

## MANILA (THE PHILIPPINES)

Celia Leones<sup>1</sup>

### Description of sample

Research studies in the Philippines are often hampered by the fact that the country is composed of approximately 7,100 islands. To attain a truly balanced representation, ideally, surveys should be conducted in all the fourteen regions of the country. However, due to time and financial constraints it was decided to confine the survey to the National Capital Region (NCR), the most urbanised area of the country.

The National Capital Region, more popularly known as Metropolitan Manila, is composed of four cities, namely Manila, Quezon, Pasay and Caloocan, and 13 municipalities including, Makati, Malabon, Mandaluyong, Marikina, Muntinlupa, Navotas, Las Piñas, Parañaque, Pasig, Pateros, San Juan, Taguig, and Valenzuela. Metro Manila covers a total area of 636 square kilometers, less than 0.5% of the national territory; nevertheless, it has 8,379,948 inhabitants, that is to say, 13.04% of the total population as of 1990.

The NCR has become the country's political, economic and educational centre as evidenced by the presence of 90% of the biggest corporations in the country: all the major newspapers, all the main television stations and 60% of the country's non-agricultural labour force.

In addition, about 90% of the internal revenue for the entire country is collected from this area and almost 80% of the national imports enter the country through the ports in the City of Manila. Metro Manila is also the nation's centre of non-primary production, providing almost one-half of the total national output in manufacturing, commerce and services. The seat of government is also located in this area.

The "barangays", the smallest political unit in the Philippines, are classified by the Department of Social Welfare and Development into two categories only, namely, depressed and non-depressed. These were also the categories employed in this study. Depressed "barangays" fell under the category "lower status residential area"; while non-depressed barangays are grouped under the "middle status residential area".

The barangay is considered depressed when it has a high level of poverty (at least 51% below poverty threshold of P/ 4,037 per month {1988 NEDA statistics}), a high rate of malnutrition among pre-school children, communities without a source of water supply, when it is classified as threatened or infiltrated by leftist groups, when it is disaster-prone, when there exist slum areas inaccessible by public transportation, when it lacks roads or has inadequate lighting facilities, and where a high number of street children, or neglected/exploited children and youths are to be found.

---

<sup>1</sup> Director, Crime Prevention and Co-ordination Branch, National Police Commission, Metro Manila, the Philippines.

There are about a handful of exclusive areas in the metropolis, but these were not included in the sample as the barangays were randomly selected. However, about three respondents from these exclusive barangays were chosen to augment the sample size. The original plan was to interview 1,500 respondents taken pro-rated to population by city/municipality. But, in actually conducting the survey, a total of 1,503 respondents were included in the sample size.

The sample size included 862 (52.4%) females and 641 (42.6%) males, of which 675 were within the 16-34 age bracket, 606 in the 35-54 age category and 222 were 55 and over.

### **Data collection technique**

The research was conducted by permanent employees of the Crime Prevention and Co-ordination Service of the National Police Commission. The research team was composed of seventeen personnel members, of which only one was male. Most of the team members had formal training in research methods and techniques, while others have previously been involved in research. An average of 8 years in the field of research is shared by team members.

All interviewers were briefed by the Philippine Research Co-ordinator. The briefings specifically dealt with researchers' familiarisation with the questionnaire; instructions for the application of the instrument were also discussed. The researchers were also requested to motivate respondents who initially appeared unwilling to co-operate. The sampling and screening questions were also introduced.

Field work was carried out in April and May 1992. Interviews with the victims of crime lasted approximately 10-15 minutes, while non-victim interviews averaged about 5 minutes.

The questionnaire was implemented in two languages, English and the vernacular (Filipino) language. At the outset of the interview respondents were asked to choose which language they preferred to use.

### **Response rate and re-contacting**

Income levels were determined by listing all income statements provided by respondents. The median was computed; so was the 25% from the lowest, and the 25% from the highest. Once all computations were made, the Philippine equivalent to the three levels of income (xxx, yyy, zzz) indicated by the questionnaire were as follows :

xxx-P/ 8,000.00  
yyy-P/ 18,000.00  
zzz-P/ 28,000.00

A total of 1,503 respondents were included in the gross sample. Three additional respondents were included in the original sample of 1,500 to augment the high income group. The three respondents were chosen because of their relatively high monthly income (P28,000 and above).

When collecting data, 34 refusals were encountered. Most of the reasons cited were: lack of time/or too busy with household chores; didn't want to be bothered/disliked being interviewed; doesn't know anything on the subject.

After screening the age factor and closest birth-date, researchers found that all the respondents they approached for an interview proved to be qualified for this task. Therefore, there was no need for a researcher to schedule a re-contacting session.

## **Victimisation rates**

Respondents were asked to relate incidents of crime which they had experienced over the last five years. Various details of what had taken place were collected in the survey.

Most rates presented in this report are personal prevalence rates (i.e. the percentage of victims aged 16 or more, who experience a specific form of crime one or more times).

The rate of victimisation was high, as 808 (53.8%) admitted being victims in the period 1986 to 1992. The total number of victimisations was 1,164 where 228 (28.2%) confessed to having experienced multiple victimisations (see Table 1).

### *Prevalence for the last 5 years*

In general, the survey reveals that crime against property has the highest rate of victimisation, indicating that the majority of the crimes are econogenic in nature. Victimization rates for the last five years demonstrate that the highest number of victimisations is recorded under personal theft with 373 (2.8%), followed by burglary with entry at 140 (9.3%) and theft of bicycle/pedicab with 87 (5.8%) (see Table 2).

It should also be noted that among owners of motor vehicles, about 75 (29.2%) were victims of theft from cars followed by car vandalism with 40 cases (15.6%).

### *Prevalence for one year*

The most common crime committed in the year that ensued was consumer fraud, as evidenced by 355 victims (23.6%) of the total sample. Almost 212 (60%) incidents of this kind were effected in shops of one sort or another, while 74 (21.7%) were detected in the market place. Almost 85% of this victimisation is not reported to the police.

It is disheartening to disclose that the second most common crime is corruption; with 175 (11.6%) admitting to giving "grease money". Most of these victims gave a bribe to government officials/personnel including Bureau of Internal Revenue agents, City/Municipal Hall employees, Metropolitan Waterworks and Sewerage System employees, and Land Transportation employees. The giving of bribes was done to facilitate the faster processing of papers and to benefit from "discounted" prices for citizen's dues.

The third highest victimisation is personal theft which amounted to 137 (9.1%) (see Table 3).

## **Reasons for not reporting**

A low reporting pattern of victims of crime is observed. Of a total of 808 victimisations only 262 (32.4%) reported to the police. Reasons for non-reporting varied.

A general tabulation, regardless of the type of crime, yielded that the most common reason was that the victim did not consider the crime serious enough to warrant reporting to the police. The second most common reason was the lack of proof or evidence or, more often, the suspect is unknown.

Most crimes involving loss of property were not reported because of the lack of evidence/proof. The public seems to believe that if evidence is weak, nothing can come of their complaints. Registering high in this category were crimes of theft of bicycle, personal theft, robbery, theft from car and theft from garages.

Victims of assault/threats, aside from considering the crime as not being serious, often know the offender (12 - 24.5%) which makes them hesitate before reporting such incidents. The close personal attachment, characteristic of the Filipino value of "pakikisama" or camaraderie, discourages referral of petty disputes to authorities/ police.

Similarly, personal crimes such as sexual offences or assaults/threats are considered inappropriate for the police. As expected, sexual offences were not reported as victims feared reprisal.

Theft of car was often reported. Only one incident was not reported because the victim solved the issue on his own; he found out that the perpetrator was known to him.

Theft from car was not reported to the police because most respondents victimised of this type of crime (21 - 37.5%) felt that the police could not do anything because they had insufficient evidence.

In cases of vandalism, almost half (46.7%) regarded the incident as not serious while six (20%) revealed that the police would not do anything about it. A relatively high percentage is reflected under the reason that the incident was inappropriate for the police; as in the case of vandalism (6 - 20%) when these incidents were often settled between the two parties.

All cases of motorcycle/tricycle theft were reported to the police.

The most common reason for non-reporting cited by almost half of the victims of thefts of bicycle is the belief that the police will not do anything because the suspect is unknown or there is insufficient evidence.

In cases of burglary, approximately 30 (31.3%) did not report because they considered the incident as not serious enough. This was closely followed by lack of proof/suspect unknown with 28 (29.2%) cases.

High rates of non-reporting were observed under attempted burglary because 44 (58.7%) admitted that they did not consider these incidents serious as they had not experienced any loss. About 17 (22.7%) also felt that there was lack of proof and that the police could do nothing. Another 13 (17.3%) felt that such incidents were inappropriate for the police.

In further evaluation, victims of crimes of theft from garages (72 - 63.7%) felt that the incidents were not serious enough so they did not bother to report the crime. Most of the cases of theft from garages involved theft of clothes from the laundry-line which occurred mostly at night.

Other reasons cited for not reporting crimes to the police included the following: the victim's lack of time/"too busy"; the belief that nothing would come of the complaint; arrival at an amicable settlement; don't trust the police; considering the incident a family problem, and considering the incident an embarrassment.

The highest rates of reporting were registered for those cases that involved heavy losses or having inflicted serious physical harm on the victims.

All five cases of theft of motorcycle or tricycle were reported to the police. About 85.7% of those victimised by theft of car had complained to the authorities. Cases

of robbery and assaults/threats ranked third and fourth but their percentages were less than half the total amount of victimisations.

## **Crime seriousness**

In general, the seriousness of a crime is perceived mainly as being related to the amount of loss or extent of damage caused by the incident.

To some degree this observation is true, but statistical data gathered (see Table 5) revealed that a good number of people consider "amount of loss" less important than their own safety and that of families. All seven victims of theft of car considered the incident as fairly serious or not very serious because they believed that crimes against persons are more serious than crimes against property. It must also be noted that most of these victims are members of the privileged or middle class group, indicating that such a loss may be relatively minimal to them.

In contrast with this, the victims of theft from cars based their perception of its seriousness on the amount of the loss. Those who considered the incident as serious numbered 13 (17.3%), 34 (45.3%) as fairly serious, and 28 (37.3%) as not very serious.

Also in this regard, 60% of the victims of theft of motorcycle/tricycle considered the incident as serious, while 40% viewed it as fairly serious. The victims of this type of crime considered the incident to be serious because these vehicles are utilised as a means of livelihood.

Almost half of the victims of theft of bicycle consider the incident to be fairly serious, 41.4% said it was not very serious and 9.3% regarded it as very serious.

A scattered pattern is observed for burglary with entry: 36 (37.1%) victims considered it as not very serious; 48 (34.3%) as fairly serious; and 40 (28.6%) as very serious. A similar trend is observed in assault/threat cases with 25 (30.9%) very serious; 27 (33.3%) fairly serious and 29 (35.8%) not very serious.

Most victims of attempted burglary considered the cases not very serious. The same pattern is observed regarding cases of theft from garages/sheds/lockups, where 99 (79.2%) respondents considered it as being not very serious. The same applies to cases of personal theft where 171 (45.8%) registered under not very serious and 155 (41.5%) under fairly serious.

As regards robbery, most cases were regarded as fairly serious by 57 (48.7%) respondents. The same can be said for sexual offences; approximately 40% were considered to be fairly serious.

## **Victims support**

Most of the assistance rendered to victims of crime was not provided by professional agencies assigned for the job. It cannot be denied that, despite the experience of Spanish and American colonisation, the Filipinos have retained the so-called "bayanihan" spirit with a tendency towards personalism, close family ties and interdependence. These various attitudes lead to obtaining support from relatives, friends and neighbours. Only a minimal percentage admitted to having received help from the police, the barangay officials, and social welfare agencies.

Respondents were asked if they considered the agencies set up to help victims of crime useful. Almost half (367 - 45.4%) said that specialised agencies were useful; a number of them clarified that these agencies were useful but that help was given only when requested.

## **Attitudes towards the police**

Out of 808 victims only 181 (22.4%) reported to the police. Of this number, 91 (50.3%) expressed satisfaction with the services provided by the police. However, 89 (49.2%) claimed they were dissatisfied.

Victim dissatisfaction was attributed to the fact that the police didn't find or apprehend the offender (47 - 52.8%); goods were not recovered (89 - 49.2%); the police didn't do enough to help them (42 - 47.2%); the police didn't seem to be interested (11 - 12.4%); police didn't keep the victims properly informed (16 -18%); police officers were slow to arrive (6 - 6.7%); police were impolite (4 - 4.5%); victim did not trust the police (3 - 3.4%) and the offender was freed (1 - 1.1%).

A larger number of respondents had a negative perception of police performance with regard to crime control. 651 (43.3%) rated police performance as "not a good job". On the other hand, 555 (37%) expressed satisfaction with police control of crime in the neighbourhood. It must also to be noted that 289 (19.2%) confessed that they didn't know anything about the issue. About 8 (0.5%) respondents said police performance was inconsistent: it could be good sometimes but bad others.

## **Fear of crime**

Respondents were asked to express their feeling of safety in their respective neighbourhoods. More than half (871 - 58%) said they felt fairly safe; 339 (22.5%) very safe; 271 (18%) a bit unsafe and 22 (1.4%) felt very unsafe.

Interviewees were also asked if they intentionally stayed away from certain streets for safety reasons. Only one third (451) admitted that they selected the streets they went along. A slightly lower percentage (27.6%) confessed they went out with someone else for safety reasons.

However, respondents show a low perception of the chances of being victimised, since they are both "careful" and crime prevention conscious. 1,008 (67.1%) said they were not likely to be victims of crime; on the other hand, the answer given by 271 (18%) was that they did not know. These respondents felt that luck plays an important part in their everyday life. Misfortunes, such as victimisation, are attributed to "kamalasan" (Filipino concept of ill-fate) or "bad luck". This shows that a number of Filipinos consider that the employment of crime prevention measures, awareness of crime procedures, etc. do not have an immediate bearing on victimisation.

## **Crime prevention**

Information was gathered on household crime protection, particularly against burglary (see Table 6). About 85% of the households have door-locks and almost half have window grills and keep watchdogs. Other measures employed are "rondas" by "barangay tanods" (community surveillance system conducted by volunteer groups), lights turned on all night, keeping whistles, nightsticks or handcuffs at hand, posting police telephone numbers on the wall in visible places for immediate reference, and never leaving clothes on the laundry-line.

Respondents admitted to allowing someone to watch over their residence when they were away for a day or two. About 52% (784) admitted having asked their

neighbour or a caretaker to keep watch over their house, while 297 (19.8%) said they did not bother to ask because it was common practice for neighbours to keep watch over one another's empty house when the occupants were away. It is also worth mentioning that 58 (3.9%) said they did not leave the house without a caretaker.

Only a handful of households, 97 (6.4%) claimed they owned guns. Of this number, 73 were handguns, 7 were shotguns and 7 were rifles. Most of those who owned guns did so because their type of work called for it. Among those who owned guns were: police officers, military men, barangay officials, and government agents.

### Attitudes towards punishment

People have different ideas about the sentence which should be assigned to offenders, as is shown in Table 7. In the opinion of most respondents, a twenty-one year old individual guilty of burglary (theft of a colour television set) for the second time, should be imprisoned. A total of 1,233 (82%) respondents - that is to say four-fifths - consider imprisonment the most appropriate sentence.

From among these, 325 (26.4%) respondents thought it wise to send the offender to prison for one year, while 230 (18.6%) interviewees were of the opinion that a 6-12 month sentence was enough. This figure was closely followed by 226 (18.3%) who thought that the detention time should be 2 years (Table 8).

## TABLES

**Table 1: Rates of victimisation**

<b>Victims</b>			808	53.76%
Total No. of victimisations	1,164			
Once	508	71.8%		
More than once	228	28.2%		
<b>Non-victims</b>			695	46.2%
<b>Total</b>			1,503	100.0%

**Table 2: Prevalence victimisation rates (5 years)\***

	Frequency	%
Theft of car	7	0.5
Theft from car	75	5.0
Car vandalism	40	2.7
Theft of motorcycle, moped, moped scooter, tricycle	5	0.3
Theft of bicycle, pedicab	87	5.8
(Owners)		
Theft of car	7	2.7
Theft from car	75	29.2
Car vandalism	40	15.6
Theft of motorcycle, moped, moped scooter, tricycle	5	7.3
Theft of bicycle, pedicab	87	23.0
Burglary with entry	140	9.3
Attempted burglary	84	5.6
Robbery	117	7.8

Theft from garage/shed/lockup	125	8.3
Personal theft	373	24.8
Sexual incidents	30	3.5
Assault/threat	81	5.4

\* Prevalence - percentage of respondents who have been victims of a specific form of crime once or more.

**Table 3: Prevalence victimisation rates (1 year)\***

	Frequency	(%)
Theft of car	5	0.3
Theft from car	27	1.8
Car vandalism	13	0.9
Theft of motorcycle, moped, moped scooter, tricycle	1	0.1
Theft of bicycle, pedicab	35	2.3
(Owners)		
Theft of car	5	2.0
Theft from car	27	10.5
Car vandalism	13	5.1
Theft of motorcycle, moped, moped scooter, tricycle	1	1.5
Theft of bicycle, pedicab	35	9.7
Burglary with entry	44	3.0
Attempted burglary	32	2.1
Theft from garages/sheds/lock-ups	50	3.3
Robbery	41	2.8
Personal theft	137	9.1
Sexual incidents	10	1.2
Assault/threat	24	1.6
Consumer fraud	355	23.6
Corruption	175	11.6

\* Prevalence - percentage of respondents who have been victims of a specific form of crime once or more.

**Table 4: Reported crimes**

	Frequency	%
Theft of car	6	85.7
Theft from car	19	25.3
Car vandalism	10	25.0
Theft of motorcycle	5	100.0
Theft of bicycle	20	23.0
Burglary with entry	44	31.6
Attempted burglary	9	10.7
Theft from garages/sheds/lockups	12	9.6
Robbery	49	41.9
Personal theft	51	13.7
Sexual incidents	5	16.7
Assault/threat	32	39.5

**Table 5: Crime seriousness\***

	Theft of car %	Theft from car %	Car vandalism %	Theft of motorcycle %	Theft of bicycle %	Burglary with entry %	Attempted burglary %	Theft from garages %	Robbery %	Personal theft %	Sexual incidents %	Assault/threat %
Very serious		17.3	2.5	60.0	9.3	28.6	3.6	1.6	31.6	12.6	33.3	30.9
Fairly serious	42.9	45.3	40.0	40.0	49.4	34.3	36.9	19.2	48.8	41.5	40.0	33.3
Not serious	57.1	37.3	57.5		41.4	37.1	59.5	79.2	19.7	45.8	26.7	35.8

\* Percentage based on victims of specific crimes.

**Table 6: Crime prevention measures**

	Frequency	%
Installed burglar alarm	35	2.3
Installed door locks	1,276	84.9
Installed window/door grills	805	53.6
Maintain watchdogs	748	49.8
High fence	248	16.5
House has a caretaker	25	1.7
None of these		
Others (specify)		
- ronda by barangay official	2	0.1
- agent	1	0.1
- always turn on lights	1	0.1
- keeps whistle, nightstick or handcuff	2	0.1
- posted telephone numbers of police on wall	1	0.8
Ask somebody to watch home	784	52.1
Neighbours watch anyway	297	19.8
Never leave house without person	58	3.9
Possession of firearms	97	6.4
Of which:		
- handgun	73	75.2
- shotgun	7	7.2
- rifle	7	7.2
Never leave clothes on the laundry line at night	1	0.1

**Table 7: Attitudes towards punishment**

	Frequency	%
Fine	107	7.1
Prison	1,233	82.0
Community service	53	3.5
Suspended sentence	7	0.5
Fine and prison	3	0.2
Death penalty	7	0.5
Reform but not in jail	1	0.1
Amicable settlement	3	0.2
Refer to barangay/turn over to police	9	0.6
Cut finger/hand	25	0.6
Kill him	2	0.1
Just let him return item	3	0.2
Imprisonment and community service	2	0.1
Reprimand	3	0.2
Give another chance	5	0.3
Physical torture	10	0.7
It depends	5	0.3
Fine, prison and pay	2	0.1

Don't know	23	1.5
------------	----	-----

**Table 8: Years of imprisonment**

Period	Frequency	%
1 month or less	40	3.2
2-6 months	152	12.3
6-12 months	230	18.6
1 year	325	26.4
2 years	226	18.3
3 years	62	5.1
4 years	23	1.9
5 years	39	3.2
6-10 years	29	2.3
11-15 years	2	0.2
16-20 years		
21-25 years		
More than 25 years	2	0.2
Life sentence	28	2.3
Don't know	69	5.6
As prescribed by law	13	1.0