dorm ³ | 4.7 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 5.9 | 8.1 | 7.1 |
| Not with parents or in dorm | 17.4 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.5 | 15.4 | 24.6 | 21.0 | 23.7 | 22.9 |
| Any Risk-Enhancing Background | 56.4 | 39.5 | 54.8 | 54.9 | 49.3 | 40.5 | 71.6 | 71.3 | 74.1 |

¹ Before age 16

² Reports no friends

³ Among the single only

* Less than 50 cases

** Less than 30 cases

14

Table 4. Percentage of Males in Each Risk Group, by Available Modes of Influence: Metro Manila

| Risk Category | All Males | Mode of Influence | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | | Schools | Media | Churches | 2 or 3 Modes | Schools only | Media only | Churches only | None |
| Substance Abusers | | | | | | | | | |
| Smokers | 64.6 | 53.9 | 65.2 | 62.9 | 61.4 | 47.2 | 72.9 | 73.3 | 77.4 |
| Early Smokers ¹ | 20.7 | 24.5 | 20.7 | 19.8 | 22.1 | 29.2 | 17.8 | 6.7 | 18.7 |
| Drinkers | 78.5 | 70.7 | 79.5 | 77.0 | 76.1 | 63.5 | 86.7 | 81.6 | 84.0 |
| Early Drinkers ¹ | 25.9 | 32.8 | 26.7 | 26.0 | 29.3 | 41.8 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 18.7 |
| Drug Users | 14.3 | 6.0 | 14.7 | 10.3 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 29.3 | 8.3 | 25.5 |
| Early Drug Users ¹ | 2.2 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 5.4 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| Any Substance Abuse | 81.8 | 75.5 | 82.7 | 80.1 | 79.3 | 70.7 | 89.6 | 88.3 | 84.0 |
| Sexual Risk-takers | | | | | | | | | |
| Premarital Sex (PMS) | 39.9 | 24.9 | 42.8 | 35.9 | 34.8 | 3.6 | 61.9 | 23.3 | 55.9 |
| PMS without condom | 23.6 | 15.3 | 24.6 | 19.5 | 19.3 | 3.6 | 37.1 | 16.6 | 45.3 |
| Commercial Sex Clients | 14.4 | 8.1 | 15.7 | 14.8 | 13.4 | 3.6 | 21.6 | 6.7 | 10.6 |
| Any Sexual Risk-Taking | 40.1 | 24.9 | 42.9 | 36.2 | 35.0 | 3.6 | 61.9 | 23.3 | 55.9 |
| Family and Residential | | | | | | | | | |
| Loner ^{2*} | | | | | | | | | |
| One parent deceased | 14.7 | 12.5 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 13.9 | 11.8 | 21.3 |
| Lives away from parents | 22.0 | 21.5 | 21.2 | 20.5 | 21.5 | 12.7 | 21.5 | 17.3 | 41.3 |
| Dormitory Experience | 21.1 | 11.3 | 21.5 | 20.7 | 17.6 | 5.4 | 32.3 | 31.6 | 25.2 |
| Currently in dorm ³ | 5.8 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 12.8 |
| Not with parents or in dorm | 16.2 | 16.3 | 15.4 | 14.8 | 15.4 | 12.7 | 16.2 | 17.3 | 28.5 |
| Any Risk-Enhancing Background | 41.3 | 32.6 | 41.4 | 40.0 | 38.3 | 29.1 | 48.1 | 43.4 | 59.9 |

¹ Before age 16

² Reports no friends

³ Among the single only

* Less than 50 cases

Table 5. Percentage of Females in Each Risk Group, by Available Modes of Influence: Metro Manila

| Risk Category | All | Mode of Influence | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Females | Schools | Media | Churches | 2 or 3 Modes | Schools only | Media only | Churches only | None |
| Substance Abusers | | | | | | | | | |
| Smokers | 35.2 | 31.0 | 35.8 | 32.2 | 33.4 | 52.2 | 46.7 | 30.6 | 31.0 |
| Early Smokers ¹ | 9.4 | 11.6 | 9.8 | 8.3 | 9.8 | 23.9 | 9.7 | 3.0 | 5.1 |
| Drinkers | 51.2 | 50.7 | 51.5 | 49.1 | 51.5 | 66.4 | 53.2 | 41.6 | 48.3 |
| Early Drinkers ¹ | 11.3 | 15.5 | 11.4 | 11.2 | 12.8 | 23.9 | 7.3 | 2.0 | 5.1 |
| Drug Users | 2.0 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Early Drug Users ¹ | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Any Substance Abuse | 56.0 | 53.3 | 56.1 | 54.2 | 56.1 | 66.4 | 57.6 | 49.5 | 53.5 |
| Sexual Risk-takers | | | | | | | | | |
| Premarital Sex (PMS) | 11.3 | 1.9 | 10.9 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 13.9 | 34.5 |
| PMS without condom | 11.1 | 1.9 | 10.9 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 13.9 | 29.4 |
| Any Sexual Risk-Taking | 11.3 | 1.9 | 10.9 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 13.9 | 34.5 |
| Family and Residential | | | | | | | | | |
| Loner ^{2*} | | | | | | | | | |
| One parent deceased | 15.9 | 14.1 | 15.6 | 15.4 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 19.7 | 23.7 | 15.6 |
| Lives away from parents | 33.7 | 26.0 | 30.8 | 66.1 | 29.9 | 42.5 | 44.4 | 73.4 | 47.8 |
| Dormitory Experience | 33.6 | 12.9 | 31.3 | 31.6 | 26.3 | 14.2 | 60.5 | 50.5 | 70.6 |
| Currently in dorm ³ | 12.0 | 8.3 | 11.1 | 12.0 | 11.2 | 14.2 | 15.3 | 14.1 | 25.9 |
| Not with parents or in dorm | 21.7 | 17.7 | 19.7 | 21.9 | 18.7 | 28.3 | 29.1 | 59.3 | 21.9 |
| Any Risk-Enhancing Background | 54.0 | 36.5 | 51.0 | 52.5 | 47.0 | 42.5 | 76.6 | 83.2 | 79.3 |

¹ Before age 16

² Reports no friends

³ Among the single only

* Less than 50 cases

Table 6. Percentage Distribution by Available Modes of Influence, by Risk Group: Males

| Risk Category | Mode of Influence | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Schools | Media | Churches | 2 or 3 Modes | Schools only | Media only | Churches only | None |
| Substance Abusers | | | | | | | | |
| Smokers | 32.0 | 68.1 | 44.5 | 46.7 | 4.3 | 24.8 | 9.1 | 15.1 |
| Early Smokers ¹ | 40.7 | 69.2 | 43.5 | 50.5 | 5.1 | 23.4 | 7.8 | 13.2 |
| Drinkers | 36.1 | 68.8 | 45.6 | 49.6 | 4.7 | 23.1 | 8.4 | 14.3 |
| Early Drinkers ¹ | 48.0 | 69.9 | 43.0 | 54.2 | 6.4 | 20.5 | 6.7 | 12.2 |
| Drug Users | 24.7 | 74.0 | 36.4 | 42.4 | 3.6 | 34.2 | 4.6 | 15.3 |
| Early Drug Users ¹ | 32.8 | 74.9 | 41.2 | 53.4 | 3.6 | 26.8 | 2.9 | 13.4 |
| Any Substance Abuse | 36.8 | 68.8 | 46.0 | 50.0 | 4.8 | 22.9 | 8.4 | 14.0 |
| Sexual Risk-takers | | | | | | | | |
| Premarital Sex (PMS) | 25.8 | 74.2 | 46.0 | 47.8 | 2.5 | 28.7 | 7.7 | 13.3 |
| PMS without condom | 25.9 | 72.2 | 45.9 | 47.1 | 2.2 | 27.8 | 8.8 | 14.2 |
| Commercial Sex Clients | 26.7 | 81.2 | 47.8 | 52.5 | 3.1 | 29.7 | 4.6 | 10.1 |
| Any Sexual Risk-Taking | 25.7 | 74.1 | 45.8 | 47.6 | 2.5 | 28.8 | 7.6 | 13.4 |
| Family and Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Loncr ^{2*} | 17.3 | 26.6 | 44.4 | 26.6 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 38.3 |
| One parent deceased | 32.7 | 62.7 | 44.8 | 46.0 | 5.5 | 21.5 | 8.6 | 18.4 |
| Lives away from parents | 49.7 | 66.7 | 50.3 | 58.1 | 6.5 | 17.4 | 7.7 | 10.5 |
| Dormitory Experience | 31.2 | 66.2 | 50.2 | 48.2 | 4.8 | 22.3 | 10.8 | 13.9 |
| Currently in dorm ³ | 46.0 | 62.6 | 50.2 | 54.7 | 6.4 | 17.9 | 8.7 | 12.3 |
| Not with parents or in dorm | 50.5 | 67.7 | 50.3 | 58.9 | 6.4 | 17.2 | 7.5 | 10.1 |
| Any Risk-Enhancing Background | 35.5 | 65.4 | 48.4 | 49.4 | 5.2 | 21.2 | 9.8 | 14.4 |
| All Males | 43.8 | 66.6 | 47.8 | 53.3 | 6.3 | 19.6 | 8.1 | 12.7 |

¹ Before age 16

² Reports no friends

³ Among the single only

* Less than 50 cases

Table 7. Percentage Distribution by Available Modes of Influence, by Risk Group: Females

| Risk Category | Mode of Influence | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Schools | Media | Churches | 2 or 3 Modes | Schools only | Media only | Churches only | None |
| Substance Abusers | | | | | | | | |
| Smokers | 37.2 | 80.2 | 56.6 | 61.0 | 1.9 | 22.7 | 8.3 | 6.2 |
| Early Smokers ¹ | 56.9 | 81.9 | 59.7 | 73.8 | 3.0 | 13.1 | 4.6 | 5.5 |
| Drinkers | 38.4 | 77.8 | 60.7 | 62.8 | 2.4 | 19.3 | 8.1 | 7.4 |
| Early Drinkers ¹ | 61.4 | 79.2 | 63.2 | 74.8 | 4.7 | 11.5 | 3.4 | 5.5 |
| Drug Users | 15.6 | 76.2 | 48.9 | 46.6 | 1.4 | 31.5 | 5.8 | 14.7 |
| Early Drug Users ¹ | 25.4 | 65.9 | 47.8 | 43.1 | 4.1 | 28.4 | 4.8 | 19.7 |
| Any Substance Abuse | 38.3 | 77.7 | 60.5 | 62.8 | 2.3 | 19.3 | 8.3 | 7.3 |
| Sexual Risk-takers | | | | | | | | |
| Premarital Sex (PMS) | 8.0 | 70.1 | 50.4 | 39.8 | 0.5 | 31.6 | 12.9 | 15.2 |
| PMS without condom | 7.9 | 70.2 | 50.5 | 39.8 | 0.5 | 31.6 | 13.0 | 15.1 |
| Any Sexual Risk-Taking | 8.0 | 70.1 | 50.4 | 39.8 | 0.5 | 31.6 | 12.9 | 15.2 |
| Family and Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Loner ^{2*} | 20.0 | 39.5 | 51.4 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 8.5 | 41.8 |
| One parent deceased | 32.3 | 67.0 | 61.5 | 54.8 | 2.9 | 18.4 | 13.3 | 10.5 |
| Lives away from parents | 50.9 | 68.7 | 65.0 | 64.4 | 5.4 | 12.6 | 10.3 | 7.0 |
| Dormitory Experience | 23.6 | 70.4 | 60.8 | 52.6 | 1.4 | 21.5 | 12.4 | 12.0 |
| Currently in dorm ³ | 33.6 | 73.3 | 70.7 | 65.4 | 1.6 | 12.9 | 12.3 | 7.8 |
| Not with parents or in dorm | 53.2 | 67.6 | 63.6 | 64.3 | 6.5 | 12.6 | 9.8 | 6.9 |
| Any Risk-Enhancing Background | 31.6 | 69.6 | 61.5 | 56.2 | 2.6 | 18.9 | 11.5 | 10.8 |
| All Females | 45.1 | 71.5 | 63.2 | 64.1 | 3.7 | 14.9 | 9.1 | 8.2 |

¹ Before age 16

² Reports no friends

³ Among the single only

* Less than 50 cases

Table 8. Percentage Distribution by Available Modes of Influence, by Risk Group: Metro Manila, Males

| Risk Category | Mode of Influence | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------|
| | Schools | Media | Churches | 2 or 3 Modes | Schools only | Media only | Churches only | None |
| Substance Abusers | | | | | | | | |
| Smokers | 41.9 | 83.7 | 52.5 | 62.9 | 2.7 | 23.7 | 4.6 | 6.1 |
| Early Smokers ¹ | 59.4 | 83.2 | 51.8 | 70.8 | 5.3 | 18.0 | 1.3 | 4.6 |
| Drinkers | 45.2 | 84.1 | 52.9 | 64.1 | 3.0 | 23.2 | 4.2 | 5.4 |
| Early Drinkers ¹ | 63.5 | 85.4 | 54.0 | 74.7 | 6.0 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
| Drug Users | 20.9 | 85.3 | 38.9 | 43.3 | 2.4 | 43.0 | 2.4 | 9.0 |
| Early Drug Users ^{1*} | 31.3 | 78.0 | 28.2 | 43.8 | 9.3 | 40.6 | 0.0 | 6.2 |
| Any Substance Abuse | 46.3 | 83.9 | 52.8 | 64.2 | 3.2 | 23.0 | 4.4 | 5.2 |
| Sexual Risk-takers | | | | | | | | |
| Premarital Sex (PMS) | 31.2 | 88.8 | 48.5 | 57.7 | 0.3 | 32.5 | 2.4 | 7.1 |
| PMS without condom | 32.4 | 86.3 | 44.5 | 53.9 | 0.6 | 32.9 | 2.9 | 9.7 |
| Commercial Sex Clients | 28.3 | 91.0 | 55.7 | 61.8 | 0.9 | 31.6 | 1.9 | 3.8 |
| Any Sexual Risk-Taking | 31.1 | 88.9 | 48.7 | 57.8 | 0.3 | 32.4 | 2.4 | 7.1 |
| Family and Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Loner ^{2*} | | | | | | | | |
| One parent deceased | 42.8 | 84.2 | 53.9 | 65.8 | 3.7 | 19.8 | 3.3 | 7.4 |
| Lives away from parents | 53.5 | 79.2 | 50.5 | 67.3 | 2.0 | 16.8 | 3.0 | 9.9 |
| Dormitory Experience | 26.8 | 84.4 | 52.7 | 55.0 | 1.0 | 32.0 | 6.1 | 6.1 |
| Currently in dorm ^{3*} | 50.0 | 81.6 | 52.6 | 72.4 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 11.8 |
| Not with parents or in dorm | 55.6 | 78.5 | 50.0 | 66.1 | 3.3 | 17.6 | 3.4 | 9.5 |
| Any Risk-Enhancing Background | 39.6 | 83.1 | 52.2 | 61.3 | 2.6 | 24.4 | 4.3 | 7.4 |
| All Males | 50.1 | 83.0 | 53.9 | 66.2 | 3.7 | 21.0 | 4.1 | 5.1 |

¹ Before age 16

² Reports no friends

³ Among the single only

* Less than 50 cases

Table 9. Percentage Distribution by Available Modes of Influence, by Risk Group: Metro Manila, Females

| Risk Category | Mode of Influence | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------|
| | Schools | Media | Churches | 2 or 3 Modes | Schools only | Media only | Churches only | None |
| Substance Abusers | | | | | | | | |
| Smokers | 45.0 | 87.6 | 62.8 | 72.6 | 1.7 | 18.0 | 4.8 | 2.8 |
| Early Smokers ¹ | 62.9 | 90.1 | 61.0 | 79.6 | 2.9 | 14.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Drinkers | 50.6 | 86.5 | 65.9 | 76.9 | 1.5 | 14.1 | 4.5 | 3.0 |
| Early Drinkers ¹ | 70.1 | 87.0 | 68.0 | 86.4 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 1.0 | 1.4 |
| Drug Users* | 13.9 | 91.7 | 61.1 | 52.8 | 0.0 | 38.9 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
| Early Drug Users ^{1*} | 25.1 | 100.0 | 62.5 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Any Substance Abuse | 48.7 | 86.3 | 66.5 | 76.7 | 1.4 | 14.0 | 4.9 | 3.0 |
| Sexual Risk-takers | | | | | | | | |
| Premarital Sex (PMS) | 8.7 | 83.5 | 50.4 | 47.5 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 6.8 | 9.7 |
| PMS without condom | 8.8 | 84.7 | 51.2 | 48.2 | 0.0 | 36.5 | 6.9 | 8.4 |
| Any Sexual Risk-Taking | 8.7 | 83.5 | 50.4 | 47.5 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 6.8 | 9.7 |
| Family and Residential | | | | | | | | |
| Loner ^{2*} | | | | | | | | |
| One parent deceased | 45.3 | 84.5 | 66.6 | 71.8 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 8.2 | 3.1 |
| Lives away from parents | 48.3 | 80.7 | 71.0 | 73.3 | 1.7 | 13.6 | 9.1 | 2.3 |
| Dormitory Experience | 19.6 | 80.1 | 64.6 | 60.0 | 0.5 | 24.5 | 8.3 | 6.7 |
| Currently in dorm ³ | 43.1 | 81.5 | 70.2 | 76.9 | 1.7 | 13.0 | 5.1 | 3.4 |
| Not with parents or in dorm | 50.7 | 79.8 | 71.0 | 71.0 | 1.9 | 13.7 | 11.8 | 1.6 |
| Any Risk-Enhancing Background | 34.6 | 81.3 | 66.8 | 66.6 | 0.9 | 19.3 | 8.5 | 4.7 |
| All Females | 51.1 | 86.1 | 68.7 | 76.5 | 1.2 | 13.6 | 5.5 | 3.2 |

¹ Before age 16

² Reports no friends

³ Among the single only

* Less than 50 cases