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# Studying the Filipino Youth 

Josefina N. Natividad

Youth or young adulthood is best regarded as a period of transition from the dependence of childhood to the independence of adulthood. It is often considered a critical period, a time when one's future lies ahead with much promise and also much risk. Demographically, youth is a period of many critical transitions: school leaving, taking on the first job, entering into the first serious relationship, first marriage, first pregnancy and other crucial life changes that can have lifelong consequences on an individual's future life trajectory. Many young people fall into a path of problematic behaviors at this stage of their lives, making choices that have adverse consequences, both in the short and the long term. Preventing these problematic behaviors and promoting positive youth development is an investment into the future of the nation. After all, the youth of today are the future of a society. Understanding the youth is an important first step toward creating the path to promoting positive youth development. For this, there is need for empirical evidence, specifically data on a representative sample of this subpopulation, gathered using rigorous methods of inquiry.

The 2013 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study (YAFS4) is the fourth round in a series of surveys on a nationally representative sample of Filipino young adults or the youth. It follows the United Nations (UN) definition of young adults as persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years. ${ }^{1}$ Based on the 2010 Philippine
census, young adults constitute 19.6 percent of the Philippine population, a proportion that has been fairly constant for the past 50 years (i.e., since the 1960 Philippine census). In 2013, we estimated the young adult Filipino population to be 19.2 million. Of these, 10.2 million were aged 15-19 and 9 million were aged 20-24.

The first YAFS survey, the 1982 Young Adult Fertility Study (YAFS1), was the initial attempt to conduct such a study on young people with a nationally representative sample in the Philippines. At that time, the emphasis of most demographic studies was fertility. Thus, YAFS1 covered only young women. Unlike the National Demographic and Health Survey which is a national survey on women of reproductive age (15-49) conducted every five years since 1968 and centered mostly on fertility and its determinants and correlates, YAFS1 included the additional topics of premarital sex, dating and courtship, and attitudes toward virginity, marriage, and family formation. YAFS1 utilized a multistage cluster stratified sampling design that yielded a national probability sample of 5,204 married and unmarried females 15-24 years of age. YAFS1 was conducted by the University of the Philippines Population Institute, with funding from the Commission on Population (PopCom) through the Population Center Foundation.

The second YAFS (YAFS2) survey was conducted in 1994. It was the first survey in the YAFS series to cover both males and females. In

[^0]YAFS2, the term "sexuality" was added to the title for the first time to reflect the change in perspective from a fertility-centered survey to one with a broader scope covering other young adult behaviors. This survey was conducted by the Demographic Research and Development Foundation, Inc. (DRDF), ${ }^{2}$ with funding support from the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and technical support from the EastWest Center Program on Population. YAFS2 had a nationally representative sample of 10,849 respondents ( 5,257 males and 5,622 females). While fertility remained one of its themes, the YAFS2 questionnaire was expanded to include new emerging topics of interest pertinent to young adults, specifically sexuality, awareness and knowledge of HIV/AIDS, and the non-sexual risk behaviors of smoking, drinking, and drug use.

The 2002 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study (YAFS3) was the second national survey of young adults, both male and female. In this round, the age coverage was expanded by three years (i.e., 15-27) because the study intended to analyze the consequences of marital behavior. It was deemed that by age 24 , the number of cases that could be analyzed for this purpose would be small. Expanding the sample to age 27 was expected to yield more cases for analysis. Because of the expanded age coverage, YAFS3 had 19,728 respondents. The YAFS3 sample aged $15-24$ was 16,964 cases. YAFS3 was the first YAFS round where a regionally representative sample of the Muslim youth was included. It also used qualitative data gathering techniques such as focus group discussions and key informant interviews to provide a deeper understanding of the survey results. Some qualitative data collection was also done before the survey to help frame the survey questionnaires. The approach for the design of YAFS3 was more interdisciplinary than YAFS2 with participation of experts from disciplines other than demography like sociology, anthropology, psychology, adolescent medicine and mass communication.

YAFS3 was conducted by the DRDF and UPPI with funding support from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, a United States-based grant-giving institution. YAFS3 was undertaken primarily to update the national and regional database on sexuality and reproductive health knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of young adults in the country. With this series of YAFS surveys, it became possible to establish trends in important reproductive health events of young adults in the Philippines such as premarital sex, sexual risk behaviors like unprotected sex, and non-sexual risk behaviors like smoking, drinking, and substance use. YAFS3 featured for the first time questions on other risk behaviors like suicidal ideation and suicide attempts.

YAFS4, conducted in 2013, used the same set of questions as YAFS3 to allow for the analysis of trends. Additionally, it contains new questions about developments affecting young people that were not yet existent in previous survey rounds, such as widespread cell phone and Internet use. Furthermore, the YAFS4 questionnaire contains a new block on health and lifestyle (e.g., diet, height, weight, exercise, body image), and self-assessed well-being (life satisfaction and happiness). New sections were added to existing blocks, such as depressive symptoms, experience of violence, and harassment using technology including cyberbullying. Funding support for YAFS4 came from the Australian government through the UNFPA and the Department of Health which released funds through the Health System Research Management Grants under the Philippine Council for Health Research and Development (PCHRD).

As with the three previous rounds, the overall objective of YAFS4 is to generate updated estimates of indicators of adolescent reproductive health such as the adolescent fertility rate, sexual and non-sexual risk behaviors of young people, and their determinants and consequences at the national and regional levels. But YAFS offers much more than information on these traditional domains.

[^1]It is also a rich data source on other aspects of young people's lives, such as schooling, employment, parental influences, values, and attitudes. Hence, YAFS4 data can be continually mined to gain further insights into this critical period of life for this current cohort of Filipino youth.

## Research design

The YAFS is designed to be a crosssectional survey of young adults aged 15-24. Results are considered representative of the Filipino youth at the national and regional levels.

## Sampling design

The survey employed a two-stage sampling design with the region as the domain and the barangay as the primary sampling unit. At 5 percent risk with 5 percent margin of error, the minimum sample size required if simple random sampling will be used is about 343 cases per domain. Since the survey followed a two-stage sampling design, the sample size was doubled to account for the design effect of 2. Hence, the target sample size was doubled to 686 cases per region. Should there be other sources of inefficiency, it is assumed that stratification in the sampling design will negate this. However, the possibility of encountering uncooperative eligible respondents as well as inaccessible locations led to further adjustment of the sample size to 800 cases per region. Finally, to allow for a more detailed analysis of the results at the regional level, the target sample size was raised to around 1,000 cases per region.

With the regions as domains, the first step was to determine the sample barangays per region. The number of sample barangays was computed based on an estimate of 15 households per barangay that can be reasonably completed by a survey team in a given day. To account for the possibility of inclusion of inaccessible barangays in the sample, a 15 percent oversampling allowance was applied to the number of sample barangays.

To determine the number of households per region, the average number of target respondents per household was computed for each region. The sample size was proportionally allocated in subsequent stratifications. Once a sample household was selected, all eligible youth respondents (aged 15-24) in that household were interviewed.

## Sample selection

To select the sample barangays in the region, barangays were first stratified into three strata (small, medium, and large), with the size of the youth population as the stratification variable. Once the three strata were formed, the number of sample barangays for the region was proportionally allocated. Within each stratum, the sample barangays were selected with probability proportional to their population size in the 2010 Census of Population. This method of selecting the barangays will result in a greater likelihood of distributing the sample barangays to all provinces.

Consequently using this method, all provinces in the country, except for three small provinces (Batanes, Siquijor, and Dinagat), were eventually included in the sample.

The urban-rural dimension was not considered in stratifying barangays since the use of population size in the stratification will implicitly consider urban-rural grouping (i.e., urban barangays have bigger population sizes, while most rural barangays have smaller population sizes). Thus, the design could guarantee the adequacy of samples for analyses made with the urban-rural dimension.

The sample barangays were divided into enumeration areas (EAs). An EA consists of around 500 households and is determined by natural and man-made boundaries like roads, bridges, and streets. In each sample barangay, one EA was selected using simple random sampling. For each barangay, a representative sample of 15 households was selected using systematic sampling, with the sampling interval derived by dividing the total number of households in
the barangay or EA by 15. All eligible members of the sample household (i.e., those 15-24 years old) were interviewed.

The population counts and the survey sample sizes for the complete YAFS4 sample (all regions) are summarized in Table 1.

In all, YAFS4 covered the 17 regions of the country: 78 provinces, 681 cities and municipalities, and 1,141 barangays. The total sample size is 19,178 cases, 9,353 males and 9,825 females.

## Survey weights

The data was weighted to ensure that the results are representative of the country's youth population and its regional distribution. The weights at the barangay level were computed using the Horvitz-Thompson estimator formula: w_hi=1/p_hi , where p_hi refers to the selection probability of ith sample barangay in stratum $h$. At the household level, the weights were adjusted based on the proportion of sample households to the total number of households in the barangay.

At the respondent level, weight adjustment was done by considering the response rate (i.e., the proportion of interviewed respondents to the total number of eligible respondents). The resulting weights were then scaled down to reflect the survey sample size.

## Survey instruments

In all, YAFS4 used a total of 10 survey instruments: 8 Main Individual Respondents Questionnaire, the Household Questionnaire, and the Community Questionnaire.

The Household Questionnaire is administered in the household that has been selected to be part of the sample regardless of whether or not the household has a member 1524 years old (eligible youth respondent). The respondent to the Household Questionnaire can be the head of the household, the spouse of the household head or any knowledgeable member of the household aged 18 years or above. The Household Questionnaire asks for information about all members of that household. Response

Table 1.1 YAFS4 sample size per region

| Region | 2010 Census of Population |  |  |  |  | 2013 YAFS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Household population | No. of barangays | No. of households | No. of youth | No. of youth per household | No. of barangays | No. of households | No. of respondents |
| 1 | 4,743,067 | 3,265 | 1,050,605 | 885,934 | 0.84 | 73 | 1,091 | 1,202 |
| 2 | 3,225,761 | 2,310 | 727,327 | 631,068 | 0.87 | 71 | 1,060 | 1,099 |
| 3 | 10,118,478 | 3,102 | 2,239,011 | 1,928,626 | 0.86 | 71 | 1,068 | 1,182 |
| 4A | 12,583,009 | 4,011 | 2,833,595 | 2,396,690 | 0.85 | 73 | 1,088 | 1,137 |
| 4B | 2,731,928 | 1,458 | 602,131 | 528,813 | 0.88 | 70 | 1,048 | 1,084 |
| 5 | 5,411,521 | 3,471 | 1,111,753 | 1,030,147 | 0.93 | 66 | 993 | 1,010 |
| 6 | 7,089,739 | 4,050 | 1,526,587 | 1,398,701 | 0.92 | 67 | 1,004 | 1,082 |
| 7 | 6,784,538 | 3,003 | 1,487,710 | 1,331,228 | 0.89 | 69 | 1,028 | 1,037 |
| 8 | 4,089,734 | 4,388 | 865,657 | 780,378 | 0.90 | 68 | 1,021 | 1,122 |
| 9 | 3,397,838 | 1,904 | 726,272 | 686,024 | 0.94 | 65 | 974 | 1,118 |
| 10 | 4,284,594 | 2,022 | 917,840 | 866,299 | 0.94 | 65 | 975 | 1,387 |
| 11 | 4,452,549 | 1,162 | 1,011,943 | 903,278 | 0.89 | 69 | 1,031 | 1,272 |
| 12 | 4,103,105 | 1,194 | 916,038 | 847,274 | 0.92 | 66 | 995 | 1,113 |
| CAR | 1,611,669 | 1,176 | 352,403 | 348,271 | 0.99 | 62 | 931 | 928 |
| ARMM | 3,248,787 | 2,490 | 538,941 | 634,937 | 1.18 | 52 | 781 | 1,056 |
| CARAGA | 2,424,788 | 1,310 | 504,257 | 488,958 | 0.97 | 63 | 949 | 1,259 |
| NCR | 11,796,873 | 1,704 | 2,759,829 | 2,360,131 | 0.86 | 72 | 1,076 | 1,090 |
| Total | 92,097,978 | 42,020 | 20,171,899 | 18,046,757 |  | 1,141 | 17,111 | 19,178 |

to the questionnaire is the basis for identifying eligible respondents in the household.

The Household Questionnaire gathers information about each member of the household such as relationship to household head, age, sex, highest grade completed, main activity, occupation, whether the household member is working abroad, and marital status. It also asks about the amenities owned by members of the household, the tenure status on the lot, and housing conditions (e.g., type of toilet facilities, source of water, housing materials) - information that is used to compute for the socioeconomic status index, the basis for determining the socioeconomic status of the household.

There are eight variants of the individual questionnaire: (1) Main single female, (2) Main married female, (3) Main single male, (4) Main married male, (5) Muslim single female, (6) Muslim married female, (7) Muslim single male, and (8) Muslim married male.

The majority of questions in the Main and the Muslim questionnaires are identical. Deviations from the Main Questionnaires were made in the sections on religion and religious practices and marriage and marriage practices and in some of attitude questions in block K (See blocks of the questionnaire below). For example, the section on religious practices in the Main Questionnaires asked for attendance in religious services such as the mass. For the Muslim questionnaires, the questions referred to practices in the Islamic faith such as fasting during Ramadan. The structure and wording of the questionnaires were designed to minimize interviewer bias and maximize clarity of response.

The Main Questionnaire contains the following blocks:

[^2]| Block H | Marriage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Block I | Puberty, Dating, and Sex |
| Block J | Fertility and Contraception |
| Block K | Knowledge and Attitudes |
|  | toward Marriage, Sex, and <br>  <br> Related Issues |
| Block L | Reproductive Health |

The Main Individual Respondents Questionnaires were administered to all members of the household aged 15-24.

The 10th instrument is the Community Questionnaire administered to the barangay captain or a person in the barangay who was knowledgeable about the community. Data from the Community Questionnaire can provide insights into the immediate environment of the young adult outside the household. The Community Questionnaire has the following sections:

| Section A | Background of the barangay <br> Communication and |
| :--- | :--- |
| Section B | Entertainment Facilities |
| Section C | Reproductive Health <br> Services |
| Section D | Economic Activities <br> Section E |
| Organizations in the <br> Barangay <br> Section F | Youth-Related Concerns <br> Section G |
| Collective Efficacy |  |

The YAFS4 questionnaires built on the core instruments used in the previous rounds and incorporated new developments that were not yet evident in 2002. As a preliminary step to developing the YAFS4 questionnaires, the DRDF team first conducted several focus group discussions with young people to better capture the prevailing conditions surrounding young adults and to frame the questions in the language that is appropriate for them. A consultative workshop participated by experts from the academe, government, non-government organizations and other stakeholders was later convened to further refine the questionnaires.

After the main questionnaires were completed, the questions that were to be revised for the Muslim version of the instrument were identified. Experts on Muslim culture were consulted in the development of the Muslimspecific questions. Focus group discussions were conducted to inquire on the propriety of asking certain questions being considered in the study.

The questionnaires were first prepared in English then translated into six major languages in the country, namely Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilonggo, Waray, Ilocano and Bicol. They were then back translated to English to ensure that the translations remained faithful to the original version. A translation into the Maguindanao language was prepared later, following a request from the Maguindanao area field team.

## Informed consent

The consent of respondents was sought before an interview could be conducted. A standard informed consent form was first read to the potential respondent. Only if he/she indicated agreement to be interviewed under the conditions read to him/her by signing the form did the actual interview proceed. For respondents who were below 18 at the interview date, a parental informed consent form was used. It was first read to the youth's parent/guardian. Only after the parent consented for the youth to be interviewed did we proceed to read the informed consent form to the selected respondent. Unlike youth older than 18, the minor respondents signed an assent form, which is part of the parental consent form.

The procedure for securing informed consent was recommended by the Ethics Review Board of PCHRD which reviewed the ethical dimensions of the survey protocol.

## Data collection

For the data collection, academe-based Regional Coordinators and Field Supervisors recruited from regional universities and organizations (Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University for Ilocos, Cagayan State

University for Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon State University for Central Luzon, UP Los Baños for CALABARZON and MIMAROPA, Ateneo de Naga for Bicol, UP Iloilo for Western Visayas, Office of Population Studies of the University of San Carlos for Central Visayas, UP Tacloban for Eastern Visayas, Xavier University for Northern Mindanao and Caraga, Western Mindanao State University for Zamboanga Peninsula, and Family Planning Organization of the Philippines for Davao and SOCCSKSARGEN) co-supervised the data collection activities in most of the regions, while the DRDF team supervised data collection in the NCR, CAR and ARMM. Field Supervisors from the DRDF were deployed for monitoring and spot checking of field activities. Field Interviewers were recruited from each region.

All field personnel underwent a 4-day training on the questionnaires, the sampling methodology, interviewing techniques, and field methods. A national training was held in December 2012 participated in by Regional Coordinators and Field Supervisors and conducted by the DRDF central team. This was followed by 14 training sessions of the regional field teams, each conducted by two or three representatives of the central team. Each regional field team consisted of at least 2 Field Supervisors and 20 Field Interviewers.

Data was gathered through face-to-face interviews. The interviewer should be of the same sex as the respondent because of the sensitive nature of some of the questions, especially on sexuality.

Data collection started in the National Capital Region after the December 2012 training. In the regions, field work began as soon as the regional training was completed, starting in January 2013. Altogether data collection was from December 2012 to May 2013 with an average duration of 3 months per region.

## Data processing

Data processing began in April 2013 even as the field work was still being completed in some study areas. Some form of data processing
occurred during field work, with field supervisors going over each completed questionnaire to ensure that these were filled in properly and that mistakes could be addressed while the teams were still in the field. Data processing in the central office consisted of office editing, coding and encoding, and data editing. A total of 72 personnel were involved in the various stages of data processing.

The Census and Survey Processing System (CSPro), a software package developed by the United States Census Bureau, was used for data entry and verification. IBM SPSS Statistics was employed for data editing and generation of statistical tables

## Organization of the book

This report presents results of the survey in main themes covered by the study. The description of results across the chapters follow a common format in that each presents the results differentiated along the same set of background characteristics, namely sex, age (classified into two categories: 15-19 and 20-24), region of residence, urban-rural residence, educational attainment at the time of the survey, and the socioeconomic status of the household to which the youth belongs. Urban-rural classification is based on the 2003 official definition of urban and rural barangays used by the then National Statistics Office (National Statistics Office, 2013). The socioeconomic status is derived from the wealth index, a composite index that categorizes households into quintiles ranging from 1 (the lowest quintile or the poorest) to 5 (the highest quintile or the wealthiest). The wealth index in turn employed information on ownership of household amenities and vehicles, and housing characteristics such as source of drinking water and type of toilet facilities in order to categorize households into the appropriate quintile following the methodology of Rutstein and Johnson (2008) that is used in demographic and health surveys (DHS) worldwide. These six basic characteristics are often used in the research literature to explain variability in individual behavior and can help us
understand better the differences and similarities among young people of today.

Furthermore, starting from Chapter 3 up to Chapter 11, findings are presented as a series of bivariate crosstabulations between a given basic characteristic and a given outcome variable. These give the reader some insights into the possible association between each background characteristic and each outcome variable. For example, for the variable smoking, the results will show the difference in smoking behavior between men and women, between the younger (15-19) and older (20-24) cohort, between urban and rural residents, across the wealth quintiles and the 17 regions of the country. In this monograph it is not the intent to test for the combined effects of the background variables. Thus, multivariate analysis is neither conducted nor presented here. That will be the subject of further studies on the YAFS4 data.

Where the data allow, each chapter also presents trends in specific outcome variables, such as the prevalence of premarital sex, drinking, smoking, and substance use, to show how these may have changed over the years. These trend data provide insights into changing behavioral patterns among the different cohorts of youth and how, at the macro level, Philippine society may also be changing.
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# Filipino Youth through the Years 

Nimfa B. Ogena<br>Grace T. Cruz

## Demography of the Filipino Youth

The number and share of the youth in the world's population is close to reaching its historical peak, a point that will mark the largest number and share of young people the world will ever see (Lam, 2007; Nugent, 2005). After this, we expect a period of decreasing share of the world's youth population owing largely to the effects of the global decline in fertility. Estimates show that the size of the youth population has reached its maximum in all regions except Africa (United Nations, 2015).

Still, there is an observed diversity in the demography of the youth population across regions and countries. In the Philippines, the number of young people aged $15-24$ is increasing, with the momentum expected to be sustained
in the coming decades (Figure 1.1). As of 2010, there were around 18 million young adults in the country, 3.4 times its size 50 years earlier (i.e., 5.3 million in 1960). It is projected to expand to a maximum size of 22.2 million in 2040, after which it will start to shrink. This projected trend is based on the Philippine medium-term population projection assumptions, which set replacement fertility to be attained in 2035.

The current structure of the youth population shows a higher number in the younger (15-19 years old) than in the older cohort (20-24 years old). This will continue until 2040, after which a reversal is projected, with the 20-24 age group exceeding the size of the 15-19 age group.

In terms of sex composition, there are currently more male than female youth as indicated by the youth sex ratio of 103 in 2010

Figure 2.1 Youth population size (in millions) and growth, Philippines: 1960-2045

(or 103 males per hundred females). This difference is expected to heighten in the future as the youth sex ratio is projected to increase to 106 in 2045. The increasing proportion of males in the youth population is a reversal of the past trend characterized by more females. In 1970, for example, there were 94 male youth for every 100 female youth, a pattern that persisted until a balanced sex ratio was registered in 2000 (Table 2.1). The main driver to the increase in the sex ratio is the improvement in infant mortality over the preceding decades resulting in higher survivorship for all infants. Since the sex ratio at birth is usually above 100 , improving infant mortality has resulted in more male babies surviving to early adulthood than had in previous times.

Similar to all other age groups, the youth population is increasing but at a decelerating pace. Its highest growth rate was posted in 1960-1970 at 3.1 percent, exceeding that of the total population growth rate of 3.0 percent, which at that time was the peak of growth of the Philippine population (Figure 2.2). Since the 1990s, the youth population has been growing at a lower rate relative to the total population. It is expected to sustain this trajectory of positive growth until 2040-2045, when it is projected to register a negative rate of growth for the first time. This negative growth rate will follow the same trajectory as that of the youngest cohort

Table 2.1 Sex ratio of youth 15-24: 1970-2045

| Year | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 - 2 4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | 95 | 94 | 94 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | 95 | 93 | 94 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | 100 | 99 | 99 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 103 | 102 | 103 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 4 5 *}$ | 106 | 106 | 106 |

Note: *Based on projections using medium assumption.
(i.e., $<15$ years old), the first age group in the country projected to register a negative rate of growth. Due to slowly declining fertility, the youngest age group has consistently been the lowest growing sector in the country since the 1960s.

While the size of the population 15-24 has been increasing over time, its percent share of the total population has remained more or less steady at 20 percent. The percent share reached its peak at 20.5 percent from 1980-1990 but is expected to decline to 16.2 percent in 2040, when the youth population will have achieved its maximum size (Figure 2.3). Studies show that the peak of the youth share of the total population (population 12-24 as a percentage of the total population) occurs at around 25-30 percent of the population for most countries (Lam, 2007).

Figure 2.2 Population growth rates by age group, Philippines: 1960-2045


Figure 2.3 Population 15-24 as a percentage of the total population and growth rate: 1960-2045


At present, the Philippine population displays a characteristic "youth bulge", that is, the bulk of the population both in 1970 and 2010 are in the age groups below 25 . But unlike other countries that show the temporary character of the youth bulge (Xenos \& Kabamalan, 2002), that of the Philippines will likely persist for a relatively prolonged period owing to the slow demographic transition in the county.

The pace of the demographic transition can be discerned from Figure 2.4 which traces the trend in fertility and infant mortality in the Philippines. While fertility rates are declining, the pace of decline has slackened in recent years. This is evident in the total fertility rate (TFR), which dropped from 6 children per woman in
the 1970s to about 3 at present (Figure 2.4). It took two decades (1973-1993) to reduce the TFR from 6 to 4, or approximately one child per decade, but 20 years (1993-2013) to reduce the TFR further by another birth (Cruz, 2014). In comparison, mortality, measured in terms of the infant mortality rate (IMR), declined more rapidly than fertility, resulting in a high rate of natural increase. The highest natural increase was observed in the 1970s, coinciding with the highest population growth rate in the country. This high population growth rate translated to an increasing volume of population increments that resulted in the large cohort of the young adult population that we observe in the country today.

Figure 2.4 TFR and IMR, Philippines: 1973-2013


Population growth momentum is the other driver of the youth bulge. Population momentum refers to the inertia that is inherent in population dynamics because childbearing takes place two to three decades after birth (Lam, 2007; Shryock et al., 1975). With the higher increments in population size, we expect the childbearing population to continue to increase despite the declining fertility rate because the youth of today who are the parents of the future have already been born. Herrin and Costello (1996) estimated that 66 percent of the country's population growth from 1995 through 2020 is due to population momentum, while unwanted (16\%) and wanted fertility (18\%) accounted for the remaining third.

The foregoing overview of the demography of the Filipino youth underscores the significance of the youth sector on the country's future. Their sheer volume alone will have distinct socioeconomic consequences that should be recognized by development planners. For example, their economic implication is evident in the ratio of the youth population to the working age group 25-64 or 25-59 which shows the youth population having a substantial share of the total working age population (Figure 2.5). In 1970, there were 61 youth aged 15-24 for every 100 adults aged $25-64$. In 2010, there were 46 youth for every 100 adults aged 25-64. Although
the ratio had declined, the trend still portrays a very youthful potential labor force.

The high proportion of the youth in the labor force has been hailed as a possible boon to a country's development if their economic potential is harnessed through gainful employment. On the other hand, if they lack the skills for gainful participation, a high proportion of the youth who end up unemployed or unemployable can present problems to the country as a whole (Emoju, 2014, Kumar, 2013) .

In the foregoing discussion, we have established that there is a sizable proportion of the Philippine population who belong to the youth age group. We have also established the projected trajectories of the growth in size of this sector relative to the total population. In order to make appropriate plans for this sector it is important to establish a clearer understanding of who the youth are, beyond their sheer size, projected growth trajectories and relative position in the overall landscape of the Philippine population. The YAFS series of surveys has been one of the more prominent sources of data on the youth in the Philippines. Past YAFS results have been used extensively by government agencies like the Commission on Population, Department of Health and Department of Education as guides in crafting policies and programs targeting this age sector.

Figure 2.5 Ratio of the population 15-24 to population 25-59 and 25-64, Philippines: 1960-2045


| 1960 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

The Youth in Context: Family, School, Peers, Work, and Community

In the following discussion, we present a description of the Filipino youth based on the results of the 2013 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study. In particular, we situate the youth within the major sources of influences in their lives: family, school, peers, work and the community. In so doing, the chapter aims to provide an overall profile of the Filipino youth of today that will help facilitate our understanding of who they are.

## A basic profile of the youth

Beginning in 1994, the YAFS study series was designed to capture a representative sample of the Filipino youth aged 15-24. Expectedly, the study sample must project a profile that closely resembles that of the total population it represents. Results of the last three survey rounds (1994, 2002, and 2013) show an almost equal gender split in the study population. Specifically, the males constitute anywhere between a 47 and 49 percent share, signifying a smaller number of males compared with the
females (Table 2.2). In the 2010 census, there is a slight numeric male edge among the youth in the country, although the difference between the census and the sample population is not significant.

In terms of age composition, the sample aptly captures the age structure of the country's youth population, as both show a higher proportion of the younger (15-19) than the older cohort (20-24). The age structure of the study sample has been more or less stable over the three survey rounds, with the younger cohort constituting around 60 percent of the youth population in the 2013 YAFS. The stability in the age structure over the three survey rounds is also evident in the consistent mean age (about 19 years) of the samples over the three YAFS rounds. Thus, the age and sex composition of the current study closely approximates the age-sex distribution of the Philippine population based on Census data, as did the three previous YAFS rounds. This bolsters the stand that the sample is representative of the Filipino youth in general, hence, the other characteristics of the sample also represent that of the population of Filipino youth of today.

Table 2.2 Percent distribution of YAFS sampled youth: 1994, 2002, and 2013

| Background characteristics | 1994 |  | 2002 |  | 2013 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | No. of cases | Percent | No. of cases | Percent | No. of cases |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 48.3 | 5,257 | 47.4 | 8,042 | 48.8 | 9,365 |
| Female | 51.7 | 5,622 | 52.6 | 8,922 | 51.2 | 9,813 |
| Both sexes | 100.0 | 10,879 | 100.0 | 16,964 | 100.0 | 19,178 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 58.2 | 6,336 | 60.3 | 10,236 | 59.6 | 11,424 |
| 20-24 | 41.8 | 4,543 | 39.7 | 6,728 | 40.4 | 7,754 |
| 15-24 | 100.0 | 10,878 | 100.0 | 16,964 | 100.0 | 19,178 |
| Mean age | 18.9 | 10,878 | 18.8 | 16,964 | 18.9 | 19,178 |

The modal highest educational attainment (36.7\%) is high school undergraduate, mainly because many of those in the age group 15-19 are still in the last years of high school (Table 2.3). About 28 percent completed high school, 21 percent attained college-level education, and 13.8 percent had elementary-level schooling. An almost negligible proportion (0.4\%) had no schooling at all, which leads to the conclusion that practically all Filipino youth have undergone some formal schooling. A gender variation in educational attainment is evident, with the females registering a somewhat better education profile relative to the males. For example, 23.8 percent of females attained college-level education compared with 18 percent of the males.

As to their main activity three months prior to the survey, 36.3 percent reported that they were in school while 25.3 percent were currently working. About one in five (19.8\%), predominantly female, were doing housework. A minority of 8.8 percent were idle, that is, not doing any of the following: studying, working, looking for work, doing housework, or doing unpaid family work. There is a notable gender difference in main activity, with more males reporting themselves to be working and more females in school or doing housework.

The majority of the youth have never been married (76.6\%). The remainder is either in a consensual union (13.8\%) or formally married (8.5\%); a small proportion (1.1\%) are separated, divorced, or widowed (Table 2.3). Compared with past YAFS results, what is striking about the 2013 YAFS sample is the high proportion of youth who are in a living-in arrangement, which exceeds those in a legal union. Living-in is more common among females (20\%) than males (8\%). Likewise, more females are in a formal union, suggesting that they enter union formation earlier than males. Given the greater proportion of females in a marital union, it is not surprising that more of them reported being separated (2\%) compared with males ( $0.3 \%$ ), although the levels are very low for both sexes.

Comparing the marital status composition from the past three YAFS rounds with the
current survey, there is ample evidence that the marital profile of the Filipino youth has undergone dramatic changes, most evidently during the last decade. For one, the proportion of never married Filipino youth declined from 83.9 percent in 2002 to 76.6 percent in 2013, yet the proportion of formally married youth also declined from 9.8 percent in 2002 to 8.5 percent in 2013 (Figure 2.6 ). On the other hand, there is a striking increase in the proportion who are in a living-in arrangement from only 4.7 percent in 1994 to 13.8 percent in 2013. Also In 2013, the proportion of the youth who are separated, widowed, or divorced, although small at 1.1 percent, increased from 0.3 percent in 1994.

In terms of geographic location, more than a third of the youth reside in the biggest regions of the country, namely CALABARZON, NCR, and Central Luzon, with a combined share of 37 percent of the total youth population in the country.

Consistent with the acknowledged dominance of the Catholic faith in the country, 79.4 percent of the youth reported themselves to be Catholics, with the remainder distributed among other Christian and non-Christian religions. One in 20 youth (5\%) are followers of Islam, a proportion that closely resembles the relative share of Muslim Filipinos to the total country population. Despite almost all youth professing to have a religion, only 34.7 percent report that they take part in religious ceremonies. About 44 percent said their parents or guardians required them to attend religious services while they were growing up, while 30.4 percent reported that their family attends religious services together. More among the female youth and the younger cohort attend religious ceremonies compared with their respective counterparts.

## The family context

## Persons who raised the youth

Family support plays a crucial role in the youth's developmental journey. In particular, the family provides a solid foundation for the

Table 2.3 Percent distribution of youth by sex, age group, and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  |  | Female |  |  | Both sexes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15-19 | 20-24 | 15-24 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 15-24 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 15-24 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 96.7 | 72.8 | 87.5 | 84.7 | 40.7 | 66.1 | 90.8 | 55.6 | 76.6 |
| Living-in | 2.6 | 16.5 | 7.9 | 11.5 | 30.3 | 19.5 | 7.0 | 23.9 | 13.8 |
| Formally married | 0.6 | 10.0 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 25.8 | 12.7 | 1.8 | 18.5 | 8.5 |
| Separated/Widowed/Divorced | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| Educational Attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 18.2 | 19.0 | 18.5 | 9.3 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 13.8 | 13.9 | 13.8 |
| High school undergraduate | 49.1 | 19.4 | 37.7 | 49.8 | 16.5 | 35.7 | 49.5 | 17.8 | 36.7 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 18.8 | 36.9 | 25.8 | 21.6 | 44.0 | 31.1 | 20.2 | 40.7 | 28.5 |
| College or higher | 13.8 | 24.7 | 18.0 | 19.3 | 30.0 | 23.8 | 16.5 | 27.5 | 21.0 |
| Type of School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 85.8 | 82.5 | 84.5 | 84.0 | 79.9 | 82.3 | 84.9 | 81.2 | 83.4 |
| Private | 13.9 | 16.9 | 15.1 | 15.8 | 19.5 | 17.4 | 14.8 | 18.3 | 16.2 |
| Catholic | 8.6 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 9.6 | 8.8 | 9.7 | 9.2 |
| Protestant | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Arabic (Eastern) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Mixed Eastern and Western | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Non-sectarian | 4.2 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 7.6 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 7.1 | 5.7 |
| Main Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 11.5 | 7.0 | 9.8 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 8.8 |
| Student | 50.8 | 12.9 | 36.3 | 56.5 | 8.9 | 36.3 | 53.6 | 10.8 | 36.3 |
| Unemployed, looking for work | 5.6 | 14.1 | 8.9 | 3.6 | 7.6 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 10.6 | 7.0 |
| Housework | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 21.9 | 50.3 | 34.0 | 13.4 | 29.1 | 19.8 |
| Unpaid family worker | 3.8 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 2.8 |
| Working (domestic helper included) | 23.1 | 56.8 | 36.0 | 8.9 | 23.6 | 15.1 | 16.1 | 38.9 | 25.3 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 5.2 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Cagayan Valley | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| Central Luzon | 9.8 | 10.8 | 10.2 | 9.6 | 13.3 | 11.2 | 9.7 | 12.2 | 10.7 |
| CALABARZON | 13.4 | 13.0 | 13.3 | 13.9 | 12.5 | 13.3 | 13.6 | 12.7 | 13.3 |
| MIMAROPA | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Bicol | 5.8 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 5.7 |
| Western Visayas | 8.6 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.7 |
| Central Visayas | 7.8 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 5.9 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 7.4 |
| Eastern Visayas | 4.7 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.3 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 3.8 |
| Northern Mindanao | 5.2 | 4.1 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 4.8 |
| Davao | 4.5 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 5.0 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 5.2 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 4.7 |
| CAR | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| ARMM | 3.1 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.5 |
| CARAGA | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.7 |
| NCR | 11.4 | 13.7 | 12.3 | 14.0 | 13.6 | 13.8 | 12.7 | 13.6 | 13.1 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 24.7 | 27.1 | 25.6 | 28.7 | 29.0 | 28.8 | 26.7 | 28.2 | 27.3 |
| Rural | 75.3 | 72.9 | 74.4 | 71.3 | 71.0 | 71.2 | 73.3 | 71.8 | 72.7 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 21.3 | 18.3 | 20.2 | 19.7 | 20.2 | 19.9 | 20.5 | 19.3 | 20.0 |
| Second | 21.4 | 18.9 | 20.5 | 21.3 | 19.7 | 20.6 | 21.3 | 19.3 | 20.5 |
| Middle | 22.2 | 22.5 | 22.3 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.7 | 21.8 | 21.8 |
| Fourth | 19.3 | 23.1 | 20.7 | 21.0 | 21.1 | 21.0 | 20.1 | 22.0 | 20.9 |
| Highest (Richest) | 15.8 | 17.1 | 16.3 | 16.8 | 17.8 | 17.2 | 16.3 | 17.5 | 16.8 |
| Religion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catholic | 79.0 | 80.5 | 79.6 | 78.7 | 79.9 | 79.2 | 78.9 | 80.2 | 79.4 |
| Other Christian | 15.6 | 13.7 | 14.9 | 15.2 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 15.4 | 14.0 | 14.8 |
| Islam | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.0 |
| Others/none | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Religiosity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take part in any religious ceremonies/ activities | 30.4 | 27.7 | 29.4 | 42.4 | 36.2 | 39.7 | 36.3 | 32.3 | 34.7 |
| Parents/guardian require $\mathbf{R}$ to attend mass/religious services, activities | 38.8 | 35.5 | 37.5 | 50.7 | 48.0 | 49.5 | 44.7 | 42.2 | 43.7 |
| R's family attend religious activities/ services together | 29.0 | 27.6 | 28.4 | 30.6 | 34.4 | 32.2 | 29.8 | 31.2 | 30.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| N | 5,771 | 3,594 | 9,365 | 5,653 | 4,161 | 9,813 | 11,424 | 7,754 | 19,178 |
| The questions on religiosity are: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A19 Do you take part in any religious ceremonies/activities: such as fasting on Ramadan, Tarawi, Eid-ul Fitr, Eid-ul Adha? like prayer rallies, fellowship, bible study or healing sessions? A21A Did your parents/guardian require you to attend: religious activities such as Ramadan, etc.? mass or religious services regularly? <br> A21B Does your family attend religious: activities such as Ramadan, Tarawi, Eid-ul Fitr, Eid-ul Adha? services together? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 2.6 Marital status of Filipino youth: 1994, 2002, and 2013

growth and development of its members. A vital building block to understanding one's family support system is identifying the person who mostly raised the youth from birth until they reached the age of majority, i.e., age 18. In the Philippines, the age of majority is when a person becomes legally qualified and responsible for all his/her civil acts (Republic Act No. 6809 of 1989). Before then, parents or guardians are expected to direct or guide the youth to become responsible members of society. The normative expectation in Philippine society is for children to be raised by both parents.

In general this expectation continues to be met as about four of five Filipino youth said they were raised by both their mother and father (Figure 2.7). Slightly more among males (85.4\%) than females (79.8\%) (Table 2.4). About 9 percent were raised by either the mother only or the mother and someone else, while 2.2 percent were raised either by the father only or the father and another person. Surrogate parents, like grandparents and other relatives raised 6.3 percent of the youth.

Being raised by both parents is more common in rural than urban areas. By region, NCR has the lowest proportion of youth raised by both parents ( $75.2 \%$ for males and $69.4 \%$ for females), while Northern Mindanao has the highest $(90.6 \%$ for males and $89.4 \%$ for females). Interestingly, the proportion raised
by both parents increases as the education level of the youth increases. This pattern is true for both males and females. In contrast, the proportion raised by both parents declines as socioeconomic status increases. This pattern is more pronounced among female than male youth.

## Parenting style of parent/guardian

Among the topics explored in YAFS4 is the type of discipline enforced in the family while the young person was growing up, as well as the types of activities that the persons raising the child approved or disapproved of. These are elements of a collection of parental behaviors that characterize parenting styles, which may later influence the youth's behaviors.

In one such question, a list of activities that young people may engage in-which could be allowed or disallowed by parents or guardians depending on how strict or liberal they arewas read to the respondents. The respondents were asked if their parents or guardians allowed them to engage in each activity. Cognizant of the possibility that the persons raising the child may impose different standards (e.g., the father may be stricter than the mother), the question was asked in reference to each of the two main persons who raised the respondent. These two persons could be any of the following: the mother,

Figure 2.7. Person who raised the youth by sex

the father, other immediate family members, or others. For both sexes, the most commonly identified first person who raised them is the father, while the second person is the mother. Results are shown in Tables 2.5 and 2.6.

For males, staying out late is the most commonly disapproved behavior by both the father ( $84.3 \%$ ) and the mother (89.4\%), followed by going out at night with friends ( $84 \%$ for the father, $89.1 \%$ for the mother). In contrast, for females, the most commonly disapproved behaviors by the father are having a boyfriend before age 18 ( $76.4 \%$ ) and going to a party at short notice ( $76.3 \%$ ). Mothers most commonly disapprove of going to a party at short notice (83.2\%).

Respondents were further asked what the usual reactions of the father and the mother were when they did something wrong or something the parent/guardian disapproved of. This is an indicator of the style of discipline practiced in the home as the youth was growing up. According to the males, when they misbehaved, the three most commonly mentioned usual reactions of fathers were physical punishment (84.3\%), grounding (83.8\%), and counseling or talking to them (83.3\%). In contrast, the top three usual reactions of mothers to male youth's
disapproved behavior were counseling (89.9\%), silent treatment (89.6\%), and verbal abuse (88.7\%).

For females, the usual reactions of the father and mother when they misbehaved was completely different in pattern from that reported by the males. The two most commonly mentioned usual reactions of the mother are counseling (84.3\%) and physical punishment (84\%), while for the father the most common reaction is to not react at all ( $79.6 \%$ ). Taken together, these indicate discernible differences in the way parents raise a male child from a female child in the Filipino home. Both male and female children can be physically punished for misbehaving, but who gives the punishment depends on the sex of the child. Males get punished by their father, whereas females are punished by their mother.

Another indicator of parenting style is how closely the parents/guardians are involved in their child's social development, as gauged from their knowledge of and meeting their child's close friends. The results in Table 2.6 show that most youth, males and females alike, reported that their fathers and mothers know of and have met their close friends. For males, about 83 percent said their fathers know of and have met their friends, while 89.8 percent said their mothers
Table 2.4 Percent distribution of youth by person who raised them until age 18 and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Persons who raised male Rs until age 18 |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males | Persons who raised female Rs until age 18 |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father only | Mother only | Both father and mother | Father and Others | Mother and Others | Others |  | Father only | Mother only | Both father and mother | Father and Others | Mother and Others | Others |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 1.1 | 5.4 | 85.0 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 5.0 | 5,771 | 1.5 | 6.5 | 80.0 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 7.6 | 5,653 |
| 20-24 | 1.0 | 5.9 | 85.9 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 4.4 | 3,593 | 1.2 | 7.7 | 79.5 | 0.7 | 3.0 | 7.8 | 4,162 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 0.6 | 2.8 | 89.8 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 472 | 2.6 | 6.4 | 78.3 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 9.0 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 2.6 | 6.1 | 85.8 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 4.3 | 345 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 81.6 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 7.1 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 0.4 | 5.6 | 87.7 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 5.7 | 952 | 0.9 | 6.1 | 81.5 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 8.1 | 1,096 |
| calabarzon | 1.1 | 7.3 | 83.7 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 1,241 | 1.2 | 12.6 | 76.8 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 6.5 | 1,303 |
| mimaropa | 0.4 | 3.5 | 87.6 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 6.0 | 283 | 1.8 | 5.4 | 83.5 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 7.2 | 279 |
| Bicol | 1.0 | 4.8 | 88.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 3.1 | 522 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 85.7 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 7.0 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 1.0 | 5.4 | 87.3 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 4.8 | 765 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 83.7 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 7.6 | 722 |
| Central Visayas | 1.5 | 3.0 | 86.6 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 741 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 85.3 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 7.4 | 674 |
| Eastern Visayas | 1.9 | 4.4 | 81.3 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 8.2 | 427 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 78.6 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 7.5 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 1.3 | 4.0 | 87.9 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 5.1 | 373 | 2.0 | 9.0 | 76.6 | 2.0 | 3.4 | 7.0 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 0.7 | 4.3 | 90.6 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 447 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 89.4 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 4.9 | 473 |
| Davao | 1.3 | 9.2 | 80.5 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 6.3 | 446 | 2.7 | 9.7 | 75.6 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 9.5 | 516 |
| soccsksargen | 2.1 | 3.2 | 89.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 439 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 87.2 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 5.2 | 460 |
| CAR | 1.2 | 2.9 | 90.1 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 172 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 83.9 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 6.5 | 199 |
| ARMM | 1.2 | 4.0 | 91.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 321 | 1.4 | 7.1 | 82.2 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 6.5 | 353 |
| Caraga | 0.8 | 4.2 | 86.8 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 4.9 | 265 | 2.0 | 7.8 | 79.2 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 5.9 | 255 |
| NCR | 0.4 | 9.4 | 75.2 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 1,151 | 1.6 | 8.6 | 69.4 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 11.0 | 1,356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.4 | 8.1 | 80.5 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 6.0 | 2,398 | 1.5 | 8.0 | 74.6 | 1.6 | 4.9 | 9.4 | 2,831 |
| Rural | 1.3 | 4.7 | 87.0 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 6,967 | 1.3 | 6.6 | 82.0 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 7.0 | 6,981 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 1.6 | 5.1 | 84.1 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 5.8 | 1,731 | 2.3 | 8.8 | 74.1 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 10.2 | 922 |
| High school undergraduate | 1.2 | 5.4 | 84.8 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 4.8 | 3,532 | 1.9 | 7.3 | 78.2 | 1.3 | 2.9 | 8.4 | 3,502 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 0.7 | 5.3 | 86.2 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 5.4 | 2,412 | 1.0 | 6.7 | 81.8 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 7.4 | 3,053 |
| College or higher | 0.8 | 6.6 | 86.6 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 1,687 | 0.6 | 6.4 | 82.0 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 6.1 | 2,336 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 1.2 | 5.2 | 86.9 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 1,888 | 1.7 | 7.3 | 81.4 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 6.7 | 1,953 |
| Second | 1.5 | 4.4 | 86.8 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 1,916 | 1.3 | 5.1 | 83.2 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 6.9 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 1.2 | 6.3 | 85.2 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 4.9 | 2,092 | 1.3 | 7.6 | 79.7 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 7.8 | 2,082 |
| Fourth | 0.7 | 5.7 | 85.2 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 1,942 | 1.4 | 7.6 | 78.2 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 8.6 | 2,064 |
| Highest (Richest) | 0.7 | 6.4 | 81.9 | 1.2 | 3.9 | 6.0 | 1,527 | 1.1 | 7.6 | 76.1 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 8.7 | 1,692 |
| Total | 1.1 | 5.6 | 85.4 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 9,365 | 1.4 | 7.1 | 79.8 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 7.7 | 9,813 |

know of and have met their close friends. For females, 74.7 percent said their fathers know of and have met their friends, and 83.8 percent said their mothers know of and have met their friends. Seemingly, more parents know of and have met
the close friends of their sons than those of their daughters, as reported by the youth.

While transitioning to adulthood, it is normal to encounter problems in various aspects of one's life. Respondents were asked with whom they were most likely to share or talk

Table 2.5 Percent distribution of male youth by parenting style of persons who raised them until age 18

| Background characteristics | 1st Person who raised male Rs until age 18 |  |  |  | No. of males | 2nd Person who raised male Rs until age 18 |  |  |  | No. of males |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father | Mother | Other immediate family members | Others |  | Father | Mother | Other immediate family members | Others |  |
| Activities disapproved by Person who raised $\mathbf{R}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Going out of town with friends | 83.2 | 11.8 | 4.8 | 0.2 | 9,258 | 4.5 | 88.2 | 6.1 | 1.2 | 8,502 |
| Staying out late | 84.3 | 10.2 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 9,253 | 3.5 | 89.4 | 5.6 | 1.5 | 8,499 |
| Spending overnight at a friend's house | 83.7 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 0.4 | 9,252 | 4.2 | 88.6 | 5.7 | 1.4 | 8,495 |
| Going to a party at short notice | 83.8 | 11.2 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 9,251 | 4.3 | 88.8 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 8,489 |
| Going out on a single date | 83.2 | 11.5 | 4.9 | 0.4 | 9,254 | 4.5 | 88.1 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 8,498 |
| Having a BF/GF before age 18 | 82.4 | 12.5 | 4.6 | 0.5 | 9,259 | 4.3 | 88.3 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 8,497 |
| Living away from home | 83.3 | 12.0 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 9,251 | 4.5 | 88.9 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 8,485 |
| Going out at night with friends | 84.0 | 10.9 | 4.7 | 0.4 | 9,250 | 4.0 | 89.1 | 5.1 | 1.8 | 8,490 |
| Usual reaction to R's disapproved behavior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Counsel/talk | 83.3 | 12.1 | 4.3 | 0.3 | 9,348 | 3.9 | 89.9 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 8,476 |
| Ground me | 83.8 | 9.8 | 5.1 | 1.3 | 9,347 | 4.9 | 86.3 | 6.0 | 2.7 | 8,475 |
| Withhold allowance | 74.2 | 15.2 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 9,348 | 5.6 | 79.6 | 9.3 | 5.6 | 8,475 |
| Give me a scolding | 81.8 | 12.9 | 5.1 | 0.2 | 9,348 | 5.7 | 87.8 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 8,476 |
| Verbally abuse me | 82.7 | 12.1 | 4.8 | 0.3 | 9,348 | 3.5 | 88.7 | 4.7 | 3.1 | 8,475 |
| Physically punish me | 84.3 | 10.4 | 5.1 | 0.2 | 9,349 | 4.8 | 88.4 | 5.6 | 1.2 | 8,477 |
| Give me the silent treatment | 77.7 | 15.4 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 9,346 | 1.9 | 89.6 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 8,475 |
| No reaction | 77.1 | 19.5 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 9,349 | 12.1 | 76.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 8,475 |
| Who knows any of R's close friend | 83.4 | 11.9 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 9,335 | 4.1 | 89.8 | 4.7 | 1.4 | 8,507 |
| Who have met any of R's close friend | 83.2 | 12.1 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 9,324 | 4.1 | 89.8 | 4.8 | 1.3 | 8,498 |

Table 2.6 Percent distribution of female youth by parenting style of persons who raised them until age 18

| Background characteristics | 1st Person who raised female Rs until age 18 |  |  |  | No. of females | 2nd Person who raised female Rs until age 18 |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father | Mother |  | Others |  | Father | Mother | $\qquad$ | Others |  |
| Activities disapproved by Person who raised R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Going out of town with friends | 75.3 | 16.3 | 8.1 | 0.2 | 9,799 | 8.6 | 81.3 | 8.5 | 1.5 | 8,599 |
| Staying out late | 75.7 | 16.6 | 7.5 | 0.2 | 9,804 | 8.2 | 82.4 | 7.9 | 1.5 | 8,592 |
| Spending overnight at a friend's house | 75.7 | 16.4 | 7.7 | 0.2 | 9,803 | 8.2 | 82.5 | 7.6 | 1.6 | 8,596 |
| Going to a party at short notice | 76.3 | 16.2 | 7.3 | 0.2 | 9,802 | 8.0 | 83.2 | 7.1 | 1.6 | 8,592 |
| Going out on a single date | 75.8 | 16.4 | 7.6 | 0.2 | 9,792 | 8.2 | 82.4 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 8,584 |
| Having a BF/GF before age 18 | 76.4 | 15.6 | 7.9 | 0.2 | 9,800 | 8.7 | 81.7 | 8.1 | 1.4 | 8,597 |
| Living away from home | 75.3 | 16.5 | 8.0 | 0.2 | 9,793 | 8.1 | 82.2 | 8.3 | 1.4 | 8,583 |
| Going out at night with friends | 75.7 | 16.9 | 7.2 | 0.2 | 9,797 | 8.1 | 82.6 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 8,584 |
| Usual reaction to R's disapproved behavior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Counsel/talk | 76.7 | 16.0 | 7.1 | 0.2 | 9,802 | 6.8 | 84.3 | 7.7 | 1.3 | 8,584 |
| Ground me | 74.6 | 17.8 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 9,801 | 5.4 | 81.5 | 12.5 | 0.6 | 8,585 |
| Withhold allowance | 67.7 | 26.2 | 4.6 | 1.5 | 9,801 | 8.7 | 80.4 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 8,584 |
| Give me a scolding | 73.2 | 18.7 | 7.9 | 0.2 | 9,802 | 8.2 | 83.3 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 8,585 |
| Verbally abuse me | 72.6 | 20.2 | 7.0 | 0.2 | 9,801 | 5.4 | 83.8 | 8.0 | 2.8 | 8,586 |
| Physically punish me | 72.2 | 19.4 | 8.3 | 0.1 | 9,802 | 7.5 | 84.0 | 7.2 | 1.3 | 8,584 |
| Give me the silent treatment | 71.3 | 19.3 | 9.1 | 0.4 | 9,802 | 5.7 | 82.3 | 8.9 | 3.2 | 8,585 |
| No reaction | 79.6 | 8.9 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 9,802 | 16.0 | 60.0 | 19.2 | 4.8 | 8,585 |
| Who knows any of R's close friend | 74.7 | 18.1 | 7.0 | 0.2 | 9,794 | 7.6 | 83.8 | 7.3 | 1.3 | 8,608 |
| Who have met any of R's close friend | 74.7 | 18.1 | 7.0 | 0.1 | 9,789 | 7.6 | 83.8 | 7.4 | 1.3 | 8,606 |

about problems they experienced when they were growing up, classified into school-related problems (e.g., bullying), financial problems, problems regarding relationships with family members, problems regarding relationships with friends, and problems with intimate relationships. Table 2.7 shows that when it comes to schoolrelated and financial problems, the youth most commonly consult their mother but when it comes to problems regarding relationships, they most commonly consult close friends. Among males, over a third (36.3\%) said they do not confide in anyone when it comes to problems regarding intimate relationships. The corresponding percentage for females is 23.5 percent.

It appears that the father is not a common choice for a confidante for either male or female youth, not even for problems that may not be so personal in nature, such as school-related and financial concerns. In this regard, the youth appear to be more connected to the mother. Moreover, in keeping with the more prominent role of peers in this age group as part of the normal development process, close friends also play a prominent role as confidantes, especially
for more personal concerns like intimate relationships.

## Siblings

The Filipino youth typically come from a large family. In all, three out of four youth have three or more siblings (Table 2.8), 14.7 percent have two siblings, 7.2 percent have one sibling, and 1.9 percent are only child. The three regions with the highest proportion of youth with three or more siblings are ARMM (89\%), Bicol (87.9\%), and Caraga (87.1\%). The region with the lowest proportion with three or more siblings is Central Luzon (66.8\%).

Table 2.8 also shows that the number of siblings is negatively associated with education and socioeconomic status. The higher the educational attainment, the lower the average number of siblings. In the same manner, the proportion of youth with three or more siblings declines as socioeconomic status increases. Slightly more youth from the rural areas (77.9\%) than from the urban areas (71.6\%) come from a family with three or more siblings.

Table 2.7 Percent distribution of male and female youth by persons they are most likely to share or talk their problems with

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No one | Father | Mother | Siblings/ relatives | Close friends | Others |  |
| With whom most likely to share or talk problem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regarding relationship with family members | 15.4 | 9.9 | 30.8 | 10.1 | 28.8 | 4.9 | 9,353 |
| Regarding relationship with friends | 25.4 | 6.1 | 19.7 | 7.4 | 38.2 | 3.2 | 9,357 |
| Regarding intimate relationships | 36.3 | 4.4 | 15.6 | 5.5 | 35.7 | 2.5 | 9,355 |
| School-related problems | 10.1 | 12.5 | 53.5 | 4.2 | 10.8 | 8.7 | 9,356 |
| Financial problems | 7.6 | 22.2 | 54.5 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 7.4 | 9,354 |
|  | Female |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females |
|  | No one | Father | Mother | Siblings/ relatives | Close friends | Others |  |
| With whom most likely to share or talk problem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regarding relationship with family members | 6.9 | 3.3 | 30.4 | 14.4 | 41.2 | 3.8 | 9,807 |
| Regarding relationship with friends | 16.4 | 1.9 | 30.2 | 16.9 | 31.8 | 2.9 | 9,810 |
| Regarding intimate relationships | 23.5 | 1.2 | 21.2 | 12.0 | 40.7 | 1.4 | 9,781 |
| School-related problems | 5.9 | 7.0 | 62.0 | 7.9 | 12.2 | 5.0 | 9,809 |
| Financial problems | 4.6 | 16.0 | 62.7 | 6.1 | 5.0 | 5.7 | 9,809 |

The majority (77.6\%) reported getting along well with all their siblings. There are slight differences in this proportion by sex, age, and socioeconomic status. More males, the older cohort, and those from the higher income quintiles reported getting along well with all siblings compared with their respective counterparts.

## The school context

Human capital investment in the youth by the family is key to their social and economic mobility in later life. Parents and guardians generally provide the motivation and support to ensure that their children complete schooling. Figure 2.8 shows that 36.4 percent of Filipino youth were in school in the three months preceding the survey, while 63.2 percent were

Table 2.8 Percent distribution of Filipino youth by number of siblings and by getting along status with their siblings

| Background Characteristics | No. of siblings |  |  |  |  | No. of Cases | Percent who get along well with (all) siblings | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 or more | Total |  |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 2.0 | 7.7 | 15.6 | 74.7 | 100.0 | 9,345 | 79.7 | 9,155 |
| Female | 1.8 | 6.7 | 13.9 | 77.6 | 100.0 | 9,798 | 75.7 | 9,658 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 2.3 | 8.4 | 16.1 | 73.3 | 100.0 | 11,399 | 76.5 | 11,207 |
| 20-24 | 1.4 | 5.3 | 12.8 | 80.4 | 100.0 | 7,742 | 79.3 | 7,606 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 2.1 | 7.3 | 19.5 | 71.1 | 100.0 | 934 | 82.7 | 913 |
| Cagayan Valley | 1.9 | 10.2 | 19.5 | 68.4 | 100.0 | 668 | 74.2 | 635 |
| Central Luzon | 2.9 | 8.2 | 22.1 | 66.8 | 100.0 | 2,049 | 84.9 | 2,001 |
| CALABARZON | 1.8 | 7.7 | 14.3 | 76.2 | 100.0 | 2,547 | 86.0 | 2,545 |
| MIMAROPA | 1.2 | 5.3 | 13.2 | 80.2 | 100.0 | 561 | 82.1 | 559 |
| Bicol | 1.1 | 3.5 | 7.5 | 87.9 | 100.0 | 1,093 | 81.9 | 1,092 |
| Western Visayas | 2.2 | 9.4 | 12.2 | 76.3 | 100.0 | 1,481 | 80.2 | 1,451 |
| Central Visayas | 1.7 | 6.7 | 13.1 | 78.5 | 100.0 | 1,412 | 70.1 | 1,398 |
| Eastern Visayas | 1.6 | 4.1 | 8.6 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 828 | 82.8 | 812 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 2.1 | 7.6 | 15.0 | 75.4 | 100.0 | 727 | 73.9 | 716 |
| Northern Mindanao | 1.8 | 6.4 | 14.0 | 77.7 | 100.0 | 921 | 61.6 | 910 |
| Davao | 1.7 | 9.0 | 15.3 | 74.0 | 100.0 | 959 | 71.8 | 929 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 2.5 | 10.1 | 14.8 | 72.6 | 100.0 | 897 | 66.2 | 858 |
| CAR | 1.6 | 4.1 | 10.5 | 83.8 | 100.0 | 370 | 77.7 | 358 |
| ARMM | 1.0 | 3.1 | 6.8 | 89.0 | 100.0 | 672 | 75.8 | 641 |
| Caraga | 1.5 | 3.1 | 8.3 | 87.1 | 100.0 | 520 | 62.2 | 518 |
| NCR | 2.0 | 7.6 | 18.3 | 72.0 | 100.0 | 2,504 | 77.1 | 2,480 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 2.0 | 8.0 | 18.3 | 71.6 | 100.0 | 5,224 | 77.2 | 5,153 |
| Rural | 1.9 | 6.8 | 13.4 | 77.9 | 100.0 | 13,918 | 77.8 | 13,660 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 0.8 | 3.0 | 7.9 | 88.3 | 100.0 | 2,645 | 74.7 | 2,580 |
| High school undergraduate | 1.9 | 6.7 | 13.4 | 78.0 | 100.0 | 7,019 | 75.6 | 6,900 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 1.4 | 6.4 | 15.5 | 76.7 | 100.0 | 5,460 | 80.7 | 5,377 |
| College or higher | 3.3 | 11.8 | 20.6 | 64.3 | 100.0 | 4,016 | 79.0 | 3,953 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 1.0 | 4.6 | 10.0 | 84.3 | 100.0 | 3,832 | 75.4 | 3,746 |
| Second | 1.7 | 5.2 | 10.9 | 82.2 | 100.0 | 3,929 | 75.4 | 3,869 |
| Middle | 1.7 | 6.4 | 15.4 | 76.6 | 100.0 | 4,164 | 77.8 | 4,096 |
| Fourth | 2.7 | 8.0 | 17.6 | 71.9 | 100.0 | 4,000 | 78.4 | 3,937 |
| Highest (Richest) | 2.7 | 12.6 | 20.6 | 64.0 | 100.0 | 3,216 | 81.8 | 3,163 |
| Total | 1.9 | 7.2 | 14.7 | 76.2 | 100.0 | 19,143 | 77.6 | 18,813 |

not in school but had been in school before. Less than 1 percent ( $0.4 \%$ ) have never been to school. There is no gender differential in schooling status, but among those in school, a slightly higher proportion of females (32.8\%) than males (27.6\%) have a college education (Figure 2.9).

There appears to be a positive association between socioeconomic status and being in school. Nearly half of the youth (46.6\%) in the richest quintile were in school compared with less than a third of the youth in the poorest quintile (29.4\%; Table 2.9).

To further explore the bivariate relationship between socioeconomic status and various dimensions of the school experience, Table 2.10 cross tabulates school characteristics by socioeconomic status among the youth who were in school at the time of the survey. Results indicate that the proportion of youth who attend public schools has a socioeconomic gradient. As socioeconomic status increases, the proportion enrolled in a public school decreases. The proportion of in-school youth who assessed their school performance as excellent/very good is highest among youth in the highest quintile and lowest among youth from the poorest quintile, but there is no monotonic increase as socioeconomic status improves.

Among those who have left school, the median age at school leaving is 16 years (Table 2.11). There are no large differentials by sex, age, urban/rural residence, and socioeconomic

Table 2.9 Percent distribution of Filipino youth by Schooling status in the past 3 months

|  | Schooling status in the past 3 months |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Figure 2.8. Schooling status in the past three months by sex


Table 2.10 Percent distribution of Filipino youth who are currently in school in the past $\mathbf{3}$ months by school characteristics

| School characteristics | Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  | Total | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lowest (Poorest) | Second | Middle | Fourth | Highest (Richest) |  |  |
| Type of school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 18.3 | 20.6 | 21.9 | 22.4 | 16.8 | 100.0 | 5,571 |
| Private | 7.9 | 10.8 | 17.7 | 23.8 | 39.7 | 100.0 | 1,415 |
| Catholic | 7.3 | 11.5 | 16.2 | 23.3 | 41.8 | 100.0 | 811 |
| Protestant | 20.9 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 18.6 | 41.9 | 100.0 | 43 |
| Arabic (Eastern) | (20.0) | (40.0) | (40.0) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 5 |
| Mixed Eastern and Western | 21.9 | 12.5 | 18.8 | 31.3 | 15.6 | 100.0 | 32 |
| Non-sectarian | 7.0 | 9.2 | 20.0 | 25.1 | 38.7 | 100.0 | 501 |
| Expected highest schooling to be attained |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | (71.4) | (7.1) | (3.6) | (10.7) | (7.1) | 100.0 | 28 |
| High school undergraduate | 34.0 | 14.0 | 18.0 | 10.0 | 24.0 | 100.0 | 50 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 30.1 | 26.0 | 20.8 | 15.6 | 7.6 | 100.0 | 1,214 |
| College or higher | 12.8 | 17.1 | 21.2 | 24.4 | 24.5 | 100.0 | 5,676 |
| Subjective assessment of school performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Excellent | 18.5 | 19.3 | 22.2 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 100.0 | 379 |
| Very good | 12.3 | 15.1 | 23.5 | 24.0 | 25.1 | 100.0 | 2,016 |
| Good | 16.5 | 19.0 | 19.9 | 23.5 | 21.1 | 100.0 | 3,888 |
| Fair | 24.4 | 25.9 | 20.3 | 16.2 | 13.3 | 100.0 | 656 |
| Poor | 32.4 | 27.0 | 13.5 | 16.2 | 10.8 | 100.0 | 37 |
| Total | 16.2 | 18.6 | 21.1 | 22.7 | 21.5 | 100.0 | 6,986 |

status. Across regions, the median age at school leaving is one year earlier in ARMM (15 years) and one year later (17 years) in MIMAROPA, Western Visayas, CAR, Caraga, and NCR. For those who left school with an elementary education, the median age at school leaving is 13 years.

Nearly two of every three youth who have left school plan to return to school. The proportion is higher among the youth in the 15-19 age group, urban residents, high school
graduates or higher, and those of higher socioeconomic status.

## Participation in school organizations

School organizations provide the youth with varied opportunities for developing accountability, responsibility, and skills such as leadership and socializing. Table 2.12 shows the proportion who participate in school

Figure 2.9. Level of schooling of the currently in school youth by sex

Table 2.11 Percent distribution of youth formerly in school by age left school, plan to return to school, and expected highest level of schooling to be completed

| Background Characteristics | Median Age left school | No. of cases | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plan to return to } \\ \text { school } \end{gathered}$ |  | No. of cases | Expected highest level of schooling to be completed |  |  |  |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Yes | No |  | Elementary | High school | Vocational | College | Post graduate |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 16.0 | 5,810 | 62.5 | 37.5 | 5,862 | 0.3 | 11.9 | 7.6 | 40.3 | 1.8 | 5,907 |
| Female | 16.0 | 6,125 | 62.9 | 37.1 | 6,158 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 45.1 | 3.4 | 6,196 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 16.0 | 5,190 | 75.8 | 24.2 | 5,224 | 0.3 | 15.3 | 7.1 | 51.5 | 1.0 | 5,251 |
| 20-24 | 17.0 | 6,745 | 52.7 | 47.3 | 6,797 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 7.6 | 36.0 | 3.9 | 6,853 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 16.0 | 565 | 69.0 | 31.0 | 568 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 10.4 | 49.9 | 1.9 | 569 |
| Cagayan Valley | 16.0 | 428 | 59.2 | 40.8 | 426 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 46.0 | 4.0 | 428 |
| Central Luzon | 16.0 | 1,585 | 61.4 | 38.6 | 1,586 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 9.8 | 45.0 | 1.6 | 1,599 |
| calabarzon | 16.0 | 1,596 | 60.6 | 39.4 | 1,602 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 7.4 | 38.3 | 3.2 | 1,599 |
| MIMAROPA | 17.0 | 337 | 63.6 | 36.4 | 338 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 8.6 | 42.8 | 1.8 | 339 |
| Bicol | 16.0 | 658 | 65.8 | 34.2 | 661 | 0.5 | 13.8 | 8.8 | 39.8 | 2.9 | 661 |
| Western Visayas | 17.0 | 925 | 64.4 | 35.6 | 939 | 0.1 | 10.6 | 6.6 | 45.2 | 1.4 | 944 |
| Central Visayas | 16.0 | 860 | 65.6 | 34.4 | 860 | 0.5 | 12.6 | 6.3 | 44.7 | 1.5 | 862 |
| Eastern Visayas | 16.0 | 516 | 57.0 | 43.0 | 523 | 1.3 | 14.7 | 5.3 | 31.8 | 3.2 | 529 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 16.0 | 457 | 51.4 | 48.6 | 459 | 0.2 | 7.2 | 2.6 | 39.3 | 1.7 | 461 |
| Northern Mindanao | 16.0 | 551 | 69.7 | 30.3 | 555 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 9.2 | 45.9 | 3.1 | 555 |
| Davao | 16.0 | 615 | 61.6 | 38.4 | 614 | 0.6 | 7.1 | 9.3 | 41.4 | 2.3 | 621 |
| soccsksargen | 16.0 | 450 | 55.5 | 44.5 | 463 | 0.2 | 7.8 | 3.9 | 38.4 | 2.3 | 487 |
| CAR | 17.0 | 245 | 66.9 | 33.1 | 245 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 9.3 | 45.1 | 5.7 | 246 |
| ARMM | 15.0 | 402 | 37.2 | 62.8 | 435 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 28.6 | 2.7 | 448 |
| Caraga | 17.0 | 310 | 71.4 | 28.6 | 311 | 0.3 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 50.5 | 2.9 | 313 |
| NCR | 17.0 | 1,435 | 71.8 | 28.2 | 1,434 | 0.1 | 10.5 | 8.0 | 48.3 | 4.4 | 1,443 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 17.0 | 3,107 | 68.9 | 37.1 | 3,107 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 48.3 | 4.0 | 3,130 |
| Rural | 16.0 | 8,828 | 60.6 | 39.4 | 8,973 | 0.2 | 9.6 | 7.3 | 40.8 | 2.2 | 8,973 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 13.0 | 2,206 | 43.8 | 56.2 | 2,238 | 1.0 | 22.2 | 2.3 | 17.3 | 0.4 | 2,260 |
| High school undergraduate | 16.0 | 2,734 | 60.7 | 39.3 | 2,753 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 5.0 | 33.3 | 0.4 | 2,766 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 17.0 | 5,131 | 69.7 | 30.3 | 5,163 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 11.8 | 55.9 | 1.3 | 5,187 |
| College or higher | 19.0 | 1,864 | 69.3 | 30.7 | 1,867 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 4.9 | 50.8 | 12.1 | 1,890 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 15.0 | 2,610 | 53.8 | 46.2 | 2,648 | 0.4 | 14.3 | 5.6 | 32.4 | 0.6 | 2,671 |
| Second | 16.0 | 2,565 | 61.6 | 38.4 | 2,595 | 0.3 | 10.1 | 8.4 | 41.0 | 1.2 | 2,614 |
| Middle | 16.0 | 2,669 | 65.0 | 35.0 | 2,682 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 7.7 | 46.4 | 1.8 | 2,692 |
| Fourth | 17.0 | 2,385 | 67.4 | 32.6 | 2,388 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 8.9 | 48.2 | 3.0 | 2,414 |
| Highest (Richest) | 17.0 | 1,706 | 68.1 | 31.9 | 1,708 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 6.0 | 48.3 | 8.9 | 1,712 |
| Total | 16.0 | 11,935 | 62.7 | 37.3 | 12,020 | 0.2 | 9.2 | 7.4 | 42.8 | 2.7 | 12,103 |

Table 2.12 Participation in school organizations among the youth by highest education attainment and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of youth that participated in school organizations |  |  |  |  |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elementary | High School | Vocational | College | Graduate | Total |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10.1 | 61.4 | 7.1 | 21.3 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 9,327 |
| Female | 5.6 | 61.5 | 6.4 | 26.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 9,760 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 8.4 | 69.4 | 3.6 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 11,369 |
| 20-24 | 6.8 | 49.1 | 11.6 | 32.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 7,717 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 5.8 | 61.0 | 7.0 | 25.8 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 940 |
| Cagayan Valley | 7.5 | 58.0 | 4.3 | 29.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 4.2 | 57.5 | 9.6 | 28.6 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2,038 |
| CALABARZON | 7.0 | 63.2 | 8.8 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2,546 |
| MIMAROPA | 9.2 | 62.3 | 8.5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 562 |
| Bicol | 10.4 | 65.5 | 4.9 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1,092 |
| Western Visayas | 6.9 | 66.7 | 7.0 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1,479 |
| Central Visayas | 10.7 | 68.3 | 3.8 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1,414 |
| Eastern Visayas | 16.6 | 57.5 | 4.6 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 822 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 10.9 | 53.0 | 6.5 | 29.1 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 724 |
| Northern Mindanao | 6.8 | 68.7 | 6.0 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 920 |
| Davao | 11.4 | 61.5 | 6.9 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 953 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 10.4 | 68.7 | 3.8 | 16.8 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 873 |
| CAR | 4.4 | 55.8 | 7.8 | 32.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 367 |
| ARMM | 14.9 | 60.7 | 3.6 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 666 |
| Caraga | 8.1 | 70.6 | 3.9 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 519 |
| NCR | 3.4 | 53.2 | 7.7 | 35.5 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2,504 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 4.4 | 54.4 | 7.7 | 33.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 5,208 |
| Rural | 9.3 | 64.6 | 6.3 | 19.8 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 13,878 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2,639 |
| High school undergraduate | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 7,006 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 0.0 | 77.7 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 5,434 |
| College or higher | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 99.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 4,008 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 20.3 | 70.4 | 2.0 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 3,818 |
| Second | 9.8 | 72.0 | 5.8 | 12.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 3,920 |
| Middle | 5.5 | 68.8 | 6.2 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 4,153 |
| Fourth | 3.4 | 54.9 | 9.6 | 32.0 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 3,981 |
| Highest (Richest) | 2.5 | 43.3 | 9.0 | 44.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 3,212 |
| Total | 7.8 | 61.5 | 6.7 | 23.9 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 19,089 |

organizations, according to the level of education. Generally, participation in school organizations peaks at the high school level (61.5\%). This is to be expected, as most youth with this level of education are still in school. Rural residents registered a higher proportion participating in high school organizations than urban youth. Expectedly, participation is higher among the $15-19$-year-olds, most of whom are still in school. The top three regions in terms of the level
of participation in high school organizations are Caraga (70.6\%), SOCCSKSARGEN (68.7\%), and Northern Mindanao (68.7\%).

About a fourth (23.9\%) of the youth participate in college organizations. Higher proportions of participation in college organizations are noted for the 20-24 age group, females, urban residents, and those of higher socioeconomic status. The top three regions in terms of the proportion participating in college
organizations are NCR (35.5\%), CAR (32\%), and Zamboanga Peninsula (29.1\%).

## Friends

The dynamics of the social life of the youth are often framed by friendships. While the quantity and quality of relationships with friends is difficult to capture, the number of the youth's close friends may be another indicator of social connectedness. In YAFS4, respondents were asked if they had any close friends; if they did, they were asked to give the number of close friends, broken down by sex. Table 2.13 shows that 90.2 percent of the youth have close friends, more among males (95.1\%) than females (85.6\%) and more among the younger (93.7\%) than older (85.1\%) cohort. The median number of close friends is 6 , with males having more males as their close friends and females likewise having more females for close friends, although both sexes have close friends of the opposite sex. The youth in NCR reported the highest median number of close friends (8), while the youth in ARMM have the lowest (4.6). Those with college education, those of higher socioeconomic status, and urban residents have a higher median number of friends.

Fraternities/sororities or gangs also provide a space for youth social development, albeit many parents may not prefer these options. Table 2.14 shows that only 5 percent of the Filipino youth are members of fraternities or sororities. Membership in fraternities is higher among the $15-19$-year-olds, urban residents, those with at least a high school education, and those of higher socioeconomic status. The top three regions in terms of youth membership in fraternities and sororities are NCR (9 \%), Zamboanga Peninsula (7.9\%), and MIMAROPA (6.8\%).

Only 2.3 percent of the youth are members of gangs. The proportion of youth who reported being members of a gang is higher among males, urban residents, and those with high school or lower education. The top three regions in terms of membership in gangs are NCR (6.3\%),

Table 2.13 Percent distribution of youth with close friends and median number of friends

| Background Characteristics | Who have close friends | No. of Cases | Median number of friends |  |  | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Males | Females | Total |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 95.1 | 9,363 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 7.0 | 8,889 |
| Female | 85.6 | 9,813 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 8,393 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 93.7 | 11,421 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 10,68 |
| 20-24 | 85.1 | 7,753 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 6,594 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 86.1 | 940 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 808 |
| Cagayan Valley | 88.2 | 670 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 589 |
| Central Luzon | 91.4 | 2,049 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 1,873 |
| CALABARZON | 91.4 | 2,547 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 2,327 |
| MIMAROPA | 93.6 | 562 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 526 |
| Bicol | 93.2 | 1,095 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 1,021 |
| Western Visayas | 89.3 | 1,487 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 1,324 |
| Central Visayas | 93.4 | 1,415 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 1,321 |
| Eastern Visayas | 90.5 | 830 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 750 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 74.2 | 729 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 539 |
| Northern Mindanao | 89.7 | 921 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 825 |
| Davao | 92.2 | 960 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 883 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 87.1 | 898 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 780 |
| CAR | 88.6 | 370 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 327 |
| ARMM | 72.4 | 675 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.6 | 487 |
| Caraga | 92.5 | 520 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 481 |
| NCR | 96.6 | 2,507 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 2,421 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 93.6 | 5,228 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 7.0 | 4,889 |
| Rural | 89.0 | 13,946 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 12,393 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 89.0 | 2,653 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 2,357 |
| High school undergraduate | 93.3 | 7,031 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 6,549 |
| High school graduate/ Vocational | 86.2 | 5,465 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 4,711 |
| College or higher | 91.1 | 4,022 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 3,663 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 86.8 | 3,840 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 3,327 |
| Second | 89.2 | 3,938 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 3,508 |
| Middle | 90.6 | 4,173 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 3,772 |
| Fourth | 92.4 | 4,004 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3,696 |
| Highest (Richest) | 92.5 | 3,219 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 2,978 |
| Total | 90.2 | 19,176 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 17,281 |

SOCCSKSARGEN (3.4\%), and Davao (3.1\%), although these numbers are generally low.

## Work

Participation in economic activities in general signifies a crossing over to a more adult role. This role shift may entail greater responsibility, but it also opens up opportunities for economic independence and the widening of social networks. Altogether, 63 percent of Filipino youth have ever worked for pay, in cash

Table 2.14 Percent distribution of youth by membership in fraternities, sororities or gangs

| Background Characteristics | Who are members of |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fraternities or sororities | No. of cases | Gangs | No. of cases |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 8.1 | 9,350 | 3.4 | 9,324 |
| Female | 2.0 | 9,775 | 1.2 | 9,765 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.4 | 11,395 | 2.1 | 11,376 |
| 20-24 | 7.2 | 7,729 | 2.6 | 7,713 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 4.3 | 938 | 0.5 | 929 |
| Cagayan Valley | 2.8 | 667 | 0.6 | 667 |
| Central Luzon | 5.0 | 2,049 | 0.8 | 2,033 |
| CALABARZON | 5.3 | 2,547 | 1.4 | 2,545 |
| MIMAROPA | 6.8 | 562 | 2.7 | 561 |
| Bicol | 6.4 | 1,092 | 1.9 | 1,092 |
| Western Visayas | 4.0 | 1,482 | 1.9 | 1,482 |
| Central Visayas | 3.3 | 1,414 | 2.8 | 1,414 |
| Eastern Visayas | 3.9 | 818 | 1.6 | 818 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 7.9 | 723 | 1.4 | 725 |
| Northern Mindanao | 3.5 | 920 | 2.1 | 920 |
| Davao | 3.3 | 957 | 3.1 | 957 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 3.3 | 888 | 3.4 | 888 |
| CAR | 0.5 | 366 | 0.5 | 365 |
| ARMM | 2.1 | 672 | 0.4 | 669 |
| Caraga | 2.9 | 520 | 1.9 | 519 |
| NCR | 9.0 | 2,507 | 6.3 | 2,506 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 7.0 | 5,223 | 4.1 | 5,213 |
| Rural | 4.2 | 13,902 | 1.6 | 13,876 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 3.5 | 2,639 | 2.2 | 2,635 |
| High school undergraduate | 4.4 | 7,018 | 3.0 | 7,013 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 5.6 | 5,454 | 2.1 | 5,430 |
| College or higher | 6.0 | 4,010 | 1.4 | 4,009 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 2.5 | 3,821 | 1.3 | 3,818 |
| Second | 3.5 | 3,925 | 2.0 | 3,923 |
| Middle | 5.1 | 4,165 | 2.0 | 4,158 |
| Fourth | 6.9 | 3,998 | 3.4 | 3,987 |
| Highest (Richest) | 7.2 | 3,214 | 2.9 | 3,205 |
| Total | 5.0 | 19,125 | 2.3 | 19,089 |

or in kind, but only 28.8 percent worked for at least one hour in the week prior to the survey (Table 2.15) or were considered employed. The percentage who have worked for pay is higher among males, 20-24-year-olds, high school graduates, and those with less than high school education. The median age when the youth started working is 17 years (Table 2.16). For their first job, 59.1 percent received cash compensation, 1 percent received compensation in kind, and 2.6 percent received compensation both in cash and in kind.

A small percentage (5.8\%) reported having a business in the week preceding the survey and were thus also considered employed (Table 2.15 ). On the other hand, 10.6 percent looked for work or tried to establish a business during the same reference period; these youth can be considered unemployed.

The proportion who have a business is higher among females, those with college or higher education, those of higher socioeconomic status, and urban residents, while the proportion looking for work or trying to establish a business in the week before the survey is higher among the 20-24-year-olds, those with at least a high school education, those of higher socioeconomic status, and urban residents. The top regions with high youth unemployment are NCR (13.1\%), Northern Mindanao (13\%), and Central Luzon and Davao (both at 12.9\%). About three in 10 (30.8\%) youth expected to work within the next three months. The top regions in terms of the proportion expecting to work in the next three months are Northern Mindanao (40.2\%), NCR (38.5\%), and MIMAROPA (35.5\%).

## Community

The youth were also asked whether they participated in community activities in the past three months and what type of activities they participated in. Table 2.16 shows the generally low levels of participation of the youth in community activities. Only 23.8 percent of the Filipino youth participated in community activities in the past three months, 17.8 percent

Table 2.15 Percent distribution of youth by selected work-related variables

| Background Characteristics | Percent of youth who |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ever worked for pay, in cash or in kind | worked for at least one hour during the past week | have business during the past week | look for work or try to establish a business during the past week | No. of cases | expect to work during the next three months | No. of Cases |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 67.6 | 41.2 | 4.4 | 10.6 | 9,364 | 26.0 | 9,259 |
| Female | 58.6 | 16.9 | 7.1 | 10.6 | 9,812 | 35.3 | 9,739 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 48.4 | 21.0 | 5.1 | 8.7 | 11,423 | 29.7 | 11,301 |
| 20-24 | 84.5 | 40.1 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 7,754 | 32.3 | 7,696 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 64.4 | 31.6 | 2.9 | 6.9 | 941 | 25.2 | 931 |
| Cagayan Valley | 70.3 | 33.7 | 4.9 | 6.1 | 670 | 20.2 | 657 |
| Central Luzon | 73.5 | 31.5 | 4.4 | 12.9 | 2,049 | 29.6 | 2,032 |
| CALABARZON | 63.1 | 31.4 | 6.6 | 10.8 | 2,547 | 33.2 | 2,531 |
| MIMAROPA | 66.4 | 32.4 | 6.6 | 9.3 | 562 | 35.5 | 561 |
| Bicol | 62.7 | 28.6 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 1,095 | 28.9 | 1,088 |
| Western Visayas | 63.1 | 28.8 | 5.0 | 9.5 | 1,487 | 28.8 | 1,463 |
| Central Visayas | 64.7 | 25.9 | 6.9 | 10.2 | 1,415 | 31.6 | 1,401 |
| Eastern Visayas | 60.9 | 27.6 | 5.7 | 8.8 | 829 | 33.9 | 817 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 55.8 | 24.6 | 7.4 | 11.3 | 729 | 27.8 | 723 |
| Northern Mindanao | 58.8 | 23.3 | 4.8 | 13.0 | 921 | 40.2 | 917 |
| Davao | 66.8 | 30.4 | 6.3 | 12.9 | 960 | 25.2 | 947 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 47.6 | 23.0 | 4.2 | 8.8 | 900 | 19.6 | 878 |
| CAR | 74.3 | 44.9 | 3.5 | 7.8 | 370 | 21.7 | 369 |
| ARMM | 37.8 | 23.4 | 7.7 | 10.5 | 674 | 29.4 | 669 |
| Caraga | 66.7 | 25.2 | 4.6 | 10.0 | 520 | 30.8 | 519 |
| NCR | 62.8 | 27.2 | 7.6 | 13.1 | 2,507 | 38.5 | 2,494 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 63.9 | 28.0 | 7.0 | 12.6 | 5,229 | 34.1 | 5,192 |
| Rural | 62.7 | 29.1 | 5.3 | 9.8 | 13,948 | 29.5 | 13,806 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 75.0 | 44.5 | 4.0 | 8.4 | 2,652 | 22.7 | 2,628 |
| High school undergraduate | 48.2 | 20.4 | 4.6 | 6.5 | 7,034 | 27.6 | 6,953 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 80.0 | 35.6 | 6.5 | 15.9 | 5,465 | 36.2 | 5,416 |
| College or higher | 57.8 | 23.8 | 7.9 | 11.8 | 4,023 | 34.3 | 3,998 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 65.6 | 29.5 | 4.5 | 9.4 | 3,841 | 29.5 | 3,791 |
| Second | 65.8 | 30.2 | 5.5 | 9.2 | 3,938 | 29.0 | 3,893 |
| Middle | 65.5 | 28.5 | 5.8 | 10.6 | 4,173 | 32.1 | 4,139 |
| Fourth | 62.2 | 28.6 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 4,005 | 32.6 | 3,980 |
| Highest (Richest) | 54.3 | 26.6 | 7.2 | 11.7 | 3,220 | 30.4 | 3,196 |
| Total | 63.0 | 28.8 | 5.8 | 10.6 | 19,177 | 30.8 | 18,999 |

Table 2.16 Percent distribution of youth participation in community activities in the past 3 months by selected characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of youth who |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | participated in community activities in the past 3 months | No. of Cases | are members of youth organizations | No. of Cases | have ever done volunteer work | No. of Cases |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 28.4 | 9,363 | 19.4 | 9,339 | 37.2 | 9,349 |
| Female | 19.4 | 9,798 | 16.2 | 9,777 | 20.6 | 9,790 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 25.4 | 11,414 | 20.7 | 11,382 | 28.2 | 11,396 |
| 20-24 | 21.4 | 7,747 | 13.5 | 7,734 | 29.4 | 7,744 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 23.2 | 941 | 12.4 | 939 | 32.7 | 939 |
| Cagayan Valley | 24.8 | 669 | 13.3 | 668 | 43.6 | 667 |
| Central Luzon | 16.3 | 2,045 | 13.6 | 2,036 | 23.4 | 2,045 |
| CALABARZON | 19.9 | 2,547 | 13.4 | 2,542 | 27.6 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 29.5 | 562 | 19.4 | 561 | 33.6 | 562 |
| Bicol | 24.9 | 1,095 | 19.8 | 1,088 | 33.8 | 1,093 |
| Western Visayas | 28.3 | 1,486 | 18.4 | 1,480 | 32.6 | 1,479 |
| Central Visayas | 19.8 | 1,414 | 21.0 | 1,413 | 31.2 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 17.2 | 829 | 20.0 | 824 | 28.3 | 827 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 22.9 | 728 | 16.5 | 727 | 14.3 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 37.6 | 921 | 29.8 | 920 | 28.9 | 918 |
| Davao | 35.7 | 959 | 31.4 | 958 | 32.9 | 957 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 27.4 | 897 | 24.4 | 897 | 19.9 | 894 |
| CAR | 32.7 | 370 | 23.2 | 367 | 46.2 | 370 |
| ARMM | 10.9 | 672 | 7.3 | 671 | 15.5 | 672 |
| Caraga | 41.0 | 520 | 36.2 | 519 | 31.7 | 518 |
| NCR | 21.6 | 2,507 | 11.1 | 2,506 | 27.9 | 2,506 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 21.0 | 5,223 | 14.0 | 5,209 | 27.4 | 5,221 |
| Rural | 24.8 | 13,937 | 19.2 | 13,908 | 29.2 | 13,918 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 17.3 | 2,650 | 11.9 | 2,642 | 24.1 | 2,646 |
| High school undergraduate | 24.4 | 7,024 | 17.3 | 6,999 | 25.7 | 7,016 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 23.9 | 5,463 | 18.3 | 5,455 | 29.4 | 5,455 |
| College or higher | 26.8 | 4,023 | 21.7 | 4,016 | 36.2 | 4,020 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 22.3 | 3,836 | 16.2 | 3,827 | 24.9 | 3,829 |
| Second | 25.6 | 3,934 | 19.7 | 3,925 | 29.0 | 3,934 |
| Middle | 25.2 | 4,169 | 18.8 | 4,159 | 29.1 | 4,163 |
| Fourth | 23.5 | 4,002 | 17.4 | 3,992 | 30.2 | 3,998 |
| Highest (Richest) | 21.8 | 3,219 | 16.3 | 3,212 | 30.5 | 3,217 |
| Total | 23.8 | 19,162 | 17.8 | 19,117 | 28.7 | 19,141 |

are members of youth organizations, and 28.7 percent have ever done volunteer work.

The community activities in which the youth most commonly participated are sportsrelated (10.6\%) and environment-related activities (7.8\%), as shown in Figure 1.10. A breakdown by sex reveals that participation in sports activities is dominated by males. Slightly more males participated in environmental activities, while slightly more females participated in religious activities.

The percentage who have ever done volunteer work is higher among males, the 20-24-year-olds, and rural residents (Table 2.16). Youth from CAR (46.2\%) and Cagayan Valley ( $43.6 \%$ ) have the highest proportion who have ever done volunteer work; the regions with the lowest are Zamboanga Peninsula (14.3\%) and ARMM (15.5\%).

## Summary and conclusions

The YAFS4 sample closely follows the age and sex composition of the Filipino youth in the total population, as did the samples of the three previous YAFS rounds, because the samples are intended to represent the total youth population in the country. One of the striking
findings regarding the profile of today's youth is the changing composition in terms of marital status, with the proportion who are currently in a consensual union or living-in rising to an unprecedented level, triggering a shift in the proportions of the never married and formally married. The education profile indicates that almost all youth, except for a negligible minority of 0.4 percent, have had formal schooling. Schoolleaving data, however, show that many young people also leave school without completing secondary education.

YAFS4 contains data on the circumstances surrounding the youth while they were growing up, such as parenting styles, sibling relationships, and communication with family and friends; these can be explored as possible explanatory factors for later behaviors when further analysis of YAFS4 data is undertaken. Likewise, involvement in prosocial activities such as community organizations and volunteer work can be explored further in future analysis as a counterpoint to the risk behaviors that have often been the focus of YAFS analysis and reporting.

Figure 2.10 Percent who participated in community activities by type of activity and sex
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# Media and Information Communication Technology Use 

Elma P. Laguna

The rapid expansion in information and communication technologies (ICTs) has changed the communication environment of today's young people, much more than in previous generations. Earlier rounds of the YAFS consistently cited the role of mass media in shaping young people's behaviors and attitudes, but none foresaw how the development of ICTs in the past decade would vastly expand young peoples' sources of information. ICTs provide the youth with greater connection to ideas and to other people around the world. The adoption of these technologies leads to new patterns of communication and expression. Communication technologies include a range of communication media and devices including print, telephone, fax, radio, television, video, audio, computer, and the Internet (Neto, Kenny, Janakiram, \& Watt, 2005).

Both young and old alike subscribe to traditional mass media forms (i.e., they watch television and listen to the radio). However, the new forms of information technologies such as the Internet tend to attract the younger generation. Across countries, younger age groups dominate the use of ICTs. In 2005, young people constituted 43 percent of all Internet users aged 15 and older in China. More than half of Internet users in Armenia, Bolivia, and Egypt also belong to the youth category (McKenzie, 2007).

There have been various attempts to study the younger generation's use of ICT. In the late 1990s, Tapscott (1998) first came up with the concept of a "Net Generation" to
refer to those born between January 1977 and December 1997, the period that coincided with the digital revolution. "Digital natives," a term coined by Prensky in 2001, refers to the generation of young people who are considered "native speakers" of the digital language of computers, video games, and the Internet (Prensky, 2001, p. 1). Particularly in the Western context, the digital natives are considered the first generation to have grown up with the new technology. Their childhood is immersed in a media-rich environment, where toys and tools of the digital age are considered an integral part of their lives (Prensky, 2001). As young adults, they use digital space for social interaction and identity formation. They are also active producers of media content. Unlike Tapscott, however, Prensky did not define digital natives in terms of birth year. Rather, he distinguished them from their predecessors, the "digital immigrants"-those who may have adopted the new technology but nonetheless keep "their foot in the past" (Prensky, 2001, p. 2). In the case of the United States, Prensky considered those born before 1980 as digital immigrants.

Several more concepts associated with digital natives have emerged in recent years, such as generation next, born digital, millennials, and Google generation. This suggests the growing interest among academicians, policy makers, marketers, and communicators, among others, to understand not only how young people born in the digital age are growing up using communication technologies, but also how these
technologies are shaping the way they socialize, interact, and form their identity as young adults (International Telecommunication Union, 2013).

The YAFS series has tracked exposure to the traditional media forms of print, radio, television, and movies. In the 2013 round, it added the use of the Internet and cell phones, technologies that have become additional sources of information for today's young people. This chapter describes the level and pattern of ICT use among young Filipinos. It explores how levels of use vary according to different background characteristics of the youth.

## Use of traditional media

Both YAFS2 in 1994 and YAFS3 in 2002 found almost universal exposure of young Filipinos to the traditional media forms, especially broadcast media. The 2013 YAFS looked at regularity of media use. Findings presented here refer to the use of mass media on a daily basis in the three months preceding the survey.

In terms of print media consumption, only 11.7 percent of young people read any form of print media (newspapers, tabloids, magazines, and books other than textbooks) on a daily basis. The level is higher among females (14.2\%) than males (9.1\%) and among the younger than the older cohort ( $14.2 \%$ vs. $8.1 \%$ ). Daily reading is more prevalent among the college educated and high school undergraduates, the majority of whom are still in school. Among the regions, reading daily is most prevalent in Bicol (17.4\%), Eastern Visayas (15.9\%), and NCR (15.8\%) and least prevalent in Davao (7.7\%), Cagayan Valley (8.2\%), and Ilocos (8.6\%; Table 3.1). The proportion that reads print media daily is uniformly low across socioeconomic status.

Listening to the radio every day was reported by 35.1 percent of the young people. This is slightly more common among the females than the males ( $37.3 \%$ vs. $32.8 \%$ ). Similarly, the older age group (20-24) exhibited a slightly higher percentage of daily radio use than the younger age group (15-19). Across regions, daily
radio listening is common among the youth from Western Visayas, Central Luzon, Ilocos, Davao, and NCR.

Of all the traditional media, television remains the most popular. In all, 67.5 percent watch television every day, with the level slightly higher among females (68.8\%) than males ( $66.2 \%$ ). There is no difference between the younger and older cohorts. The proportion increases monotonically as education level increases, from 50.7 percent among those with elementary education to 72.7 percent among those with college education. Similarly, the proportion that watches television daily consistently increases as socioeconomic status improves. In the poorest quintile, 39.9 percent watch TV daily, while the comparative percentage for the richest quintile is 81.4 percent. Across the regions, watching TV daily is most prevalent in NCR (85.8\%), Central Luzon (82.6\%), and CALABARZON (80.2\%) and least prevalent in ARMM (33.9\%), Zamboanga Peninsula (47.9\%), and CAR (48.1\%).

Finally, 14.7 percent of all young people reported that they watch movies every day. Slightly more males than females, as well as youth from urban areas than rural areas, watch movies daily. There is no discernible pattern by education and socioeconomic status. More young people from NCR (21.9\%), Eastern Visayas (20.7\%), Northern Mindanao (17.7\%), CALABARZON (17\%), and Caraga (16.2\%) watch movies daily compared with the national average. Unlike the other traditional media forms, movies can be accessed through various means, such as in a movie house, through television, through video equipment, or on the Internet. The YAFS4 questionnaire did not specifically ask for the means through which movies are accessed. Figure 3.1 below compares daily media use of young males and females.

## Cell phone use

| The deregulation of | the |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| telecommunications industry in | 1995 |
| following the passage of Republic Act | 7925 |


| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  | No. of Males | Female |  |  |  | No. of Females | Both sexes |  |  |  | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Print | Radio | TV | Movie |  | Print | Radio | TV | Movie |  | Print | Radio | TV | Movie |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 10.8 | 30.3 | 66.4 | 15.7 | 5,769 | 17.6 | 35.8 | 68.4 | 13.4 | 5,648 | 14.2 | 33.0 | 67.4 | 14.6 | 11,413 |
| 20-24 | 6.3 | 36.9 | 65.9 | 17.3 | 3,593 | 9.6 | 39.4 | 69.2 | 12.9 | 4,159 | 8.1 | 38.2 | 67.7 | 15.0 | 7,752 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 8.5 | 37.8 | 72.6 | 11.3 | 474 | 8.8 | 41.1 | 69.8 | 8.8 | 468 | 8.6 | 39.4 | 71.3 | 10.0 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 5.0 | 19.9 | 60.1 | 8.5 | 343 | 11.7 | 31.4 | 62.0 | 12.0 | 327 | 8.2 | 25.5 | 60.9 | 10.2 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 5.1 | 33.0 | 80.0 | 11.2 | 953 | 12.8 | 45.0 | 85.0 | 7.4 | 1,097 | 9.2 | 39.4 | 82.6 | 9.2 | 2,050 |
| calabarzon | 5.8 | 32.3 | 79.6 | 18.8 | 1,243 | 12.6 | 38.8 | 80.8 | 15.3 | 1,303 | 9.3 | 35.6 | 80.2 | 17.0 | 2,547 |
| mimaropa | 13.4 | 29.3 | 66.1 | 26.5 | 283 | 16.1 | 34.4 | 62.1 | 21.9 | 279 | 14.6 | 31.7 | 64.2 | 14.7 | 562 |
| Bicol | 14.9 | 30.3 | 50.3 | 15.7 | 521 | 19.5 | 32.6 | 59.4 | 13.1 | 574 | 17.4 | 31.5 | 55.1 | 14.4 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 9.8 | 42.4 | 65.4 | 13.9 | 764 | 15.7 | 45.3 | 67.1 | 9.7 | 722 | 12.7 | 43.8 | 66.3 | 11.9 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 8.8 | 35.8 | 59.3 | 15.0 | 742 | 11.7 | 39.2 | 63.7 | 9.8 | 673 | 10.2 | 37.5 | 61.4 | 12.5 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 14.5 | 26.1 | 56.0 | 23.0 | 427 | 17.4 | 28.6 | 58.7 | 18.4 | 402 | 15.9 | 27.4 | 57.3 | 20.7 | 829 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 6.4 | 25.9 | 50.8 | 15.0 | 372 | 15.4 | 28.7 | 45.2 | 12.1 | 355 | 10.7 | 27.4 | 47.9 | 13.6 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 10.5 | 31.6 | 52.8 | 19.0 | 447 | 10.5 | 38.3 | 55.1 | 16.7 | 474 | 10.5 | 35.1 | 54.0 | 17.7 | 921 |
| Davao | 6.1 | 38.8 | 67.2 | 13.0 | 445 | 9.1 | 39.6 | 66.7 | 11.1 | 515 | 7.7 | 39.2 | 67.0 | 12.0 | 960 |
| soccsksargen | 9.1 | 33.0 | 51.7 | 6.8 | 437 | 12.0 | 35.0 | 56.9 | 12.4 | 460 | 10.6 | 34.1 | 54.4 | 9.7 | 900 |
| CAR | 6.4 | 22.1 | 45.3 | 16.2 | 172 | 19.7 | 31.0 | 50.5 | 13.6 | 198 | 13.7 | 27.0 | 48.1 | 14.9 | 370 |
| ARMM | 5.0 | 18.5 | 30.8 | 9.7 | 321 | 21.9 | 16.5 | 36.6 | 9.4 | 355 | 13.8 | 17.4 | 33.9 | 9.5 | 671 |
| Caraga | 9.4 | 26.5 | 58.3 | 16.2 | 316 | 14.9 | 27.2 | 57.5 | 16.1 | 255 | 12.1 | 16.4 | 57.9 | 16.2 | 520 |
| NCR | 14.2 | 38.6 | 85.6 | 26.1 | 1,150 | 17.2 | 39.7 | 85.9 | 18.3 | 1,357 | 15.8 | 39.2 | 85.8 | 21.9 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 10.9 | 36.4 | 80.6 | 20.0 | 2,398 | 15.8 | 40.5 | 82.4 | 14.6 | 2,831 | 13.5 | 38.6 | 81.5 | 17.1 | 5,228 |
| Rural | 8.4 | 31.6 | 61.2 | 15.0 | 6,962 | 13.6 | 36.0 | 63.3 | 12.6 | 6,982 | 11.0 | 33.8 | 62.3 | 13.8 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 5.4 | 31.4 | 51.6 | 13.3 | 1,730 | 9.4 | 32.6 | 49.1 | 11.0 | 922 | 6.8 | 31.8 | 50.7 | 12.5 | 2,651 |
| High school undergraduate | 17.3 | 29.7 | 66.2 | 17.0 | 3,530 | 17.4 | 34.4 | 67.0 | 14.2 | 3,503 | 14.4 | 32.1 | 66.6 | 15.6 | 7,032 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 4.6 | 38.8 | 71.9 | 17.3 | 2,410 | 10.3 | 42.9 | 74.1 | 14.7 | 3,052 | 7.8 | 47.1 | 73.1 | 15.8 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 14.5 | 32.3 | 73.1 | 16.4 | 1,688 | 16.6 | 36.3 | 72.3 | 10.7 | 2,336 | 15.8 | 34.6 | 72.7 | 13.1 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 8.7 | 30.0 | 40.3 | 10.9 | 1,887 | 12.7 | 31.0 | 39.5 | 9.5 | 1,954 | 10.7 | 30.5 | 39.9 | 10.2 | 3,840 |
| Second | 8.7 | 33.0 | 60.6 | 15.8 | 1,916 | 13.6 | 38.7 | 64.3 | 13.0 | 2,022 | 11.2 | 36.0 | 62.5 | 14.4 | 3,935 |
| Middle | 9.2 | 35.7 | 73.4 | 18.4 | 2,091 | 15.4 | 36.4 | 76.9 | 14.4 | 2,082 | 12.3 | 34.0 | 75.1 | 16.4 | 4,173 |
| Fourth | 9.2 | 34.1 | 78.7 | 20.5 | 1,942 | 12.6 | 40.3 | 80.9 | 16.1 | 2,063 | 11.0 | 38.1 | 79.8 | 18.2 | 4,006 |
| Highest (Richest) | 9.6 | 32.8 | 79.4 | 15.4 | 1,527 | 17.4 | 40.4 | 83.2 | 12.6 | 1,693 | 13.7 | 37.4 | 81.4 | 13.9 | 3,219 |
| Total | 9.1 | 32.8 | 66.2 | 16.3 | 9,361 | 14.2 | 37.3 | 68.8 | 13.2 | 9,813 | 11.7 | 35.1 | 67.5 | 14.7 | 19,174 |

Figure 3.1 Daily use of traditional media by sex

(Telecommunications Policy Act) paved the way for the rapid development of ICT in the country. Today, cell phones have become the most common communication technology tool for every Filipino. Table 3.2 presents the level of Internet use and cell phone ownership among Filipino youth.

Overall, 78.3 percent of the youth own a cell phone; the level is slightly higher among females ( $80.8 \%$ ) than males ( $75.7 \%$ ) and among the older ( $83 \%$ ) than the younger ( $75.2 \%$ ) cohort. Cell phone ownership increases consistently as education level rises, from 51.3 percent among those with elementary-level schooling to 94.6 percent among the college educated. This increasing pattern is also found when the wealth index is taken into consideration. Among the lowest quintile, 58 percent reported ownership of a cell phone, increasing to 92.9 percent among the highest wealth quintile. The proportions of youth who own a cellphone are highest in CALABARZON (87.3\%), Ilocos (86.8\%), Central Luzon (85.7\%), and NCR (84.8\%) and lowest in ARMM (52.4\%).

Aside from communication, cell phone is also used as a means to meet new friends and form new relationships, some not requiring face-to-face contact. Among all youth who own a cell phone, 43.6 percent reported having text mates
whom they have not met personally (Table 3.3). This practice is more common among males (54.5\%) than females (33.9\%) and among the younger (48.3\%) than the older cohort (37.4\%). As shown in Figure 3.2, there is a reverse education and socioeconomic status gradient in this practice in that the proportion decreases as the education level and socioeconomic status rise. The prevalence of the practice is highest in Eastern Visayas (53.7\%), Caraga (52.4\%), and SOCCSKSARGEN (51.6\%) and lowest in CAR (30.9\%), NCR (35.9\%), and ARMM (37.3\%). Interestingly, more young people from rural areas than urban areas reported having text mates whom they have not personally met (45.8\% vs. 38.4\%).

While cell phones are generally used for communication (i.e., calling and sending SMS), the development of mobile phone technology, particularly the introduction of smart phones, has added a new function for cell phones. Almost half of the young people in the country use their phones for entertainment purposes, such as listening to music, playing games, and surfing the Internet, while 13.2 percent reported that their phones are used to take and store pictures and videos. These other cell phone functions are reported more by the younger age group than the older age group. Across regions, more

Figure 3.2 Percent of youth with text mates whom they have not met personally by education level and socioeconomic status

young people from CALABARZON (56\%), NCR (55.8\%), Eastern Visayas (54.4\%), and Cagayan Valley (52.3\%) are using their cell phones for entertainment. The percentage of young people reporting the use of cell phones other than for communication increases with rising educational attainment and socioeconomic status. This could be a function of access, as young people of higher socioeconomic status are more likely to own a smart phone than their less economically able counterparts (see Table 3.4).

## Internet and social media use

In 2002, when YAFS3 was conducted, the Internet was still a relatively new innovation in the Philippines. In YAFS3, Internet use among young people was only about 2 percent. In the intervening period, Internet use has grown tremendously and has since become a ubiquitous source of information and a potent communication tool for Filipinos, especially the youth. This section presents findings on Internet use for social networking, communication, entertainment, and the formation of online friendships.

In general, 58.9 percent of today's youth use the Internet (Table 3.2). The level of Internet use is slightly higher among females (61\%) than males (56.6\%) and among the younger (60.3\%) than the older (56.7\%) cohort. Expectedly, there is a distinct education gradient in Internet use, from almost universal use (91.3\%) among the college educated to a low 20.5 percent among
those with elementary education. Internet use also increases as socioeconomic status rises.

The regional profile of Internet use shows a picture of two regions at extreme ends and the rest of the regions within a narrow range in between. In the NCR, 92.3 percent use the Internet. In contrast, only 22.4 percent use the Internet in ARMM. The prevalence of Internet use in the rest of the regions falls between 40 percent to slightly below 70 percent.

The Internet serves several functions for youngpeople, butits mostfrequentuse is forsocial purposes such as social networking, checking emails, and chatting. It is also frequently used for school work and entertainment (see Figure 3.3). Among Internet users, 80.3 percent reported using the Internet for social networking; again, females have a slightly higher prevalence ( $84.5 \%$ ) than males (75.6\%). The difference by education is not so pronounced. The regions with the highest prevalence of social networking among Internet users are NCR (87.8\%), Central Luzon, Ilocos, and CALABARZON (all at about 84\%). The prevalence is lowest in ARMM (60.7\%), SOCCSKSARGEN (66.5\%), Northern Mindanao (69.2\%), and CAR (69.3\%; Table 3.5).

Next to social networking, the Internet is used for purposes such as checking emails and chatting. About four in 10 Filipino youth reported this Internet function. Following the education and socioeconomic gradient in Internet use, the proportion of young people who use the Internet for communication also increases with a rise in education and socioeconomic status. Young people from the regions of Central Luzon (53.7\%),

Table 3.2 Percent of males and females who use the internet and own a cellular phone by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  | No. of Males | Female |  | No. of Females | Both sexes |  | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Internet | Cellular phone |  | Internet | Cellular phone |  | Internet | Cellular phone |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 57.7 | 71.9 | 5,771 | 63.1 | 78.6 | 5,653 | 60.3 | 75.2 | 11,423 |
| 20-24 | 54.9 | 81.9 | 3,594 | 58.3 | 83.9 | 4,160 | 56.7 | 83.0 | 7,754 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 64.7 | 85.0 | 474 | 67.9 | 88.7 | 468 | 66.3 | 86.8 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 40.0 | 80.5 | 344 | 52.3 | 84.4 | 327 | 46.1 | 82.3 | 671 |
| Central Luzon | 70.8 | 83.2 | 953 | 65.1 | 87.0 | 1,097 | 67.8 | 85.7 | 2,050 |
| CALABARZON | 64.1 | 84.0 | 1,243 | 65.1 | 90.5 | 1,303 | 64.7 | 87.3 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 45.7 | 77.7 | 283 | 49.8 | 81.0 | 279 | 47.7 | 79.4 | 562 |
| Bicol | 38.4 | 70.3 | 521 | 41.5 | 74.5 | 574 | 40.1 | 72.5 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 37.2 | 69.6 | 764 | 51.7 | 82.3 | 722 | 44.3 | 75.8 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 63.5 | 73.8 | 742 | 70.9 | 81.7 | 673 | 67 | 77.6 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 39.6 | 67.4 | 427 | 43.7 | 65.2 | 402 | 41.6 | 66.3 | 830 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 44.2 | 68.1 | 373 | 42.1 | 71.9 | 355 | 43.2 | 70 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 47.9 | 72.3 | 447 | 61.8 | 77.6 | 474 | 55 | 75 | 921 |
| Davao | 56.2 | 71.1 | 445 | 57.1 | 78.2 | 515 | 56.7 | 74.9 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 40.5 | 68.6 | 440 | 42.7 | 62.3 | 461 | 41.6 | 65.4 | 901 |
| CAR | 38.7 | 78.5 | 172 | 56.6 | 85.8 | 198 | 48.4 | 82.2 | 371 |
| ARMM | 16.8 | 55.1 | 321 | 27.5 | 50.0 | 355 | 22.4 | 52.4 | 675 |
| Caraga | 51.7 | 68.7 | 316 | 56.1 | 73.2 | 255 | 53.9 | 71 | 520 |
| NCR | 92.8 | 81.1 | 1,152 | 91.9 | 87.8 | 1,357 | 92.3 | 84.8 | 2,508 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 84.2 | 80.9 | 2,398 | 82.9 | 87.2 | 2,831 | 83.6 | 84.3 | 5,228 |
| Rural | 47.1 | 73.9 | 6,966 | 52.2 | 78.3 | 6,982 | 49.6 | 76.1 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 21.1 | 51.4 | 1,732 | 19.3 | 51.0 | 922 | 20.5 | 51.3 | 2,651 |
| High school undergraduate | 52.6 | 71.0 | 3,531 | 51.6 | 71.8 | 3,503 | 52.1 | 71.4 | 7,032 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.4 | 87.8 | 2,412 | 61.7 | 88.8 | 3,053 | 62.5 | 88.4 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 91.9 | 93.3 | 1,688 | 90.8 | 95.7 | 2,336 | 91.3 | 94.6 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 23.9 | 56.9 | 1,889 | 29.4 | 59.0 | 1,954 | 26.7 | 58 | 3,840 |
| Second | 39.7 | 70.1 | 1,916 | 49.2 | 75.9 | 2,022 | 44.6 | 73.1 | 3,935 |
| Middle | 59.0 | 78.3 | 2,092 | 61.7 | 84.2 | 2,082 | 60.3 | 81.2 | 4,173 |
| Fourth | 75.9 | 85.0 | 1,942 | 80.0 | 91.5 | 2,063 | 78 | 88.3 | 4,006 |
| Highest (Richest) | 90.6 | 90.8 | 1,527 | 87.7 | 94.8 | 1,693 | 89.1 | 92.9 | 3,219 |
| Total | 56.6 | 75.7 | 9,363 | 61.0 | 80.8 | 9,364 | 58.9 | 78.3 | 19,177 |

Figure 3.3 Uses of the Internet by sex


SOCCSKSARGEN (53.1\%), Ilocos (51.9\%), and Davao (50.6\%) registered the highest proportion of Internet use for communication purposes.

Finally, the Internet facilitates schoolrelated work. About four in 10 reported using the Internet for this purpose. Across background characteristics, the use of the Internet for school work is higher among females (49.8\%), younger youth ( $45.7 \%$ ), those from the rural areas (42.1\%), and those from the regions of CAR (68.2\%) and Cagayan Valley (57.8\%). Meanwhile, 17 percent of the youth cited the entertainment
function of the Internet. This includes activities such as listening to music, downloading movies and TV shows, and playing online games. More males than females use the Internet for entertainment purposes (18.4\% vs. 15.7\%, respectively). The prevalence is higher among young people from urban areas and the younger age group. The proportion also increases with a rise in education and socioeconomic status. Across regions, it is highest in NCR and lowest in ARMM and CAR.

Table 3.3 Percent of younger people with textmates whom they have not met personally by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  | Female |  | Both sexes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Number of Males | Percent | Number of Females | Percent | Number of Cases |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 57.8 | 4,135 | 39.4 | 4,425 | 48.3 | 8,560 |
| 20-24 | 49.8 | 2,936 | 27.0 | 3,472 | 37.4 | 6,407 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 47.8 | 400 | 31.1 | 411 | 39.2 | 811 |
| Cagayan Valley | 53.4 | 277 | 30.5 | 275 | 42.1 | 551 |
| Central Luzon | 57.7 | 792 | 26.0 | 961 | 40.3 | 1,753 |
| CALABARZON | 56.5 | 1,043 | 35.3 | 1,181 | 45.2 | 2,224 |
| MIMAROPA | 57.5 | 219 | 35.8 | 226 | 46.5 | 445 |
| Bicol | 57.2 | 362 | 45.8 | 428 | 51.1 | 789 |
| Western Visayas | 56.7 | 527 | 33.4 | 587 | 44.4 | 1,113 |
| Central Visayas | 50.1 | 547 | 38.3 | 549 | 44.2 | 1,095 |
| Eastern Visayas | 58.0 | 286 | 49.0 | 261 | 53.7 | 547 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 50.4 | 252 | 32.3 | 254 | 41.3 | 506 |
| Northern Mindanao | 61.6 | 323 | 40.6 | 367 | 50.4 | 691 |
| Davao | 61.8 | 317 | 38.4 | 401 | 48.8 | 717 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 60.3 | 300 | 42.2 | 282 | 51.6 | 583 |
| CAR | 37.3 | 134 | 25.7 | 167 | 30.9 | 301 |
| ARMM | 42.6 | 176 | 32.0 | 175 | 37.3 | 351 |
| Caraga | 62.6 | 182 | 42.5 | 186 | 52.4 | 368 |
| NCR | 48.3 | 933 | 26.0 | 1,184 | 35.9 | 2,117 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 51.0 | 1,938 | 28.5 | 2,456 | 38.4 | 4,393 |
| Rural | 55.8 | 5,133 | 36.4 | 5,441 | 45.8 | 10,574 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 60.9 | 887 | 43.4 | 465 | 54.9 | 1,352 |
| High school undergraduate | 59.2 | 2,498 | 43 | 2,504 | 51.1 | 5,002 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.3 | 2,113 | 31.9 | 2,697 | 41.3 | 4,810 |
| College or higher | 45 | 1,572 | 24.3 | 2,230 | 32.9 | 3,803 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 58.4 | 1,066 | 40.0 | 1,145 | 48.9 | 2,210 |
| Second | 58.3 | 1,338 | 40.5 | 1,526 | 48.8 | 2,864 |
| Middle | 57.0 | 1,633 | 39.1 | 1,745 | 47.7 | 3,378 |
| Fourth | 53.1 | 1,648 | 27.4 | 1,877 | 39.4 | 3,525 |
| Highest (Richest) | 46.5 | 1,387 | 25.4 | 1,604 | 35.2 | 2,990 |
| Total | 54.5 | 7,071 | 33.9 | 7,895 | 43.6 | 14,966 |


| Background characteristics | Male |  |  | No. of | Female |  |  | No. of Females | Both sexes |  |  | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Communication | Entertainment | Others |  | Communication | Entertainment | Others |  | Communication | Entertainment | Others |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 99.1 | 48.7 | 12.5 | 4,143 | 99.3 | 50.1 | 14.5 | 4,437 | 99.2 | 49.4 | 13.5 | 8,581 |
| 20-24 | 99.1 | 45.4 | 11.7 | 2,942 | 99.6 | 44.9 | 13.9 | 3,487 | 99.6 | 45.1 | 12.9 | 6,430 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 99.8 | 51.5 | 8.7 | 402 | 99.5 | 48.2 | 12.0 | 415 | 99.6 | 49.8 | 10.4 | 817 |
| Cagayan Valley | 99.6 | 50.7 | 4.7 | 277 | 98.9 | 53.8 | 11.0 | 272 | 99.3 | 52.3 | 7.8 | 549 |
| Central Luzon | 99.6 | 42.7 | 17.2 | 797 | 99.6 | 45.8 | 17.8 | 964 | 99.6 | 44.4 | 17.5 | 1,755 |
| calabarzon | 97.9 | 49.1 | 10.7 | 1,043 | 99.2 | 62.0 | 21.1 | 1,180 | 98.6 | 56.0 | 16.2 | 2,223 |
| mimaropa | 98.2 | 44.3 | 7.3 | 219 | 98.7 | 50.9 | 15.0 | 226 | 98.4 | 47.5 | 11.4 | 446 |
| Bicol | 98.9 | 51.1 | 4.4 | 365 | 99.5 | 40.5 | 8.7 | 426 | 99.2 | 45.4 | 6.8 | 793 |
| Western Visayas | 99.8 | 44.4 | 10.9 | 532 | 99.7 | 41.3 | 8.4 | 595 | 99.7 | 42.8 | 9.6 | 1,126 |
| Central Visayas | 99.8 | 35.6 | 9.0 | 547 | 100.0 | 38.2 | 5.5 | 550 | 99.9 | 36.9 | 7.3 | 1,098 |
| Eastern Visayas | 100.0 | 57.5 | 12.8 | 288 | 99.6 | 51.0 | 25.4 | 260 | 99.8 | 54.4 | 18.8 | 548 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 99.6 | 48.4 | 12.2 | 254 | 98.0 | 35.9 | 8.2 | 256 | 99.0 | 42.0 | 10.4 | 510 |
| Northern Mindanao | 99.7 | 51.4 | 28.8 | 323 | 99.2 | 29.4 | 9.0 | 367 | 99.4 | 39.7 | 18.1 | 690 |
| Davao | 99.1 | 51.4 | 13.6 | 317 | 99.5 | 44.0 | 10.2 | 403 | 99.3 | 47.3 | 11.5 | 719 |
| soccsksargen | 99.3 | 44.2 | 13.0 | 301 | 100.0 | 35.3 | 14.3 | 286 | 99.7 | 39.9 | 13.5 | 586 |
| CAR | 99.3 | 48.9 | 5.2 | 135 | 98.2 | 37.9 | 7.1 | 169 | 98.7 | 42.8 | 6.3 | 304 |
| ARMM | 97.2 | 35.2 | 5.1 | 176 | 100.0 | 30.1 | 2.9 | 175 | 98.6 | 32.7 | 4.0 | 352 |
| Caraga | 99.5 | 59.3 | 34.4 | 183 | 99.5 | 37.4 | 11.2 | 187 | 99.2 | 48.2 | 22.6 | 368 |
| NCR | 100.0 | 49.0 | 11.1 | 932 | 99.6 | 61.2 | 19.7 | 1,192 | 99.8 | 55.8 | 15.9 | 2,125 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 99.8 | 48.7 | 12.4 | 1,939 | 99.6 | 57.0 | 18.7 | 1,468 | 99.7 | 53.4 | 15.9 | 4,406 |
| Rural | 99.1 | 46.8 | 12.0 | 5,146 | 99.3 | 43.7 | 12.2 | 5,457 | 99.2 | 45.2 | 12.1 | 10,603 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 98.8 | 40.6 | 10.3 | 889 | 99.4 | 35.3 | 8.3 | 470 | 99.0 | 38.8 | 9.7 | 1,360 |
| High school undergraduate | 99.0 | 46.2 | 12.2 | 2,506 | 99.5 | 46.1 | 11.1 | 2,513 | 99.2 | 46.1 | 11.6 | 5,019 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 99.5 | 47.6 | 13.0 | 2,117 | 99.2 | 46.0 | 15.4 | 2,706 | 99.4 | 46.7 | 14.4 | 4,824 |
| College or higher | 99.7 | 52.6 | 12.0 | 1,573 | 27.4 | 54.5 | 17.5 | 2,234 | 99.6 | 53.7 | 15.2 | 3,807 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 98.4 | 42.4 | 11.6 | 1,073 | 99.4 | 33.0 | 7.2 | 1,152 | 98.9 | 37.5 | 9.3 | 2,226 |
| Second | 99.5 | 43.1 | 12.0 | 1,342 | 99.6 | 41.9 | 10.5 | 1,528 | 99.6 | 42.5 | 11.2 | 2,871 |
| Middle | 99.3 | 46.5 | 10.5 | 1,637 | 99.5 | 42.1 | 11.7 | 1,752 | 99.3 | 44.3 | 11.1 | 3,389 |
| Fourth | 99.5 | 49.3 | 12.1 | 1,647 | 99.3 | 53.9 | 17.5 | 1,888 | 99.5 | 51.8 | 15.0 | 3,535 |
| Highest (Richest) | 99.4 | 53.8 | 14.6 | 1,386 | 99.4 | 63.1 | 21.8 | 1,605 | 99.3 | 58.8 | 18.5 | 2,991 |
| Total | 99.3 | 47.3 | 12.1 | 7,085 | 99.4 | 47.8 | 14.2 | 7,925 | 99.4 | 47.6 | 13.2 | 15,010 |

Table 3.5 Uses of Internet by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  | Both sexes |  |  |  |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entertainment | Communication | $\begin{gathered} \text { Social } \\ \text { networking } \end{gathered}$ | School work | males | Entertainment | Communication | $\begin{gathered} \text { Social } \\ \text { networking } \end{gathered}$ | School work | females | Entertainment | Communication | Social networking | School work |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 18.4 | 39.0 | 73.5 | 34.1 | 3,324 | 17.5 | 43.3 | 85.0 | 56.5 | 3,564 | 17.9 | 41.2 | 79.5 | 45.7 | 6,888 |
| 20-24 | 18.5 | 45.4 | 79.2 | 29.0 | 1,974 | 13.2 | 53.5 | 83.8 | 40.0 | 2,422 | 15.7 | 49.9 | 81.7 | 35.0 | 4,395 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 24.5 | 48.7 | 81.0 | 30.1 | 305 | 17.7 | 55.0 | 86.5 | 47.3 | 318 | 21.1 | 51.9 | 83.7 | 38.8 | 624 |
| Cagayan Valley | 9.5 | 38.7 | 67.4 | 49.6 | 138 | 10.1 | 35.9 | 76.0 | 64.1 | 171 | 9.7 | 37.3 | 72.1 | 57.8 | 308 |
| Central Luzon | 21.4 | 51.2 | 84.1 | 17.6 | 674 | 16.2 | 56.0 | 84.2 | 44.7 | 714 | 18.6 | 53.7 | 84.2 | 31.6 | 1,389 |
| calabarzon | 20.4 | 35.6 | 78.3 | 30.5 | 797 | 16.8 | 41.4 | 88.5 | 48.6 | 851 | 18.6 | 38.6 | 83.6 | 39.8 | 1,648 |
| MImAROPA | 18.4 | 41.1 | 65.9 | 46.5 | 129 | 5.8 | 32.6 | 80.4 | 52.5 | 138 | 8.2 | 36.7 | 73.4 | 49.4 | 267 |
| Bicol | 11.7 | 37.5 | 75.0 | 37.5 | 200 | 10.8 | 57.1 | 82.8 | 50.0 | 238 | 11.3 | 48.2 | 79.0 | 44.4 | 439 |
| Western Visayas | 6.8 | 41.5 | 62.7 | 39.8 | 284 | 11.9 | 51.6 | 89.5 | 58.7 | 372 | 9.2 | 47.3 | 77.9 | 50.5 | 656 |
| Central Visayas | 22.7 | 35.1 | 71.5 | 30.2 | 471 | 18.4 | 38.0 | 83.0 | 53.5 | 477 | 20.7 | 37.0 | 77.3 | 42.0 | 948 |
| Eastern Visayas | 10.1 | 47.3 | 72.2 | 34.9 | 169 | 12.9 | 52.6 | 80.6 | 40.9 | 175 | 11.5 | 49.9 | 76.5 | 38.0 | 344 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 13.7 | 49.7 | 73.9 | 32.1 | 165 | 11.0 | 51.0 | 79.2 | 55.7 | 149 | 12.4 | 50.3 | 76.7 | 43.3 | 313 |
| Northern Mindanao | 17.9 | 35.5 | 68.7 | 38.8 | 214 | 11.6 | 34.6 | 69.9 | 64.8 | 292 | 14.7 | 34.9 | 69.2 | 53.8 | 507 |
| Davao | 16.4 | 46.0 | 70.0 | 31.6 | 250 | 14.6 | 54.6 | 84.0 | 49.0 | 294 | 15.4 | 50.6 | 77.6 | 40.9 | 544 |
| soccsksargen | 12.8 | 55.1 | 63.6 | 38.6 | 176 | 8.0 | 51.3 | 69.0 | 46.2 | 297 | 10.3 | 53.1 | 66.5 | 42.7 | 373 |
| CAR | 7.5 | 34.3 | 64.2 | 61.8 | 67 | 7.6 | 45.0 | 72.3 | 71.4 | 112 | 7.6 | 41.0 | 69.3 | 68.2 | 179 |
| ARMm | 3.7 | 37.0 | 55.6 | 42.6 | 54 | 3.1 | 59.8 | 62.9 | 58.3 | 97 | 3.4 | 52.0 | 60.7 | 52.7 | 150 |
| Caraga | 16.2 | 45.3 | 75.4 | 33.3 | 138 | 11.4 | 49.0 | 79.7 | 47.9 | 143 | 13.0 | 47.0 | 77.5 | 40.7 | 280 |
| NCR | 38.1 | 36.9 | 81.6 | 32.2 | 1,066 | 31.2 | 46.8 | 93.3 | 43.2 | 1,247 | 34.3 | 42.3 | 87.8 | 38.2 | 2,314 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 30.7 | 41.4 | 79.2 | 31.5 | 2,019 | 27.3 | 50.1 | 90.2 | 48.5 | 2,348 | 28.8 | 46.1 | 85.1 | 40.6 | 4,366 |
| Rural | 14.2 | 41.4 | 73.4 | 32.7 | 3,279 | 10.9 | 45.7 | 80.8 | 50.7 | 3,639 | 12.6 | 43.7 | 77.3 | 42.1 | 6,918 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 4.3 | 27.4 | 70.1 | 7.4 | 365 | 4.0 | 35.6 | 83.1 | 14.1 | 177 | 4.2 | 30.1 | 74.4 | 9.8 | 542 |
| High school undergraduate | 15.9 | 36.0 | 73.4 | 32.1 | 1,856 | 11.5 | 40.9 | 81.3 | 52.7 | 1,806 | 13.7 | 38.4 | 77.3 | 42.2 | 3,662 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 21.5 | 43.4 | 77.5 | 24.1 | 1,527 | 15.0 | 47.1 | 87.1 | 32.6 | 1,882 | 17.9 | 45.5 | 82.8 | 28.8 | 310 |
| College or higher | 33.7 | 49.1 | 77.7 | 46.2 | 1,549 | 27.4 | 54.4 | 85.1 | 65.6 | 2,119 | 30.1 | 52.2 | 82.0 | 57.4 | 3,669 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 5.7 | 30.3 | 63.5 | 29.0 | 452 | 4.0 | 37.0 | 72.4 | 45.2 | 1,954 | 4.8 | 34.1 | 68.4 | 38.1 | 1,026 |
| Second | 9.3 | 40.4 | 71.3 | 30.8 | 760 | 10.1 | 43.1 | 79.0 | 49.4 | 2,022 | 9.7 | 41.9 | 75.6 | 41.4 | 1,753 |
| Middle | 16.3 | 41.6 | 76.6 | 28.1 | 1,233 | 14.6 | 44.7 | 84.4 | 48.9 | 2,082 | 15.4 | 43.2 | 80.6 | 38.8 | 2,516 |
| Fourth | 28.4 | 40.7 | 79.1 | 34.2 | 1,470 | 22.8 | 49.8 | 87.3 | 49.6 | 2,063 | 25.5 | 45.5 | 83.4 | 42.3 | 3,120 |
| Highest (Richest) | 35.8 | 46.0 | 77.4 | 35.6 | 1,382 | 28.5 | 54.1 | 90.0 | 52.7 | 1,693 | 32.0 | 50.2 | 83.0 | 44.5 | 2,869 |
| Total | 18.4 | 41.4 | 75.6 | 32.2 | 5,298 | 15.7 | 47.4 | 84.5 | 49.8 | 5,298 | 17.0 | 44.6 | 80.3 | 41.6 | 11,284 |

Similar to the cell phone, the Internet likewise provides a means to establish relationships without face-to-face contact, referred to as online or virtual friendships. Among Internet users, more than half (52.3\%) have online or virtual friends (i.e., friends they have not met personally). The pattern of difference by age and sex is the same as that for text mates in that more males than females ( $57.9 \%$ vs. $47.3 \%$ ) and more of the younger than the older cohort ( $53.7 \%$ vs. 50\%) have virtual
friends. There is no discernible difference by education level. In terms of regional differences, this kind of relationship is more common among young people from Central Luzon, Davao, NCR, and ARMM (Table 3.6).

## Exposure to pornography through media

The exposure of Filipino youth to pornographic materials through videos increased slightly between the 2002 YAFS and

Table 3.6 Percent of young people with online friends whom they have not met personally by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  | Female |  | Both sexes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | No. of Males | Percent | No. of Females | Percent | No. of Cases |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 58.0 | 3,310 | 49.7 | 3,547 | 53.7 | 6,857 |
| 20-24 | 57.8 | 1,967 | 43.6 | 2,410 | 50.0 | 4,376 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 49.5 | 303 | 40.4 | 317 | 44.8 | 620 |
| Cagayan Valley | 58.8 | 136 | 51.2 | 168 | 54.6 | 304 |
| Central Luzon | 69.4 | 673 | 50.9 | 713 | 59.8 | 1,387 |
| CALABARZON | 59.3 | 796 | 46.0 | 852 | 52.4 | 1,648 |
| MIMAROPA | 57.4 | 129 | 52.2 | 138 | 54.7 | 267 |
| Bicol | 52.5 | 200 | 56.3 | 238 | 54.7 | 437 |
| Western Visayas | 53.4 | 279 | 40.9 | 372 | 46.3 | 652 |
| Central Visayas | 37.1 | 469 | 40.3 | 477 | 38.7 | 946 |
| Eastern Visayas | 56.2 | 169 | 43.9 | 171 | 50.1 | 339 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 45.1 | 162 | 44.2 | 147 | 44.8 | 310 |
| Northern Mindanao | 48.8 | 213 | 44.7 | 293 | 46.3 | 505 |
| Davao | 66.8 | 250 | 52.9 | 293 | 59.3 | 543 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 60.2 | 176 | 43.8 | 192 | 51.4 | 368 |
| CAR | 50.0 | 66 | 41.4 | 111 | 44.6 | 177 |
| ARMM | 69.8 | 53 | 49.5 | 91 | 57.3 | 143 |
| Caraga | 43.1 | 137 | 47.6 | 143 | 45.4 | 280 |
| NCR | 66.7 | 1,064 | 50.6 | 1,239 | 58.1 | 2,303 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 64.3 | 2,014 | 50.7 | 2,339 | 57.0 | 4,353 |
| Rural | 54.0 | 3,263 | 45.0 | 3,617 | 49.3 | 6,879 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 56.1 | 360 | 51.4 | 175 | 54.5 | 536 |
| High school undergraduate | 54.5 | 1,843 | 46.8 | 1,791 | 50.7 | 3,634 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 57.9 | 1,526 | 46.2 | 1,876 | 51.4 | 3,402 |
| College or higher | 62.4 | 1,547 | 48.2 | 2,114 | 54.2 | 3,661 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 45.0 | 447 | 40.3 | 566 | 42.3 | 1,013 |
| Second | 50.9 | 753 | 43.1 | 986 | 46.5 | 1,739 |
| Middle | 56.6 | 1,227 | 47.2 | 1,281 | 51.8 | 2,509 |
| Fourth | 61.9 | 1,468 | 51.3 | 1,646 | 56.3 | 3,114 |
| Highest (Richest) | 63.0 | 1,381 | 48.2 | 1,477 | 55.4 | 2,859 |
| Total | 57.9 | 5,277 | 47.3 | 5,955 | 52.3 | 11,232 |

2013 YAFS. In 2002, 55 percent of the youth aged 15-24 reported having ever watched pornographic videos. This rose to 56.5 percent in 2013. The same gender difference is found in the two survey rounds (see Figure 2.4). More males have ever watched pornographic materials than females, although the percentage among females rose slightly from 36.4 percent in 2002 to 38.1 percent in 2013. A higher percentage of young people in the age group 20-24 and those with high education have ever watched pornographic materials. Exposure to pornography through videos is higher among youth from Caraga (66.7\%), followed by NCR (66.2\%). Only 21.7 percent of the youth in ARMM have ever watched pornographic materials (Table 3.7).

In contrast, there is a slight decline in the percentage of youth who have ever read pornographic materials between 2002 and 2013, from 38.5 percent to 35.6 percent. Exposure to print materials with adult content is higher among males, the older youth, and those with high education. In terms of regional differences, more young people from NCR (47.4\%), CALABARZON (45\%), and Bicol (38\%) reported having ever read pornographic materials. Again, youth from ARMM registered the lowest percentage who have ever read materials with pornographic content (11.1\%). Exposure to both print and video pornographic materials tends to increase with the level of education and socioeconomic status. Among young people with elementary education or no schooling, 20.8 percent and 49 percent have been exposed to pornography
through print and video, respectively. Among those with college or higher education, exposure to pornographic materials through both media platforms rose to 48.1 percent and 63.3 percent, respectively.

Furthermore, ICTs, particularly the Internet, offer young people the possibility to discreetly access information on issues that they may be too embarrassed to ask or talk about because of cultural reasons. Sex-related topics are one of the top search topics on the Internet (McKenzie, 2007).

Among young Filipinos who reported to be Internet users, 26.3 percent admitted to having accessed websites with sexually explicit content (Table 3.8). There is an obvious disparity between males and females, with 46.7 percent of males reporting to have accessed adult-themed websites compared with 8.3 percent among females. The prevalence is also higher among the older cohort and those living in urban areas (both $32.3 \%$ ). In terms of socioeconomic status, the proportion of young people who reported accessing adult-themed websites rose with increasing socioeconomic status. This is consistent with the pattern of Internet use. The youth from NCR (36\%) have the highest prevalence of access to websites with sexual content, while those from ARMM have the lowest (11.5\%).

Figure 3.4 Exposure to pornographic materials by sex: 2002 and 2013


Table 3.7 Percent of young people who have been exposed to pornographic materials by different media and by background characteristic

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  | Female |  |  | Both sexes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Read pornographic materials | Watch pornographic videos | N of cases | Read pornographic materials | Watch pornographic videos | N of cases | Read pornographic materials | Watch pornographic videos | N of cases |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 36.8 | 70.0 | 5,768 | 22.7 | 28.7 | 5,640 | 29.8 | 49.6 | 6,888 |
| 20-24 | 53.2 | 85.1 | 3,590 | 36.1 | 50.9 | 4,158 | 44.4 | 66.8 | 4,395 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 41.0 | 80.1 | 473 | 29.1 | 41.0 | 468 | 35.1 | 60.8 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 31.3 | 71.5 | 344 | 34.8 | 38.7 | 326 | 33.0 | 55.5 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 47.2 | 81.5 | 953 | 20.4 | 33.8 | 1,097 | 32.9 | 56.0 | 2,049 |
| CALABARZON | 60.8 | 85.0 | 1,243 | 30.0 | 39.2 | 1,304 | 45.0 | 61.5 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 34.0 | 72.4 | 283 | 28.3 | 34.4 | 279 | 31.3 | 53.6 | 562 |
| Bicol | 39.7 | 70.3 | 522 | 36.5 | 36.6 | 573 | 38.0 | 52.7 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 32.5 | 63.8 | 765 | 24.1 | 36.1 | 721 | 28.4 | 50.3 | 1,485 |
| Central Visayas | 38.4 | 76.0 | 741 | 30.2 | 47.5 | 673 | 34.5 | 62.4 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 26.8 | 59.8 | 423 | 30.8 | 32.6 | 399 | 28.7 | 46.6 | 822 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 34.9 | 74.2 | 372 | 23.3 | 32.9 | 356 | 29.3 | 54.0 | 728 |
| Northern Mindanao | 48.3 | 78.7 | 447 | 22.6 | 35.1 | 473 | 35.1 | 56.3 | 920 |
| Davao | 46.7 | 79.1 | 446 | 25.9 | 40.4 | 515 | 35.6 | 58.4 | 959 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 38.7 | 75.0 | 440 | 20.2 | 30.2 | 457 | 29.3 | 52.2 | 897 |
| CAR | 39.0 | 72.7 | 172 | 35.4 | 31.8 | 198 | 37.0 | 50.8 | 370 |
| ARMM | 8.1 | 29.1 | 320 | 13.8 | 15.0 | 353 | 11.1 | 21.7 | 673 |
| CARAGA | 38.1 | 83.8 | 265 | 27.1 | 48.8 | 254 | 32.6 | 66.7 | 519 |
| NCR | 57.3 | 87.9 | 1,150 | 38.9 | 47.8 | 1,353 | 47.4 | 66.2 | 2,502 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 54.1 | 85.6 | 2,396 | 34.8 | 44.3 | 2,826 | 43.6 | 63.3 | 5,222 |
| Rural | 39.3 | 72.4 | 6,962 | 25.8 | 35.6 | 6,972 | 32.5 | 54.0 | 13,934 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 23.3 | 60.4 | 684 | 16.3 | 27.5 | 666 | 20.8 | 49.0 | 2,648 |
| High school undergraduate | 36.9 | 70.9 | 1,025 | 20.7 | 28.9 | 2,484 | 28.8 | 50.0 | 7,021 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.5 | 85.9 | 341 | 33.3 | 45.9 | 1,651 | 42.2 | 63.5 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 61.6 | 87.3 | 214 | 38.3 | 45.9 | 1,264 | 48.1 | 63.3 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 26.9 | 61.8 | 1,886 | 21.7 | 28.3 | 1,947 | 24.2 | 44.8 | 3,833 |
| Second | 36.4 | 71.8 | 1,916 | 25.3 | 35.6 | 2,021 | 30.7 | 53.2 | 3,937 |
| Middle | 45.9 | 77.5 | 2,090 | 28.4 | 39.9 | 2,077 | 37.2 | 58.7 | 4,167 |
| Fourth | 50.2 | 83.0 | 1,941 | 31.5 | 42.1 | 2,062 | 40.6 | 62.0 | 4,003 |
| Highest (Richest) | 58.7 | 86.6 | 1,525 | 35.9 | 45.2 | 1,691 | 46.8 | 64.9 | 3,217 |
| Total | 42.1 | 75.8 | 9,363 | 28.4 | 38.1 | 9,811 | 35.6 | 56.5 | 19,156 |

## Summary and conclusions

Compared with their predecessors, today's generation of youth are exposed to a far wider range of choices in connecting with the world, as it is in their generation that advancements in ICTs have proceeded at a very rapid pace. As such, they have greater access to information and resources that were not readily available to earlier generations. The Internet and mobile
telecommunications, in particular, have not only provided young people with a means of communication but have also extended their options for entertainment and socialization. They are no longer just passive consumers of technology but can be active producers of media content.

The findings showed that young Filipinos are still using the traditional media forms, although there is greater preference on

Table 3.8 Percent of young people who have accessed website with sexually explicit content, by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  | Female |  | Both sexes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | $N$ of cases | Percent | $N$ of cases | Percent | N of cases |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 40.5 | 3,306 | 5.7 | 3,549 | 22.5 | 6,854 |
| 20-24 | 57.1 | 1,970 | 12.2 | 2,411 | 32.3 | 4,381 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 39.4 | 302 | 4.1 | 317 | 21.3 | 619 |
| Cagayan Valley | 30.4 | 135 | 7.7 | 169 | 18 | 306 |
| Central Luzon | 42.1 | 673 | 8.3 | 714 | 24.7 | 1,388 |
| CALABARZON | 53.6 | 797 | 6.8 | 852 | 29.4 | 1,649 |
| MIMAROPA | 33.3 | 129 | 5.0 | 139 | 18.7 | 268 |
| Bicol | 39.1 | 197 | 8.0 | 238 | 22 | 436 |
| Western Visayas | 32.6 | 282 | 8.7 | 368 | 19.1 | 650 |
| Central Visayas | 40.0 | 470 | 6.5 | 477 | 23.1 | 948 |
| Eastern Visayas | 37.1 | 167 | 8.6 | 174 | 22.5 | 342 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 55.8 | 163 | 8.8 | 147 | 33.2 | 310 |
| Northern Mindanao | 37.4 | 214 | 5.6 | 286 | 19.2 | 500 |
| Davao | 43.6 | 250 | 10.0 | 291 | 25.6 | 542 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 48.0 | 173 | 3.6 | 192 | 24.7 | 365 |
| CAR | 35.4 | 65 | 7.3 | 110 | 18.2 | 176 |
| ARMM | 26.4 | 53 | 3.2 | 95 | 11.5 | 148 |
| CARAGA | 40.9 | 137 | 9.8 | 143 | 24.9 | 281 |
| NCR | 63.2 | 1,065 | 12.8 | 1,246 | 36 | 2,312 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 57.1 | 2,015 | 10.9 | 2,346 | 32.3 | 4,361 |
| Rural | 40.2 | 3,262 | 6.6 | 3,613 | 22.6 | 6,874 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 33.3 | 363 | 11.4 | 156 | 26.2 | 539 |
| High school undergraduate | 37.7 | 1,843 | 4.9 | 1,711 | 21.5 | 3,541 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 49 | 1,525 | 10.2 | 1,684 | 27.6 | 3,402 |
| College or higher | 58.2 | 1,546 | 9.3 | 1,912 | 30 | 3,654 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 30.6 | 451 | 5.5 | 568 | 16.5 | 1,019 |
| Second | 33.8 | 751 | 6.0 | 980 | 18.1 | 1,731 |
| Middle | 41.5 | 1,225 | 7.4 | 1,279 | 24.1 | 2,505 |
| Fourth | 50.3 | 1,471 | 8.4 | 1,647 | 28.2 | 3,118 |
| Highest (Richest) | 59.7 | 1,378 | 11.6 | 1,485 | 34.8 | 2,863 |
| Total | 46.7 | 5,277 | 8.3 | 5,960 | 26.3 | 11,237 |

broadcast media, particularly television. But this generation of youth is at the threshold of profound change in mass media forms. With more than half of young Filipinos using the Internet and more than two thirds owning cell phones, there is a greater possibility of media use convergence as contents from traditional media have become readily accessible through the Internet. Access to pornography and adult-themed content, for example, extends to the Internet and cell phones. On the other hand, the findings also underscored
the benefits that young people get from ICT. For instance, a significant proportion use the Internet for school-related activities. However, given the vast amount of information available through the Internet, concerns have been raised about young people's ability to filter and sort through the information they retrieve from the Internet.

While access to ICTs, particularly for young people, has improved through the years, there is still an obvious digital divide
within socioeconomic status and educational attainment, as well as across regions. The regional profile of Internet use depicts a picture of two regions at opposing ends, with Internet use registered at 92.3 percent in NCR and 22.4 percent in ARMM, while the rest of the regions fall within the range in between. Regardless of how the Internet is used, the same pattern prevails, with NCR and its neighboring areas at the high end and ARMM at the bottom end.

In the same manner, Internet use and cell phone ownership show a positive association with socioeconomic status and education. Young people at the lower end of both educational and socioeconomic status have a lower prevalence of Internet use and cell phone ownership compared with their counterparts. More equitable access to technology for young people requires addressing this socioeconomic disparity.

## References

International Telecommunication Union. (2013). Measuring the information society. Geneva, Switzerland: International Telecommunication Union.

McKenzie,D.(2007).Youth,ICTsand development. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/ curated/en/2007/03/7458887/youth-icts-development

Neto, I., Kenny, C., Janakiram, S., \& Watt, C. (2005). Look before you leap: The bumpy road to e-development. In Robert Schware (Ed.), E-development: From excitement to effectiveness (pp. 1-22). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. On the Horizon, 9(5), 1-6.

Tapscott, D. (1998). Growing up digital. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

# Subjective Well-Being, Self-Assessed Health, and Lifestyle 

Josefina N. Natividad

In the fourth iteration of the YAFS, a new area of study on the status of the Filipino youth is added, expanding the scope of the study beyond the core topics of fertility, sexuality, and attendant risk behaviors. For YAFS4, we added a section on health and lifestyle in recognition of the growing interest in the study of chronic diseases that may originate from habits and behaviors associated with certain lifestyles that are acquired in one's early years such as the ages of $15-24$. Among these are habits related to diet, exercise, and leisure activities. YAFS4 also expanded the section on understanding how Filipino youth perceive themselves, using a variety of indicators. These self-assessments can be used as explanatory factors for variations in behaviors or can be dependent variables to be explained in future analysis. In all, this new addition to the YAFS data enriches our current understanding of the Filipino youth of today.

## Self-assessed status

Overall, the self-assessed status measures aim to capture the individual's sense of how well he/she is doing with his/her life along a number of dimensions. All these measures can be conceived of as indicators of subjective well-being in its various facets. The notion that subjective well-being-a term that broadly captures an individual's evaluation of his or her life-is an important factor for understanding psychological well-being and overall mental health is well supported in theory and research (Moksnes \& Espnes, 2013). Subjective well-
being, in turn, is often measured in terms of life satisfaction and self-esteem. While much of the literature on subjective well-being pertains to the adult population, a number of studies have looked at the adolescent years in which a multitude of biological, psychological, social, and cognitive changes are occurring, posing many challenges to the adolescent, with effects that may persist through adulthood.

Investigating the factors that may affect life satisfaction, Proctor, Linley, and Malbey (2009) reported only a very modest role played by gender and socioeconomic status among children and adolescents. Other studies that found a more pronounced gender difference generally reported boys as scoring higher on life satisfaction than girls (Goldbeck et al., 2007; Moksnes \& Espnes, 2012). Similarly, males tend to report higher self-esteem than do females. Numerous studies show the positive link between self-esteem and psychological health and well-being during adolescence. Conversely, low self-esteem has been linked to experiencing more symptoms of anxiety and depression (Orth et al., 2009).

YAFS4 contained a number of self-assessed indicators of subjective well-being. These are life satisfaction, happiness, self-esteem, and depression. Life satisfaction and happiness are measured through a straightforward question asking the respondents to rate their satisfaction with their lives or how happy they are on a 10 -point scale. Self-esteem is measured by the Rosenberg scale, while depression is
measured using a short version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression (CES-D) scale.

Table 4.1 shows the self-assessments of Filipino youth broken down by region, urbanrural residence, highest educational attainment, and socioeconomic status based on the wealth index. Because of the often-documented strong gender difference in these measures observed in other studies, Table 4.1 shows the selfassessments separately for men and women.

## Self-esteem

The mean self-esteem score for all participants is $18.5^{1}$ with no difference between men and women. There is a considerable variation in the overall mean self-esteem score across the regions, ranging from the highest mean score of 19.8 from Central Luzon to the lowest mean score of 16.7 from Northern Mindanao. Within some regions, there are observed differences in mean scores between men and women, but no consistent pattern is apparent. In some regions, women have higher mean self-esteem

Table 4.1 Mean self-perception scores by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Mean <br> Self -esteem score |  |  | Mean depression score |  |  | Mean life satisfaction rating |  |  | Mean self-rated happiness |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | All | Male | Female | All | Male | Female | All | Male | Female | All |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 18.8 | 17.8 | 18.3 | 19.2 | 20.7 | 19.9 | 7.5 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.1 |
| Cagayan Valley | 17.6 | 18.5 | 18.0 | 20.2 | 19.3 | 19.8 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Central Luzon | 19.7 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 18.1 | 17.6 | 17.8 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.3 |
| CALABARZON | 18.6 | 19.3 | 19.0 | 19.2 | 19.6 | 19.4 | 7.2 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.5 |
| MIMAROPA | 19.3 | 19.3 | 19.3 | 19.7 | 19.4 | 19.5 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| Bicol | 19.1 | 18.7 | 18.9 | 20.5 | 21.0 | 20.8 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.5 |
| Western Visayas | 18.2 | 18.6 | 18.4 | 20.0 | 20.2 | 20.1 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 7.9 |
| Central Visayas | 17.5 | 17.6 | 17.5 | 19.3 | 20.8 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 7.4 | 7.6 |
| Eastern Visayas | 17.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 18.4 | 17.7 | 18.0 | 20.0 | 21.4 | 20.7 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| Northern Mindanao | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 21.4 | 21.5 | 21.4 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 7.5 |
| Davao | 18.3 | 17.5 | 17.8 | 19.9 | 20.2 | 20.1 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 7.5 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 19.1 | 18.1 | 18.6 | 17.4 | 19.5 | 18.4 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| CAR | 18.3 | 17.8 | 18.0 | 19.8 | 21.0 | 20.5 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.5 |
| ARMM | 17.7 | 18.8 | 18.3 | 21.8 | 20.8 | 21.2 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.8 | 7.5 |
| Caraga | 17.0 | 16.7 | 16.8 | 21.3 | 21.5 | 21.4 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 7.3 |
| NCR | 19.6 | 19.0 | 19.3 | 19.9 | 20.3 | 20.1 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.0 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 19.2 | 18.9 | 19.0 | 19.6 | 20.0 | 19.8 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 8.0 |
| Rural | 18.2 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 19.7 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 7.8 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 17.7 | 17.5 | 17.6 | 20.1 | 20.6 | 20.3 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| High school undergraduate | 18.4 | 18.2 | 18.3 | 19.8 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 18.6 | 18.4 | 18.5 | 19.4 | 20.0 | 19.7 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| College or higher | 19.5 | 19.2 | 19.3 | 19.4 | 19.8 | 19.6 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.0 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 17.8 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 20.2 | 20.5 | 20.3 | 6.7 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| Second | 18.0 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 19.8 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 7.8 |
| Middle | 18.4 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 19.6 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Fourth | 19.0 | 18.8 | 18.9 | 19.5 | 19.9 | 19.7 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Highest (Richest) | 19.4 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 19.3 | 19.6 | 19.4 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 8.1 | 8.2 |
| Total | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 19.7 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |

[^3]scores (e.g., Cagayan Valley, CALABARZON, ARMM); in others, the men have higher scores (SOCCSKSARGEN, Zamboanga Peninsula, CAR). Still, the differences in scores between the sexes are small, rarely exceeding one point.

Youth from urban areas have higher selfesteem scores than youth from rural areas. Self-esteem also tends to increase as the level of education increases, with the college educated recording the highest mean scores for both men and women. The same pattern is observed for socioeconomic status, with a monotonic increase in the self-esteem score as the wealth quintile increases, from its lowest level among the poorest (mean of 17.7) to the highest level among the richest (mean of 19.5).

## Depressive symptoms

In measuring depressive symptoms, YAFS4 adopted a 12 -item version of the 20 -item CES-D scale, a common scale used to screen for depression in the general population. Because there are no validated cut-off scores for depression among Filipino youth for this scale, we report and compare the mean depressive symptoms in place of a classification of the study population into the depressed and not depressed. For the 12 -item scale, the range is $12-36$.

The results show that the overall mean depressive symptoms score is 19.9. It is slightly higher among women (mean of 20.1) than men (mean of 19.7). Among the regions, the highest mean depression scores are found in Northern Mindanao and Caraga, both higher than the national average, at 21.4. The lowest mean scores are found in Central Luzon (mean of 17.8) and SOCCSKSARGEN (mean of 18.4). In all regions, except Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon, MIMAROPA, Eastern Visayas, and ARMM, women have slightly higher mean depressive symptoms scores than men.

There is a very slight difference in mean depression scores between urban and rural residents, with rural residentsscoringmarginally higher (mean of 19.9) than urban residents (mean of 19.8). By educational attainment, the
mean depression score is highest among those with no schooling or with elementary education (mean of 20.3) and decreases monotonically as educational attainment increases, with the lowest mean score recorded among the college educated (mean of 19.6). The same pattern of an inverse relationship is observed for socioeconomic status, with the highest mean depression score among youth in the poorest quintile (20.3) and the lowest among youth in the richest quintile (19.4).

## Life satisfaction and happiness

Two measures of global self-assessed well-being were used in YAFS4. Each asked the respondent to give a self-assessed rating on two indicators of positive well-being: life satisfaction and happiness, both on a scale of $1-10$, with 1 rated as the least satisfactory and 10 as the most satisfactory self-assessment.

For life satisfaction, the question was "How satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?"; for happiness, the question was "Taking all things together, would you say you are ..." Flashcards showing the numbers $1-10$ in an array, with 1 labeled "dissatisfied" or "not happy at all" and 10 labeled "satisfied" or "very happy" for life satisfaction and happiness, respectively, were presented to the respondents, who were then asked to report their self-assessments on these two measures by pointing to the appropriate number.

We tested the correlation between the two measures to check whether these are highly collinear and positively tapping the same construct. Results showed that the coefficient of correlation (Pearson's r) between the two measures is statistically significant and positive, indicating that life satisfaction and happiness are positively related. However, r is low ( $\mathrm{r}=$ .398), suggesting that the two measures are not tapping the same construct (i.e., not measuring the same thing).

Overall, the mean life satisfaction rating is 7.2, 7.1 among men and 7.2 among women. Among the regions, the life satisfaction rating is
highest at 7.6 among the youth of Central Luzon. In all, there are five regions where the mean life satisfaction rating is above the national average of 7.2. The other four are NCR (7.4) and CALABARZON,Ilocos, and ARMM, all with arating of 7.3. The lowest average life satisfaction rating is recorded in Northern Mindanao (6.7), followed by Caraga and Davao, both at 6.8. Urban residents have a slightly higher life satisfaction rating (7.4) than rural residents (7.1). Differentiating by educational attainment, those with the highest level of education also have the highest average life satisfaction rating (7.5), while those with the lowest level of education have the lowest average rating (6.9). Those with high school undergraduate education (most of whom are still in school) have a satisfaction rating equal to the national average, while those with a completed high school education scored 7.1. Meanwhile, there is a clear gradient by socioeconomic status, with the poorest reporting the lowest mean life satisfaction (6.8) and the richest reporting the highest (7.6), with a consistent rise in the mean rating as socioeconomic status improves.

For self-rated happiness, the overall average rating is higher at 7.9 than the average life satisfaction rating, which is 7.2 . The same four regions with the highest life satisfaction ratings also had the highest average happiness ratings. These are the contiguous Luzon regions of Central Luzon, NCR, CALABARZON, and Ilocos. The region with the lowest self-rated happiness is Caraga at 7.3 , while there are six regions with the next lowest happiness rating of 7.5. These are CAR, Bicol, Zamboanga Peninsula, ARMM, Northern Mindanao, and Davao.

As to the other attributes of residence, education, and socioeconomic status, the same patterns of differentials observed with life satisfaction manifest in the mean happiness rating. Urban residents, the better educated, and those with higher socioeconomic status give themselves a higher rating on happiness than their respective counterparts. There is no observed sex difference, with both men and women recording an average happiness rating of 7.9 .

## Health, diet, and exercise

## Self-rated health

Another self-assessed measure is that of the youth's health status. Respondents were asked to rate their current health status as very healthy, healthier than average, of average health, somewhat unhealthy, or very unhealthy. In Table 4.2 , very healthy and healthier than average are combined to form the category "healthier than average."

Results (see Table 4.2) show that the greatest proportion reported themselves as being healthy, either healthier than average (43\%) or of average health (49.3\%). This is to be expected, as the ages of $15-24$ are among the age groups with the lowest levels of mortality. A self-assessed status of unhealthy (somewhat or very) is thus uncommon. Only 7.6 percent overall reported being unhealthy (somewhat or very).

Focusing only on unhealthy selfassessed status (somewhat and very unhealthy combined), there are distinct regional differences. While at the national level, 7.6 percent assessed themselves to be unhealthy, the percentage ranges from a low of 4.6 percent in CAR to 12.1 percent in Northern Mindanao. The three regions with over 10 percent of youth who assessed themselves to be unhealthy are Northern Mindanao, Caraga (11.8\%), and Davao (10.2\%), while the regions with the lowest proportion who are unhealthy are CAR (4.6\%) and SOCCSKSARGEN (4.9\%).

The percentage of youth with an unhealthy self-assessed status is higher among rural (8.1\%) than urban (6.4\%) residents. It increases monotonically as the level of education decreases, with 9 percent of those with no schooling or with elementary education reporting an unhealthy status compared with only 5.4 percent among the college educated. By socioeconomic status, youth in the poorest quintile have the highest percentage with an unhealthy self-assessed status ( $9.6 \%$ ). The percentage progressively decreases to the fourth quintile (6\%) but
increases for the youth in the richest quintile (6.7\%).

## Body mass index and body image

In recent decades, low- and middle-income countries have been described as experiencing the double burden of malnutrition, a situation where a sizable proportion of the population such as children, adolescents, and childbearing women are undernourished while, at the same time, the prevalence of overweight/obesity is increasing. Under- and overnutrition are both linked to major health risks. Adults who are undernourished in infancy and early childhood face the risk of stunting, both in physical and mental development. Women who are underweight prior to pregnancy and gain little weight during pregnancy face an elevated risk of complications and death. They are also more likely to give birth to low-birth-weight babies who face a greater risk of dying in infancy. On the other hand, the health risks associated with overweight and obesity are well documented in the research literature, the most common of which are diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and heart disease.

The most common measure used to gauge the nutrition status among adults is the body mass index (BMI), ${ }^{2}$ a simple measure of weight-for-height ratio that is fairly easy to obtain. In the YAFS survey, youth respondents were asked to report their height and weight. These measures were then used to calculate the individual's BMI. The use of a self-report rather than actual measurements may be subject to bias, as some may not know their exact height or weight or may tend to underestimate their weight and overestimate their height. Nevertheless, if all respondents are similarly biased in their reporting, the results may still be used to compare across categories of youth to examine differentials.

Table 4.2 Self-assessed health by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Very healthy/ healthier than average | Average health | Somewhat unhealthy | Very nhealthy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 41.7 | 52.2 | 5.6 | 0.5 |
| Female | 44.3 | 46.5 | 8.4 | 0.8 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 42.5 | 49.9 | 6.9 | 0.6 |
| 20-24 | 43.8 | 48.3 | 7.2 | 0.6 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 41.9 | 52.2 | 5.7 | 0.2 |
| Cagayan Valley | 36.9 | 57.6 | 4.8 | 0.6 |
| Central Luzon | 42.5 | 51.0 | 6.0 | 0.6 |
| CALABARZON | 44.9 | 48.3 | 6.0 | 0.9 |
| MIMAROPA | 49.4 | 42.8 | 7.1 | 0.7 |
| Bicol | 36.3 | 55.2 | 7.8 | 0.7 |
| Western Visayas | 38.5 | 52.6 | 7.9 | 1.1 |
| Central Visayas | 40.4 | 50.9 | 8.0 | 0.7 |
| Eastern Visayas | 43.4 | 48.6 | 7.5 | 0.5 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 36.8 | 56.0 | 6.9 | 0.3 |
| Northern Mindanao | 52.6 | 35.2 | 11.7 | 0.4 |
| Davao | 33.0 | 56.8 | 9.4 | 0.8 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 35.4 | 59.7 | 4.7 | 0.2 |
| CAR | 51.2 | 44.1 | 4.1 | 0.5 |
| ARMM | 37.1 | 53.4 | 9.1 | 0.4 |
| Caraga | 44.4 | 43.8 | 11.2 | 0.6 |
| NCR | 54.1 | 39.4 | 5.9 | 0.6 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 48.9 | 44.7 | 5.8 | 0.6 |
| Rural | 40.8 | 51.0 | 7.5 | 0.6 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 33.3 | 57.6 | 8.1 | 0.9 |
| High school undergraduate | 40.7 | 50.8 | 7.7 | 0.8 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 45.8 | 46.7 | 7.0 | 0.5 |
| College or higher | 49.9 | 44.6 | 5.2 | 0.2 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 37.1 | 53.2 | 9.2 | 0.4 |
| Second | 39.1 | 51.9 | 7.9 | 1.0 |
| Middle | 42.7 | 50.4 | 6.4 | 0.5 |
| Fourth | 48.0 | 46.1 | 5.6 | 0.4 |
| Highest (Richest) | 49.3 | 44.0 | 5.9 | 0.8 |
| Total | 43.0 | 49.3 | 7.0 | 0.6 |

[^4]We computed the BMI for each respondent and classified the values according to the following cut points recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO): ${ }^{3}$

| Underweight | $<18.5$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| Normal weight | $18.5-24.9$ |
| Overweight | $25-29.9$ |
| Obese | 30 and higher |

Overall, the average BMI at 19.8 (see Table 4.3) indicates that the average Filipino youth falls within the normal range, tending toward the lower limit of the range (18.5-24.9). The general picture also indicates that overweight and obesity are not yet common among youth of this cohort, as only 4.8 percent are classified as overweight and 1.1 percent as obese. The striking finding is that over a third of Filipino youth are underweight (34.8\%) The total picture is a classic case of a population experiencing the double burden of malnutrition.

Underweight is more common among the 15-19-year-olds, while the 20-24-year-olds have a higher percentage with above-normal BMI ( 7.9 \% compared with 4.6 \% among the 15-19-yearolds). By sex, more females have above-normal BMI, ${ }^{4}$ although the difference between the sexes is not high ( $6.0 \%$ for women vs. $5.8 \%$ for men). Moreover, more women than men are underweight (37.0 \% vs. 32.5\%).

As with all the preceding self-assessed measures, there are notable regional differences. The percentage of underweight is highest among youth in Western Visayas (39.4\%), CALABARZON (38.8\%), and Ilocos (38.3\%). The region with the lowest percentage of underweight is CAR, with only 20 percent.

At the other end of the BMI range are those whose BMI is classified as either overweight or obese. Because the percentage with BMI exceeding 29 is very low, we combined overweight and obese into one category called above normal. Figure 3.1 shows the percentage with above-normal BMI by region.

Figure 4.1 shows that, at 10 percent, NCR has the highest percentage of youth with above-normal BMI. This is consistent with findings from other developing countries where overweight/obesity is more prevalent in urban areas. None of the other regions equals this level. The prevalence of above-normal BMI is lowest in Eastern Visayas (3.8\%), which is also among the poorest regions in the country.

Differentials across the other background characteristics as shown in Figure 4.2 indicate that the percentage with above-normal BMI is highest among urban residents, those with college-level education, and the youth from the richest quintile. These results corroborate what has been reported in other low- and

Figure 4.1 Percent with above-normal BMI by region


[^5]middle-income countries that are experiencing the double burden of malnutrition about the effects of urbanization and rising incomes on the nutritional status of the population. Urbanization is generally associated with increased consumption of refined sugars and animal fats, accompanied by a more sedentary lifestyle (Drewnovski \& Popkin, 1997), while higher education and socioeconomic status are associated with higher household food security
brought about by higher income and thus more access to food (Tebekaw et al., 2014).

Body image
Body image was originally defined in the 1930s as "the picture of our own body which we form in our mind" (Schilder,1978 as cited in Pallan et al., 2011, p.1). Throughout the years, the concept has evolved into a multidimensional

Table 4.3 Percent distribution of BMI by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Underweight | Normal | Overweight | Obese | Mean BMI | Very unhealthy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 32.5 | 61.7 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 19.9 | 5.8 |
| Female | 37.0 | 56.9 | 4.9 | 1.1 | 19.7 | 6.0 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 42.0 | 53.4 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 19.3 | 4.6 |
| 20-24 | 24.2 | 67.9 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 20.6 | 7.9 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 38.3 | 56.5 | 4.2 | 1.0 | 19.6 | 5.2 |
| Cagayan Valley | 27.0 | 67.6 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 20.2 | 5.4 |
| Central Luzon | 35.7 | 57.5 | 6.0 | 0.8 | 19.8 | 6.8 |
| CALABARZON | 38.8 | 56.0 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 19.5 | 5.2 |
| MIMAROPA | 37.7 | 56.4 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 19.4 | 5.9 |
| Bicol | 37.7 | 56.4 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 19.7 | 5.9 |
| Western Visayas | 39.0 | 56.7 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 19.5 | 4.3 |
| Central Visayas | 33.1 | 61.9 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 19.7 | 5.1 |
| Eastern Visayas | 33.6 | 62.6 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 19.7 | 3.8 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 31.0 | 63.6 | 4.7 | 0.7 | 19.9 | 5.4 |
| Northern Mindanao | 34.4 | 61.5 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 19.7 | 4.0 |
| Davao | 32.0 | 63.1 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 19.8 | 4.9 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 32.0 | 62.9 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 19.8 | 5.1 |
| CAR | 20.2 | 72.4 | 5.7 | 1.6 | 20.7 | 7.4 |
| ARMM | 28.7 | 64.3 | 5.7 | 1.2 | 20.3 | 7.0 |
| Caraga | 37.0 | 58.9 | 3.7 | 0.4 | 19.4 | 4.1 |
| NCR | 34.3 | 55.3 | 8.0 | 2.4 | 20.3 | 10.4 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 35.3 | 56.2 | 6.9 | 1.6 | 20.0 | 8.5 |
| Rural | 34.6 | 60.4 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 19.7 | 4.9 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 34.1 | 61.2 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 19.7 | 4.8 |
| High school undergraduate | 42.6 | 53.1 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 19.2 | 4.3 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 31.2 | 63.1 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 20.0 | 5.8 |
| College or higher | 26.8 | 63.6 | 7.6 | 2.1 | 20.6 | 9.7 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 33.0 | 63.0 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 19.7 | 4.0 |
| Second | 36.8 | 58.9 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 19.5 | 4.3 |
| Middle | 37.8 | 56.6 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 19.7 | 5.6 |
| Fourth | 34.2 | 58.9 | 5.4 | 1.5 | 19.9 | 6.9 |
| Highest (Richest) | 31.5 | 59.1 | 7.6 | 1.8 | 20.4 | 9.3 |
| Total | 34.8 | 59.3 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 19.8 | 5.9 |

construct that embodies "neurological, psychological and sociocultural elements" (Pallan, 2011, p.1). The effect of body image on quality of life is potentially extensive (Pruzinsky, 2004).

Much of the research on body image has been conducted in the area of eating disorders. A disconnect between perceived body image and actual body weight through under- or overestimation of body weight and dissatisfaction with body image can lead to inappropriate eating habits and in extreme cases can be a cause for eating disorders such as bulimia and anorexia nervosa. In YAFS4, body image was determined by asking the question "How will you describe yourself in terms of your body weight?" The respondent was then asked to choose from a set of images that depict different body types according to weight: skinny, thin, just right/ normal, chubby, and obese. This range of images roughly corresponds to the BMI classification, with skinny and thin corresponding to underweight, just right to normal, chubby to overweight, and obese to obese.

Figure 4.3 presents a comparison of the percent distribution of body image and BMI for all respondents. The distribution of responses follows the same pattern: The most commonly reported body image was just right/normal, just as most had BMI that fell within the normal range. Similarly, the next most common self-
perception was skinny/thin, just as underweight was the second most common BMI. These indicate a general congruence in self-image and BMI at the aggregate level.

Figure 4.4, on the other hand, is a cross tabulation of BMI and body image. This figure shows a more pronounced discrepancy between BMI and body image. In all, 6 in 10 of the underweight perceive their body weight to be just right/normal, while a small percentage (about $3 \%)$ of the underweight perceive themselves to be chubby/obese. Among the overweight, 4 in 10 perceive themselves to be normal in body weight, while among the obese, about 3 in 10 perceive their body weight to be normal. Such incongruences can lead to behaviors that are inappropriate and potentially unhealthy. Those who are underweight but perceive themselves as chubby may be prone to eating disorders such as anorexia nervosa or bulimia. On the other hand, those who are overweight/obese but perceive their weight as normal may persist in unhealthy eating habits that lead to further weight gain.

## Physical exercise

Among the contributory factors to overweight is the lack of physical exercise. Overall, a lifestyle with little physical activity coupled with overweight/obesity is a major risk factor for non-communicable diseases (NCDs)

Figure 4.2 Percent with above-normal BMI by background characteristics

such as hypertension and diabetes. Regular physical exercise is one of the recommendations of WHO to help prevent the onset of NCDs.

In the survey, physical exercise was measured through self-reported frequency of physical exercise by the respondent. The frequency of physical exercise is shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 shows that over 4 in 10 Filipino youth reported exercising at least twice a week. However, about a third (32.6\%) reported that they never exercise. There is a huge disparity between the sexes in exercise habits, with far less women exercising at least twice a week (34\%) than men (59.4\%). The gender difference is even more noteworthy when comparing the percentage who said they never exercise; while 19.5 percent of male youth reported that they never exercise, the corresponding percentage for female youth is a high 45.1 percent. By age
group, there is a higher percentage among the 20-24-year-olds who reported they never exercise ( $36.6 \%$ ) compared with the 15-19-yearolds (29.9\%) but only a small difference in the percentage who exercise twice a week. There is no notable difference between rural and urban residents, either in the percentage who exercise twice a week or the percentage who never exercise. For both educational attainment and socioeconomic status, there is no clear and consistent pattern to describe differences in exercise frequency, except for the finding that those with the lowest level of schooling and those who belong to the lowest income quintile have the lowest prevalence of exercising at least twice a week and the highest prevalence of never exercising.

Lastly, regional differences show that the percentage who said they never exercise is highest among youth in the Mindanao regions

Figure 4.3 Percent distribution of body image and BMI


Figure 4.4 Congruence of body image and BMI

of ARMM (49.1\%), SOCCSKSARGEN (43.7\%), and Davao (42.8\%) and lowest in Central Visayas (18.6\%), Caraga (24.7\%), and CAR (24.7\%). Exercising at least twice a week is most prevalent in CAR (57.1\%), Central Visayas (55.9\%), and Western Visayas (54.6\%), the same regions with the lowest prevalence of never exercising.

Table 4.4 Frequency of exercise by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | At least 2x a week | Once a week | Occasionally | Never |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 59.4 | 13.5 | 7.7 | 19.5 |
| Female | 34.0 | 12.6 | 8.4 | 45.1 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 47.3 | 14.7 | 8.2 | 29.9 |
| 20-24 | 45.0 | 10.6 | 7.8 | 36.6 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 49.3 | 13.8 | 7.7 | 29.3 |
| Cagayan Valley | 45.5 | 12.5 | 8.2 | 33.7 |
| Central Luzon | 44.0 | 14.1 | 3.3 | 38.6 |
| CALABARZON | 43.4 | 12.9 | 6.8 | 36.9 |
| MIMAROPA | 50.1 | 14.7 | 7.3 | 27.9 |
| Bicol | 44.5 | 16.7 | 12.9 | 25.9 |
| Western Visayas | 54.6 | 9.6 | 8.3 | 27.4 |
| Central Visayas | 55.9 | 15.8 | 9.8 | 18.6 |
| Eastern Visayas | 51.9 | 11.5 | 10.0 | 26.6 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 42.8 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 37.1 |
| Northern Mindanao | 44.1 | 13.7 | 15.0 | 27.2 |
| Davao | 39.5 | 11.4 | 6.4 | 42.8 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 40.9 | 9.9 | 5.6 | 43.7 |
| CAR | 57.1 | 11.4 | 6.8 | 24.7 |
| ARMM | 35.2 | 9.9 | 5.8 | 49.1 |
| Caraga | 40.1 | 14.5 | 20.8 | 24.7 |
| NCR | 47.6 | 13.9 | 5.9 | 32.6 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 45.3 | 14.9 | 6.4 | 33.3 |
| Rural | 46.8 | 12.3 | 8.6 | 32.3 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 43.4 | 11.2 | 6.9 | 38.4 |
| High school undergraduate | 46.8 | 14.2 | 8.0 | 31.1 |
| High school graduate/ <br> Vocational | 45.1 | 11.4 | 9.0 | 34.4 |
| College or higher | 49.4 | 14.2 | 7.3 | 29.0 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 43.5 | 10.2 | 8.8 | 37.6 |
| Second | 44.4 | 13.9 | 9.3 | 32.5 |
| Middle | 46.9 | 12.7 | 8.3 | 32.1 |
| Fourth | 49.0 | 13.3 | 6.8 | 30.8 |
| Highest (Richest) | 48.3 | 15.3 | 6.7 | 29.7 |
| Total | 46.4 | 13.0 | 8.0 | 32.6 |

## Average sleep

Table 4.5 presents the results on the average hours of sleep the youth reported getting per night. On the average, Filipino youth reported getting 8.1 hours of sleep. There is no great disparity in average sleep duration between men ( 8.2 hours) and women ( 8.1 hours) and between the younger ( 8.2 hours) and older youth ( 8.0 hours). Urban residents reported an average of 7.9 hours of sleep, lower than the 8.2 hours reported by rural residents. Youth with the lowest level of education reported a longer sleep duration at 8.3 hours as compared to those with college-level education (7.8 hours). Likewise, the youth who belong to the lowest income quintile also have the longest average sleep duration at 8.3 hours, while those from the richest income quintile have the shortest average sleep duration (7.9 hours).

Across the regions, average sleep duration ranges from a high of 8.3 hours reported in Eastern Visayas, MIMAROPA, Bicol, and Cagayan Valley, to a low of 7.8 hours reported by the youth in ARMM and CAR.

## Diet

Research on the double burden of malnutrition generally report that among the factors that contribute to the increasing prevalence of overweight amidst the still high prevalence of underweight in many low- and middle-income economies is the increasing availability and access to foods high in fats and sugar. Changing food preferences and food availability are among the factors that need to be documented to establish the evidence base for future intervention programs to combat the consequence of the double burden of malnutrition, which, in the adult population, means an increasing prevalence of overweight and obesity leading to an increase in the prevalence of diabetes and heart disease among other lifestyle diseases. Therefore, in YAFS4, a section in the questionnaire on health and lifestyle was included for the first time.

One of the components of this section is self-reported consumption of a selected list of common foods that are deemed to have unhealthy effects when consumed frequently, mostly because of their high sugar, fat, or salt content. The food consumption frequency is a proxy measure for diet. Table 4.6 shows the frequency of consumption of these selected food and drinks.

Table 4.5 Mean hours of sleep by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Mean hours of sleep |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |
| Male | 8.2 |
| Female | 8.1 |
| Age |  |
| 15-19 | 8.2 |
| 20-24 | 8.0 |
| Region |  |
| llocos | 8.2 |
| Cagayan Valley | 8.3 |
| Central Luzon | 8.2 |
| CALABARZON | 8.2 |
| MIMAROPA | 8.3 |
| Bicol | 8.3 |
| Western Visayas | 8.1 |
| Central Visayas | 8.2 |
| Eastern Visayas | 8.3 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 8.2 |
| Northern Mindanao | 8.1 |
| Davao | 8.1 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 8.1 |
| CAR | 7.8 |
| ARMM | 7.8 |
| Caraga | 8.2 |
| NCR | 7.9 |
| Place of residence |  |
| Urban | 7.9 |
| Rural | 8.2 |
| Educational attainment |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 8.3 |
| High school undergraduate | 8.2 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 8.2 |
| College or higher | 7.8 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 8.3 |
| Second | 8.2 |
| Middle | 8.2 |
| Fourth | 8.1 |
| Highest (Richest) | 7.9 |
| Total | 8.1 |

Of the list of food mentioned, chips and instant noodles are the most frequently consumed, with 37.5 percent and 28.3 percent of the youth consuming chips and instant noodles, respectively, two or more times per week. Among the drinks, coffee/tea and carbonated drinks are the most frequently consumed, with 39.1 percent drinking coffee/tea five to seven times a week and 15 percent taking carbonated drinks with the same frequency.

In Table 4.7, the percentage of youth who consumed each given food or drink at least twice a week is cross tabulated with their background characteristics. There is no distinct difference between the younger (15-19) and the older (2024) youth in their patterns of food consumption, but there are some notable differences between the sexes for some items. More women consumed chocolates/sweets at least twice a week while more men drank carbonated drinks and energy drinks with the same frequency. Similarly, more urban residents consume chips and carbonated drinks than their rural counterparts. There are other notable differences in the frequency of consumption between rural and urban residents that are more a function of availability and access than of preference. Examples are hamburgers, french fries, and fried chicken, which are more available in urban areas.

Regional comparison likewise reflects preference as well as availability. As expected, consumption of all food and drinks on the list (except instant noodles) at a frequency of twice or more per week is highest in the more urbanized regions, notably in NCR, CALABARZON, and Ilocos. Youth in the Davao Region have the highest frequency of consuming instant noodles at least twice a week. The higher frequency of consumption of items like hamburgers, french fries, and fried chicken in the urbanized regions is mostly attributed to their ready availability in fast food establishments in urban centers. Chips, instant noodles, and carbonated drinks are readily available all over the country, so the differentials in the level of consumption of these items are probably mostly affected by buying power as well as preference. It is worth noting
that in the poorer regions such as Bicol, Eastern Visayas, Caraga, and ARMM, the percentages consuming the given items on the list tend to be on the lower end.

In examining the Filipino youth's consumption patterns of these selected food items that are known to pose health risks if consumed frequently, the overall picture formed is that of consumption levels that are not yet alarmingly high. This is consistent with the findings on BMI on this same study population, which show that the level of overweight/obesity among the Filipino youth is rather low compared with the levels in developed countries. These findings also indicate that the more prevalent issue to be addressed is the high percentage of underweight. Still, the study points out certain incipient concerns when it comes to food/drink preferences and choices that are probably best addressed now that the levels of consumption are still relatively low. Among these are the comparatively high consumption levels for carbonated drinks, chips, and instant noodles, all of them processed food-two well established to have little or no nutritional value (i.e., sodas and chips) and one with high sodium content.

## Leisure

In the literature, leisure time is most commonly conceptualized as free time, that is, time not spent on work or gainful activity or other essential activities like sleeping. In the research on leisure in developed countries, there are usually seven categories under which activities undertaken during free or leisure time are classified. These are passive leisure (e.g., television viewing), active recreation (e.g., sports activities), amateur arts and crafts activity (e.g., hobbies like crochet), arts participation (as a consumer of professional arts activity like attending concerts and plays), folk life (any ethnic communal activities), informal social life (e.g., hanging out with friends, attending parties), and organized social participation (e.g., volunteering in socio-civic activities, religious activities; Peterson, 1981). The activities undertaken during one's free time can vary according to one's personal preferences and the means available with which to pursue one's interests. But there is also a large element of the social and cultural environment that directs one's choices of leisure activities. There are also

Table 4.6 Frequency of consumption of selected food and drinks

| Food and drinks | Never | Less than once a <br> week | Once a week | 2-4 times a week 5-7 times a week |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instant noodles | 9.0 | 27.8 | 35.0 | 23.6 | 4.7 |
| Chips | 13.5 | 24.0 | 25.0 | 22.1 | 15.4 |
| Hamburger | 31.3 | 30.8 | 23.9 | 11.2 | 2.8 |
| French fries | 42.1 | 28.5 | 18.9 | 7.4 | 3.2 |
| Fried chicken | 19.3 | 32.4 | 28.2 | 15.4 | 4.7 |
| Fried street food | 24.8 | 26.5 | 23.7 | 16.1 | 8.8 |
| Grilled street food | 19.9 | 28.4 | 27.2 | 17.3 | 7.1 |
| Chocolate/desserts | 22.8 | 31.4 | 24.8 | 14.1 | 6.9 |
| Coffee/tea | 16.5 | 13.9 | 13.2 | 17.2 | 39.1 |
| Carbonated/soft drinks | 9.8 | 22.5 | 28.4 | 24.3 | 15.0 |
| Sweet bottled drinks | 23.7 | 25.9 | 25.4 | 17.4 | 7.6 |
| Energy drinks | 49.7 | 21.2 | 17.1 | 8.0 | 4.0 |


| Background characteristics | Instant noodles | Chips | Hamburger | French fries | Fried chicken | Fried street food | Grilled street food | Chocolates/ desserts | Carbonated drinks | Sweet bottled drinks | Energy drinks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 29.8 | 35.0 | 13.5 | 8.7 | 18.3 | 27.6 | 26.3 | 16.3 | 43.1 | 25.8 | 18.1 |
| Female | 26.8 | 39.9 | 14.4 | 12.3 | 21.9 | 22.4 | 22.7 | 25.4 | 35.7 | 24.3 | 6.3 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 28.5 | 41.0 | 14.7 | 10.8 | 20.1 | 27.0 | 25.5 | 22.1 | 40.4 | 25.8 | 12.0 |
| 20-24 | 27.9 | 32.4 | 12.8 | 10.2 | 20.1 | 21.9 | 23.0 | 19.2 | 37.8 | 23.9 | 12.0 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 35.2 | 41.5 | 16.2 | 12.4 | 16.3 | 33.9 | 31.9 | 22.5 | 56.0 | 26.4 | 15.6 |
| Cagayan Valley | 30.6 | 41.9 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 12.4 | 27.5 | 23.0 | 16.6 | 44.1 | 25.3 | 13.3 |
| Central Luzon | 33.8 | 39.8 | 14.4 | 10.8 | 21.9 | 33.2 | 26.2 | 23.3 | 46.8 | 32.2 | 10.5 |
| CALABARZON | 30.4 | 43.1 | 20.8 | 13.7 | 25.4 | 37.1 | 30.6 | 28.5 | 38.8 | 28.4 | 13.1 |
| MIMAROPA | 23.3 | 31.3 | 14.9 | 8.7 | 14.6 | 23.7 | 19.8 | 23.3 | 27.9 | 20.6 | 9.4 |
| Bicol | 13.3 | 23.2 | 11.8 | 7.9 | 13.6 | 16.7 | 16.6 | 16.3 | 15.5 | 13.2 | 10.1 |
| Western Visayas | 24.6 | 36.5 | 11.5 | 7.8 | 19.1 | 18.5 | 25.4 | 14.9 | 43.8 | 23.7 | 13.9 |
| Central Visayas | 27.5 | 31.3 | 9.0 | 5.4 | 15.6 | 18.5 | 22.7 | 14.0 | 25.5 | 15.8 | 9.3 |
| Eastern Visayas | 28.2 | 36.4 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 15.0 | 16.9 | 23.0 | 14.0 | 25.1 | 13.9 | 11.8 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 32.8 | 37.8 | 6.9 | 4.5 | 12.4 | 16.2 | 21.0 | 14.0 | 32.9 | 20.6 | 13.6 |
| Northern Mindanao | 23.1 | 23.6 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 11.2 | 15.1 | 23.2 | 16.5 | 27.9 | 16.5 | 9.7 |
| Davao | 35.6 | 40.8 | 8.1 | 6.1 | 16.5 | 19.5 | 29.3 | 14.4 | 47.5 | 17.2 | 9.3 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 27.4 | 36.3 | 3.7 | 1.6 | 9.9 | 11.6 | 15.0 | 14.1 | 44.4 | 16.7 | 5.6 |
| CAR | 23.6 | 28.7 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 11.7 | 22.0 | 19.3 | 15.5 | 36.5 | 22.2 | 12.2 |
| ARMM | 29.3 | 33.6 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 6.0 | 9.4 | 8.8 | 14.6 | 29.8 | 21.0 | 11.1 |
| Caraga | 21.2 | 28.8 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 15.2 | 12.7 | 18.7 | 12.1 | 26.7 | 16.0 | 10.4 |
| NCR | 28.5 | 48.0 | 30.5 | 26.9 | 42.3 | 35.9 | 29.0 | 36.2 | 55.9 | 44.9 | 16.8 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 29.4 | 43.8 | 22.6 | 19.5 | 33.1 | 33.0 | 29.4 | 31.0 | 51.2 | 36.3 | 14.1 |
| Rural | 27.8 | 35.2 | 10.7 | 7.2 | 15.3 | 21.9 | 22.6 | 17.2 | 34.9 | 20.8 | 11.3 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 28.2 | 30.2 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 11.4 | 17.6 | 20.1 | 10.4 | 31.1 | 16.4 | 13.3 |
| High school undergraduate High school graduate/ | 28.5 | 38.6 | 13.8 | 8.4 | 19.0 | 26.9 | 25.3 | 20.3 | 38.8 | 23.3 | 11.9 |
| Vocational | 27.9 | 34.3 | 13.3 | 10.9 | 19.0 | 22.9 | 23.4 | 19.9 | 38.9 | 24.4 | 12.4 |
| College or higher | 28.4 | 44.9 | 20.0 | 16.7 | 29.4 | 29.1 | 27.3 | 30.6 | 46.2 | 34.7 | 10.9 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 26.7 | 28.2 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 8.3 | 13.8 | 17.7 | 11.5 | 26.1 | 13.6 | 9.6 |
| Second | 27.4 | 34.8 | 9.6 | 5.9 | 13.7 | 21.0 | 22.8 | 15.3 | 32.7 | 18.8 | 11.1 |
| Middle | 29.3 | 36.6 | 13.7 | 9.4 | 18.8 | 28.3 | 25.9 | 19.6 | 39.1 | 23.2 | 11.7 |
| Fourth | 28.9 | 42.4 | 18.7 | 13.8 | 26.6 | 31.2 | 29.5 | 26.5 | 48.1 | 32.6 | 14.9 |
| Highest (Richest) | 29.1 | 47.2 | 24.3 | 20.8 | 35.7 | 30.8 | 26.3 | 34.0 | 52.6 | 39.4 | 12.9 |
| Total | 28.3 | 37.5 | 14.0 | 10.5 | 20.1 | 24.9 | 24.5 | 21.0 | 39.3 | 25.1 | 12.0 |

intergenerational differences in the manner in which leisure time is spent.

The YAFS4 data recorded the common leisure activities of the youth of today. Comparisons with past and future rounds of the YAFS survey will thus document the prevalent leisure activities of each cohort of young adults at various historical times. In Table 4.8, we list the most common leisure activities of Filipino youth who were in the age group 15-24 in 2013. The question that elicited these activities was "What do you mainly do in your leisure time?" No prompt was given as to the possible answers. Respondents were free to mention any activity they deemed as leisure and to name as many activities as they wanted. Table 4.8 presents the seven most commonly mentioned leisure activities of the Filipino youth. In decreasing order beginning with the most commonly mentioned activity, these are television viewing, texting, listening to music, engaging in sports, meeting up with friends, surfing the Internet, and reading.

Based on the categories cited above, the top seven leisure activities of Filipino youth in 2013 fall under three categories: passive leisure (watching television, listening to music, surfing the Internet, and reading), active recreation (playing sports), and informal social life (meeting up with friends and texting). Of these seven activities, four are mediated by technology (television watching, listening to music, surfing the Internet, and texting).

Comparing across background characteristics reveals some differences as well as basic similarities in the main leisure activities of the youth. Comparing by age, the order from highest to lowest percentage of main leisure activity is the same for the younger and the older youth. Watching television remains the most prevalent form of main leisure activity, whereas reading is the least prevalent. But the comparative percentages distinctly vary for some activities. More among the 15-19-year-olds play sports and read, mainly because this age group contains many in-school youth (mostly in high school) for whom these activities are also reinforced by the school.

Comparison by sex indicates clear gender differences in leisure activities, the most notable of which is playing sports, which is the most popular leisure activity of men (the main leisure activity of $43.6 \%$ of men) and the least popular for women (only $2 \%$ reported it as their main leisure activity). Furthermore, more women read, watch television, and text. Rural-urban differences are not so striking, as the differences in percentage per activity are not very high, with the notable exception of surfing the Internet, which is the main leisure activity of 27.6 percent of urban youth but only 7.3 percent of rural youth. Differences in leisure activities by educational attainment indicate that for the technology-mediated leisure activities, there is a clear education gradient, with the percentage reporting these activities as their main pastime consistently increasing as education increases. For the non-technologymediated activities, there remains evidence of an education gradient in the reverse direction. The percentages reporting playing sports and meeting up with friends consistently decrease as educational attainment increases. For reading, there are two groups with relatively higher percentages reporting this activity: high school undergraduates and the college educated. As earlier noted, the high school undergraduates are mostly in-school youth; thus, reading for leisure may be a function of exposure to reading in school.

The pattern of differences across socioeconomic status mimics that of education differentials. The percentage who reported the technology-mediated activities as their main leisure activity consistently increases as socioeconomic status increases. This is to be expected because these leisure activities are directly affected by buying power. Meeting up with friends and playing sports show a reverse pattern, with a decreasing percentage reporting these as their main leisure activity as socioeconomic status increases.

Regional differences reflect basic differences among the regions in levels of urbanization and economic status. In the

Table 4.8 Most common leisure activities by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Watch TV | Text | Listen to music | Play sports | Meet up with friends | Go online/ Surf internet | Read |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 42.6 | 26.5 | 26.1 | 43.6 | 18.0 | 13.9 | 5.5 |
| Female | 55.6 | 33.6 | 27.8 | 2.0 | 17.4 | 11.8 | 17.2 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 48.0 | 32.9 | 27.0 | 24.6 | 18.3 | 13.6 | 13.1 |
| 20-24 | 51.2 | 26.1 | 26.9 | 19.0 | 16.7 | 11.6 | 9.0 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 54.7 | 29.1 | 29.6 | 18.2 | 13.4 | 9.4 | 7.7 |
| Cagayan Valley | 50.0 | 28.4 | 24.8 | 27.0 | 20.5 | 6.6 | 10.7 |
| Central Luzon | 63.5 | 43.7 | 29.3 | 19.1 | 10.7 | 16.7 | 7.3 |
| CALABARZON | 50.9 | 30.7 | 32.5 | 21.6 | 11.9 | 12.6 | 8.4 |
| MIMAROPA | 44.9 | 26.2 | 27.5 | 26.5 | 15.4 | 7.2 | 11.5 |
| Bicol | 48.6 | 28.3 | 26.9 | 24.7 | 18.8 | 8.4 | 17.2 |
| Western Visayas | 46.4 | 31.1 | 27.0 | 23.9 | 16.2 | 5.1 | 11.1 |
| Central Visayas | 39.2 | 27.8 | 23.2 | 27.0 | 29.2 | 10.8 | 13.0 |
| Eastern Visayas | 46.3 | 24.5 | 22.8 | 24.8 | 27.6 | 6.6 | 14.4 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 35.6 | 28.3 | 23.3 | 22.5 | 25.3 | 9.0 | 13.2 |
| Northern Mindanao | 49.7 | 32.6 | 26.8 | 23.5 | 15.5 | 5.9 | 11.1 |
| Davao | 52.7 | 30.9 | 23.9 | 22.2 | 22.8 | 11.6 | 9.7 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 45.1 | 32.1 | 18.5 | 20.8 | 21.8 | 6.6 | 13.8 |
| CAR | 42.3 | 27.1 | 24.1 | 18.4 | 26.3 | 5.7 | 19.2 |
| ARMM | 37.5 | 14.3 | 20.3 | 15.9 | 15.4 | 3.9 | 16.1 |
| Caraga | 40.3 | 26.3 | 24.3 | 28.1 | 27.2 | 6.6 | 10.0 |
| NCR | 52.9 | 27.7 | 29.9 | 20.8 | 14.0 | 34.5 | 13.0 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 54.5 | 31.3 | 29.7 | 20.3 | 14.6 | 27.6 | 11.6 |
| Rural | 47.3 | 29.7 | 25.9 | 23.1 | 18.8 | 7.3 | 11.4 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 36.9 | 17.5 | 17.8 | 29.4 | 23.3 | 2.7 | 3.3 |
| High school undergraduate | 46.1 | 29.2 | 24.2 | 25.7 | 18.8 | 10.1 | 12.0 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.9 | 33.2 | 30.3 | 19.1 | 14.9 | 11.3 | 8.4 |
| College or higher | 56.4 | 35.7 | 33.2 | 16.3 | 15.8 | 26.1 | 19.8 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 31.6 | 20.0 | 19.2 | 24.5 | 24.1 | 1.7 | 10.5 |
| Second | 47.5 | 27.6 | 25.4 | 23.2 | 18.7 | 4.7 | 11.3 |
| Middle | 55.3 | 32.4 | 26.5 | 22.7 | 16.9 | 9.9 | 11.6 |
| Fourth | 55.9 | 35.3 | 31.0 | 21.2 | 15.1 | 18.5 | 10.9 |
| Highest (Richest) | 55.6 | 35.6 | 33.3 | 19.8 | 13.3 | 32.0 | 13.3 |
| Total | 49.3 | 30.1 | 27.0 | 22.3 | 17.7 | 12.8 | 11.5 |

relatively more urbanized and more developed regions like NCR, Central Luzon, CALABARZON, and Ilocos, the proportions of youth whose main leisure activity is technology mediated and dependent on one's purchasing power tend to be the highest. The one exception is texting, which is dominated by youth from Northern Mindanao, SOCCSKSARGEN, and Western Visayas, in addition to youth from Central Luzon. On the other hand, activities that are not technology mediated like playing sports and meeting up
with friends have the highest percentages of youth from CAR, Caraga, Cagayan Valley, Eastern Visayas, and Central Visayas reporting these activities as their main leisure activities. The implication of these results is that in regions where the technology is available and more youth are able to spend for the services, leisure will be dominated by technology-mediated activities that tend to be passive and sedentary and require less face-to-face social interaction. In NCR, Ilocos, CALABARZON, and Central

Luzon, where technology-mediated leisure activities are most prevalent, the proportion of youth whose main leisure activity is meeting up with friends is the lowest.

## Traveling as leisure

One emerging form of leisure in the Philippines is traveling for pleasure. This phenomenon is partly due to the more affordable cost of air travel and probably more spending capacity for greater numbers of Filipinos compared to previous decades. To track this new type of leisure activity that before now has been largely conceived as the prerogative only of the rich or of people in the developed world, a set of questions on traveling for leisure was asked in the 2013 YAFS. Specifically, the question was "Have you ever traveled purely for leisure, within the country or abroad?" To capture recent experience of leisure travel, the same question was asked with a reference period of the past 12 months prior to the survey.

Results show that 26.5 percent of all Filipino youth said they have ever traveled purely for leisure; 26 percent have traveled within the country, while less than 1 percent have traveled abroad. Of those who have ever traveled for leisure, 65 percent traveled in the 12 months prior to the survey. They represent 17 percent of all Filipino youth.

Broken down by background characteristics, Table 4.9 shows that there is no notable difference between age groups and between the sexes in the percentage who have traveled for leisure. But distinct differences are observed with urban-rural residence, educational attainment, and socioeconomic status. More urban residents have ever traveled for leisure than rural residents. The percentage increases as education level and socioeconomic status rise, implying that traveling for leisure is probably highly correlated with the level of one's economic means (proxied by education and socioeconomic status). Still, it is worth noting that the percentages who have ever traveled for leisure among those with the lowest level of
education and those who belong to the lowest quintiles are not low, indicating that travel for leisure is not totally suppressed by the lack of economic means. Altogether, this baseline data on traveling for leisure may be indicative of a new leisure activity that is worth tracking in future rounds of YAFS, as it may indicate changes in leisure activities for Filipinos in general.

Table 4.9 Percent of Filipino youth who have ever traveled for leisure


Figure 4.5 Percent who ever traveled for leisure


In Figure 4.4, the percentage who have ever traveled by region is shown in decreasing order. As in most lifestyle indicators of the youth presented thus far, NCR is on top of the list and, at 41 percent, way above the national average of 26.5 percent. Travel for leisure is also comparatively high in Davao, Ilocos, CAR, and CALABARZON. The less developed regions of ARMM and Bicol are at the bottom of the list, at about 10 and 14 percent, respectively.

## Summary and conclusions

In the simple bivariate cross tabulation of the various indicators of subjective well-being, health, and lifestyles of Filipino youth with the basic background characteristics of age, sex, region of residence, urban-rural residence, educational attainment, and socioeconomic status measured as wealth quintiles, there are observed recurring patterns in the relationships of the background variables to the various dependent variables described in this section of the report.

In the various measures of self-assessed status, youth who reside in the more developed regions of the country, specifically NCR, Central Luzon, and CALABARZON, consistently score the highest in positive self-assessment (selfesteem, life satisfaction, and happiness), while
youth from Northern Mindanao and Caraga are consistently among the lowest scoring. Youth from these latter two regions also have the highest mean depression scores. Socioeconomic status and educational attainment also show a similar pattern in that they exhibit a characteristic direct relation with positive selfassessment: The more educated and the higher the socioeconomic status, the higher the mean scores for each of these positive self-assessment measures. The pattern is the same for selfassessed health. Conversely, the relationship is inverse when it comes to the depression score.

Indications of the so-called double burden of nutrition are abundantly evident in the findings, with a very high level of undernutrition amidst a small percentage of the overweight/ obese. The patterns suggest that overweight/ obesity is somewhat associated with higher education and socioeconomic status and with the more developed regions in the country, especially NCR. Meanwhile, the comparison of body image and BMI suggests that there may be a segment of youth who have incorrect perceptions of their bodies, which can possibly lead to equally incorrect eating and exercise habits.

Data on exercise indicate a clear gender difference, with female youth showing a very low prevalence of exercising. There is also
an evident gender difference in diet or food/ drink consumption, with more men consuming carbonated drinks and more women, chocolates/ sweets. Overall, the data on food consumption indicate relatively low levels of consumption of foods with poor nutritional value (compared with developed countries), especially processed food. The hypothesis that affordability may be partly driving the observed differentials in the consumption of these low-nutritional-value foods is supported by the consistent education and socioeconomic gradient in the consumption of the foods and drinks on our list. Generally, those who can afford these foods and drinks more (i.e., the better educated and those from the higher wealth quintiles) also have higher consumption levels.

The main leisure activities of the Filipino youth show a predominance of passive, sedentary activities and reliance on technology-mediated pastimes (texting, surfing the Internet, listening to music). An emergent form of leisure activity, traveling for leisure, is documented for the first time.

These new data on health and lifestyle gathered for the first time in the YAFS series will be the baseline data against which to measure developments in these fields, especially the health-related components. Future rounds of YAFS may consider the use of objective measures of height and weight (through body measurements with scales and tape measures) to have a more reliable measure of BMI than selfreports.
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# Beliefs and Attitudes of the Youth: Change and Continuity 

Josefina N. Natividad Maria Midea M. Kabamalan

The youth of each generation are shaped by forces that emanate from the traditions of the past as well as by factors that are unique to their current milieu. Among these traditions are normative beliefs about what is proper or acceptable, imbibed by the current generation through socialization processes that begin in the family and later radiate to other institutions as the child's social circle expands. Normative beliefs are not immutable; they can change through time as a result of forces like modernization, urbanization, economic development, and technological changes, sometimes gradually, sometimes abruptly, such as when a significant historical event occurs to disrupt long-held beliefs.

Beliefs are generally thought to affect behavior. Although abundant research literature shows that beliefs and attitudes do not directly lead to specific behaviors and that the relationship of attitudes and behavior is more nuanced than outright causation (Ajzen \& Fishbein, 1977, 1980, Schuman and Johnson, 1976), it is still worthwhile to study beliefs as they generally guide our actions. Beliefs are also a gauge of what the current generation thinks. By measuring the same beliefs over time, one can also gather insight into changing norms and guides to behavior in the wider society.

Since 1994, the YAFS series has tracked beliefs and attitudes related to the core areas of youth sexuality and fertility. These beliefs and attitudes center on premarital sex and premarital conception, marriage and cohabitation, divorce,
and abortion. In this section, we present the beliefs and attitudes of Filipino youth on these topics, broken down by background characteristics. We then present trends in beliefs and attitudes by presenting the data from the two previous rounds (1994 and 2002) compared with the results from the 2013 YAFS.

## Ideal age at marriage

In general, Filipino youth believe that the ideal age for marriage is 23.6 years for a woman and 24.6 years for a man (Table 4.1). There is a distinct gender difference: Men say that the ideal age is 23.1 years for a woman and 24 years for a man, whereas women say the ideal age is one year later (i.e., 24.1 years for women and 25.1 years for men). Rural residents give a younger ideal age at marriage for both men and women compared with urban residents. The ideal age at marriage also tends to increase with a rising level of education and improving socioeconomic status. For example, for those with elementary-level schooling, the ideal age at marriage is 23.3 and 22.2 years for a man and a woman, respectively, while for the college educated, the ideal age is 25.4 years for a man and 24.6 years for a woman. Similarly, among those from the lowest quintile, the ideal age at marriage is 23.7 years for a man and 22.6 years for a woman. The corresponding age for the youth in the richest quintile is 25.3 for a man and 24.5 for a woman.

Across the regions, the ideal age at marriage for a man is highest in the NCR, Western Visayas,
and Bicol, all at 25 years, and lowest in ARMM at 22.6 . For a woman, the highest ideal age at marriage (24 years) is reported in NCR, Western Visayas, and Ilocos. Again, the lowest ideal age at marriage for a woman is reported by youth from ARMM at 21.8 years.

Personal course of action when there is parental opposition to one's marriage plans

In the traditional Filipino family, parents exert a strong influence on a child's choice of a marital partner. Although they may not directly

Table 5.1 Percent who express specific beliefs and attitudes about marriage, cohabitation, premarital sex and premarital conception, by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Ideal age at marriage |  | Perceived personal course of action when there is parental opposition to marriage |  |  | Feel compelled to marry if got pregnant/ got someone pregnant | Approve of premarital sex |  | Feel virginity at marriage is important/ very important for a woman | Believe their own community will accept couples who are living in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | For a man | For a woman | Marry anyway | Live together | Follow parents |  | For a man | For a woman |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 24.0 | 23.1 | 52.1 | 14.2 | 33.7 | 71.4 | 38.6 | 30.2 | 77.0 | 57.8 |
| Female | 25.1 | 24.1 | 35.1 | 6.4 | 58.4 | 56.9 | 21.8 | 16.9 | 82.2 | 55.6 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 24.6 | 23.8 | 38.0 | 8.7 | 53.2 | 65.7 | 25.3 | 18.9 | 83.3 | 52.2 |
| 20-24 | 24.5 | 23.4 | 51.4 | 12.4 | 36.2 | 61.4 | 36.9 | 30.0 | 74.4 | 63.4 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 24.8 | 24.3 | 49.8 | 9.1 | 41.1 | 65.0 | 32.3 | 24.0 | 79.0 | 55.5 |
| Cagayan Valley | 23.8 | 23.1 | 50.7 | 12.0 | 37.3 | 78.0 | 34.9 | 25.1 | 83.9 | 55.0 |
| Central Luzon | 24.3 | 23.5 | 44.3 | 15.6 | 40.0 | 67.9 | 34.9 | 28.0 | 82.0 | 72.2 |
| CALABARZON | 24.6 | 23.8 | 53.2 | 5.1 | 41.6 | 69.3 | 32.7 | 27.1 | 82.4 | 59.5 |
| MIMAROPA | 24.8 | 23.6 | 41.2 | 6.4 | 52.4 | 68.1 | 22.1 | 17.6 | 83.2 | 48.0 |
| Bicol | 25.0 | 23.7 | 36.2 | 7.8 | 56.0 | 75.3 | 25.8 | 19.4 | 85.0 | 43.3 |
| Western Visayas | 25.0 | 24.2 | 42.0 | 11.2 | 46.7 | 57.6 | 33.8 | 27.7 | 83.8 | 58.1 |
| Central Visayas | 24.7 | 23.5 | 42.3 | 12.6 | 45.1 | 57.0 | 23.6 | 17.9 | 72.7 | 47.2 |
| Eastern Visayas | 24.8 | 23.6 | 38.0 | 12.7 | 49.3 | 64.4 | 32.3 | 27.0 | 81.5 | 66.8 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 24.2 | 23.0 | 43.2 | 6.2 | 50.6 | 69.6 | 37.1 | 24.3 | 86.0 | 60.3 |
| Northern Mindanao | 24.4 | 23.2 | 31.6 | 9.3 | 59.2 | 54.5 | 26.6 | 22.0 | 76.1 | 44.9 |
| Davao | 24.1 | 22.8 | 38.9 | 13.6 | 47.5 | 42.6 | 30.8 | 25.0 | 69.1 | 72.7 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 24.4 | 23.3 | 57.2 | 10.1 | 32.8 | 71.2 | 20.8 | 17.0 | 84.1 | 58.9 |
| CAR | 24.3 | 23.5 | 53.5 | 7.9 | 38.3 | 67.8 | 26.3 | 19.7 | 77.0 | 48.5 |
| ARMM | 22.6 | 21.8 | 27.8 | 2.8 | 69.3 | 64.4 | 9.1 | 3.3 | 95.8 | 7.2 |
| Caraga | 24.4 | 23.2 | 36.8 | 11.0 | 52.2 | 64.4 | 34.1 | 27.7 | 77.7 | 56.2 |
| NCR | 25.2 | 24.5 | 40.5 | 12.7 | 46.8 | 59.8 | 32.7 | 24.7 | 70.2 | 62.0 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 25.1 | 24.2 | 40.8 | 11.9 | 47.3 | 60.7 | 31.7 | 24.6 | 74.8 | 63.5 |
| Rural | 24.4 | 23.4 | 44.4 | 9.6 | 45.9 | 65.2 | 29.4 | 23.0 | 81.5 | 54.2 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 23.3 | 22.2 | 43.2 | 13.0 | 43.8 | 70.7 | 30.3 | 24.6 | 77.9 | 50.3 |
| High school undergraduate | 24.5 | 23.6 | 37.3 | 9.7 | 52.9 | 66.4 | 26.5 | 20.6 | 81.9 | 52.6 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 24.6 | 23.6 | 48.8 | 10.8 | 40.5 | 62.1 | 34.3 | 27.7 | 78.5 | 61.8 |
| College or higher | 25.4 | 24.6 | 47.0 | 8.5 | 44.3 | 57.9 | 30.1 | 21.7 | 78.4 | 61.1 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 23.7 | 22.6 | 41.0 | 9.9 | 49.0 | 66.3 | 25.8 | 20.4 | 81.4 | 48.3 |
| Second | 24.4 | 23.4 | 43.2 | 9.3 | 47.5 | 65.7 | 27.5 | 22.0 | 82.0 | 53.8 |
| Middle | 24.6 | 23.6 | 43.6 | 11.0 | 45.4 | 64.5 | 31.7 | 25.3 | 79.4 | 59.4 |
| Fourth | 24.8 | 24.1 | 43.0 | 10.8 | 46.3 | 60.7 | 31.9 | 24.5 | 77.0 | 61.2 |
| Highest (Richest) | 25.3 | 24.5 | 47.0 | 10.0 | 42.9 | 62.5 | 33.6 | 25.0 | 78.4 | 61.1 |
| Total | 24.6 | 23.6 | 43.4 | 10.2 | 46.3 | 64.0 | 30.0 | 23.4 | 79.7 | 56.7 |

choose their child's future spouse, parental acceptance of a child's potential partner is considered essential. Thus, when there is parental opposition to a proposed marriage, children are placed in a dilemma about which course of action to take. In earlier generations, the will of parents almost always prevailed when it came to choosing a life partner. In the survey, we posed the hypothetical question "If your boyfriend proposed marriage/if you had proposed marriage but your parents were opposed to your marrying, would you marry anyway, live together with boyfriend/ girlfriend, or follow parents?" The normatively acceptable answer in the traditional view is to follow one's parents.

Overall, less than half (46.3\%) said they would follow their parents' wishes, while the rest said they would defy their parents either by marrying anyway ( $43.4 \%$ ) or by living together (i.e., entering a consensual union; 10.2\%). More females (58.4\%) than males (33.7\%) and more among the younger (53.2\%) than the older (36.2\%) youth said they would follow their parents' wishes. There are no consistent patterns in responses across education and socioeconomic status. Urban residents have a slightly higher percentage who would follow their parents' wishes compared with rural residents. The regions with the highest percentages who would follow their parents are ARMM (69.3\%), Northern Mindanao (59.2\%), and Bicol (56\%); the regions with the lowest percentages are SOCCSKSARGEN (32.8\%), Cagayan Valley (37.3\%), and CAR (38.3\%; Table 5.1).

## Feeling compelled to marry because of premarital pregnancy

In earlier generations of youth, premarital conception was uncommon; if it occurred at all, the young couple was usually compelled to legitimize the pregnancy by getting formally married. In YAFS4, respondents were asked whether they would feel compelled to marry if they got pregnant (for females) or got someone pregnant (for males) out of wedlock. The results show that the majority of youth (64\%) said they
would feel compelled to marry because of a premarital pregnancy, which indicates that there is still some adherence to the traditional value of legitimizing an out-of-wedlock conception through formal marriage.

Tabulations across the categories of the background characteristics reveal some notable differences. Males (71.4\%) more than females (56.9\%) reported feeling compelled to marry under these circumstances. Slightly more rural (65.2\%) than urban residents (60.7\%) and more among those with elementary education (70.7\%) than those with other educational attainment felt compelled to marry, with the college educated (57.9\%) feeling the least compelled to marry. There is no marked distinction by socioeconomic status. Among the regions, the lowest percentage who would feel compelled to marry following a premarital pregnancy was reported by the youth from Davao Region (42.6\%), followed by the youth from Northern Mindanao (54.5\%). At the other extreme, the highest percentage was recorded in Cagayan Valley (78\%), followed by Bicol (75.3\%).

## The importance of virginity in a woman

It has often been observed that Filipino society tends to have a double standard when it comes to sexual behavior in that women are held to a higher standard than men. Among the traditional values in Philippine society is the value for virginity for a woman when she marries. To gauge how salient this value remains among today's youth, we asked the question "Nowadays, is it important for a woman to be a virgin when she gets married?" The responses are "yes, very important," "yes, important," and "no, not important."

In all, almost eight in 10 (79.7\%) were of the opinion that it is very important/important for a woman to be a virgin when she gets married (Table 5.1). More women, 15-19-year-olds, and rural residents expressed this sentiment than their respective counterparts. Belief in the importance of a woman's virginity is almost universal among youth in ARMM (95.8\%). High proportions of youth from the Zamboanga

Peninsula (86\%) and Bicol (85\%) also expressed support for this view. The regions with the lowest percentages who agreed that it is very important/ important for a woman to be a virgin when she marries are Davao (69.1\%), NCR (70.2\%), and Central Visayas (72.7\%).

## Approval of premarital sex

A related value to virginity is the prohibition of sexual activity outside of marriage. If preserving virginity is very important in a society, then no sexual activity should happen before formal marriage. Since the experience of premarital sex is one of the key variables being tracked by the YAFS series, approval of this practice is likewise one of the key values/attitudes tracked by YAFS. In the latest round, the questions asked were "Do you approve of women having sex before marriage?" and "Do you approve of men having sex before marriage?"

The results show that Filipino youth are as conservative in their views regarding premarital sexual activity as they are with virginity. In all, only 30 percent approve of men having sex before marriage and 23.4 percent approve of women doing the same. Expectedly, more men than women and more of the 20-24-year-olds than the 15-19-year-olds approve of premarital sex for men and for women. The urban-rural difference is less pronounced and in the expected direction of higher agreement among urban than rural youth. There is no clear and consistent pattern of difference by educational attainment and socioeconomic status.

In the regions, ARMM youth show the most consistent belief in the interrelated topics of virginity for a woman and premarital sex for both men and women. ARMM youth showed the lowest levels who approve of premarital sex for men (9.1\%) and women (3.3\%), which supports their almost universal agreement that virginity is very important/important for a woman when she marries. There is evidence of a double standard of morality for men and women in all regions, as manifested in the higher percentage who approve of premarital sex for a man than for a woman. The
differences are greatest in Zamboanga Peninsula, which shows the highest degree of difference in approval for premarital sex for men compared with women. It is also worth noting that although the youth from Zamboanga Peninsula are second only to ARMM in the percentage who think it is very important/important for a woman to be a virgin before she marries, the youth in Zamboanga also have the highest percentage who approve of men having premarital sex (37.1\%).

In addition to Zamboanga, the regions with the highest percentages who approve of men having sex before marriage are Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon, and Caraga. The percentages who approve of women having sex before marriage are highest in Central Luzon, Western Visayas, Caraga, CALABARZON, and Eastern Visayas. ARMM, SOCCSKSARGEN, MIMAROPA, and Central Visayas have the lowest percentages who approve of premarital sex for men and women.

## Perceived community support for couples who are living in

Given the implicit value for marriage and sexual activity within marriage in Philippine society, YAFS explored the acceptability of couples who are in a consensual union or living in. Unlike the previous questions that asked for the youth's individual beliefs or attitudes, we asked them their perception of the acceptability of live-in arrangements in the community they lived in. This question thus required them to assess community norms rather than their own individual stand on the matter. Specifically, the question was "Do you think the people in your community would accept two unmarried persons who are living in?"

Over half (56.7\%) of the youth expressed the belief that their community would accept unmarried people who are living in; the percentages were higher among the older youth, the urban residents, the better educated (high school graduates and the college educated), and those belonging to the higher socioeconomic brackets (fourth and fifth quintiles).

In general, the variations across the regions seem to reflect the degree of adherence
to traditional values on marriage, premarital sex, and consensual unions in the region. For example, youth in Davao Region have the highest percentage who expressed the belief that consensual unions are acceptable to their community. This is consistent with the finding that Davao youth also have the lowest percentage who think virginity is important when a woman marries, as well as the lowest percentage who said they would feel compelled to marry if they got pregnant or got someone pregnant out of wedlock. At the other extreme are youth in ARMM, who, through their responses to the various indicators of traditional beliefs, consistently portray more traditional values. Only 7.2 percent of youth in ARMM believe that their community will accept two unmarried people who are living in.

## Support for a bill to legalize divorce

The Philippines is the last country in the world that does not allow divorce for its citizens (with the exception of Muslims; Hundley \& Santos, 2014). In the last two rounds of YAFS, the sentiment of the youth about the introduction of a law to allow divorce has been measured by asking the direct question "If a bill to legalize divorce in the Philippines for non-Muslims is submitted in Congress, would you support the bill?" In YAFS4, 41.4 percent answered "yes" to this question, which implies that support for a divorce bill is not so high among the youth (Table 5.2).

Support for a divorce bill is somewhat higher among females, older youth, and urban residents. The percentage expressing support for a divorce bill increases steadily as education level rises. By socioeconomic status, more youth belonging to the two highest quintiles would support a divorce bill compared with youth from the poorest quintiles.

Across the regions, support for a divorce bill is highest in the NCR, although at 53.2 percent, the level is not overwhelmingly high. The other region where at least half of the youth would support a divorce bill is Bicol. Surprisingly, only 42.3 percent of the youth in ARMM would support a divorce bill even as divorce is allowed for

Muslims. The region with the lowest percentage of potential supporters of a divorce bill is CAR (29.6\%).

## Approval of abortion

Another issue for which the attitudes and opinions of Filipino youth were sought is abortion. In the Philippines, abortion is generally illegal, and a person who intentionally causes an abortion can be subjected to imprisonment. Still, although the Penal Code does not list specific exceptions to the general prohibition on abortion, under the general criminal law principles of necessity as set forth in article 11(4) of the Code, an abortion may be legally performed to save the pregnant woman's life (United Nations Population Division, n.d., p. 35).

The question on abortion has two components. The first is a global question that asks "Do you approve of a woman having an abortion?" Regardless of their answer to this global question, all respondents were asked if they would approve of abortion under a series of hypothetical circumstances. The responses to the global question indicate a prevalent opposition to the practice of abortion, as only 4.2 percent of Filipino youth answered the question in the affirmative. But when the situation is qualified and particular circumstances under which abortion may be performed are presented, the proportions expressing approval of abortion increase compared with the answer to the global question.

Under the eight circumstances presented, for which the respondents were asked if they would approve of abortion, the situation with the highest percentage of agreement is when "the life of the pregnant woman is in danger" (35.9\%). Other circumstances under which about one in 10 would approve of abortion, in decreasing order, are: when the pregnancy is a result of incest, when the child may be deformed, and when the pregnancy is a result of rape. In all eight scenarios, more men than women expressed approval of abortion, although the difference between the sexes is not so high.

Slightly more men (36.8\%) than women (35.1\%), more older youth (38.1\%) than younger youth (34.5\%), and more urban (38.1\%) than rural (35.1\%) residents approve of abortion when the mother's life is in danger. There is also an increasing prevalence of approval as education level increases. As to socioeconomic status, there are no clear patterns, but those from the two highest wealth quintiles also manifest a higher
prevalence of approval of abortion when the mother's life is in danger.

Among the regions, support for the idea of abortion when the mother's life is in danger is highest (all at above 40\%) in CALABARZON, CAR, NCR, and SOCCSKSARGEN. However, even among these regions, approval of abortion when the mother's life is in danger is not the majority idea. The highest percentage of approval is only 44.5

Table 5.2 Percent who express specific beliefs and attitudes about divorce and abortion by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Support a bill to legalize divorce | Approve of a woman having an abortion | Approve of abortion if... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | The woman is single | The couple is too young | The life of the mother is in danger | The child may be born deformed | The pregnancy is a result of rape | The pregnancy is a result of incest | The couple does not want more children | The couple has many children |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 39.8 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 36.8 | 15.4 | 14.3 | 17.4 | 8.7 | 8.4 |
| Female | 43.0 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 35.1 | 13.1 | 10.5 | 13.0 | 5.6 | 6.2 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 38.4 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 34.5 | 14.0 | 13.1 | 15.5 | 7.5 | 7.3 |
| 20-24 | 45.9 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 5.3 | 38.1 | 14.6 | 11.3 | 14.6 | 6.6 | 7.2 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 38.0 | 4.9 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 34.3 | 11.9 | 15.4 | 19.8 | 4.5 | 5.0 |
| Cagayan Valley | 34.5 | 4.7 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 26.4 | 12.8 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 7.9 | 8.6 |
| Central Luzon | 47.6 | 7.3 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 31.2 | 18.6 | 17.1 | 21.4 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| CALABARZON | 37.2 | 3.7 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 44.5 | 15.4 | 12.4 | 16.5 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| MIMAROPA | 41.9 | 3.2 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 24.7 | 13.0 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 9.4 | 8.2 |
| Bicol | 52.0 | 3.2 | 11.2 | 9.6 | 38.0 | 17.0 | 14.3 | 14.2 | 13.8 | 12.4 |
| Western Visayas | 31.9 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 34.7 | 10.3 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 4.7 | 5.1 |
| Central Visayas | 35.9 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 34.8 | 12.6 | 8.8 | 12.9 | 4.7 | 5.2 |
| Eastern Visayas | 39.9 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 35.5 | 16.7 | 12.3 | 16.3 | 7.3 | 8.1 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 40.5 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 5.2 | 32.6 | 12.4 | 12.2 | 20.8 | 5.0 | 6.2 |
| Northern Mindanao | 38.2 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 28.6 | 11.8 | 8.9 | 9.9 | 5.6 | 6.8 |
| Davao | 41.1 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 31.4 | 10.0 | 7.1 | 10.6 | 3.1 | 3.8 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 38.2 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 41.3 | 12.0 | 10.1 | 11.9 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| CAR | 29.6 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 42.4 | 14.6 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 3.8 | 4.3 |
| ARMM | 42.3 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 25.8 | 11.0 | 15.9 | 21.3 | 3.6 | 5.2 |
| Caraga | 38.7 | 4.2 | 7.7 | 9.6 | 39.5 | 15.2 | 14.8 | 13.1 | 11.5 | 11.7 |
| NCR | 53.2 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 8.0 | 42.1 | 16.4 | 15.1 | 16.9 | 9.5 | 8.9 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 47.9 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 38.1 | 15.3 | 13.2 | 16.0 | 7.8 | 7.5 |
| Rural | 39.0 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 35.1 | 13.8 | 12.1 | 14.8 | 6.9 | 7.2 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 38.4 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 32.3 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 16.8 | 8.1 | 8.7 |
| High school undergraduate | 39.4 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 6.9 | 33.1 | 14.0 | 12.9 | 14.7 | 8.0 | 7.5 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 43.7 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 36.5 | 13.2 | 11.4 | 14.9 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
| College or higher | 43.8 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 42.6 | 16.0 | 11.8 | 15.1 | 5.7 | 7.3 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 38.4 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 32.7 | 12.8 | 10.9 | 14.5 | 7.3 | 7.4 |
| Second | 38.3 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 31.7 | 13.0 | 12.2 | 13.9 | 7.1 | 6.7 |
| Middle | 39.8 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 6.1 | 37.1 | 14.2 | 12.6 | 15.4 | 7.2 | 7.9 |
| Fourth | 46.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 5.9 | 38.8 | 15.9 | 13.0 | 16.6 | 7.4 | 7.5 |
| Highest (Richest) | 45.4 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 39.9 | 15.2 | 13.4 | 15.1 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| Total | 41.4 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 35.9 | 14.2 | 12.4 | 15.1 | 7.1 | 7.3 |

percent, reported by the youth in CALABARZON. At the other end, approval is lowest (all at below $30 \%$ ) in Northern Mindanao, Cagayan Valley, ARMM, and MIMAROPA.

Of the three other conditions for abortion that were approved by more than 10 percent of the youth, there is slightly more support for the idea of abortion in the case of incest (15.1\%) than rape (12.4\%); slightly more too approve of abortion when the pregnancy is a result of incest than when the child may be born deformed (14.2\%). Support for the idea of abortion for a pregnancy that is the result of incest is highest in ARMM (21.3\%) and Zamboanga Peninsula (20.8\%).

## Trends in beliefs and attitudes

It is possible to follow how some of the preceding beliefs and attitudes have changed through the years because the same questions were asked to elicit the information in the three YAFS survey rounds with a complete youth sample of men and women (1994, 2002, and 2013). These beliefs and attitudes revolved around topics related to marriage, premarital sex, divorce, and abortion.

Beliefs about virginity and premarital sex
Perhaps the most awaited statistic produced by the YAFS series is the prevalence of premarital sex. The unspoken assumption is that sexual activity before marriage is unacceptable in the society, more so for women than for men. This further implies that for women more than men, virginity at the time of marriage is expected.

Figure 5.1 shows how belief in the importance of virginity at marriage has changed since 1994, comparing by age group and sex. Overall, there is a steady rise in the percentage who believe that virginity at marriage for a woman is not important, from 8.5 percent in 1994 to 20.3 percent in 2013. The increase in the prevalence of this belief was more steep between 2002 and 2013 than between 1994 and 2002. While the prevalence of this belief is observed among both men and women and the younger and the older youth, the highest relative increase in the percentage who believe that virginity at marriage is not important is observed among women 15-19 years old between the 2002 and 2013 survey rounds.

Figure 5.2 shows the response to the question "Would you approve of a woman having premarital sex?" Consistent with the findings of an increase in the proportion who believe that

Figure 5.1 Percent who believe it is not important for a woman to be a virgin when she marries, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013

virginity at marriage is not important, the results also show a consistent increase in the percentage who approve of premarital sex for a woman, from 12.8 percent in 1994 to 23.4 percent in 2013. This time, the increase in approval was sharper between the 1994 and 2002 YAFS than between the 2002 and 2013 YAFS.

## Ideal age at marriage

The ideal age at marriage for a man remained the same, at 25 years, from 1994 to 2013 (Figure 5.3). Broken down by sex, the ideal mean age for a man, as reported by women, is higher by one year that that given by men. On the other hand, the overall ideal age at marriage for a woman increased by one year, from 23 years in 1994 to 24 in 2013. As with the ideal age for a man, women gave an ideal age that is one year higher than that given by the men.

## Dealing with premarital conception

Respondents in each survey round from 1994 to 2013 were asked to give their opinion on what a woman who gets pregnant out of wedlock should do. The two most common responses are "keep the baby without getting married" and "try to get the father to marry her." These are two opposing views: the first is a break from traditional beliefs that premarital sex is unacceptable and therefore that all pregnancies should occur within marriage, and the second is a perpetuation of the normative belief that the pregnancy should be legitimized by formal marriage. The third and fourth options are "put the baby up for adoption" and "try to end the pregnancy," with neither view getting much support in all three rounds.

In Figures 5.4 and 5.5, we present the trend in the proportion who chose the first two options. The trend indicates a consistent rise in the percentage espousing the less conservative

Figure 5.2 Percent who approve of premarital sex for a woman, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


Figure 5.3 Ideal age at marriage for males and females, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


[^6]view (keep the baby without getting married), from 58.2 percent in 1994 to 67.8 percent in 2013. The increase is steep between 1994 and 2002 but plateaued between 2002 and 2013 for the men. For the women, a rise is observed between 2002 and 2013. In general, more women than men think that a woman should keep the baby without getting married when she gets pregnant out of wedlock.

Correspondingly, there is a consistent decline in the percentage who think that the woman should "try to get the father to marry her," the more traditional response to an out-ofwedlock pregnancy (Figure 5.5), although less marked, from 36.1 percent in 1994 to 29.6 percent in 2013. Consistently, a gender difference is observed, with more men than women espousing this view. The decline in the overall percentage is mainly attributed to the decline in the support for this view among women, even as the pattern of men's responses did not indicate a clear trend.

## Support for a divorce law in the Philippines

Around the time the 2002 YAFS was being conceptualized, the possibility of introducing a divorce law in the Philippines was also being discussed more openly than in previous years in the Philippines. Prompted by this development, a new question was introduced in the YAFS3 survey: "Should a divorce bill be introduced in the Philippines, will you support it?"

Results in Figure 5.6 indicate that only a little over a third (37.3\%) of the youth said they would support a divorce bill in the Philippines if it were introduced. The percentage was marginally higher among men than women and among younger than older youth. After 11 years, the 2013 YAFS results indicate a modest rise to 41.4 percent in the proportion who would support a divorce bill. The increase is most pronounced among young women in the age group 20-24. The increases among men, among both younger and older youth, and among 15-19-year-old women are modest.

Figure 5.4 Percent who said that a woman who gets pregnant out of wedlock should keep the baby without getting married, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


Figure 5.5 Percent who said that a woman who gets pregnant out of wedlock should try to get the father of the child to marry her, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


## Support for abortion in the Philippines

The responses to the global question "Do you approve of a woman having an abortion?" indicate that a high level of disapproval of the practice remains (see Figure 5.7). Throughout the 20-year period, the approval level fluctuated between 4 and 5 percent only.

Figure 5.8 shows the responses to the questions on specific circumstances under which the youth may approve of abortion in the three YAFS rounds. The trend in the percentages who approve shows a downward trajectory for each of the given conditions. The decline is most pronounced for the condition "The life of the pregnant woman is in danger." While half approved of abortion under this circumstance in 1994, the approval dropped to 35.9 percent in 2013.

The timing of the YAFS survey in 2013 may have contributed somewhat to the results for this question. While the field work was ongoing, the debates on the Reproductive Health Bill were at their most heated, with extensive media coverage on the opposing positions taken by the various stakeholders in the bill. The Catholic Church has taken the particularly strong position that the Reproductive Health Bill would "only promote the use of abortifacient drugs" (Macairan, 2012). Some of that probably filtered down to the consciousness of the youth, and the effect was a decline in the support for abortion, even when the life of the mother is in danger. However, the possibility of a real decline in support for
abortion under various circumstances over the 20-year period cannot be discounted, as there is consistency in the decrease, as seen even in the 2002 YAFS results.

## Summary and conclusions

Results from the 2013 YAFS indicate that generally, support remains for the traditional beliefs and values on the importance of virginity, the unacceptability of premarital sex, and the need to marry when confronted with premarital pregnancy, although the numbers indicate no overwhelming support for these norms. In general, there is also a higher prevalence of support for traditional views among the younger youth (15-19-year-olds), rural residents, those with lower educational attainment, and those who belong to the lower socioeconomic quintiles. There are considerable variations among the 17 regions in the levels of support for the traditional views. The ARMM youth stand out as consistently expressing the highest prevalence of support for the traditional values. Contrary to expectations, the NCR youth were not consistently the regional group with the lowest levels of support for the traditional values.

The trend over the past 20 years, from YAFS2 in 1994 to YAFS4 in 2013, indicates a gradual shift toward decreasing support for the traditional beliefs on virginity, premarital sex, and premarital conception among the youth. Overall, we found no evidence of high levels rejecting these beliefs; hence, the majority still espouse the normative beliefs of society on virginity and

Figure 5.6 Percent who said they would support a bill to legalize divorce in the Philippines, by age and sex: 2002 and 2013

women engaging in premarital sex. But the pace of change is uneven across these values. While most still believe in the importance of virginity and the unacceptability of premarital sex, there is a move toward greater acceptance of the decoupling of premarital pregnancy and formal marriage. The trend toward higher acceptance of the option "to keep the baby without getting married" in 2013 compared with 1994 indicates greater acceptance of the idea that a premarital pregnancy need no longer be legitimized by formal marriage.

This shift of attitude may be behind the rise in consensual unions among the youth who do not get formally married but may live together as a consequence of premarital pregnancy. It is not farfetched to surmise that the absence of a divorce law in the Philippines may partially drive the phenomenon of increasing premarital pregnancy and consensual unions and the rising tolerance for these heretofore unacceptable practices.

Figure 5.7 Percent who approve of a woman having an abortion, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


Figure 5.8 Percent who approve of abortion under specific circumstances: 1994, 2002, and 2013
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# Non-sexual Risk Behaviors 

Grace T. Cruz

This chapter examines the non-sexual risk behaviors of the Filipino youth that the Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Survey (YAFS) series has traditionally tracked. This includes smoking, drinking, drug use, suicide ideation and attempts, and the experience of physical violence. The latter two are among the new areas covered in the last two survey rounds. Monitoring these risk behaviors among the young people is important as a public health concern not only because of their long-term effects but also because they are interrelated with other health issues faced by the youth. Young people who smoke are more likely to drink, do drugs, and engage in other risky behaviors. Those who start smoking earlier are at greater risk to be hooked on the vice (Breslau, Fenn, \& Peterson, 1993; Park, et al., 2004; den Exter Blokland, et al., 2004). The close interrelationships among these non-sexual and sexual risk behaviors are clearly established in the literature (Kirby, 1999; Vallejo-Medina \& Sierra, 2015). Smoking, drinking, and drug use have been found to serve as "gateways" that lead young people to other sexual risk behaviors such as early sexual initiation, unprotected sex, and casual sex (Abbey, 2002; Jewkes, Morrell, \& Christofides, 2009; Valejo-Medina \& Sierra, 2015). They are likewise linked with the perpetration of violence and violence victimization among young people. Adolescents' involvement in life-threatening behaviors such as suicide has also been found to be mediated by poor health behavior, which includes smoking and drinking (Laukkanen, et al., 2002).

That young people subscribe to the abovementioned non-sexual risk behaviors despite their known negative implications has been a continuing challenge for health planners. Still, majority of young people exhibit some degree of resilience in spite of their subscription to these health risk behaviors. This is evident in their continuing overall health and mortality improvement. For example, life table estimates in the country suggest that in the last four decades, 15 -year-old females and males gained on average, about four and two years on life expectancy, respectively (i.e., 1970 and 2010). This means that the current cohort of young people is generally healthier than the previous generations that came before them. This extension in life expectancy, however, reflects only a partial gain, which could have been exploited to its fullest potential had their health risks been reduced, if not altogether eradicated. No doubt, efforts to address these non-sexual risk behaviors will ensure better health profiles and reduce the incidence of premature deaths among young people.

## Results

## Smoking

To assess exposure to smoking, we asked the respondents if they had ever tried smoking and if so, the timing and related circumstances of their initiation as well as the persistence of their tobacco consumption. Results show that
among all youth, 38.8 percent have ever smoked, significantly more so among the males relative to the females. However, a much lower proportion (19.7\%) are currently smoking, again more among the males than the females. The decline in the proportion who ever smoked relative to those currently smoking suggests that some smokers eventually quit the practice. The dropout rate is higher among the females, with only 4.7 percent currently smoking from among the 22.1 percent who initiated tobacco use. The corresponding
figures for the males are 35.4 percent and 56.3 percent, respectively (Table 6.1).

The good news is that tobacco use among young Filipinos in general has dropped in the last two decades. For the males in particular, the proportion who are currently smoking dropped to its lowest level since it was first monitored by YAFS in 1982 (i.e., $40.4 \%, 37.6 \%$, and $35.4 \%$ in 1994, 2002, and 2013, respectively). For their female counterparts, the corresponding proportions increased from 4.2 percent in 1994

Table 6.1 Percent of males and females who ever smoked and currently smoking by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ever smoked | Currently smoking |  | Ever smoked | Currently smoking |  | Ever smoked | Currently smoking |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 48.0 | 28.0 | 5,769 | 16.9 | 3.1 | 5,652 | 32.6 | 15.6 | 11,422 |
| 20-24 | 69.8 | 47.3 | 3,589 | 29.1 | 6.8 | 4,161 | 47.9 | 25.6 | 7,750 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 57.5 | 33.4 | 473 | 20.9 | 3.6 | 468 | 39.3 | 18.6 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 49.0 | 30.2 | 345 | 21.4 | 3.1 | 327 | 35.5 | 17.0 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 54.1 | 45.5 | 953 | 24.7 | 6.6 | 1,096 | 38.4 | 24.7 | 2,050 |
| CALABARZON | 59.5 | 39.0 | 1,243 | 23.1 | 3.4 | 1,303 | 40.8 | 20.8 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 54.1 | 31.4 | 283 | 16.1 | 2.9 | 279 | 35.2 | 17.3 | 562 |
| Bicol | 62.3 | 37.7 | 522 | 18.3 | 2.6 | 574 | 39.3 | 19.3 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 59.9 | 40.1 | 764 | 20.8 | 2.9 | 722 | 40.9 | 22.1 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 57.5 | 33.2 | 742 | 12.9 | 2.4 | 673 | 36.3 | 18.5 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 41.3 | 23.9 | 426 | 15.1 | 2.7 | 402 | 28.6 | 13.8 | 829 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 58.0 | 34.6 | 374 | 11.5 | 1.1 | 355 | 35.3 | 18.4 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 56.6 | 27.3 | 447 | 12.9 | 0.6 | 474 | 34.1 | 13.5 | 921 |
| Davao | 62.6 | 36.6 | 446 | 16.3 | 2.1 | 515 | 37.8 | 18.1 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 48.1 | 25.3 | 439 | 9.3 | 0.7 | 460 | 28.2 | 12.7 | 900 |
| CAR | 65.9 | 29.5 | 1,150 | 25.8 | 2.0 | 198 | 44.3 | 14.9 | 370 |
| ARMM | 35.4 | 26.5 | 173 | 8.5 | 0.3 | 355 | 21.3 | 12.5 | 671 |
| Caraga | 69.8 | 30.9 | 316 | 23.5 | 1.6 | 255 | 47.1 | 16.4 | 520 |
| NCR | 58.2 | 39.1 | 265 | 44.9 | 15.8 | 1,357 | 51.0 | 26.6 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 58.0 | 38.2 | 2,398 | 33.5 | 9.7 | 2,831 | 44.7 | 22.8 | 5,228 |
| Rural | 55.8 | 34.4 | 6,962 | 17.5 | 2.6 | 6,982 | 36.6 | 18.5 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 61.8 | 46.2 | 1,730 | 19.2 | 5.4 | 922 | 47.0 | 32.0 | 2,651 |
| High school undergraduate | 51.6 | 32.4 | 3,530 | 19.5 | 4.8 | 3,503 | 35.6 | 18.6 | 7,032 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 61.5 | 38.3 | 2,410 | 25.2 | 5.5 | 3,052 | 41.2 | 20.0 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 53.2 | 26.7 | 1,688 | 23.0 | 3.0 | 2,336 | 35.7 | 13.0 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 54.7 | 34.9 | 1,886 | 13.3 | 2.1 | 1,954 | 33.6 | 18.2 | 3,840 |
| Second | 57.2 | 34.3 | 1,913 | 18.9 | 2.4 | 2,022 | 37.5 | 17.9 | 3,935 |
| Middle | 56.2 | 36.6 | 2,091 | 23.2 | 4.8 | 2,082 | 39.8 | 20.7 | 4,173 |
| Fourth | 57.6 | 37.4 | 1,942 | 26.6 | 6.7 | 2,063 | 41.6 | 21.6 | 4,006 |
| Highest (Richest) | 55.8 | 33.2 | 1,527 | 29.1 | 7.7 | 1,693 | 41.8 | 19.8 | 3,219 |
| Total | 56.3 | 35.4 | 9,361 | 22.1 | 4.7 | 9,813 | 38.8 | 19.7 | 19,174 |

to 5.9 percent in 2002 and decreased to 4.7 percent in 2013 (Figure 6.1).

Sociodemographic, environmental, and personal factors are correlated with young people's tobacco use, as evident in the differentials in the exposure level across background variables. Those residing in NCR registered the highest level (51\%) of exposure to tobacco (\% who ever smoked), while the exposure is lowest in ARMM (21.3\%).

Generally, males and those in the older age groups are more likely to be currently smoking. The proportion of male current smokers is highest in Central Luzon (45.5\%), Western Visayas (40.1\%), and NCR (39.1\%). For the females, it is highest in NCR (15.8\%) and Central Luzon (6.6\%). Living in urban areas as compared to rural areas is associated with a higher prevalence of tobacco use. This is quite apparent among the females; about a third of those from the urban areas ever smoked, which is about twice the level in the rural areas. The same pattern is noted for current tobacco use, with the proportion currently smoking at 9.7 percent and 2.6 percent for urban and rural females, respectively. The urban-rural differential is not as stark for the males, where an almost comparable level of use is noted.

Figure 6.1 Percent of youth who are currently smoking cigarettes by sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


No definite education gradient for tobacco exposure is evident from the data, although a gender distinction is notable. Generally, those with the lowest educational attainment (no schooling and elementary) registered the highest proportion who ever smoked and are currently smoking, although the level does not necessarily decline monotonically as one goes up the education ladder. This pattern seems to be true with males and for the current smoking status of the females. A different pattern is observed for females in terms of the proportion who ever smoked, however, with higher education associated with higher proportion of ever use. At least 25.2 percent and 23 percent of high schooland college-educated females, respectively, reported to have ever smoked, which is higher than the level observed among those with a lower educational background (about 19\% for those with lower than high school education).

The SES differentials are also quite distinct between the males and the females. While a positive relationship generally exists between the proportions who ever smoked and the SES, the pattern is not as evident for current smoking. Data also show no substantial difference in cigarette exposure across the SES categories for the males, but a clear positive relationship is noted for the females. About 29 percent of females in the highest quintile have ever smoked as compared to 13.3 percent for their counterparts in the lowest quintile. The figures for the proportion currently smoking are 7.7 percent and 2.1 percent, respectively.

The timing of the onset of cigarette use is important to consider given the health consequences associated with early exposure, including the increased likelihood of addiction resulting from in prolonged use and exposure to nicotine. Among those who have ever smoked, they started at 15.9 years, on the average. More than a quarter (27\%) among those who have ever smoked started smoking before they turned 15 years old; this proportion increases dramatically to around nine in 10 by the time they turn 18 years old (Table 6.2). This implies that among the youth who have ever used tobacco, most of
them have tried it even before reaching the age of majority (i.e., 18 years).

Generally, the males smoke earlier than the females, starting at an average age of 15.7 (vs. 16.3 years among females). Males' earlier initiation is also evident from the findings showing that at least 28.8 percent among them had their first smoke by age 15 as compared to 22.7 percent for their female counterparts. Lower education is not only associated with higher prevalence of smoking but also with earlier age of initiation to tobacco use, with those attaining at least a high school diploma initiating smoking
a year later than their counterparts with lower education. No apparent age differential is noted in the initiation across the regions. Youth from SOCCSKSARGEN reported the lowest mean age of first tobacco use at 15.5 years on the average.

## Drinking

Another problem associated with the youth is alcohol consumption. Like smoking, drinking-especially binge drinking and persistent consumption of alcohol-can compromise one's health and pose safety risks,

Table 6.2 Percent of youth by age first started to smoke and mean age smoking initiation by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age started to smoke |  |  |  |  |  | Mean age started to smoke | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 15 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | above 18 |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 28.8 | 17.6 | 16.3 | 14.3 | 10.9 | 12.1 | 15.7 | 5,263 |
| Female | 22.7 | 15.4 | 16.9 | 12.7 | 13.8 | 18.5 | 16.3 | 2,166 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 24.0 | 18.9 | 15.1 | 17.3 | 11.1 | 13.7 | 16.0 | 371 |
| Cagayan Valley | 26.1 | 16.8 | 16.0 | 12.6 | 10.5 | 18.1 | 16.0 | 238 |
| Central Luzon | 27.0 | 15.0 | 17.3 | 13.2 | 14.0 | 13.6 | 16.0 | 788 |
| CALABARZON | 27.4 | 17.5 | 21.3 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 11.5 | 15.8 | 1,037 |
| MIMAROPA | 21.9 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 12.8 | 14.3 | 15.3 | 16.1 | 196 |
| Bicol | 20.6 | 17.4 | 15.8 | 16.9 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 16.2 | 431 |
| Western Visayas | 25.5 | 20.1 | 18.6 | 12.0 | 11.5 | 12.2 | 15.7 | 607 |
| Central Visayas | 29.8 | 15.2 | 16.3 | 12.6 | 11.9 | 14.2 | 15.7 | 514 |
| Eastern Visayas | 19.9 | 20.8 | 14.0 | 12.3 | 11.4 | 21.6 | 16.4 | 236 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 26.1 | 14.8 | 18.3 | 12.5 | 11.7 | 16.7 | 16.0 | 257 |
| Northern Mindanao | 29.7 | 15.7 | 14.1 | 16.9 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 15.7 | 313 |
| Davao | 25.9 | 17.9 | 14.3 | 15.4 | 11.8 | 14.6 | 15.9 | 363 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 35.0 | 16.9 | 13.8 | 9.4 | 10.2 | 14.6 | 15.5 | 254 |
| CAR | 29.4 | 10.4 | 16.6 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 20.2 | 15.9 | 163 |
| ARMM | 23.7 | 19.4 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 9.4 | 17.3 | 16.1 | 139 |
| Caraga | 28.7 | 16.4 | 14.3 | 12.7 | 14.3 | 13.5 | 15.6 | 244 |
| NCR | 29.8 | 16.6 | 13.9 | 16.8 | 10.2 | 12.8 | 15.7 | 1,277 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 29.1 | 16.5 | 14.4 | 15.3 | 11.4 | 13.2 | 15.8 | 2,336 |
| Rural | 26.1 | 17.2 | 17.4 | 13.2 | 11.9 | 14.3 | 15.9 | 5,091 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 31.2 | 20.0 | 15.5 | 12.0 | 9.3 | 12.1 | 15.6 | 1,242 |
| High school undergraduate | 36.0 | 21.1 | 15.8 | 11.3 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 15.2 | 2,503 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 18.6 | 13.9 | 18.0 | 15.8 | 15.0 | 18.6 | 16.5 | 2,247 |
| College or higher | 21.1 | 11.8 | 16.0 | 16.8 | 16.0 | 18.3 | 16.3 | 1,435 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 25.7 | 19.1 | 18.3 | 13.4 | 9.8 | 13.6 | 15.8 | 1,290 |
| Second | 26.9 | 16.0 | 17.2 | 13.8 | 11.7 | 14.5 | 15.9 | 1,473 |
| Middle | 25.8 | 17.5 | 16.8 | 13.2 | 12.9 | 13.8 | 15.9 | 1,656 |
| Fourth | 27.4 | 17.2 | 15.3 | 14.2 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 15.8 | 1,665 |
| Highest (Richest) | 29.5 | 15.1 | 14.9 | 15.0 | 11.8 | 13.7 | 15.9 | 1,344 |
| Total | 27.0 | 17.0 | 16.5 | 13.9 | 11.7 | 13.9 | 15.9 | 7,429 |

such as involvement in vehicular accidents. Excessive drinking is also associated with other consequences such as school problems and could negatively affect peer and family relationships.

More Filipino youth drink than smoke. In all, 68.2 percent have ever drunk alcohol while 36.7 percent are current drinkers. As with smoking, drinking is a male-dominated behavior; while 53.2 percent of males are current drinkers, the corresponding proportion for females is only 21 percent (Table 6.3). Regardless of sex, drinking is more prevalent in the older (46.5\%) than the younger (30.1\%)
cohort. Older males (20-24 age group) exhibited the highest prevalence who ever drunk at 89.2 percent, although their female counterparts are not far behind (71.2\%). By education, a positive relationship is apparent, with those having at leastahigh school diplomaregistering a markedly higher level of alcohol consumption relative to those with lower educational attainment. The college educated have the highest prevalence of current alcohol drinking behavior (62.9\% and 28.9\% for males and females, respectively). High school undergraduates reported the lowest level of current drinking, which could be attributed to

Table 6.3 Percent of males and females who ever drank and are currently drinking by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ever drank | Currently drinking |  | Ever drank | Currently drinking |  | Ever drank | Currently drinking |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 68.8 | 42.9 | 5,770 | 52.2 | 17.1 | 5,652 | 60.6 | 30.1 | 11,422 |
| 20-24 | 89.2 | 69.8 | 3,590 | 71.2 | 26.3 | 4,160 | 79.5 | 46.5 | 7,751 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ilocos | 79.1 | 54.3 | 473 | 65.5 | 17.5 | 468 | 72.3 | 36.0 | 942 |
| Cagayan Valley | 73.8 | 50.6 | 344 | 62.0 | 11.3 | 326 | 68.1 | 31.5 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 80.9 | 64.5 | 953 | 62.1 | 20.5 | 1,096 | 70.8 | 41.0 | 2,050 |
| CALABARZON | 81.5 | 54.4 | 1,243 | 67.3 | 24.1 | 1,305 | 74.2 | 38.9 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 75.3 | 49.1 | 283 | 58.8 | 12.5 | 279 | 67.1 | 31.0 | 562 |
| Bicol | 77.0 | 53.8 | 522 | 56.9 | 14.0 | 573 | 66.5 | 33.0 | 1,094 |
| Western Visayas | 69.2 | 52.5 | 764 | 53.5 | 14.3 | 722 | 61.6 | 33.9 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 80.2 | 60.5 | 742 | 61.8 | 23.6 | 674 | 71.4 | 43.0 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 72.8 | 48.2 | 427 | 69.7 | 36.7 | 403 | 71.3 | 42.7 | 830 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 64.1 | 38.1 | 373 | 44.7 | 9.3 | 356 | 54.6 | 24.0 | 730 |
| Northern Mindanao | 77.9 | 46.5 | 447 | 49.9 | 10.6 | 473 | 63.5 | 28.2 | 920 |
| Davao | 81.8 | 53.6 | 446 | 49.4 | 13.4 | 514 | 64.5 | 32.1 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 62.6 | 33.7 | 439 | 32.1 | 6.7 | 460 | 46.9 | 19.9 | 899 |
| CAR | 84.3 | 64.7 | 173 | 65.5 | 13.7 | 197 | 74.3 | 37.4 | 370 |
| ARMM | 10.8 | 3.5 | 316 | 5.4 | 0.8 | 353 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 671 |
| Caraga | 88.3 | 50.0 | 265 | 72.0 | 17.6 | 255 | 80.2 | 34.0 | 520 |
| NCR | 92.7 | 68.8 | 1,150 | 84.2 | 45.4 | 1,357 | 88.1 | 56.1 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 86.3 | 61.9 | 2,398 | 72.8 | 32.4 | 2,831 | 79.0 | 45.9 | 5,229 |
| Rural | 73.3 | 50.2 | 6,962 | 55.2 | 16.3 | 6,983 | 64.2 | 33.3 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 67.5 | 48.9 | 1,730 | 43.4 | 15.3 | 922 | 59.1 | 37.2 | 2,652 |
| High school undergraduate | 69.1 | 43.5 | 3,530 | 47.4 | 14.4 | 3,503 | 58.3 | 29.0 | 7,032 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 86.6 | 63.9 | 2,410 | 70.0 | 24.1 | 3,052 | 77.3 | 41.6 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 87.4 | 62.9 | 1,688 | 73.5 | 28.9 | 2,336 | 79.3 | 43.2 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 63.4 | 41.0 | 1,887 | 41.1 | 10.4 | 1,954 | 52.1 | 25.4 | 3,841 |
| Second | 73.8 | 48.3 | 1,913 | 53.0 | 15.7 | 2,022 | 63.1 | 31.5 | 3,935 |
| Middle | 77.2 | 56.4 | 2,091 | 63.4 | 20.0 | 2,082 | 70.3 | 38.2 | 4,173 |
| Fourth | 83.8 | 61.0 | 1,942 | 72.0 | 27.1 | 2,063 | 77.7 | 43.5 | 4,005 |
| Highest (Richest) | 86.4 | 60.3 | 1,527 | 72.8 | 33.2 | 1,692 | 79.2 | 46.1 | 3,220 |
| Total | 76.6 | 53.2 | 9,360 | 60.2 | 21.0 | 9,814 | 68.2 | 36.7 | 19,174 |

exposure. Those in the lower educational levels are more likely to be younger and are expected to have a lower exposure to drinking relative to their older counterparts.

An urban-rural differential is also evident, with 45.9 percent of urban youth currently drinking as compared to 33.3 percent for their rural counterparts. This pattern affirms the variation found across the regions, where the prevalence of current drinking is highest in NCR (56.1\%), Central Visayas (43\%), and Eastern Visayas (42.7\%) and almost non-existent in ARMM (2.1\%). The high current level of alcohol consumption observed in NCR is true for both gender, with almost half (45.4\%) of the females currently drinking as compared to 68.8 percent for their male counterparts.

Unlike smoking, a clear positive relationship between alcohol consumption and SES is evident. About a fourth (25.4\%) of those in the lowest quintile are currently drinking as compared to almost half (46.1\%) among those in the highest quintile. While the prevalence of current drinking is lower among the females relative to the males, the SES differential is sharper among the former, with about a third of those in the highest quintile (33.2\%) currently drinking, which is more than three times the proportion in the poorest quintile (10.4\%). The magnitude of the difference is less for the males, where the prevalence among the richest quintile ( $60.3 \%$ ) is about 1.5 times higher than that of the poorest quintile (41\%).

Young people smoke before they drink. Initiation to smoking happens at age 15.9 years on the average as compared to 16.3 years for drinking. About 19 percent had their first taste of alcoholic beverages before turning 15 as compared to 27 percent for smoking. However, the exposure rate to drinking increases more rapidly with age relative to smoking so that by the time they reach age 18 , the levels of exposure for smoking and drinking are generally comparable (about 85\% exposure rate for both before age 18). There is no perceptible difference in the timing of initiation to alcohol by place of
residence, educational attainment, SES, and region (Table 6.4).

Similar to smoking, there has also been a perceptible decline in drinking prevalence over the last decade, particularly for the males, where the proportion who are currently drinking dropped from 61.1 percent in 2002 to 53.2 percent in 2013. The same pattern is noted for the females, although to a much lesser degree than that of males, from 23.6 percent in 2002 to 21 percent in 2013 (Figure 6.2). This gender difference in the trend data suggests bigger recent improvements in male drinking behavior relative to the females, albeit males continue to outdo females in alcohol consumption.

The observed decline in drinking among the youth, particularly among the males, is a welcome development given the social, behavioral, and health problems associated with frequent and excessive alcohol consumption. Study findings show that a considerable number admitted to have gotten into trouble due to excessive drinking, particularly among older males (21\%). At least 27.4 percent of older males and 7.3 percent of older females have experienced passing out during a drinking session because of too much alcohol intake; this

Figure 6.2 Percent of youth who are currently drinking alcoholic beverages by sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013

reveals the extent of extreme drinking behavior experienced by some young people. What is also revealing is the general lack of awareness among parents or guardians and even spouses/partners about the adolescents' drinking behavior, particularly among females in their teens (15-19 years old). Only about a third of the youth aged 15-24 admitted that their parents are aware of their drinking behavior (Table 6.5). For teenage girls, the level is lowest at 14.4 percent, which is worrisome considering that some of them have reported that they had passed out due to excessive alcohol intake.

Drug use

The increasing prevalence of drug use among the Filipino youth, particularly the males as revealed in the 1994 and 2002 rounds of YAFS has precipitated greater interest in continuing to monitor this youth risk behavior. Notwithstanding the reported low level of drug use in the country, the severe and far-reaching consequences of drug use, particularly among the young users, is in itself a compelling reason to continue understanding this issue and thus help achieve lower illegal drug demand-if not

Table 6.4 Percent of youth by age first started to drink and mean age of drinking initiation by background characteristics
$\left.\begin{array}{llllllllll} \\ & \text { Background Characteristics } & & & \text { Age started to drink } & & \text { Mean age started } \\ \text { to drink }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { No. } \\ \text { of cases }\end{array}\right]$

Table 6.5 Other indicators of drinking behavior by sex and age

| Sex and age | Percent who have ever gotten into trouble in connection with drinking | Percent who have passed out in a drinking session because $R$ drank too much | Percent whose parent/guardian is aware of R's drinking | Percent whose spouse/live-in partner is aware of R's drinking | Percent whose parent/guardian (never married) or spouse/live-in partner (married) is aware of R's drinking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 14.0 | 18.4 | 49.4 | 68.7 | 49.3 |
| 15-19 | 9.9 | 12.8 | 38.7 | 63.1 | 38.6 |
| 20-24 | 20.6 | 27.4 | 66.7 | 69.8 | 66.5 |
| Female | 2.6 | 5.0 | 18.5 | 17.3 | 18.5 |
| 15-19 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 14.4 | 13.3 | 14.4 |
| 20-24 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 24.0 | 18.7 | 24.0 |
| Both sexes | 8.2 | 11.5 | 33.6 | 30.6 | 33.5 |
| 15-19 | 6.1 | 8.1 | 26.7 | 22.3 | 26.6 |
| 20-24 | 11.3 | 16.6 | 43.8 | 33.1 | 43.6 |
| Total | 8.2 | 11.5 | 33.6 | 30.6 | 33.5 |

altogether eliminate it-particularly among the young population sector.

Consistent with the trend in smoking and drinking, the prevalence of drug use among the youth has dropped over the past decade (Figure 6.3). This is particularly notable among the males, whose prevalence of current use of drugs declined from 4.7 percent in 2002 to 1.3 percent in 2013. The Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB) of the Philippines defines drugs as chemicals that affect a person in such a way as to bring about physiological, emotional, or behavioral change, while "dangerous drugs" are those that have a high tendency for abuse and dependency.

YAFS4 findings reveal drug use to be less common compared to smoking and drinking, with 4 percent admitting to having ever abused drugs. Drug use is male dominated, with an 8-to-1 male-to-female ratio among those who have ever used drugs (i.e., $7.1 \%$ and $0.9 \%$ among males and females, respectively) (Table 6.6). The proportion of currentuse is muchlower compared to that of ever use but with more marked male dominance ( $1.3 \%$ vs. $0.1 \%$ for males and females, respectively). Shabu (or methamphetamine) and marijuana are identified as the "most used" illicit drugs of the youth in the country regardless of sex (Figures 6.4a and 6.4b).

Differences in drug use by age and place of residence follow the same direction as smoking and drinking. Data also show a clear education and SES pattern for the males, with the highest level of drug use reported among those with the highest education and in the richest quintile. About 9 percent of males with college education or higher have ever used drugs as compared to 5.8 percent for those at the lowest end of the education ladder. The corresponding values for SES are 8.1 percent among males in the richest quintile and 5 percent for their poorest

Figure 6.3 Percent of youth who are currently using using drugs by sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


Figure 6.4a Types of drugs ever tried by male youth

Figure 6.4b Types of drugs ever tried by female youth


Table 6.6 Percent of males and females who ever used drugs and currently using drugs by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ever used drugs | Currently using drugs |  | Ever used drugs | Currently using drugs |  | Ever used drugs | Currently using drugs |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 5,770 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 5,652 | 2.6 | 0.5 | 11,422 |
| 20-24 | 11.0 | 1.8 | 3,591 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 4,160 | 5.8 | 1.0 | 7,751 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 3.0 | 0.4 | 473 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 468 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 2.0 | 0.6 | 345 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 326 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 671 |
| Central Luzon | 2.0 | 0.3 | 953 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1,097 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 2,049 |
| CALABARZON | 6.7 | 1.8 | 1,244 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1,304 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 2,548 |
| MIMAROPA | 2.5 | 0.4 | 284 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 279 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 562 |
| Bicol | 4.8 | 0.2 | 521 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 573 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 4.5 | 1.2 | 764 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 723 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 11.2 | 3.4 | 741 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 674 | 6.4 | 1.8 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 2.6 | 0.2 | 427 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 402 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 829 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 7.8 | 0.8 | 373 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 355 | 4.0 | 0.4 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 15.7 | 4.3 | 447 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 473 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 921 |
| Davao | 18.2 | 2.7 | 446 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 515 | 9.2 | 1.3 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 7.3 | 1.4 | 439 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 461 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 900 |
| CAR | 4.0 | 0.0 | 173 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 198 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 371 |
| ARMM | 1.9 | 0.6 | 318 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 354 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 672 |
| Caraga | 13.2 | 3.0 | 266 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 254 | 7.1 | 1.5 | 519 |
| NCR | 10.2 | 0.6 | 1,150 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 1,357 | 6.0 | 0.8 | 2,508 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 9.6 | 1.3 | 2,397 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2,831 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 5,228 |
| Rural | 6.2 | 1.3 | 6,963 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 6,981 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 5.8 | 1.0 | 1,731 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 922 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 2,653 |
| High school undergraduate | 5.6 | 1.2 | 3,530 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 3,502 | 3.2 | 0.6 | 7,031 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 8.8 | 1.4 | 2,411 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 3,052 | 4.4 | 0.8 | 5,461 |
| College or higher | 9.0 | 1.7 | 1,687 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 2,336 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 5.0 | 0.9 | 1,887 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1,953 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 3,840 |
| Second | 6.4 | 1.1 | 1,914 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 2,022 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 3,936 |
| Middle | 7.1 | 1.5 | 2,091 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2,081 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 4,172 |
| Fourth | 8.9 | 1.1 | 1,941 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 2,063 | 4.9 | 0.7 | 4,005 |
| Highest (Richest) | 8.1 | 2.0 | 1,527 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1,692 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 3,220 |
| Total | 7.1 | 1.3 | 9,364 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 9,813 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 19,173 |

counterpart. Across regions, Davao registered the highest proportion of youth who have ever used and are currently using drugs at 9.2 percent and 1.3 percent, respectively.

Among the three problem behaviors assessed so far, initiation to drugs comes relatively later. The mean age at first drug use is 17.3 years on the average and is similar for males and females (Table 6.7). That illicit drug experimentation comes later than smoking and drinking is also evident in the timing of initiation among those exposed to drugs. Significantly, teen girls are more likely to be initiated to drugs
sooner than their male counterparts, with 10.7 percent among the former having their first exposure prior to age 15 as compared to 8.5 percent among the males. By age 18, however, more teen boys than girls have been exposed to drugs. The timing of exposure to drugs also reveals that unlike smoking and drinking, where the onset happens mostly prior to age 18, drug initiation happens later which seems to agree to the data of the Dangerous Drugs Board that drug abusers in the country are about 28 years, on average (n.d.).

Table 6.7 Percent of youth by age first started to use drugs and mean age of drug use initiation by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age started to use drugs |  |  |  |  |  | Mean age started to use drugs | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 15 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | above 18 |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 8.5 | 11.6 | 15.4 | 16.6 | 19.2 | 28.7 | 17.3 | 656 |
| Female | 10.7 | 19.0 | 9.5 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 35.7 | 17.4 | 84 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 6.7 | 13.3 | 40.0 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 16.6 | 15 |
| Cagayan Valley | 9.1 | 27.3 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 9.1 | 16.5 | 11 |
| Central Luzon | 15.8 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 10.5 | 15.8 | 26.3 | 16.9 | 19 |
| CALABARZON | 3.6 | 7.1 | 29.8 | 16.7 | 17.9 | 25.0 | 17.4 | 84 |
| MIMAROPA | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 55.6 | 18.7 | 9 |
| Bicol | 10.3 | 20.7 | 10.3 | 13.8 | 10.3 | 34.5 | 17.0 | 29 |
| Western Visayas | 7.9 | 23.7 | 10.5 | 7.9 | 13.2 | 36.8 | 17.5 | 38 |
| Central Visayas | 5.6 | 10.1 | 12.4 | 16.9 | 12.4 | 42.7 | 18.0 | 89 |
| Eastern Visayas | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 33.3 | 17.7 | 15 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 6.9 | 6.9 | 3.4 | 27.6 | 24.1 | 31.0 | 17.8 | 29 |
| Northern Mindanao | 5.3 | 12.0 | 16.0 | 17.3 | 18.7 | 30.7 | 17.6 | 75 |
| Davao | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 12.5 | 18.2 | 21.6 | 16.8 | 88 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 8.3 | 11.1 | 8.3 | 16.7 | 30.6 | 25.0 | 17.3 | 36 |
| CAR | 12.5 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 17.2 | 8 |
| ARMM | 0.0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 17.4 | 6 |
| Caraga | 8.1 | 5.4 | 10.8 | 16.2 | 27.0 | 32.4 | 17.7 | 37 |
| NCR | 11.2 | 15.1 | 11.2 | 15.8 | 18.4 | 28.3 | 17.0 | 152 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 10.3 | 12.9 | 15.4 | 15.8 | 17.3 | 28.3 | 17.1 | 274 |
| Rural | 7.9 | 12.2 | 14.3 | 16.9 | 18.4 | 30.2 | 17.4 | 466 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 5.6 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 14.8 | 17.6 | 29.6 | 17.5 | 108 |
| High school undergraduate | 17.9 | 10.8 | 17.0 | 21.5 | 16.1 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 223 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 4.2 | 12.9 | 10.4 | 15.0 | 15.4 | 42.1 | 17.8 | 240 |
| College or higher | 5.3 | 11.2 | 17.2 | 13.6 | 23.7 | 29.0 | 17.5 | 169 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 9.1 | 11.1 | 15.2 | 24.2 | 18.2 | 22.2 | 17.3 | 99 |
| Second | 8.5 | 12.1 | 19.1 | 11.3 | 17.7 | 31.2 | 17.4 | 141 |
| Middle | 6.5 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 14.8 | 17.2 | 36.7 | 17.6 | 169 |
| Fourth | 12.2 | 12.2 | 12.8 | 16.8 | 14.8 | 31.1 | 17.1 | 196 |
| Highest (Richest) | 6.6 | 13.9 | 16.1 | 18.2 | 23.4 | 21.9 | 17.2 | 137 |
| Total | 8.7 | 12.4 | 14.8 | 16.6 | 18.0 | 29.5 | 17.3 | 740 |

## Physical violence

Interpersonal violence is defined as "the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against another person or against a group or community that results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation" (Dahlberg \& Krug, 2002, p.5). Involvement in physical violence can either be as a victim or as an offender.

Youth involvement in violence in the country was initially explored in the 2002 YAFS and pursued in the 2013 YAFS. However, only one question was phrased similarly in the two surveys, which allows for the tracking of change in youth involvement in violence over time. Specifically, the question asked was "Have you ever experienced being threatened by someone?" The rest of the questions used different time frames, which render them incomparable.

Results of the 2013 YAFS reveal that about a quarter of the youth (23.7\%) reported having ever been threatened by someone. This is slightly higher than the 20.8 percent level noted in 2002. The exposure to violence is true for both males and females (Table 6.8). Males, urban residents, those in the lower educational bracket, and those in the top two SES quintiles are more prone to the experience. On the other hand, respondents were also asked if they have been on the receiving end of physical violence and if they have been perpetrators of an act of physical violence against someone in the 12 months preceding the survey.

The level of youth experience of violence is generally high. The proportion who have ever experienced being hurt by someone in the past 12 months is 17.2 percent, which is lower than the proportion who reported hurting someone ( $22.5 \%$ ). More males and those in the 15-19 age bracket are prone to violence. While there is no clear monotonic education pattern, those in the lowest education brackets are more predisposed to being avictim of physical violence. In particular, high school undergraduates registered the highest proportion (21.3\%) who reported having been at the receiving end of violence. A clearer
positive pattern emerges for SES, with increasing brushes with violence noted as one goes up the SES ladder. For example, 14.1 percent among those belonging to the poorest quintile have ever been hurt by someone in the past year as compared to 20.5 percent among those in the richest quintile. The corresponding figures for those who admitted having perpetuated violence for the same period are 18.2 percent and 27 percent, respectively. This seems to suggest that poverty does not necessarily predispose the youth to violent behavior. Across the regions, those living in NCR reported the highest level of recent experience with violence, both as a victim (29.5\%) and as a perpetrator (34.5\%). Meanwhile, the proportions who experienced violence either as a victim (5.5\%) or a perpetrator (10.5\%) are lowest in ARMM.

In the study, we also asked the respondents if they carried a weapon with them in the last 12 months. Results show that the percentage is highest among the older males (11.2\%) and lowest among the younger females (2.1\%) (Table 6.9).

Circumstances surrounding the experience of violence vary across age and gender. Violence against the males in general has been perpetuated by their friends as well as classmates or schoolmates (for the younger cohort). Friends have also been the recipients of the young males' violent outbursts (Table 6.9). Unlike the males, the females' experience with violence is more likely to occur within the domestic front. In particular, teenage girls are more likely to have been hurt by their mother (3.9\%), father (3.2\%), or siblings (3.4\%) and are more likely to vent their physical aggression on their siblings (7.4\%). Intimate partner violence is more apparent among the older females, as indicated by their experience of violence involving someone with whom they have a close interpersonal relationship, such as a husband, partner, or boyfriend. Older females are more likely to report being physically hurt by their spouse, partner, or boyfriend, but at the same time, they also inflict physical violence on their intimate partners (Table 6.9).

Table 6.8 Percent who experienced violence by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Ever been threatened by someone | No. of cases | Ever experienced being hurt by someone in the past 12 months | No. of cases | Have hurt someone in the past 12 months | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 30.2 | 9,361 | 21.1 | 9,358 | 24.5 | 9,363 |
| Female | 17.4 | 9,809 | 13.6 | 9,792 | 20.6 | 9,808 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 23.5 | 11,421 | 20.0 | 11,407 | 23.8 | 11,419 |
| 20-24 | 23.8 | 7,751 | 13.2 | 7,745 | 20.6 | 7,752 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 18.9 | 942 | 16.7 | 942 | 22.7 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 22.5 | 671 | 14.9 | 670 | 27.4 | 671 |
| Central Luzon | 13.6 | 2,049 | 16.4 | 2,049 | 23.6 | 2,050 |
| CALABARZON | 23.7 | 2,547 | 18.4 | 2,539 | 24.9 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 21.5 | 562 | 18.5 | 561 | 19.8 | 562 |
| Bicol | 19.6 | 1,095 | 20.0 | 1,095 | 16.5 | 1,094 |
| Western Visayas | 21.0 | 1,484 | 11.0 | 1,482 | 15.6 | 1,485 |
| Central Visayas | 28.3 | 1,415 | 14.7 | 1,415 | 18.7 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 26.5 | 829 | 13.3 | 826 | 13.5 | 827 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 20.0 | 729 | 11.0 | 729 | 20.6 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 24.7 | 920 | 17.8 | 921 | 21.0 | 921 |
| Davao | 25.7 | 960 | 14.2 | 960 | 23.1 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 19.4 | 899 | 14.7 | 898 | 18.9 | 898 |
| CAR | 29.2 | 370 | 16.8 | 370 | 27.6 | 369 |
| ARMM | 11.7 | 674 | 5.5 | 674 | 10.5 | 674 |
| Caraga | 35.8 | 520 | 17.3 | 519 | 25.4 | 519 |
| NCR | 35.4 | 2,505 | 29.5 | 2,503 | 34.5 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 28.2 | 5,226 | 23.1 | 5,224 | 29.9 | 5,229 |
| Rural | 21.9 | 13,944 | 15.0 | 13,927 | 19.8 | 13,942 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 24.9 | 2,654 | 18.6 | 2,646 | 20.7 | 2,653 |
| High school undergraduate | 24.4 | 7,031 | 21.3 | 7,025 | 25.5 | 7,029 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 23.1 | 5,461 | 13.2 | 5,459 | 21.3 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 22.2 | 4,023 | 14.8 | 4,019 | 20.2 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 22.2 | 3,841 | 14.1 | 3,829 | 18.2 | 3,838 |
| Second | 22.4 | 3,936 | 15.4 | 3,935 | 19.5 | 3,937 |
| Middle | 23.2 | 4,171 | 17.2 | 4,170 | 22.7 | 4,171 |
| Fourth | 25.7 | 4,005 | 19.6 | 4,003 | 25.8 | 4,005 |
| Highest (Richest) | 24.9 | 3,218 | 20.5 | 3,216 | 27.0 | 3,219 |
| Total | 23.7 | 19,172 | 17.2 | 19,153 | 22.5 | 19,171 |

Suicide

The 2014 World Health Organization Global Report cited suicide as the second leading cause of death globally among people 15 to 29 years of age (WHO, 2014). The significant toll that suicide takes on young lives notwithstanding, studies on the true state of suicide in certain settings like the Philippines remain scarce largely due to data
constraints (mostly cultural factors). Where suicide is consideredataboo,itislikelythat deaths resulting from suicide are not properly recorded, resulting in the underestimation of suicide rates. The few studies on suicide among Filipino youth, including those emanating from the previous YAFS series, reveal low incidence rates. What is alarming, however, is the increasing incidence of suicide, with females registering the highest

Table 6.9 Other indicators of the youth's experience of violence by sex and age

| Indicators of violence | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  |
| Person who hurt R in the last 12 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Friend | 7.3 | 4.2 | 9,351 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 9,788 | 5.0 | 2.2 | 19,141 |
| Classmate/schoolmate | 5.4 | 0.6 | 9,351 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 9,788 | 3.5 | 0.5 | 19,141 |
| Father | 1.8 | 1.0 | 9,351 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 9,788 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 19,141 |
| Spouse/partner (BF/GF) | 1.1 | 1.5 | 9,351 | 1.2 | 4.4 | 9,788 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 19,141 |
| Mother | 1.0 | 0.5 | 9,351 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 9,788 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 19,141 |
| Siblings | 1.3 | 0.9 | 9,351 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 9,788 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 19,141 |
| Person hurt by $\mathbf{R}$ in the last $\mathbf{1 2}$ months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Friend | 9.5 | 6.8 | 9,354 | 5.3 | 1.9 | 9,808 | 7.4 | 4.2 | 19,161 |
| Classmate/schoolmate | 8.2 | 2.6 | 9,354 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 9,808 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 19,161 |
| Father | 0.1 | 0.3 | 9,354 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 9,808 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 19,161 |
| Spouse/partner (BF/GF) | 0.1 | 0.8 | 9,354 | 3.7 | 8.1 | 9,808 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 19,161 |
| Mother | 0.1 | 0.0 | 9,354 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 9,808 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 19,161 |
| Siblings | 1.8 | 1.6 | 9,354 | 7.4 | 4.0 | 9,808 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 19,161 |
| Percent who carried a weapon in the last 12 months | 8.1 | 11.2 | 9,306 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 9,772 | 5.2 | 6.7 | 19,077 |

suicide rates among 15-24-year-olds (Redaniel, Lebanan-Dalida, \& Gunnell, 2011). The same study found no substantial differential in rates across all age groups among the males. Findings indicating that for every suicide there are many more people who attempt suicide (WHO, 2014) suggest the need for closer scrutiny not only of suicide attempts but also of suicide ideation as
a significant risk factor to the risk of suicide in general.

It is in this context that the YAFS studies since 2002 have inquired into the youth's experiences of suicide ideation and attempts as well as the circumstances surrounding these experiences. Results show that like smoking, drinking, and drug use, the proportion of youth who have ever thought of committing suicide

Figure 6.5a Percent of youth who have ever thought of committing suicide by sex: 2002 and 2013


Figure 6.5b Percent of youth who have ever tried to commit suicide among those who ever thought of committing suicide by sex: 2002 and 2013

declined in the last decade from 13.4 percent in 2002 to 8.7 percent in 2013 (Figure 6.5a). However, the proportion among those who thought of committing suicide who attempted suicide increased from 25 percent to 37 percent with the increasing pattern observed for both males and females (Figure 6.5b). It should be

Table 6.10 Percent who ever thought of and who have tried committing suicide by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent who ever thought of committing suicide | Percent who tried to commit suicide | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |
| Male | 4.5 | 1.5 | 9,356 |
| Female | 12.6 | 4.8 | 9,807 |
| Age |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 7.3 | 2.5 | 11,412 |
| 20-24 | 10.7 | 4.3 | 7,749 |
| Region |  |  |  |
| llocos | 10.0 | 2.6 | 940 |
| Cagayan Valley | 5.2 | 1.8 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2,047 |
| CALABARZON | 8.3 | 2.4 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 7.1 | 2.0 | 561 |
| Bicol | 7.7 | 3.7 | 1,094 |
| Western Visayas | 8.4 | 4.0 | 1,483 |
| Central Visayas | 12.4 | 3.2 | 1,414 |
| Eastern Visayas | 8.1 | 3.0 | 828 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 9.5 | 3.2 | 728 |
| Northern Mindanao | 11.3 | 4.2 | 920 |
| Davao | 12.3 | 3.2 | 961 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 6.3 | 1.6 | 898 |
| CAR | 8.1 | 1.6 | 369 |
| ARMM | 6.2 | 1.8 | 675 |
| Caraga | 13.8 | 3.8 | 520 |
| NCR | 10.9 | 5.6 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |
| Urban | 9.5 | 4.5 | 5,224 |
| Rural | 8.3 | 2.7 | 13,937 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 7.9 | 3.1 | 2,653 |
| High school undergraduate | 8.1 | 3.0 | 7,026 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 9.0 | 3.2 | 5,461 |
| College or higher | 9.7 | 3.5 | 4,019 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 8.0 | 2.6 | 3,839 |
| Second | 9.1 | 3.1 | 3,936 |
| Middle | 8.5 | 2.9 | 4,170 |
| Fourth | 7.8 | 3.2 | 3,999 |
| Highest (Richest) | 10.2 | 4.4 | 3,217 |
| Total | 8.7 | 3.2 | 19,162 |

noted, however, that the level of reported suicide attempts is an underestimate as the study captures only non-fatal suicide attempts and excludes successful ones.

Results from the 2013 YAFS show that generally, more females than males entertained suicidal thoughts and attempted to end their lives. Around 12.6 percent of female youth aged 15-24 have ever thought of committing suicide as compared to 4.5 percent for their male counterparts (Figure 6.5a). The corresponding figures for suicide attempts are 4.8 percent and 1.5 percent, respectively (Table 6.10). Suicide ideation is also higher among the older youth, urban residents, those with higher education, and those in the highest income brackets. Suicide attempts are also higher among the older cohort, urban residents, and those residing in NCR. The reported level of suicide attempts does not vary much across education categories and is slightly elevated for those in the highest quintile.

Across regions, youth living in CARAGA (13.8\%), Central Visayas (12.4\%), and Davao (12.3\%) expressed the highest level of suicide ideation, while those in Central Luzon (3.1\%), Cagayan Valley (5.2\%), and ARMM (6.2\%) registered the lowest. For suicide attempts, the proportions are generally low in all regions. The highest prevalence is recorded in NCR at 5.6 percent. In most regions, the proportion who ever attempted suicide is below 3 percent.

A significant proportion (37\%) of those with suicidal thoughts eventually carried out their plans to end their lives. Among them, a few reported the use of violent means of suicide. Different methods were employed by the males and females, with wrist slashing and substance ingestion more common among females and hanging oneself more common among males. Family problems and relationships are the most frequently mentioned precipitating factors for youth's suicide attempts (Table 6.11).

The study findings indicate a strong relationship between adolescent suicide ideation and attempts and the presence of depression, low self-esteem, and alcohol abuse (Table 6.12). The CES-D depression scale and Rosenberg's

Table 6.11 Methods and reasons for committing suicide

| Indicators of suicide | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  |
| Method used to commit suicide |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ingesting substances | 0.1 | 0.1 | 9,350 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 9,805 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 19,157 |
| Slashed wrist | 0.2 | 0.8 | 9,350 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 9,805 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 19,157 |
| Hang self | 0.6 | 0.8 | 9,350 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 9,805 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 19,157 |
| Reason for attempting to commit suicide |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family problem | 0.7 | 0.8 | 9,354 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 9,803 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 19,159 |
| Quarrel with spouse/partner | 0.2 | 1.0 | 9,354 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 9,803 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 19,159 |
| Note: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Method used in YAFS3 - one answer only Method used in YAFS4 - multiple response |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6.12 Percent who ever thought of and who have ever tried committing suicide by mean depression and self-esteem score and drinking behavior

|  | Mean depression | Mean self-esteem score | Percent of currently drinking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Suicide ideation |  |  |  |
| Yes | 9.6 | 17.5 | 36.9 |
| No | 7.7 | 18.6 | 36.7 |
| Total | 7.9 | 18.5 | 36.7 |
| Suicide attempt |  |  |  |
| Yes | 10.0 | 17.6 | 43.0 |
| No | 9.4 | 17.4 | 33.4 |
| Total | 9.6 | 17.5 | 36.9 |

self-esteem scale were used to measure the level of depression and self-esteem, respectively. Results indicate that those who ever considered and attempted to end their lives exhibited higher depression scores relative to those who did not. For example, those who have ever thought of committing suicide registered a mean depression score of 9.6 as compared to 7.7 among those who have not experienced such thoughts. In a similar vein, the mean self-esteem score of those who contemplated suicide is lower than those who did not. Youth who have tried to do something to end their lives are more likely to be current drinkers of alcoholic beverages compared to those who have not gone through the experience ( $43 \%$ vs. $33.4 \%$, respectively).

## Summary and conclusions

The foregoing discussion demonstrates that young Filipinos face a wide range of nonsexual risk behaviors. Alcohol consumption is
the most predominant among them, with about two in three having tried alcoholic beverages, although the prevalence of current drinkers is down to a third at the time of the survey. The youth are more likely to drink than to smoke, although they get initiated to tobacco sooner than to alcohol. There is considerable exposure to violence, both as a victim and as a perpetrator, with a higher incidence of intimate partner violence observed among the older female youth. Reports on suicide attempts and drug abuse may be much lower but are nevertheless significant considering their direct toll on the young persons' health and mortality condition. Findings indicating that over a third (37\%) among those who contemplated suicide eventually carried it out provide an idea of the extent of the mental health problem among Filipino youth. Suicide ideation and the subsequent actions to end one's life which are found to be closely interrelated with self-esteem, depression, and current alcohol consumption, suggest the dangerous
connections among these unhealthy youth behaviors.

The dangers posed by these risk behaviors lie not only in the prevalence of practice but also in the timing of initiation. With many starting to explore these risk behaviors in their early teens, addiction and consequently long-term potential use, as in the case of smoking, are more likely to occur. These, in turn, are expected to be associated with greater health risk in later life.

The good news, however, is that for most of these non-sexual risk behaviors, the experience is far from universal. Many have dropped out after their initial excursions into these risky experiences. Moreover, results indicate a consistent decline in the prevalence of smoking, drinking, drug use, and suicide ideation and attempts over the last decade. Only the experience of violence increased over the same period.

The differentials in exposure to nonsexual risks across sectors of the youth population provide a clear mapping of youth vulnerability. Generally, the males are more likely to smoke, drink, do drugs, and engage in violence, but more females have entertained suicidal thoughts and carried them out. Compared to the rural areas, urban areas are associated with a higher prevalence of all the non-sexual risk behaviors considered in the analysis. However, the effect of education is not as clear. For the males, better education is associated with higher levels of alcohol and drug consumption but a lower level of smoking. Males with the lowest education registered the highest preponderance of smoking. For the females, the opposite effects of higher education are also noted in that higher educational attainment is associated with greater exposure to smoking and drinking. No clear education pattern is noted for the perpetuation of violence, although a higher incidence of being at the receiving end of violence is noted among those with poorer education. Suicide ideation is also higher among the better educated. The males exhibit a positive relationship between SES and drinking, drug use, and suicide ideation. For the females, higher

SES is associated with higher levels of smoking, alcohol use, and suicide ideation. Those of higher SES are also more likely to experience violence, both as a perpetrator and as a victim.

In sum, it seems that higher education and SES are both associated with higher exposure to smoking, drinking, and suicide ideation for the females and the males, with increased levels of drinking, drug use, and suicide ideation. Does this imply that the higher level of some of these risk behaviors such as smoking and drinking found among highly educated young people and those in the higher SES can be a function of access? The education patterns are not clear suggesting the need for further analysis to tease out the true direction of the relationship in a multivariate model.

The findings also show that while data over the last decade suggest a drop in the prevalence of these risk behaviors, the remaining proportion of young people who are still currently hooked on these risky behaviors is substantially high.
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# Sexual Behavior 

Maria Paz N. Marquez

The first YAFS conducted in 1982 was conceptualized primarily to examine sexuality-related issues and their antecedents among Filipino female youth to design interventions that would address the rising trend in unplanned and teenage pregnancy. Since then, YAFS has been known as the pioneering large-scale study of Filipino youth sexuality. The most recent YAFS round provides a comprehensive source of information on the Filipino youth's knowledge, attitude, and behavior related to sexuality. One of the main features of the YAFS4 survey is the inclusion of questions on new forms of sexual activity that have emerged in recent years, such as having a "fuck buddy" (FUBU), phone sex, and recording sex videos. It should be noted that YAFS-as with most surveys that deal with sensitive issues such as sexual behavior-is prone to social desirability bias, which could lead to overreporting of sexual activity among males and under-reporting among females (Wellings et al., 2006). To minimize this limitation, the study devised several measures to ensure privacy during the interview process and confidentiality of the responses.

Sexual behavior covers a broad spectrum of activities including masturbation, kissing, petting, and having sex. The survey defined the term "having sex" as sexual intercourse or coitus that involves vaginal or anal penetration (Demographic Research and Development Foundation \& University of the Philippines Population Institute, 2012). This chapter
discusses the patterns and trends of three aspects of sexual behavior: initiation of sexual activity, premarital sex experience, and risky sexual behaviors. Since gender disparity in sexual behavior is well established, most of the analyses in this chapter will be separate for males and females. In addition, apart from the five background characteristics, marital status has also been included in this chapter as one of the differentiating factors of sexual behavior.

## Sexual experience

The majority of Filipino youth age 15-24 have not yet engaged in sexual intercourse. Table 7.1 shows that three in five youth have not initiated sexual activity ( $61.6 \%$ among males and $59.4 \%$ among females). Conversely, 2 in 5 youth have sexual experience. Among males, 38.5 percent have engaged in sex; 35.8 percent did so while they were still single. A minority of males' (2.6\%) first sexual intercourse occurred after marriage. Among females, 40.6 percent have sexual experience. Similar to males, most sexual initiations of females are premarital (28.7\%), but a substantial 11.9 percent reported marital first sex.

## Age at sexual initiation

Age at sexual initiation is considered a proxy measure of exposure to the risk of pregnancy among females and the risk of fatherhood among males. It is also an important
Table 7.1 Percent distribution of the sexual experience of youth 15-24 years old by sex and background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No sexual experience | With sexual experience |  |  | Total | No. of males | No sexual experience | With sexual experience |  |  | Total | No. of females |
|  |  | Premarital first sex | Marital first sex | Total |  |  |  | Premarital first sex | Marital first sex | Total |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 79.4 | 19.9 | 0.7 | 20.6 | 100.0 | 5,770 | 80.5 | 14.1 | 5.3 | 19.5 | 100.0 | 5,652 |
| 20-24 | 33.0 | 61.4 | 5.7 | 67.0 | 100.0 | 3,592 | 30.7 | 48.5 | 20.8 | 69.3 | 100.0 | 4,161 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 70.3 | 29.7 | 0.0 | 29.7 | 100.0 | 8,198 | 89.9 | 10.1 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 100.0 | 6,483 |
| Ever marrried | 0.0 | 78.8 | 21.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1,166 | 0.0 | 65.0 | 35.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 3,331 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 61.1 | 35.9 | 3.0 | 38.9 | 100.0 | 473 | 64.0 | 26.4 | 9.6 | 36.0 | 100.0 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 67.2 | 29.1 | 3.8 | 32.8 | 100.0 | 344 | 55.0 | 25.4 | 19.6 | 45.0 | 100.0 | 327 |
| Central Luzon | 54.2 | 43.2 | 2.6 | 45.8 | 100.0 | 952 | 55.1 | 35.7 | 9.2 | 44.9 | 100.0 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 62.7 | 36.1 | 1.2 | 37.3 | 100.0 | 1,243 | 65.5 | 22.5 | 12.0 | 34.5 | 100.0 | 1,304 |
| MIMAROPA | 62.5 | 34.6 | 2.8 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 283 | 59.3 | 28.2 | 12.5 | 40.7 | 100.0 | 280 |
| Bicol | 67.9 | 29.2 | 2.9 | 32.1 | 100.0 | 521 | 62.8 | 21.6 | 15.5 | 37.2 | 100.0 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 67.1 | 31.7 | 1.2 | 32.9 | 100.0 | 764 | 60.5 | 31.9 | 7.6 | 39.5 | 100.0 | 722 |
| Central Visayas | 59.0 | 40.3 | 0.7 | 41.0 | 100.0 | 742 | 61.4 | 29.7 | 8.9 | 38.6 | 100.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 68.6 | 27.2 | 4.2 | 31.4 | 100.0 | 427 | 55.5 | 23.6 | 20.9 | 44.5 | 100.0 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 59.7 | 36.8 | 3.5 | 40.3 | 100.0 | 372 | 56.1 | 31.8 | 12.1 | 43.9 | 100.0 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 63.3 | 35.6 | 1.1 | 36.7 | 100.0 | 447 | 60.0 | 30.7 | 9.3 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 473 |
| Davao | 58.5 | 39.9 | 1.6 | 41.5 | 100.0 | 446 | 55.8 | 37.7 | 6.4 | 44.2 | 100.0 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 70.7 | 25.9 | 3.4 | 29.3 | 100.0 | 440 | 62.9 | 20.6 | 16.5 | 37.1 | 100.0 | 461 |
| CAR | 66.9 | 30.8 | 2.3 | 33.1 | 100.0 | 172 | 51.8 | 37.1 | 11.2 | 48.2 | 100.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 72.9 | 6.2 | 20.9 | 27.1 | 100.0 | 321 | 61.5 | 7.1 | 31.4 | 38.5 | 100.0 | 353 |
| Caraga | 61.9 | 35.8 | 2.3 | 38.1 | 100.0 | 265 | 58.3 | 31.5 | 10.2 | 41.7 | 100.0 | 254 |
| NCR | 50.8 | 48.6 | 0.6 | 49.2 | 100.0 | 1,151 | 56.4 | 34.7 | 8.9 | 43.6 | 100.0 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 52.5 | 46.3 | 1.2 | 47.5 | 100.0 | 2,398 | 58.8 | 33.1 | 8.1 | 41.2 | 100.0 | 2,831 |
| Rural | 64.7 | 32.2 | 3.1 | 35.3 | 100.0 | 6,966 | 59.6 | 26.9 | 13.4 | 40.4 | 100.0 | 6,983 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 63.0 | 31.1 | 5.9 | 37.0 | 100.0 | 1,731 | 43.5 | 30.9 | 25.5 | 56.5 | 100.0 | 921 |
| High school undergraduate High school graduate/ | 74.4 | 24.0 | 1.6 | 25.6 | 100.0 | 3,530 | 71.7 | 18.8 | 9.5 | 28.3 | 100.0 | 3,503 |
| Vocational | 48.6 | 48.7 | 2.7 | 51.4 | 100.0 | 2,412 | 44.5 | 39.5 | 15.9 | 55.5 | 100.0 | 3,052 |
| College or higher | 51.8 | 47.0 | 1.2 | 48.2 | 100.0 | 1,688 | 66.7 | 28.6 | 4.8 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 2,336 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 68.0 | 26.7 | 5.3 | 32.0 | 100.0 | 1,887 | 49.4 | 28.6 | 22.0 | 50.6 | 100.0 | 1,953 |
| Second | 68.9 | 28.5 | 2.5 | 31.1 | 100.0 | 1,916 | 59.3 | 27.8 | 12.8 | 40.7 | 100.0 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 59.9 | 37.7 | 2.5 | 40.1 | 100.0 | 2,090 | 58.7 | 29.3 | 12.0 | 41.3 | 100.0 | 2,082 |
| Fourth | 54.7 | 43.9 | 1.4 | 45.3 | 100.0 | 1,942 | 63.5 | 28.5 | 7.9 | 36.5 | 100.0 | 2,064 |
| Highest (Richest) | 55.4 | 43.4 | 1.2 | 44.6 | 100.0 | 1,527 | 66.8 | 29.4 | 3.8 | 33.2 | 100.0 | 1,692 |
| Total | 61.6 | 35.8 | 2.6 | 38.5 | 100.0 | 9,363 | 59.4 | 28.7 | 11.9 | 40.6 | 100.0 | 9,813 |

indicator of exposure to the transmission of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) including HIV. In the survey, age at sexual initiation was derived from responses to two questions asking for (1) the age at first premarital sex among youth with premarital sex experience and (2) the age at marriage or cohabitation among ever married youth with no premarital sex experience.

Table 7.2 presents the percentage distribution and median age at sexual initiation by background characteristics. Males reported a lower median age of 17.8 years compared with 18.2 years for females, signifying that males were generally initiated into sex at a younger age than females. As expected, the younger cohort of youth (15-19 years old) reported a lower median age at sexual initiation than the older cohort (20-24 years old) for both sexes. For males, the median age at first sex reported by those in the ages $15-19$ is 16.6 years, while the median age at first sex for those in the ages 20-24 is 18.7 years. The corresponding figures for females are 16.8 and 18.8 years, respectively.

Interestingly, a gender variation is evident in the differentials of the median age by marital status. On average, ever married males engaged in sex at a much later age than their never married counterparts (18.4 vs. 17.7 years), while for females, the reverse is true. Never married females reported a higher median age of 18.5 years compared with the ever married at 18.1 years.

Across regions, the youngest median age at sexual initiation for males was recorded in NCR (17.0 years) and Davao Region (17.4 years), while the oldest was in CAR (18.6 years) and ARMM (19.3 years). Females exhibited a different pattern, with the highest median ages found in Bicol (18.6 years) and Central Visayas (18.5 years) and the lowest in Davao Region (17.7 years). In most regions, the median age at first sex of males is lower than that of females. However, for Cagayan Valley, Eastern Visayas, SOCCSKSARGEN, CAR, ARMM, and Caraga, it is the females who engage in sex earlier than males on average. The age at sexual initiation of female youth in ARMM was, on
average, 1.4 years earlier than that of their male counterparts ( 17.9 years old vs. 19.3 years old).

On average, urban residents reported an earlier onset of intercourse than their rural counterparts for both sexes. There is no clear pattern in the median age at first sex by education among males, but among females, a monotonic increase is apparent, with the median age at sexual initiation two years later among those with college education (19.1 years) compared with youth who had no or elementary schooling (16.9 years). Increasing socioeconomic status is associated with a decreasing median age at first sex among males, but there is no distinct pattern among females.

Among the sexual behaviors tracked by the YAFS series is early sexual initiation, defined as beginning sexual activity before age 18. The proportion is computed from the youth age 1824 to avoid the censoring effect of the inclusion of youth who were not yet 18 years old. Also of particular interest is the proportion of youth age 15-24 who have had sexual intercourse before age 15. This is one of the core indicators used by the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS to measure the global progress made to halt the spread of HIV/AIDS (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, 2009a).

The results of the three YAFS rounds indicate an increasing proportion of youth who began sexual activity before age 18 , from 12.9 percent in 1994 to 24.3 percent in 2013 for both males and females (Figure 7.1). Among males, this proportion increased from 13.8 percent in 1994 to 25.1 percent in 2013; for females, the corresponding increase was from 12 percent to 23.5 percent. The "younging" trend in the onset of sexual intercourse is also evident in the declining median age at first sex. For males, the median age at sexual initiation decreased from 18.0 years in 1994 to 17.8 in 2013; for females, it decreased from 18.8 in 1994 to 18.2 in 2013 (data not shown).

Looking at the proportion of youth with early sexual activity across background characteristics reveals interesting findings (Table 7.2). By marital status, there is a wide disparity
age 18 by sex and background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Median age at first sex | No. of males 15-24 years old with sexual experience | Had sex before age 15 | No. of males 15-24 years old | Had sex before age 18 | No. of males 18-24 years old | Median age at first sex | No. of females 15-24 years old with sexual experience | Had sex before age 15 | No. of females 15-24 years old | Had sex before age 18 | No. of females 18-24 years old |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 16.6 | 1,159 | 3.2 | 5,740 | 25.4 | 2,197 | 16.8 | 1,030 | 2.1 | 5,583 | 26.9 | 1,953 |
| 20-24 | 18.7 | 2,316 | 3.7 | 3,504 | 24.9 | 3,504 | 18.8 | 2,625 | 1.8 | 3,906 | 21.8 | 3,907 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 17.7 | 2,404 | 2.8 | 8,170 | 21.2 | 4,646 | 18.5 | 646 | 0.3 | 6,475 | 6.1 | 3,085 |
| Ever marrried | 18.4 | 1,071 | 7.4 | 1,074 | 41.9 | 1,055 | 18.1 | 3,009 | 5.5 | 3,013 | 42.8 | 2,774 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 17.8 | 178 | 2.1 | 468 | 23.6 | 284 | 18.1 | 154 | 1.5 | 455 | 24.2 | 273 |
| Cagayan Valley | 18.4 | 107 | 1.8 | 337 | 15.6 | 205 | 18.0 | 131 | 2.3 | 311 | 25.9 | 197 |
| Central Luzon | 17.7 | 421 | 4.8 | 937 | 30.3 | 630 | 18.3 | 474 | 2.1 | 1,079 | 22.8 | 782 |
| CALABARZON | 17.8 | 443 | 4.4 | 1,222 | 26.5 | 740 | 18.3 | 422 | 1.5 | 1,277 | 22.9 | 726 |
| MIMAROPA | 18.2 | 104 | 2.8 | 282 | 22.8 | 167 | 18.3 | --- | 1.1 | 273 | 20.7 | 174 |
| Bicol | 17.8 | 162 | 2.1 | 516 | 21.3 | 310 | 18.6 | 195 | 1.3 | 555 | 19.5 | 339 |
| Western Visayas | 17.8 | 240 | 2.3 | 753 | 22.3 | 480 | 18.3 | 246 | 1.5 | 683 | 20.6 | 427 |
| Central Visayas | 18.2 | 301 | 2.8 | 738 | 21.4 | 471 | 18.5 | 240 | 1.4 | 653 | 17.9 | 368 |
| Eastern Visayas | 18.4 | 128 | 2.4 | 421 | 18.5 | 233 | 18.0 | 151 | 2.4 | 375 | 24.9 | 221 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 17.8 | 146 | 2.7 | 369 | 29.0 | 241 | 18.1 | 119 | 1.9 | 317 | 21.5 | 205 |
| Northern Mindanao | 17.8 | 162 | 1.8 | 445 | 25.9 | 247 | 18.3 | 175 | 1.3 | 458 | 20.4 | 260 |
| Davao | 17.4 | 176 | 4.3 | 437 | 30.4 | 270 | 17.7 | 214 | 2.4 | 501 | 30.1 | 322 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 18.1 | 122 | 2.8 | 433 | 16.7 | 227 | 18.0 | 146 | 2.1 | 436 | 26.2 | 229 |
| CAR | 18.6 | 54 | 2.4 | 170 | 16.5 | 109 | 18.5 | 90 | 1.6 | 192 | 19.1 | 136 |
| ARMM | 19.3 | 83 | 0.9 | 319 | 8.6 | 220 | 17.9 | 121 | 3.8 | 341 | 24.4 | 213 |
| Caraga | 17.9 | 100 | 1.9 | 264 | 26.1 | 161 | 17.8 | 97 | 3.3 | 246 | 30.6 | 134 |
| NCR | 17.0 | 548 | 6.2 | 1,134 | 36.2 | 705 | 17.8 | 575 | 2.9 | 1,340 | 27.0 | 854 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 17.4 | 1,104 | 5.7 | 2,364 | 34.3 | 1,488 | 18.0 | 1,112 | 2.5 | 2,777 | 25.1 | 1,758 |
| Rural | 18.0 | 2,371 | 2.6 | 6,881 | 21.8 | 4,213 | 18.2 | 2,543 | 1.8 | 6,713 | 22.7 | 4,102 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 17.9 | 607 | 3.4 | 1,699 | 23.0 | 998 | 16.9 | 455 | 7.9 | 859 | 48.4 | 506 |
| High school undergraduate High school graduate/ | 17.2 | 882 | 3.1 | 3,509 | 23.4 | 1,324 | 17.2 | 902 | 2.6 | 3,413 | 39.5 | 1,057 |
| Vocational | 18.1 | 1,193 | 3.3 | 2,367 | 25.6 | 1,998 | 18.5 | 1,569 | 0.9 | 2,931 | 21.7 | 2,464 |
| College or higher | 17.8 | 792 | 3.9 | 1,666 | 27.3 | 1,380 | 19.1 | 728 | 0.2 | 2,285 | 9.8 | 1,833 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 18.0 | 582 | 2.1 | 1,869 | 19.4 | 1,059 | 17.8 | 861 | 2.7 | 1,830 | 35.3 | 1,095 |
| Second | 18.0 | 574 | 1.9 | 1,895 | 20.4 | 1,137 | 18.3 | 750 | 2.4 | 1,952 | 21.7 | 1,137 |
| Middle | 18.0 | 801 | 2.7 | 2,054 | 23.2 | 1,309 | 18.3 | 791 | 2.1 | 2,014 | 22.0 | 1,255 |
| Fourth | 17.8 | 856 | 5.3 | 1,918 | 29.8 | 1,244 | 18.1 | 713 | 1.2 | 2,025 | 20.9 | 1,297 |
| Highest (Richest) | 17.3 | 662 | 5.1 | 1,508 | 33.3 | 952 | 18.3 | 539 | 1.5 | 1,669 | 18.1 | 1,076 |
| Total | 17.8 | 3,475 | 3.4 | 9,244 | 25.1 | 5,701 | 18.2 | 3,655 | 2.0 | 9,489 | 23.5 | 5,860 |

Figure 7.1 Percent of youth age 15-24 who had sex before age 18 by sex: 1994, 2002, 2013

in the proportion who initiated sex before age 18 between ever married and never married youth, suggesting that the sexual activity may have prompted the union. The 41.9 percent of ever married males with early sexual initiation is nearly double that of their never married counterparts. Among females, the proportion among the ever married (42.8\%) is seven times higher than that among the never married (6.1\%).

Worth noting is the proportion of youth in NCR with early sexual initiation, particularly for males, the highest among all regions. More than 3 in 10 (36.2\%) young men in NCR began sexual activity before they turned 18 , with 6.2 percent having sex at a very young age (below 15 years old). Females in NCR also recorded a high proportion of early sexual debut at 27 percent, but this is lower than Davao Region's 30.1 percent and Caraga's 30.6 percent. However, when sexual activity of females before age 15 is examined, ARMM and Caraga stand out with 3.8 and 3.3 percent, respectively.

For both sexes, early sexual activity is more pervasive among urban than rural residents. Also notable are the divergent gender patterns of early sexual activity by educational attainment and socioeconomic status. Among males, the proportion who had sex before age 18 is positively associated with both education and socioeconomic status, but an inverse association is evident for females. In other words, early sexual initiation is more prevalent among the more educated and wealthier males, but it is the
low-educated and poorer females who recorded greater prevalence of early sexual activity.

## Premarital sexual initiation

## Premarital sexual experience

The YAFS series has also been tracking the prevalence of premarital sexual activity, defined as sex before cohabitation or formal marriage, among Filipino youth. Premarital sex per se does not pose a higher risk for early and unintended pregnancy or increase the risk for STI transmission. The concern regarding premarital sex lies on its social unacceptability in the country, as reported in an earlier chapter.

Trend data reveal a substantial upward shift in the prevalence of premarital sex, from 17.9 percent in 1994 to 32.2 percent in 2013 (Figure 7.2). With the increasing prevalence of premarital sexual activity comes a narrowing of the gap in the level between men and women. In 1994, 26.2 percent of young men had premarital sexual experience, more than double the 10.2 percent prevalence among young women. Two decades later, 35.8 percent of males and 28.7 percent of females have engaged in premarital sex, a difference of only 7 percentage points. In fact, in 2013, the prevalence of premarital sexual activity is higher for females than males in CAR ( $37.1 \%$ vs. $30.8 \%$ ) and Western Visayas (31.9\% vs. 31.7\%), as shown in Table 7.1.

Figure 7.2 Percent of youth age 15-24 with premarital sex experience by sex: 1994, 2002, 2013


It is evident in Table 7.1 that the lion's share of the young people's sexual initiations are premarital in nature. Among youth with sexual experience, 93.1 percent of males and 70.7 percent of females had their first sex prior to marriage.

Table 7.1 also presents the proportion of youth with premarital sex experience for males and females across background characteristics. The proportion of youth with premarital sex experience is much higher among the older than the younger cohort ( $61.4 \%$ vs. $19.9 \%$ for males and $48.5 \%$ vs. $14.1 \%$ for females). As expected, ever married youth reported a higher prevalence of premarital sex than never married youth. Nearly 8 in 10 ( $78.8 \%$ ) ever married males have engaged in premarital sex, while the corresponding proportion among the never married males is only 29.7 percent. Among females, the gap is even wider at 65 percent among the ever married against 10.1 percent among the never married.

Males from NCR (48.6\%) and Central Luzon (43.2\%) and females from Davao Region ( $37.7 \%$ ) and CAR (37.1\%) reported the highest levels of premarital sexual activity. ARMM, where early marriage is common, reported the lowest at 6.2 percent for males and 7.1 percent for females. Regardless of sex, premarital sex is more common in urban than rural areas. By education, the level of premarital sex is highest among high school graduates (43.6\%) and lowest among high school undergraduates (21.4\%), a pattern that is evident for both males and females. However,
the proportion with premarital sex experience is positively associated with socioeconomic status for males but not for females.

## Wantedness of first premarital sex

Respondents with premarital sex experience were asked to describe the wantedness of their first premarital sex by choosing from four scenarios: The first intercourse/contact was (1) something they wanted to happen at that time, (2) something they did not want to happen but went along with, (3) something they did not plan to happen but happened anyway, and (4) something that happened against their will. The results indicate that Filipino youth's sexual initiation is typically unplanned. Table 7.3 shows that less than half ( $46.6 \%$ ) of the youth wanted their first sex to happen at the time it did. One in five (21\%) youth said they did not want it to happen but went along with it, while 29.8 percent said they did not plan it but it happened anyway. The remaining 2.5 percent admitted that their first sex happened against their will (coercive sex).

Coercive sex is more common among females than males ( $3.8 \%$ vs. $1.5 \%$, respectively). It is also more prevalent among younger youth, Bicol and MIMAROPA residents, and the least educated compared with their counterparts.

## Protection during first premarital sex

What makes premarital sex risky is not only the age at which it first transpired but also if the sexual act is not protected from the risk of conception or STIs. Table 7.3 shows the proportion of young people who used any form of protection and the proportion who used a
condom during their premarital sexual initiation. Special attention is accorded to the condom because among all methods, it has the distinction of providing dual protection against unintended pregnancy and STIs. The condom is the method of choice for Filipino youth's sexual initiation, as it accounts for 58.3 percent of protected sexual activities.

Table 7.3 Percent distribution of wantedness of first premarital sex and percent who used protection during first premarital sex among youth 15-24 years old with premarital sex experience by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Youth whose first premarital sex was something the youth: |  |  |  |  | Youth with premarital sex experience who: |  | No. of youth who ever had premarital sex |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wanted to happen at that time | Did not want to happen but went along with | Did not plan but happened anyway | Happened against will | Total | Used any form of protection during first premarital sex | Used condom during first premarital sex |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 53.4 | 16.0 | 29.1 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 26.6 | 15.7 | 3,217 |
| Female | 38.0 | 27.5 | 30.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 16.2 | 9.2 | 2,498 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 46.1 | 22.1 | 28.7 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 21.0 | 12.0 | 1,845 |
| 20-24 | 46.9 | 20.5 | 30.4 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 22.6 | 13.3 | 3,869 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 47.6 | 18.9 | 31.2 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 27.3 | 17.7 | 3,036 |
| Ever marrried | 45.6 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 16.1 | 7.4 | 2,678 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 42.0 | 19.3 | 36.9 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 33.6 | 18.5 | 274 |
| Cagayan Valley | 54.9 | 22.8 | 19.8 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 13.7 | 9.3 | 162 |
| Central Luzon | 46.8 | 24.0 | 28.9 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 17.9 | 15.2 | 772 |
| CALABARZON | 51.5 | 14.5 | 32.6 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 30.9 | 17.8 | 688 |
| MIMAROPA | 38.1 | 26.8 | 30.4 | 4.8 | 100.0 | 22.8 | 10.2 | 168 |
| Bicol | 44.0 | 18.7 | 32.1 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 15.7 | 15.0 | 252 |
| Western Visayas | 53.3 | 22.2 | 20.6 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 12.4 | 10.2 | 418 |
| Central Visayas | 41.0 | 25.6 | 30.0 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 29.8 | 10.9 | 480 |
| Eastern Visayas | 49.4 | 22.7 | 25.0 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 15.9 | 10.2 | 176 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 44.7 | 20.2 | 33.7 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 6.2 | 208 |
| Northern Mindanao | 47.4 | 21.3 | 28.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 9.8 | 5.2 | 287 |
| Davao | 49.7 | 15.2 | 32.5 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 19.8 | 9.2 | 348 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 54.0 | 21.6 | 22.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 176 |
| CAR | 40.7 | 25.4 | 29.7 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 22.2 | 13.6 | 118 |
| ARMM | 61.3 | 12.9 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 9.7 | 6.5 | 31 |
| Caraga | 60.0 | 15.8 | 20.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 14.5 | 5.5 | 165 |
| NCR | 40.6 | 22.5 | 33.9 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 31.5 | 16.3 | 995 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 44.0 | 21.7 | 31.6 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 26.1 | 15.0 | 1,955 |
| Rural | 48.0 | 20.6 | 28.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 11.8 | 3,759 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 59.8 | 17.4 | 19.1 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 11.7 | 5.0 | 726 |
| High school undergraduate | 48.0 | 22.1 | 27.2 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 10.2 | 1,382 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 44.7 | 20.5 | 32.2 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 20.4 | 11.1 | 2,219 |
| College or higher | 41.5 | 22.6 | 34.2 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 22.3 | 1,387 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 50.3 | 21.6 | 24.6 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 12.0 | 5.1 | 915 |
| Second | 46.9 | 23.4 | 26.9 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 14.5 | 8.7 | 1,018 |
| Middle | 49.4 | 18.3 | 28.7 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 21.6 | 9.3 | 1,281 |
| Fourth | 41.8 | 20.9 | 35.4 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 27.6 | 15.8 | 1,376 |
| Highest (Richest) | 46.4 | 21.6 | 31.2 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 30.9 | 23.5 | 1,124 |
| Total | 46.6 | 21.0 | 29.8 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 22.1 | 12.9 | 5,714 |

Figure 7.3 Percent who used any form of protection during first premarital sex by sex: 1994, 2002, 2013


Most of the first premarital sexual encounters of Filipino youth were unprotected. Among youth with premarital sex experience, 12.9 percent used a condom during their sexual initiation while 9.2 percent used other methods, notably withdrawal. The rest (77.9\%) were unprotected. The low level of protected sex is not surprising given the generally spontaneous nature of the sexual initiation, as described earlier.

The proportion who reported using a condom during first sex is higher for males ( $15.7 \%$ ) than females ( $9.2 \%$ ), which is expected because the condom is a male-dependent method. Condom use is also higher among the older cohort of youth, the never married, and urban residents compared with their respective counterparts. Condom use at sexual initiation is more widespread among young people in Ilocos (18.5\%), CALABARZON (17.8\%), and NCR (16.3\%) and least pervasive in Northern Mindanao (5.2\%) and Caraga (5.5\%). Condom use during first sex rises with corresponding increases in the levels of educational attainment and socioeconomic status. For instance, only 1 in 20 of the least educated or the poorest youth used a condom. In contrast, more than one in five among the college educated or those belonging to the richest quintile reported condom use. The wide disparity across education categories suggests that lack of knowledge about the condom or its sources may have hindered condom use. On the other hand, the large difference in condom use between the poorest and the richest segments of the youth
population implies that more financially welloff youth are able to afford condoms and other contraceptive methods more than their poorer counterparts.

The trend data in Figure 7.3 show that the prevalence of protected sexual initiation among males has remained stable over the past 20 years, while a seesaw pattern is apparent among females. From 1994 to 2013, nearly a quarter of males age 15-24 used any form of protection during their first premarital sex. In contrast, from 8.5 percent in 1994, the proportion of females who used protection during their sexual debut climbed to 15.8 percent in 2002 but went down to 14.1 percent in 2013. The good news is the rising level of condom use during the sexual initiation of both male and female youth. Among males, the 8.9 percent level of condom use in 1994 steadily rose until 2003, when it surpassed the level of use of other methods combined ( $14.6 \%$ vs. $9.7 \%$, respectively). Among females, the rather low 1.4 percent level of condom use increased to 6.6 percent in 2002 but dipped slightly to 6.3 percent in 2013.

When asked for the main reason why the youth or their partner did not use any form of protection the first time they had premarital sex, the leading reason given was they did not expect to engage in sex at thattime. This was reported by 50.5 percent of male youth and 44.6 percent of female youth (Figure 7.4). A substantial 10.4 percent of males and 14 percent of females also admitted a lack of knowledge about contraceptives as the

Figure 7.4 Percent distribution of the main reason for non-use of protection during first premarital sex by sex

reason for their unprotected sexual initiation. In addition, 14.2 percent of males but only 3.2 percent of females felt that the sexual act would not be fun if they used contraceptives. Objection by their sexual partner was the main reason given by a sizable 12.1 percent of females and 6.6 percent of males. Nearly 9 percent of females said they wanted to get pregnant. The corresponding proportion for males who wanted to get their partners pregnant is much lower at 1 percent. A variety of other reasons were mentioned, each rarely exceeding 1 percent, but when combined constitute about one tenth of all responses. These include belief that contraceptives are wrong or dangerous to use, deficient knowledge on where to get contraceptives, firm belief that pregnancy will not happen, inability to use contraceptives because they were drunk at that time or were raped, or simply personal choice.

## Reason for first premarital sex

Meston and Buss (2007) identified a multitude of reasons why people engage in sexual intercourse. They noted significant gender differences that are also evident in the YAFS4 data. As shown in Figure 7.5, there is a considerable gender disparity in the main reason why Filipino youth engaged in sex for the first time. For a great majority ( $71.9 \%$ ) of females, expression of love is the primary motivating factor for their first sexual activity. In contrast, only 30.6 percent of males gave the same reason, and a nearly equal proportion
(27.9\%) admitted that release of sexual tension or arousal compelled them to have sex for the first time. The latter reason was reported by only 5.8 percent of females. In addition, for 21.4 percent of males and 6.7 percent of females, the desire to experience something new or curiosity about sex was the driving force behind their sexual initiation. Furthermore, a notable 9.5 percent of males and 6 percent of females were under the influence of drugs and alcohol when they first engaged in sexual intercourse, suggesting that their first sexual experience was nonconsensual in nature. Another 8.3 percent of males and 5.9 percent of females said they gave in to their partner's desire to have sex. Peer pressure was also one of the reasons mentioned by the youth, but it figured in only less than 1 percent of the young people's sexual debut. Other reasons cited for initiating sex include the desire to get themselves or their partner pregnant, to make up after a fight or misunderstanding, to escape from family problems, to prove virginity, and as a form of rebellion.

## Risky sexual behaviors

The survey elicited information on a number of other sexual activities, which if unprotected could pose a higher risk for unplanned pregnancy and contracting STIs including HIV. These are commercial sex (paying for sex and being paid in exchange for sex), casual sex, having a FUBU, coercive sex, sex with

Figure 7.5 Percent distribution of the main reason for engaging in first premarital sex by sex

multiple partners, extramarital sex, and sex between males. Commercial sex, for instance, is an important public health concern because clients of sex workers are considered important bridging groups in the transmission of STIs and HIV to wider sexual networks (Wellings et al., 2006). The proportions of youth who engaged in these risky sexual activities are presented in Table 7.4.

## Commercial sex

Commercial sex or transactional sex is defined in the study as sexual acts involving payment either in cash or in kind. The survey questions asked whether the respondent is a seeker (the respondent paid for sex) or a provider (the respondent has been paid for sex). Aside from cash, payments come in many forms, from expensive material things such as cellphones and other electronic gadgets, jewelry, clothes, perfume, and tuition fee payment to as little as cellphone load, slippers, and teddy bears. Intangibles such as assistance in doing homework are also exchanged for sexual favors.

Commercial sex activities among the young people are rather low: 1.4 percent have ever paid for sex, while 1.5 percent have been paid in exchange for sexual favors. About 3 percent of males reported having paid for or received payment for sex, while the comparable figure for females is considerably lower at less than 1 percent. Since commercial sex is illegal in
the country, there is reason to believe that the reported data may be under-reported.

Commercial sex is more common among older youth (20-24 years old) and urban residents. Both types of commercial sex activities are most common in NCR and Davao Region and least prevalent in Cagayan Valley and ARMM. There is no clear pattern in the prevalence of these sexual activities by marital status and education. A positive association is apparent, however, between socioeconomic status and the proportion who paid for sex, signifying a higher capacity to pay for such favors among the youth belonging to the highest quintile compared with their poorer counterparts.

## Casual sex and sex with a FUBU

In recent years, casual sexual relationships or sexual hook-ups, as they are called in popular media, are increasingly becoming a normative experience among adolescents and young adults, particularly among university students in Western countries (Fielder, Walsh, Carey, \& Carey, 2013; Garcia, Reiber, Massey, \& Merriweather, 2012; Wentland \& Reissing, 2014).

In the 2013 YAFS, casual sex refers to sexual activities outside the context of a romantic relationship, with no payment involved, and which happened only once or twice (e.g., onenight stand). Sexual partners in this type of sexual activity include strangers, acquaintances, neighbors, board mates, dorm mates, and friends.
Table 7.4 Percent of youth 15-24 years old who have engaged in risky sexual activities by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Youth who have: |  |  |  |  |  | No. of youth | Ever-married youth who have engaged in extramarital sex | No. of evermarried youth | Percentage of males who have sex with males (MSM) | No. of males |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ever paid for sex | Received payment for sex | Casual sex experience | A "fuck buddy" (FUBU) | Coercive sex experience | Sex with multiple partners |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 2.7 | 2.7 | 9.4 | 6.6 | 3.2 | 25.0 | 9,364 | 10.1 | 1,164 | 5.1 | 9,364 |
| Female | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 9,813 | 0.6 | 3,325 | --- | - |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 7.8 | 11,424 | 1.4 | 1,051 | 3.4 | 5,771 |
| 20-24 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 8.5 | 6.1 | 7.4 | 25.6 | 7,755 | 3.6 | 3,436 | 7.7 | 3,594 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 1.4 | 1.4 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 13.1 | 14,683 | --- | --- | 4.9 | 8,200 |
| Ever marrried | 1.4 | 1.5 | 4.7 | 3.5 | 13.2 | 21.3 | 4,496 | 3.1 | 4,489 | 6.3 | 1,166 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 0.6 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 2.9 | 5.0 | 14.8 | 941 | 3.1 | 194 | 5.1 | 473 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 8.6 | 671 | 0.0 | 176 | 1.2 | 344 |
| Central Luzon | 2.1 | 1.6 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 15.8 | 2,050 | 1.2 | 573 | 5.0 | 953 |
| CALABARZON | 1.2 | 1.3 | 6.8 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 16.2 | 2,546 | 2.8 | 528 | 6.4 | 1,243 |
| MIMAROPA | 1.8 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 5.5 | 14.4 | 563 | 2.7 | 146 | 7.1 | 283 |
| Bicol | 0.6 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 6.6 | 10.8 | 1,095 | 2.1 | 233 | 3.3 | 521 |
| Western Visayas | 1.2 | 0.9 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 12.3 | 1,486 | 1.1 | 277 | 4.2 | 764 |
| Central Visayas | 1.2 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 3.2 | 5.4 | 15.7 | 1,415 | 2.1 | 291 | 4.2 | 741 |
| Eastern Visayas | 1.1 | 0.6 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 12.4 | 829 | 0.5 | 216 | 3.5 | 426 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 1.4 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 14.7 | 729 | 1.6 | 193 | 5.4 | 373 |
| Northern Mindanao | 1.4 | 2.6 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 14.8 | 921 | 3.1 | 196 | 7.8 | 448 |
| Davao | 2.4 | 2.4 | 6.4 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 18.9 | 960 | 2.6 | 230 | 7.0 | 446 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 0.3 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 4.2 | 7.7 | 901 | 1.1 | 188 | 2.3 | 440 |
| CAR | 1.1 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 10.8 | 370 | 1.0 | 102 | 1.7 | 173 |
| ARMM | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 676 | 0.0 | 207 | 0.6 | 321 |
| Caraga | 1.0 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 6.0 | 15.6 | 520 | 1.8 | 110 | 4.5 | 266 |
| NCR | 2.4 | 2.8 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 4.8 | 24.1 | 2,507 | 11.3 | 626 | 7.9 | 1,150 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 2.0 | 2.5 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 4.6 | 21.3 | 5,228 | 6.8 | 1,216 | 7.0 | 2,398 |
| Rural | 1.1 | 1.1 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 4.3 | 12.6 | 13,949 | 1.7 | 3,272 | 4.4 | 6,967 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 1.8 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 5.2 | 15.2 | 2,653 | 1.9 | 776 | 4.9 | 1,731 |
| High school undergraduate High school graduate/ | 0.8 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 10.0 | 7,033 | 4.5 | 1,219 | 3.7 | 3,532 |
| Vocational | 1.9 | 1.7 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 6.4 | 18.6 | 5,465 | 2.3 | 1,816 | 6.5 | 2,412 |
| Vocational College or higher | 1.3 | 1.3 | 6.6 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 18.6 | 4,023 | 3.8 | 678 | 5.9 | 1,687 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 0.9 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 4.7 | 10.2 | 3,843 | 1.4 | 1,202 | 3.4 | 1,888 |
| Second | 1.0 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 4.4 | 11.5 | 3,938 | 1.0 | 911 | 5.0 | 1,917 |
| Middle | 1.6 | 1.5 | 5.0 | 3.1 | 5.1 | 16.0 | 4,172 | 3.3 | 978 | 5.3 | 2,091 |
| Fourth | 1.7 | 1.2 | 6.6 | 5.7 | 4.1 | 18.3 | 4,005 | 4.6 | 861 | 4.9 | 1,942 |
| Highest (Richest) | 1.7 | 2.2 | 7.8 | 6.0 | 3.6 | 19.6 | 3,219 | 7.3 | 534 | 7.0 | 1,527 |
| Total | 1.4 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 15.0 | 19,177 | 3.1 | 4,489 | 5.1 | 9,364 | Notes: --- Not applicable

The proportion who have engaged in casual sex is 9.4 percent among males and only 0.7 percent for females.

As mentioned earlier, a new type of sexual relationship was documented for the first time in the 2013 YAFS: nonromantic regular sexual relationships where two people who are not in a romantic relationship regularly engage in sexual intercourse. In the language of the youth, this is called "FUBU" or "FB" (short for "friends with benefits"). ${ }^{1}$ Sex with a FUBU may pose a higher vulnerability to STIs because it does not include an expectation of exclusivity in the sexual relationship. Hence, this type of arrangement carries a higher likelihood of having multiple partners for either partner. This sexual activity was reported by 3.6 percent of Filipino youth: 6.6 percent of males but only 0.7 percent of females.

For both casual sex and sex with a FUBU, the patterns across background characteristics are similar. The older youth, the urban residents, the more educated, and the economically well off exhibit a higher proportion of both casual sex and FUBU sex. Among regions, these sexual activities are most prevalent in NCR, where 8 percent have experienced casual sex and 9 percent have a FUBU.

## Coercive sex

In addition to nonconsensual sex during premarital sexual initiation (Table 7.3), the survey also asked the respondents if they have ever been forced into having sexual intercourse at any time in their lives. The results presented in Table 7.4 reveal that 4.4 percent of the youth have experienced coercive sex. This risky sexual behavior has the distinction of being the only one in which females outnumber the males (5.5\% vs. $3.2 \%$, respectively). However, like the other risky sexual behaviors, the older youth, the ever married, and the urban residents recorded a higher prevalence compared with their counterparts. In terms of geographic variation, the proportion
with coercive sex is highest in Bicol (6.6\%) and Caraga (6\%) and lowest in Central Luzon (2.1\%). There is no distinct pattern in the level of coercive sex experience across educational attainment and socioeconomic status gradients.

## Sex with multiple partners

The proportion of youth who have engaged in sex with multiple partners measures the lifetime number of sexual partners. It is derived from responses to several questions asking for the number of sexual partners for each type of risky sexual behavior and whether the respondents have engaged in sex with someone other than their first partner. It should be noted that the data do not capture whether the sexual partnerships are concurrent (overlapping in time) or serial (one partner at a time). The former allows for a more rapid spread of STIs than the latter.

Table 7.4 shows that sexual monogamy remains the dominant pattern among Filipino youth, with only 15 percent reporting having more than one sexual partner. Multiple partnership is five times more prevalent among males than females ( $25 \%$ vs. $5.5 \%$, respectively), lending support to the widely held belief that men are naturally polygamous. This finding comes as no surprise within the context of Philippine society, where the double standard of morality in sexual aspects privileges men (Medina, 2015). Having numerous "sexual conquests" among men is proof of their masculinity and enhances their reputation (Meston \& Buss, 2007), whereas females with large numbers of sexual partners are often viewed in a negative light and labeled as "flirts" or "loose women."

Huge disparities are also apparent in other background characteristics. Older youth, who have had presumably more opportunity to engage in sex with a greater number of partners compared with their more junior counterparts, exhibit a higher preponderance of multiple partnership. A quarter of the youth in the ages 15-24 and only

[^7]7.8 percent of those in the ages 15-19 reported multiple sexual partners. By marital status, one fifth (21.3\%) of the ever married youth have engaged in sex with more than one partner, while the corresponding proportion for the never married is lower at 13.1 percent. It should be noted that for ever married youth, the sexual partners include those that they have interacted with prior to the marriage or cohabitation.

The prevalence of multiple partnership is highest in NCR (24.1\%) and lowest in ARMM (3\%). This pattern is also evident in the urban-rural divide, wherein 21.3 percent of urban residents as against 12.6 percent of rural residents reported having sex with more than one partner. Higher proportions of multiple sexual partnership are also found among better-educated youth than those with lower educational attainment. By socioeconomic status, the proportion of multiple partnership monotonically increases from 10.2 percent among the poorest to 19.6 percent among the richest group of youth.

## Extramarital sex

One form of concurrent multiple partnership is extramarital sex, defined as engaging in sexual intercourse with someone other than one's spouse or live-in partner while still married or cohabiting. In extramarital sex, the risk of acquiring STI and HIV infections is greater, as it extends to a wider sexual network consisting of the unfaithful spouses and their marital and extramarital partners. Medina (2015) noted that extramarital sex is more strongly condemned in the country than premarital sex because it does not only disrupt an ongoing marriage but also affects the married individuals, their children, and other family members.

This risky sexual behavior was reported by 3.1 percent of all youth, with the prevalence among males 10 times higher compared with females ( $10.1 \%$ vs. $0.6 \%$, respectively). As a subset of sex with multiple partners, the differentials of extramarital sex experience across the youth's background characteristics mimic those of the former.

The differentials by specific marital status categories are not shown in Table 7.4, but the pattern validates the instability of cohabitation. Young people in a living-in arrangement are more susceptible to extramarital sex, as 4.2 percent admitted having extramarital sex experience. In contrast, only 0.9 percent of formally married youth have a concurrent sexual partner apart from their spouses. The youth who have been separated from their spouses or live-in partners reported the highest proportion of extramarital sex experience at 6.4 percent, which suggests that the extramarital affair may have been the cause of the separation.

## Males who have sex with males

One of the sexual behaviors tracked by YAFS that is specific to males is same-sex activity or "men who have sex with men" (MSM). According to the UNAIDS Action Framework (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, 2009b), the term refers to males who have sex with other males, regardless of whether they have sex with women or have a personal or social identity associated with that behavior, such as being "gay" or "bisexual." It is of value to track this behavior because it poses a heightened risk for STIs, especially HIV, if unprotected. MSM is one of the sectors of the population with a rapidly growing incidence of HIV infection in the Philippines since 2008 (Philippine National AIDS Council, 2014). Consequently, young, sexually active men who have sex with men are now considered the core transmitters of the HIV epidemic in the country (Ross et al., 2013).

Table 7.4 shows that 5.1 percent of males have engaged in sex with a fellow male. This practice is most prevalent in NCR (7.9\%) and Northern Mindanao (7.8\%) and least common in ARMM (0.6\%) and Cagayan Valley (1.2\%). Similar to other types of risky sexual activities, more of the 20-24-year-olds and urban males have engaged in sex with another male than their respective counterparts. MSM is more common among ever married males ( $6.3 \%$ ) than never married males (4.9\%), while there is no discernible pattern in

Figure 7.6 Percent of youth 15-24 years old who have engaged in risky sexual activities by sex: 2002 and 2013

this practice across males' educational attainment or socioeconomic status categories.

## Change in risky sexual behavior over time

Comparable data on selected risky sexual behavior for 2002 and 2013 are depicted in Figure 7.6. Data from the past two survey years reveal a decline in the levels of commercial sex activities among males but an increase in multiple sex and extramarital sex. In 2013, 2.7 percent of males reported having paid for sex, about half of the level found in 2002. The proportion of males who received payment for sex, meanwhile, recorded a slight decline from 3.9 to 2.7 percent. For females, the prevalence of commercial sex is too low for a meaningful analysis.

An upsurge in the proportion with multiple sex partners is observed for both men and women. Males recorded a considerable increase, from 17.4 percent in 2002 to 25 percent in 2013. A more modest increase is evident for females, from 2 to 5.5 percent in the same period. For extramarital sex, the proportions changed slightly between

2002 and 2013 but in opposite directions for men and women.

## Unprotected sex during risky sexual activities

Although the prevalence of the risky sexual activities described earlier may be on the low side, it is still a cause for concern because most young people engage in these activities without protection against the risk of unintended pregnancy and contracting STIs. For example, among males who have ever paid for sex, only 28.6 percent reported using a condom every time they paid for sex in the past 12 months before the survey (Figure 7.7). Among male youth who were paid in exchange for sexual favors, only 11 percent reported consistent condom use in the past 12 months prior to the survey. Those who engaged in casual sex reported higher levels of protected sex. Of those with casual sex experience, 53.8 percent used a condom the last time they had casual sex. The same level is recorded among males with FUBU sex. Extramarital sex activities are likewise mostly unprotected. Three in 10 males used a

Figure 7.7 Percent of males 15-24 years old who used a condom during risky sexual activities

condom the last time they engaged in sex with their extramarital partner.

## Summary and conclusions

The 2013 YAFS provides a rich source of information on various facets of the sexual behavior of Filipino youth. The results indicate a heightened, bolder, and wider range of sexual behavior among the young. Trend data reveal that Filipino youth are increasingly becoming sexually active at an early age. Coupled with the delay in entry into marital union, it comes as no surprise that a growing proportion of youth are engaging in sex prior to marriage. What compounds the rising level of premarital sex is the low and unchanging level of first sexual encounters that are protected from unintended conception and STIs.

Sexual risk taking among the youth is becoming more pervasive, but contrary to general perceptions, the increase overtime is quite modest. Recent years have witnessed the emergence of new forms of sexual interactions outside of committed relationships, such as sex with a FUBU. Sex with multiple partners registered the highest prevalence at 15 percent, while commercial sex, casual sex, sex with a FUBU, coercive sex, extramarital sex, and MSM all recorded singledigit levels. Although the proportions may be on the low side, when translated to absolute terms, this amounts to millions of young Filipinos who are potentially at risk of adverse consequences, especially in the context of low prevalence of the use of protection.

The established gender variation of sexual behavior is substantiated by the findings. Males are more sexually adventurous, as evidenced by the higher proportions who engage in risky sexual activities compared with females. It is only in coercive sex that females outnumber males. While some risky sexual behavior remains the domain of men, the narrowing gap in early sexual initiation and premarital sex points to increasing feminization of these sexual behaviors. This does not bode well, as the costs of such sexual activities are higher for females, particularly concerning pregnancy risks.

The findings also highlight distinct regional differences suggesting the possible influence of modernization and easy access to new technologies. The regional variation paints a picture of two extreme regions. Young people in NCR consistently reported the highest prevalence of risky sexual behavior among all regions, while the youth of ARMM repeatedly reported the lowest. A similar scenario is evident for premarital sex, with young people from ARMM exhibiting the lowest preponderance, largely due to the high prevalence of early marriage.

The differentials by other background characteristics reveal expected findings. That various sexual activities manifest at higher levels among the older cohort of youth is not surprising, as youth in the 20-24 age bracket have had longer exposure to these activities than those in the 15-19 age group. Urban-rural differentials are consistent with the regional findings. Generally, education and socioeconomic status show a
positive association with risky sexual behavior, with the prevalence higher among the more educated and better-off youth. The same direction of association, however, is evident in the use of protection, particularly condoms, suggesting that risks are minimized.

The findings altogether demonstrate the extent of the young people's vulnerability to unintended pregnancy and STI transmission. They underscore the need for sexual and reproductive health interventions for this important segment of the population.
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# Fertility and Fertility Preferences 

Josefina N. Natividad<br>Maria Paz N. Marquez

The first survey in the YAFS series conducted in 1982 was designed as a fertility study on young women aged 15-24. Only in the second YAFS conducted in 1994 was the topic of sexuality included and the sample expanded to include male youth. Beginning in 1994, the YAFS results came to be associated more with sexuality than fertility. In this report on the 2013 YAFS, we reintroduce a focus on fertility in this age group, especially in light of the findings that fertility in the early childbearing years has been on the rise.

In describing the fertility of the youth, it is important to keep in mind that young adulthood covers two distinct age groups when it comes to childbearing. Generally, in the teen years, which include the ages $15-19$, childbearing is considered too early and fraught with risk, both to mother and child (Natividad, 2013). Meanwhile, ages 20-24 mark the beginning of childbearing for most women. At these ages, childbearing is considered more biologically sound as well as culturally more acceptable in contrast to the teen years. Thus, there is typically a sharp increase in childbearing from late teenhood to the early 20s. To illustrate, results of the 2013 National Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) show that the age-specific fertility rate (ASFR) of women aged 15-19 is 57 births per thousand women. In comparison, the ASFR among 20-24-year-old women was 148 births per thousand women (Philippine Statistics Authority \& ICF International, 2014). Therefore, in reading about youth fertility, which spans the
ages $15-24$, one must be aware of this important distinction.

The YAFS4 provides a rich source of data on youth fertility based on the pregnancy history of all women regardless of marital status. The pregnancy history collected detailed information on pregnancy intention; the child's sex, age, date of birth, date of pregnancy termination, and survival status; and prenatal, delivery, postnatal, and breastfeeding practices for each pregnancy and birth of the women. The main measure we use to describe youth fertility is the proportion of women who have begun childbearing. This refers to women who have had a birth plus women who were pregnant with their first child at the time of the survey. Through this measure, we can better describe the timing of childbearing because a woman (or more specifically, her experience of the first birth) is counted only once unlike the ASFR where a woman can contribute more than one birth (Singh, 1998).

## Pregnancy and motherhood among young adults

Table 8.1 presents information on women 15-24 years old who have begun childbearing by background characteristics. Nearly one third of these young women have commenced childbearing, of which 29.4 percent have had a live birth and 3 percent are pregnant with their first child. As mentioned earlier, the early 20s mark the onset of most Filipino women's reproductive life; this is substantiated by the survey results.

The majority (57.8\%) of the 20-24-year olds have begun childbearing, while the corresponding figure for their more junior counterparts is only 13.7 percent. Since a marital union provides a steady sexual partner, higher exposure to the risk of pregnancy is expected among women who are married or in a consensual union. The data lend support to this, as high proportions

Table 8.1 Percent of females who have had a live birth, pregnant with first child and have begun childbearing by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Have had a live birth | Are pregnant with first child |  | No. of Females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 11.0 | 2.6 | 13.7 | 5,653 |
| 20-24 | 54.4 | 3.4 | 57.8 | 4,160 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 4.0 | 0.6 | 4.7 | 6,483 |
| Living-in | 75.9 | 9.8 | 85.6 | 1,912 |
| Formally married | 83.8 | 5.0 | 88.8 | 1,246 |
| Separated/Widowed | 76.3 | 1.1 | 76.9 | 173 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 25.2 | 3.0 | 28.0 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 33.1 | 4.3 | 37.4 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 32.2 | 3.9 | 36.1 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 24.6 | 2.2 | 26.7 | 1,305 |
| MIMAROPA | 30.5 | 3.2 | 33.7 | 279 |
| Bicol | 27.2 | 2.1 | 29.4 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 28.5 | 4.7 | 33.3 | 723 |
| Central Visayas | 27.6 | 2.2 | 29.7 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 33.0 | 2.5 | 35.3 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 35.2 | 2.5 | 37.7 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 32.3 | 3.4 | 35.7 | 474 |
| Davao | 34.6 | 2.9 | 37.5 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 27.6 | 3.3 | 31.0 | 461 |
| CAR | 37.6 | 3.1 | 40.4 | 198 |
| ARMM | 29.4 | 1.7 | 31.1 | 354 |
| Caraga | 30.6 | 3.1 | 33.9 | 254 |
| NCR | 28.2 | 2.7 | 31.0 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 28.7 | 2.6 | 31.3 | 2,831 |
| Rural | 29.7 | 3.1 | 32.8 | 6,982 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 43.0 | 3.8 | 46.7 | 922 |
| High school undergraduate | 21.1 | 2.1 | 23.2 | 3,503 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 41.6 | 3.9 | 45.5 | 3,053 |
| College or higher | 20.7 | 2.7 | 23.4 | 2,336 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 39.5 | 3.3 | 42.8 | 1,953 |
| Second | 31.8 | 2.9 | 34.7 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 29.5 | 3.3 | 32.8 | 2,081 |
| Fourth | 25.7 | 2.9 | 28.6 | 2,064 |
| Highest (Richest) | 19.4 | 2.4 | 21.8 | 1,693 |
| Total | 29.4 | 3.0 | 32.4 | 9,813 |

(85.6\% among women in a living-in arrangement and $88.8 \%$ among formally married women) have started childbearing compared with only 4.7 percent among never married women.

By place of residence, there is very little difference in the proportion who have begun childbearing between urban (31.3\%) and rural (32.8\%) women. However, across regions, the proportion ranges from a low of 26.7 percent in CALABARZON to a high of 40.4 percent in CAR. There is no clear pattern in the proportion who have begun childbearing across education categories, but socioeconomic status, a variable that the literature consistently shows to exert a significant influence on fertility behavior, displays an inverse association. From 42.8 percent among the poorest group of women, the proportion who have begun childbearing is down to half (21.8\%) among women in the richest quintile.

In addition to the proportion of women who have begun childbearing, another important indicator of youth fertility is the proportion who have ever been pregnant. It must be noted that the latter measure will always result in a higher level compared with the former, since it includes women whose pregnancy did not result in a live birth. The results in Table 8.2 show that 33.5 percent of women 15-24 years old have ever been pregnant, about one percentage point higher than the proportion who have begun childbearing. This difference implies that at least 1 percent of women have experienced a pregnancy that ended either in a spontaneous or induced abortion or in a non-live birth. As expected, the patterns in the proportion of women who have ever been pregnant across the different background characteristics mirror that of the proportion who have begun childbearing.

Of particular interest in Table 8.2 is the proportion of women who have had three or more pregnancies. In the absence of contraceptive practice, we would expect these young women to eventually end up with a large family size, as they are still at the starting point of their childbearing period yet have already had three or more pregnancies. Overall, 2.7 percent
of women 15-24 years old have had at least three pregnancies. This percentage is highest in ARMM and Eastern Visayas, both high-fertility regions, where 7.1 percent and 5.2 percent of women, respectively, have already had three or more pregnancies. Among formally married
women, a sizeable 11.4 percent have already been pregnant at least three times.

Table 8.2 also presents the proportion of women who were pregnant at the time of the interview ("currently pregnant"), which measures not only fertility but also fecundity or

Table 8.2 Percent distribution of females by number of pregnancies and percent who have been pregnant and currently pregnant by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | No. of pregnancies ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  | Have ever been pregnant | Are currently pregnant | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 or more | Total |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 85.6 | 12.0 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 14.4 | 3.5 | 5,653 |
| 20-24 | 40.6 | 34.4 | 18.8 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 59.4 | 8.2 | 4,161 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 95.2 | 4.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 6,483 |
| Living-in | 11.3 | 57.9 | 24.8 | 5.9 | 100.0 | 88.7 | 16.8 | 1,912 |
| Formally married | 9.0 | 49.8 | 29.7 | 11.4 | 100.0 | 91.0 | 13.6 | 1,245 |
| Separated/Widowed | 15.0 | 57.2 | 23.1 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 85.0 | 2.9 | 173 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 70.4 | 21.3 | 7.5 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 29.6 | 4.3 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 61.3 | 25.5 | 11.0 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 38.7 | 8.3 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 62.6 | 23.3 | 11.9 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 37.3 | 6.3 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 72.4 | 16.6 | 7.9 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 27.6 | 5.9 | 1,304 |
| MIMAROPA | 63.9 | 24.6 | 7.9 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 35.7 | 5.7 | 280 |
| Bicol | 69.3 | 17.9 | 9.4 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 30.5 | 4.0 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 65.9 | 23.4 | 8.3 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 34.2 | 7.1 | 722 |
| Central Visayas | 68.5 | 22.3 | 8.2 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 31.5 | 5.5 | 674 |
| Eastern Visayas | 63.3 | 21.3 | 10.2 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 36.8 | 6.5 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 61.7 | 23.1 | 11.3 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 38.6 | 5.3 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 63.5 | 24.7 | 11.0 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 36.6 | 4.4 | 474 |
| Davao | 61.9 | 25.6 | 9.9 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 38.1 | 6.4 | 515 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 68.7 | 21.5 | 7.6 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 31.3 | 4.3 | 460 |
| CAR | 58.8 | 28.1 | 10.1 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 41.1 | 4.6 | 199 |
| ARMM | 68.6 | 13.0 | 11.3 | 7.1 | 100.0 | 31.4 | 7.4 | 354 |
| Caraga | 64.7 | 22.7 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 35.0 | 5.9 | 255 |
| NCR | 67.7 | 21.1 | 8.1 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 32.3 | 3.6 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 67.5 | 21.6 | 8.2 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 32.5 | 4.4 | 2,831 |
| Rural | 66.1 | 21.4 | 9.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 33.9 | 5.9 | 6,983 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 51.1 | 24.9 | 16.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 | 48.8 | 9.3 | 921 |
| High school undergraduate | 75.8 | 13.9 | 7.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 24.2 | 3.8 | 3,503 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.1 | 31.8 | 11.9 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 46.9 | 7.6 | 3,053 |
| College or higher | 76.2 | 17.9 | 5.1 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 23.8 | 3.6 | 2,336 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 55.7 | 23.7 | 15.3 | 5.3 | 100.0 | 44.2 | 7.8 | 1,954 |
| Second | 64.2 | 22.7 | 11.1 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 35.8 | 5.7 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 66.2 | 22.5 | 8.1 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 33.8 | 6.9 | 2,082 |
| Fourth | 70.6 | 21.2 | 6.4 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 29.3 | 3.7 | 2,063 |
| Highest (Richest) | 77.1 | 16.7 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 22.9 | 3.0 | 1,692 |
| Total | 66.5 | 21.5 | 9.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 33.5 | 5.5 | 9,813 |

[^8]the capacity to bear children. This is an important fertility measure because when translated to absolute terms, it provides an indication of the demand for maternal and infant health services and facilities at a given time, particularly since early pregnancy is associated with increased health risk for both mother and child.

Overall, 5.5 percent of women 15-24 years old are currently pregnant. This proportion ranges from a low of 3.6 percent in NCR to a high of 8.3 percent in Cagayan Valley. This proportion likewise varies considerably according to women's other background characteristics. There are more than twice as many pregnant women among the 20-24-year-old women compared with women in the younger ages (8.2\% vs. $3.5 \%$, respectively). While a negligible 0.7 percent of never married women were pregnant at the time of the interview, the corresponding figures are 16.8 percent and 13.6 percent among living-in women and formally married women, respectively. Disaggregation by educational attainment and socioeconomic status also shows a wide disparity between the lowest and highest categories, but there is no clear general pattern.

## Age at first birth

Age at first birth is an important fertility indicator because it signals the start of a woman's reproductive career. Postponing the first birth typically shortens the duration of the childbearing period, which can contribute to the decline of the total fertility rate. Table 8.3 presents the percent distribution of women's age at first birth categorized into three: below 18 years, $18-19$ years, and $20-24$ years. The table also shows the median age at first birth, which represents the age by which half of the women have experienced giving birth.

Among females aged 15-24 who have given birth, the median age at first birth is 19.3 years, a full year older than the median age at sexual initiation (median age of 18.2 years at first sex) as reported in the preceding chapter. More than a quarter (26.3\%) had their first birth before they turned 18, 37.3 percent between the ages of 18
and 19 and 36.4 percent after their teens (ages 20-24). Among 15-19-year-old women who have given birth, three in five bore a child before they turned 18, while the corresponding proportion among the 20-24 year olds is much lower at 17 percent. For the latter group, a high 46.5 percent had their first birth in their 20s.

Differentials by marital status exhibited a somewhat surprising finding. The formerly married (separated/widowed) reported the earliest commencement of childbearing, with 32.3 percent having given birth before age 18 and a median age at first birth of 18.9 years. In comparison, the median age at first birth among the formally married is higher by about half a year (19.5 years).

Among all regions, ARMM and Caraga have the lowest median age at first birth (18.9 years) while Bicol and CAR have the highest (19.7 years), followed by MIMAROPA (19.6 years). Delayed childbearing among Bicol and CAR youth is also manifested in the low proportions who gave birth before age 18 ( $19 \%$ and $15.1 \%$, respectively). In contrast, a third of NCR and ARMM female youth bore a child before they turned 18.

Urban-rural differentials show a slightly higher median age at first birth among rural women (19.3 years) relative to urban women (19.2 years). The median age at first birth monotonically increases with increasing educational attainment, from 17.9 years among women who did not reach high school to 20.1 years among those who have reached college. There is no clear variation in the age at first birth by socioeconomic status. However, women belonging to the lowest quintile recorded the earliest median age at first birth of 18.8 years. Also worth noting is that one in three of young women in the lowest quintile gave birth before age 18, much higher than the proportions for their economically better-off counterparts.

## Teenage fertility

In this section, we present the fertility experience of the 15-19-year-old women. As
noted earlier in this chapter, childbearing in the teen years is known to be associated with higher risks both to mother and child compared to childbearing in the 20s. A high teenage fertility rate is thus considered a cause for concern and calls for public health intervention.

Among women aged 15-19 at the time of the survey, the YAFS4 results show that 14.4 percent have ever been pregnant. Over the 20 -year period covered by the YAFS, this percentage rose dramatically only in the last 10 years, doubling from 6.9 percent in 2002 to its

Table 8.3 Percent distribution of females who have given birth by age at first birth and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age at first birth |  |  |  |  | No. of females who have ever given birth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 18 | 18-19 | 20-24 | Total | Median |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 60.2 | 39.8 | --- | 100.0 | 17.7 | 613 |
| 20-24 | 17.0 | 36.6 | 46.5 | 100.0 | 19.8 | 2,227 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 25.3 | 37.2 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 261 |
| Living-in | 20.8 | 35.6 | 43.6 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 1,033 |
| Formally married | 30.0 | 38.6 | 31.4 | 100.0 | 19.5 | 1,414 |
| Separated/Widowed | 32.3 | 35.4 | 32.3 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 130 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 23.9 | 38.5 | 37.6 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 117 |
| Cagayan Valley | 27.5 | 32.4 | 40.2 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 102 |
| Central Luzon | 22.8 | 35.7 | 41.5 | 100.0 | 19.5 | 342 |
| CALABARZON | 24.6 | 38.2 | 37.2 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 317 |
| MIMAROPA | 18.5 | 35.8 | 45.7 | 100.0 | 19.6 | 81 |
| Bicol | 19.0 | 39.9 | 41.2 | 100.0 | 19.7 | 153 |
| Western Visayas | 29.5 | 29.5 | 41.1 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 207 |
| Central Visayas | 23.9 | 37.5 | 38.6 | 100.0 | 19.4 | 184 |
| Eastern Visayas | 28.0 | 34.1 | 37.9 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 132 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 26.6 | 40.3 | 33.1 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 124 |
| Northern Mindanao | 19.7 | 45.4 | 34.9 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 152 |
| Davao | 32.6 | 31.5 | 36.0 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 178 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 26.8 | 38.6 | 34.6 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 127 |
| CAR | 15.1 | 41.1 | 43.8 | 100.0 | 19.7 | 73 |
| ARMM | 33.3 | 30.5 | 36.2 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 105 |
| Caraga | 27.4 | 38.4 | 34.2 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 73 |
| NCR | 34.2 | 42.2 | 23.5 | 100.0 | 19.0 | 374 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 27.5 | 40.8 | 31.8 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 800 |
| Rural | 25.8 | 35.9 | 38.3 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 2,040 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 49.9 | 29.7 | 20.5 | 100.0 | 17.9 | 391 |
| High school undergraduate | 39.0 | 38.3 | 22.7 | 100.0 | 18.5 | 731 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 17.9 | 39.1 | 42.9 | 100.0 | 19.6 | 1,237 |
| College or higher | 9.6 | 36.8 | 53.6 | 100.0 | 20.1 | 481 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 33.7 | 38.0 | 28.3 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 763 |
| Second | 23.2 | 39.7 | 37.0 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 624 |
| Middle | 22.9 | 32.6 | 44.5 | 100.0 | 19.6 | 607 |
| Fourth | 24.3 | 41.0 | 34.7 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 522 |
| Highest (Richest) | 24.4 | 33.3 | 42.3 | 100.0 | 19.5 | 324 |
| Total | 26.3 | 37.3 | 36.4 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 2,840 |

[^9]14.4 percent level in 2013 (Figure 8.1). ${ }^{1}$ Between 1994 and 2002, the percentage of women who have ever been pregnant hardly changed (7.1 percent in 1994 vs. 6.9 percent in 2002).

In Figure 8.2 we show the prevalence of early childbearing, i.e., the percentage of women aged 15-19 at the time of the survey who had begun childbearing. Comparing 2002 and 2013 results indicates that the prevalence of early childbearing more than doubled in the 10 -year period from 6.3 percent in 2002 to 13.6 percent in 2013. The latter is broken down to 11 percent who were already mothers and 2.6 percent who were pregnant with their first child when they were interviewed.

Table 8.4 and Table 8.5 show the fertility profile of 15-19 year olds across background characteristics. Again, two measures of fertility are shown: the proportion who have begun childbearing and the proportion who have ever
been pregnant. The difference between these two measures is an indicator of pregnancy loss. Broken down into single years, results in Table 8.4 show that the prevalence of early childbearing begins at a low level of 1.7 percent at age 15 , rising dramatically by ages 17,18 and 19 . Among 19-year olds, 35.1 percent had already begun childbearing. Comparing across the woman's marital status, 2.2 percent of $15-19$-year-old women who were never married at the time of the survey have begun childbearing. The percentage increases considerably to 78 percent among teens in a consensual union or livingin arrangement and to 81.8 percent among the formally married. Even at this young age, a number of teens reported their marital status to be separated/widowed. Of this group, 53.5 percent have begun childbearing.

The two regions highest on the list in the two teenage fertility indicators are Cagayan

Figure 8.1 Percent of females age 15-19 who have ever been pregnant: 1994, 2002, 2013


[^10]Table 8.4 Percent of females age 15-19 who have had a live birth, pregnant with first child, and who have begun childbearing by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Have had a live birth | Are pregnant with first child | Have begun childbearing | No. of females age 15-19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 1,261 |
| 16 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 1,173 |
| 17 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 10.4 | 1,222 |
| 18 | 18.9 | 4.0 | 23.0 | 1,049 |
| 19 | 29.9 | 5.4 | 35.1 | 948 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 1.6 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 4,789 |
| Living-in | 61.9 | 16.3 | 78.0 | 651 |
| Formally married | 70.8 | 10.7 | 81.8 | 171 |
| Separated/Widowed | 48.8 | 4.7 | 53.5 | 43 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 10.6 | 2.5 | 12.7 | 284 |
| Cagayan Valley | 14.9 | 3.2 | 18.1 | 187 |
| Central Luzon | 11.4 | 3.7 | 15.1 | 544 |
| CALABARZON | 7.1 | 1.0 | 8.1 | 785 |
| MIMAROPA | 10.3 | 1.9 | 12.3 | 155 |
| Bicol | 7.3 | 1.2 | 8.8 | 328 |
| Western Visayas | 10.9 | 4.3 | 15.1 | 403 |
| Central Visayas | 11.2 | 1.9 | 13.1 | 427 |
| Eastern Visayas | 9.7 | 2.1 | 11.8 | 238 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 13.5 | 2.7 | 16.3 | 185 |
| Northern Mindanao | 10.9 | 2.5 | 13.1 | 284 |
| Davao | 13.6 | 3.1 | 16.7 | 288 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 10.3 | 3.3 | 13.7 | 301 |
| CAR | 15.5 | 2.1 | 18.4 | 98 |
| ARMM | 10.8 | 1.0 | 11.8 | 195 |
| Caraga | 13.1 | 3.8 | 17.4 | 161 |
| NCR | 13.9 | 3.8 | 17.7 | 793 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 12.0 | 3.0 | 14.9 | 1,623 |
| Rural | 10.7 | 2.5 | 13.2 | 4,031 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 22.9 | 3.3 | 26.1 | 525 |
| High school undergraduate | 7.9 | 1.9 | 9.8 | 2,818 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 18.9 | 4.4 | 23.3 | 1,221 |
| College or higher | 4.6 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 1,089 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 15.8 | 2.7 | 18.5 | 1,114 |
| Second | 11.6 | 2.6 | 14.1 | 1,203 |
| Middle | 10.3 | 3.3 | 13.6 | 1,199 |
| Fourth | 9.5 | 2.3 | 11.9 | 1,187 |
| Highest (Richest) | 7.6 | 2.3 | 9.9 | 951 |
| Total | 11.0 | 2.7 | 13.7 | 5,654 |

Valley and CAR. Cagayan has the highest percentage of teens who have ever been pregnant (19.1\%; Table 8.5) while CAR has the highest proportion who have begun childbearing at age 15-19 (18.4\%; Table 8.4). Considering that CAR also has the highest median age at first birth and the lowest proportion of women whose first birth occurred below age 18 among all regions, these imply that while CAR has the highest proportion of women who have begun childbearing at ages 15-19, the teenage births are actually concentrated in the late teen years (i.e., ages 18 and 19). By either measure, teen fertility is lowest in Bicol and CALABARZON, both at less than 10 percent of teenage women.

More women residing in urban areas have begun childbearing compared with rural residents. By education, women with elementarylevel schooling have the highest prevalence of early childbearing (26.1\%), followed by high school graduates (23.3\%). Those with collegelevel education have the lowest at 7 percent. High school undergraduates have a relatively low level of teen childbearing mainly because this group is composed mostly of those who are still in high school. The pattern by socioeconomic status indicates a clear gradient, with those belonging to the poorest quintile having the highest proportions who have either gotten pregnant (19.7\%) or begun childbearing (18.5\%), and those belonging to the highest quintile having the lowest ( $10.3 \%$ and $9.9 \%$ respectively). In between, the proportion steadily decreases with an increase in socioeconomic status.

Comparing the difference between the proportion who have had a pregnancy (Table 8.5) and the proportion who have begun childbearing (Table 8.4) across background characteristics, the difference is lowest among 15 -year-olds compared with other ages. Those who are separated have the highest difference (9.3 percentage points), while there is no difference among the never married. Those who belong to the lowest education level and the poorest quintile have the biggest difference between the proportions who have ever been pregnant and have begun childbearing; otherwise, there

Table 8.5 Percent distribution of females age 15-19 years by number of pregnancies and percent who have been pregnant and currently pregnant by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | No. of pregnancies ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Have ever been pregnant | Are currently pregnant | No. of females age 15-19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 or more | Total |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 98.2 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 1,260 |
| 16 | 95.5 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 4.5 | 1.4 | 1,176 |
| 17 | 88.5 | 9.6 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 11.5 | 3.2 | 1,218 |
| 18 | 75.7 | 20.4 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 24.3 | 6.0 | 1,050 |
| 19 | 63.8 | 29.0 | 7.3 | 100.0 | 36.2 | 7.5 | 949 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 97.8 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 4,788 |
| Living-in | 17.5 | 66.8 | 15.7 | 100.0 | 82.5 | 21.7 | 651 |
| Formally married | 15.2 | 69.6 | 15.2 | 100.0 | 84.8 | 16.0 | 171 |
| Separated/Widowed | 37.2 | 44.2 | 18.6 | 100.0 | 62.8 | 7.0 | 43 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 87.0 | 11.6 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 2.5 | 284 |
| Cagayan Valley | 80.9 | 13.3 | 5.9 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 5.3 | 188 |
| Central Luzon | 84.0 | 11.9 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 16.0 | 5.3 | 544 |
| CALABARZON | 91.2 | 7.5 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 8.8 | 2.0 | 785 |
| MIMAROPA | 85.2 | 12.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 14.8 | 3.2 | 155 |
| Bicol | 90.5 | 7.6 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 9.5 | 2.1 | 327 |
| Western Visayas | 83.7 | 12.6 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 16.3 | 5.8 | 404 |
| Central Visayas | 85.4 | 14.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 14.6 | 2.1 | 426 |
| Eastern Visayas | 87.4 | 9.7 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 12.6 | 3.0 | 238 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 83.2 | 14.1 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 16.8 | 3.3 | 185 |
| Northern Mindanao | 85.9 | 13.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 14.1 | 2.5 | 283 |
| Davao | 83.0 | 14.6 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 17.0 | 4.5 | 288 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 86.3 | 12.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 13.7 | 3.3 | 300 |
| CAR | 81.6 | 16.3 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 18.4 | 3.1 | 98 |
| ARMM | 88.1 | 7.2 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 11.9 | 2.1 | 194 |
| Caraga | 82.0 | 14.9 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 18.0 | 5.6 | 161 |
| NCR | 82.0 | 15.1 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 18.0 | 3.8 | 793 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 84.6 | 12.8 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 15.4 | 3.5 | 1,623 |
| Rural | 86.0 | 11.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 14.0 | 3.5 | 4,030 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 71.6 | 20.0 | 8.4 | 100.0 | 28.4 | 6.2 | 525 |
| High school undergraduate | 89.6 | 8.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 10.4 | 2.3 | 2,817 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 75.8 | 21.2 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 24.2 | 5.8 | 1,221 |
| College or higher | 92.9 | 6.9 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 7.1 | 2.5 | 1,089 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 80.3 | 16.4 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 19.7 | 4.1 | 1,113 |
| Second | 85.0 | 11.6 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 15.0 | 3.7 | 1,203 |
| Middle | 85.5 | 11.9 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 14.5 | 4.6 | 1,198 |
| Fourth | 88.0 | 10.5 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 12.0 | 2.4 | 1,187 |
| Highest (Richest) | 89.7 | 9.1 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 10.3 | 2.4 | 952 |
| Total | 85.6 | 12.0 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 14.4 | 3.5 | 5,653 |

Note: a Including current pregnancy
is no consistent pattern by education and socioeconomic status.

While it is risky enough to have begun childbearing in the teen years, having more than one pregnancy at this young age subjects the young woman to repeated risks. In Table 8.5 we show the results on the experience of repeat pregnancies during the teen years, based on data from the 15-19 year old respondents. Overall, 2.4 percent of women 15-19 years old have been pregnant more than once. By background characteristics, the proportion who have experienced more than one pregnancy is highest among the 19-year old women (7.3\%), separated/ widowed (18.6\%), women from Cagayan Valley (5.9\%), urban residents (2.6\%), women with no schooling or those who have reached only the elementary level (8.4\%) and women belonging to the second quintile (3.4\%).

## Male teen fertility

In the study of fertility in general and teen fertility in particular, an often-overlooked topic is the issue of early fatherhood. In this report, we present the experience of teen males with regard to early childbearing in the form of the proportion of 15-19-year-old males who reported that they have gotten someone pregnant. Unlike teenage childbearing, this measure is prone to bias, as men may not always know whether they have gotten someone pregnant, especially if they are not in a marital union as males in this age group are most likely to be.

In all, 2.4 percent of males aged 15-19 reported that they have gotten someone pregnant (Table 8.6). The proportion is higher among urban (3.7\%) than rural (2\%) residents. Across marital status, teen males in consensual unions and the formally married have very high proportions who have gotten someone pregnant.

This measure also varies widely across regions, from a low of 0.9 percent in Cagayan Valley and Zamboanga Peninsula to a high of 4.7 percent in NCR and Caraga. By education status, there is no difference between those with high and low education. Neither is there a pattern
by socioeconomic status, although the highest proportion who have gotten someone pregnant is recorded among young males with the highest socioeconomic status, at 3.3 percent.

Overall, the wide disparity between the proportion of teen males who reported having gotten someone pregnant and the proportion of teen girls who have ever been pregnant likely comes from two major factors: (1) reporting error by males due to lack of knowledge of whether they have fathered a child and (2) teenage women getting pregnant by non-teen partners.

## Fertility preferences

All youth, regardless of marital or fertility status, were asked the question "How many children do you want to have?" The response to this question is likely a result of both personal preference and the influence of prevalent fertility norms. In general, males want more children (mean of 2.8) than do females (mean of 2.3; Table 8.7). There is no difference between the 15-19 and 20-24-year-old males; among females, the $15-19$-year-olds on the average want a slightly lower number (mean of 2.3) than the 20-24-year-olds (mean of 2.4).

The pattern of difference in the preferred number of children across background characteristics is similar for men and women. Rural residents prefer slightly more children than urban residents. Those with the lowest educational attainment have the highest mean preferred number of children, but all those with higher than elementary education tend to have almost the same mean preferred number of children. The same is true for socioeconomic status. Those who belong to the poorest quintile also express a higher preferred number of children than all the rest, but those who belong to the second up to the fifth (richest) quintiles tend to express a similarly lower preference, with no apparent difference among the remaining four quintiles.

Across regions, youth in ARMM registered the highest preferred number of children as well

Table 8.6 Percent of males who have gotten someone pregnant by age group and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Males age 15-19 years |  | Males age 20-24 years |  | Males age 15-24 years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Have gotten someone pregnant | No. of males | Have gotten someone pregnant | No. of males | Have gotten someone pregnant | No. of males |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 0.7 | 5,582 | 4.3 | 2,617 | 1.8 | 8,200 |
| Living-in | 58.0 | 150 | 74.8 | 592 | 71.4 | 742 |
| Formally married | 34.4 | 32 | 78.1 | 360 | 74.5 | 392 |
| Separated/Widowed | (33.3) | 6 | (64.0) | 25 | 58.1 | 31 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 1.3 | 303 | 24.1 | 170 | 9.5 | 473 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.9 | 221 | 20.5 | 122 | 8.1 | 345 |
| Central Luzon | 3.0 | 564 | 20.3 | 389 | 10.1 | 953 |
| CALABARZON | 1.3 | 773 | 18.3 | 469 | 7.7 | 1,243 |
| MIMAROPA | 2.3 | 175 | 25.9 | 108 | 11.3 | 283 |
| Bicol | 2.1 | 332 | 21.2 | 189 | 9.0 | 521 |
| Western Visayas | 2.8 | 495 | 19.7 | 269 | 8.8 | 764 |
| Central Visayas | 2.4 | 449 | 18.5 | 292 | 8.9 | 742 |
| Eastern Visayas | 1.5 | 271 | 24.5 | 155 | 9.9 | 426 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 0.9 | 228 | 29.0 | 145 | 12.0 | 374 |
| Northern Mindanao | 2.0 | 299 | 24.3 | 148 | 9.4 | 447 |
| Davao | 2.7 | 259 | 27.3 | 187 | 13.0 | 446 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 1.0 | 298 | 28.2 | 142 | 9.8 | 440 |
| CAR | 2.1 | 95 | 17.9 | 78 | 9.3 | 172 |
| ARMM | 1.7 | 177 | 37.5 | 144 | 17.8 | 321 |
| Caraga | 4.7 | 171 | 23.4 | 94 | 10.9 | 265 |
| NCR | 4.7 | 657 | 30.2 | 493 | 15.7 | 1,150 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 3.7 | 1,423 | 25.9 | 975 | 12.8 | 2,398 |
| Rural | 2.0 | 4,348 | 22.9 | 2,619 | 9.8 | 6,967 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 2.6 | 1,049 | 28.2 | 682 | 12.7 | 1,731 |
| High school undergraduate | 1.7 | 2,835 | 32.6 | 696 | 7.8 | 3,531 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 3.7 | 1,085 | 24.1 | 1,326 | 15.0 | 2,413 |
| College or higher | 2.8 | 799 | 12.8 | 890 | 8.0 | 1,687 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 2.1 | 1,231 | 32.9 | 657 | 12.9 | 1,889 |
| Second | 1.8 | 1,236 | 23.3 | 681 | 9.4 | 1,916 |
| Middle | 2.2 | 1,282 | 22.2 | 810 | 9.9 | 2,091 |
| Fourth | 2.9 | 1,111 | 23.1 | 830 | 11.5 | 1,941 |
| Highest (Richest) | 3.3 | 911 | 17.2 | 616 | 8.9 | 1,527 |
| Total | 2.4 | 5,771 | 23.7 | 3,594 | 10.6 | 9,365 |

Notes: Figures in parentheses are based on less than 30 cases.
Totals may not add up due to rounding
as the highest difference between the sexes. Male youth in ARMM want an average of 4.6 children, whereas female youth want only 3.5 . ARMM is an outlier in this regard, as none of the regions come close to this desired number of children. Among males, the next highest number of preferred children is 3.0 , which was registered
among male youth from Eastern Visayas. For female youth, the second highest preferred number of children is 2.5 , among female youth from CAR and Central Mindanao. On the other hand, the lowest preferred number of children is found among male youth in Ilocos, at 2.5. Among female youth, six regions registered the lowest

| Background Characteristics | Preferred number of children among males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males | Preferred number of children among females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total | Mean |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total | Mean |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 0.7 | 5.8 | 38.3 | 39.4 | 8.4 | 6.0 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 5,761 | 0.6 | 10.7 | 59.0 | 24.3 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 5,614 |
| 20-24 | 0.4 | 5.4 | 40.1 | 37.7 | 8.6 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 3,589 | 1.0 | 11.3 | 51.4 | 27.1 | 6.6 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 4,146 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 0.6 | 5.5 | 38.0 | 39.2 | 8.7 | 5.9 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 8,189 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 57.2 | 24.8 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 6,433 |
| Living-in | 0.1 | 7.4 | 51.5 | 34.5 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 742 | 0.1 | 13.0 | 58.1 | 24.7 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 1,912 |
| Formally married | 0.0 | 4.9 | 34.9 | 37.9 | 11.0 | 7.4 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 3.1 | 391 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 45.0 | 31.5 | 9.0 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 1,242 |
| Separated/Widowed | 0.0 | 0.0 | 39.3 | 35.7 | 17.9 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 3.0 | 28 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 56.1 | 17.9 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.1 | 173 |
| Number of living children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0.7 | 5.6 | 38.4 | 39.0 | 8.5 | 5.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 8,304 | 1.1 | 9.5 | 57.9 | 24.9 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 6,567 |
| 1 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 45.7 | 34.7 | 6.7 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 654 | 0.1 | 20.5 | 53.9 | 21.7 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.1 | 1,845 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 46.1 | 39.0 | 8.7 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 242 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 58.4 | 26.6 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 632 |
| 3 or more | 0.0 | 2.0 | 13.7 | 41.2 | 21.6 | 19.6 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 3.5 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 66.7 | 13.7 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 100.0 | 3.3 | 183 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 1.5 | 7.0 | 46.7 | 35.3 | 6.6 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 472 | 1.1 | 9.0 | 61.2 | 25.1 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.6 | 6.1 | 43.6 | 36.9 | 7.6 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 344 | 0.9 | 12.0 | 52.9 | 24.9 | 8.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 0.8 | 6.2 | 40.2 | 43.1 | 6.6 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 953 | 1.0 | 10.7 | 56.5 | 27.3 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 0.0 | 6.6 | 38.8 | 42.7 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 1,241 | 0.2 | 11.8 | 59.0 | 24.6 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 1,295 |
| MIMAROPA | 0.0 | 3.5 | 33.3 | 46.5 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 283 | 0.4 | 12.5 | 57.0 | 27.2 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 279 |
| Bicol | 0.2 | 4.4 | 34.8 | 43.3 | 9.4 | 7.1 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 520 | 1.7 | 11.5 | 51.1 | 28.8 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 0.8 | 3.9 | 41.7 | 40.9 | 8.0 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 762 | 1.1 | 13.9 | 57.4 | 23.1 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 0.9 | 7.2 | 42.0 | 35.1 | 9.9 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 740 | 0.3 | 14.7 | 55.3 | 22.7 | 5.8 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 0.7 | 5.2 | 30.6 | 41.9 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 3.0 | 425 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 55.3 | 29.0 | 4.5 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 400 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 0.0 | 6.2 | 38.9 | 36.7 | 9.7 | 7.0 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 373 | 0.6 | 11.3 | 58.1 | 25.5 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 0.2 | 4.3 | 40.5 | 39.6 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 447 | 0.2 | 12.2 | 53.6 | 25.3 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 473 |
| Davao | 0.2 | 6.7 | 43.1 | 34.6 | 8.3 | 5.6 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 445 | 1.2 | 8.9 | 59.1 | 25.0 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 505 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 0.5 | 5.5 | 34.8 | 37.5 | 10.3 | 9.6 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 439 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 49.7 | 29.1 | 6.8 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 457 |
| CAR | 1.7 | 4.7 | 34.9 | 37.8 | 12.8 | 6.4 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 172 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 50.5 | 30.6 | 9.2 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 198 |
| ARMM | 0.0 | 0.6 | 11.3 | 20.4 | 24.1 | 25.7 | 17.9 | 100.0 | 4.6 | 319 | 0.3 | 5.5 | 22.3 | 28.6 | 18.2 | 14.7 | 10.4 | 100.0 | 3.5 | 347 |
| Caraga | 0.8 | 5.3 | 35.8 | 42.6 | 7.5 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 265 | 0.8 | 10.6 | 52.2 | 28.6 | 4.7 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 255 |
| NCR | 1.0 | 6.4 | 44.4 | 35.4 | 8.3 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 1,151 | 1.2 | 9.9 | 63.4 | 22.0 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 1,347 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.8 | 6.4 | 43.1 | 36.9 | 8.1 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 2,399 | 1.0 | 10.6 | 59.9 | 23.4 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 2,814 |
| Rural | 0.5 | 5.4 | 37.5 | 39.4 | 8.6 | 6.3 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 6,954 | 0.6 | 11.0 | 54.1 | 26.4 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 6,946 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 0.2 | 7.5 | 35.5 | 34.0 | 10.1 | 9.9 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 1,725 | 1.0 | 13.8 | 46.6 | 24.2 | 8.4 | 3.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 912 |
| High school undergraduate | 0.6 | 5.8 | 39.5 | 38.4 | 8.2 | 6.2 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 3,528 | 0.5 | 11.2 | 58.2 | 23.9 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 3,483 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 0.5 | 5.0 | 38.0 | 42.9 | 7.6 | 3.6 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 2,412 | 0.7 | 11.9 | 55.8 | 25.7 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 3,039 |
| College or higher | 1.0 | 4.3 | 42.6 | 38.3 | 8.6 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 1,686 | 1.1 | 8.1 | 55.8 | 28.1 | 4.9 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 2,327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 0.4 | 5.3 | 35.3 | 36.5 | 9.4 | 10.1 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 3.0 | 1,879 | 0.4 | 10.1 | 50.5 | 26.9 | 7.6 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 1,944 |
| Second | 0.6 | 6.0 | 37.9 | 38.2 | 9.1 | 6.5 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 1,914 | 0.5 | 11.1 | 56.2 | 24.7 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 2,004 |
| Middle | 0.5 | 5.0 | 40.5 | 39.7 | 8.0 | 4.3 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 2,091 | 0.7 | 12.1 | 56.8 | 25.0 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 2,070 |
| Fourth | 0.6 | 5.4 | 41.6 | 39.0 | 7.9 | 4.2 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 1,940 | 1.0 | 10.8 | 59.2 | 25.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 2,060 |
| Highest (Richest) | 1.0 | 6.9 | 39.3 | 40.4 | 7.9 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 1,526 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 56.2 | 26.2 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 1,682 |
| Total | 0.6 | 5.6 | 39.0 | 38.7 | 8.5 | 5.7 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 9,350 | 0.8 | 10.9 | 56.2 | 25.5 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 9,760 |

preferred number of children, all at 2.2. These are Ilocos, CALABARZON, MIMAROPA, NCR, Central Visayas, and Western Visayas.

Table 8.7 also presents the percent distribution of the responses by the individual number of children the respondents said they want to have, putting into sharper focus the difference between the sexes as well as among the regions, differences which are averaged out when looking only at the mean. For example, more than half of all female youth (56.2\%) want two children only; the comparative proportion for males is lower at 39 percent. Moreover, 67.9 percent of females want two or fewer children; for males, the comparative figure is much lower at 45.2 percent. A small percentage wants no children at all $(0.6 \%$ among males and $0.8 \%$ among females). Preference for high fertility defined as wanting four or more children is low with 16.1 percent of male youth and 7.1 percent of female youth wanting four or more children. The low proportion expressing preference for 4 or more children is reflected across all the regions with the notable exception of ARMM where 67.7 percent of males and 43.4 percent of females said they wanted four or more children.

## Trend in preferred number of children

Results from the NDHS on the ideal family size as expressed by women in the reproductive age shows that over the past 20 years (NDHS 1993, 1998, 2003, 2008, and 2013), the ideal family size has been consistently declining alongside the total fertility rate. Moreover, younger females (15-19) have likewise consistently registered a lower ideal family size than older females (20-24)-the same pattern observed in the YAFS results.

The YAFS series provides comparative data for men that cannot be found in the NDHS. Figure 8.3 shows the trend in the mean preferred number of children over the same 20 -year period among Filipino youth by sex. It shows a consistent pattern of difference between the sexes, with males wanting more children. In 1994, male youth wanted on the average 3.3 children, while
female youth reported wanting 2.8 children. By 2013, the preferred number of children declined to 2.8 for males and 2.3 for females. While the preferred number of children has consistently declined, the difference between the sexes has been constant at 0.5 children.

## Unintended pregnancies

The preceding chapter on sexual behavior documented a low and inconsistent use of contraceptive methods during young people's various sexual activities, which may result in unplanned pregnancies. Unintended pregnancies are an important concern since such pregnancies are associated with a host of adverse consequences not only for the mother but for her child as well.

To assess the prevalence of unintended pregnancies among the youth, the intention or planning status at the time of conception of each pregnancy was asked. Specifically, the women were asked "At the time you became pregnant, did you want to become pregnant then, did you want to wait until later, or did you not want to become pregnant at all?" Responses of "wanted to become pregnant then" are considered intended pregnancies, pregnancies that were wanted at a later time are classified as mistimed pregnancies, and responses of not wanting to become pregnant at all are deemed unwanted pregnancies. The latter two combined constitute unintended pregnancies. It should be noted that althoughthis measure of unintended pregnancies is widely used, it is likely to underestimate unintended pregnancies because it is subject to recall error and post-factum rationalization bias (Bankole \& Westoff, 1998; Santelli et al., 2003). To minimize recall bias of pregnancy intention, the analysis was restricted to births in the five years prior to the survey.

Table 8.8 presents the distribution of births to women in the five years preceding the survey according to their intention status and selected characteristics at the time of birth. Overall, 37.4 percent of births to women aged 1524 are unintended, 22.1 percent are mistimed,

Figure 8.3 Mean preferred number of children by sex: 1994, 2002 and 2013

and 15.3 percent were not wanted at all at the time of conception.

There is no distinct pattern in the proportion of unintended pregnancies by birth order. Unintended pregnancies, however, are highest among first-order births; 2 in 5 first births are unintended. Meanwhile, the proportion of unintended pregnancies is inversely related with the age of the mother at the time of birth. Such pregnancies are most prevalent among the youngest cohort of women. Data show that nearly half ( $46.7 \%$ ) of births to women below 18 years old are unintended, with about one unwanted birth for every five births. In contrast, only one third of births to women 20-24 years old are unintended.

By marital status of the mother at the time of birth, unmarried women (single or separated/widowed) posted higher proportions of unintended pregnancies compared with their counterparts. Among births to never married mothers, three in five were unintended, with one in three an unwanted birth. Among births to separated or widowed women, half were unintended. In contrast, the corresponding proportions among women in a living-in arrangement and formal marriage are much lower at 37.5 percent and 24.6 percent, respectively.

## Abortion attempt

To avoid unintended births, some women resort to abortion. In the Philippines, abortion is legally restricted, and women who
undergo this procedure are highly stigmatized. Despite this, it is estimated that a substantial 610,000 pregnancies among Filipino women end in abortion annually (Hussain \& Finer, 2013). Unfortunately, most of these abortions are performed under clandestine and unsafe conditions that put women's lives and health in jeopardy.

To determine whether the young women have done anything to prematurely end a pregnancy, the following question was posed for each pregnancy, including the current one: "Did you or with the help of someone else do something to end the pregnancy early?" An affirmative response to this query is considered an attempt at induced abortion. The results indicate that more than one in 10 (11.6\%) of ever-pregnant females have done something to terminate any of their pregnancies early (Table 8.9). There is no notable difference in this proportion between the two age cohorts of women. Likewise, a comparison between age groups across socioeconomic characteristics reveals generally similar patterns.

Predictably, the never married women consistently reported the highest proportion while the formally married reported the lowest proportionwhohave made anattemptat premature termination of a pregnancy. Among never married women 15-24 years old, 20.1 percent reported having done something to end the pregnancy early, while only 8.2 percent of their formally married counterparts reported such a practice. This comes as no surprise, since pregnancy outside the context of a marital union is still largely viewed as socially
unacceptable in Philippine society, although that view seems to be changing.

A comparison across regions shows that more than a quarter (26.3\%) of women from Zamboanga Peninsula have tried to terminate a pregnancy. This is overwhelmingly higher than the figures recorded by regions with the next highest proportions, namely Western Visayas (18.8\%) and NCR (17.4\%). At the other end of the spectrum, Central Luzon (4.2\%) and ARMM (4.9\%) registered the lowest incidence of attempted pregnancy termination. Also worth noting is the high incidence of abortion attempts among the $15-19$-year-olds in Western Visayas, where 23.3 percent have tried to end any of their pregnancies early.

The proportion of women with abortion attempt experience is higher in urban areas than in rural areas ( $14.9 \%$ vs. $10.4 \%$ ) and increases with educational attainment, from 9.3 percent among the least educated women to 13.7 percent among the college-educated women. There is no distinct pattern across socioeconomic status categories, but women belonging to the poorest quintile reported the lowest proportion at 10.3 percent.

## Summary and conclusions

The youth of today are the parents of the next generation. Analysis of fertility behavior at the earliest onset of childbearing provides important information for possible interventions to improve fertility outcomes for the teenage youth who have already begun childbearing and to prevent too early childbearing for those who have not. One of the most significant findings from the YAFS4 is the evidence of a doubling of the proportion of women aged 15-19 at the survey date who have begun childbearing (who have either borne a live birth or were pregnant at the time of the survey) in the last 10 years. To the extent that early childbearing is associated with increased risk to both mother and child, this unprecedented rise implies a higher need for maternal health services for very young women who have already begun childbearing. Further analysis of the YAFS4 results is needed to unravel the antecedents of this sharp rise in teen fertility.

Another significant finding is the high level of unintended pregnancies, either because these are mistimed or not wanted at all at the time of conception. This, along with the finding in the previous chapter of low contraceptive

Table 8. 8 Percent distribution of births to females age 15-24 in the five years preceding the survey by the intention status of birth, birth order and mother's characteristics at the time of the birth

| Background Characteristics | Intention status of birth |  |  | Total | Unintended births | Number of births |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intended | Mistimed | Unwanted |  |  |  |
| Birth order |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 59.4 | 22.4 | 18.2 | 100.0 | 40.6 | 2,566 |
| 2 | 71.0 | 21.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 | 29.0 | 880 |
| 3 or more | 66.4 | 21.1 | 12.5 | 100.0 | 33.6 | 232 |
| Mother's age at birth |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below 18 | 53.3 | 26.9 | 19.9 | 100.0 | 46.7 | 615 |
| 18-19 | 62.1 | 20.8 | 17.1 | 100.0 | 37.9 | 1,209 |
| 20-24 | 66.0 | 21.5 | 12.5 | 100.0 | 34.0 | 1,854 |
| Mother's marital status at birth ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 40.2 | 25.3 | 34.4 | 100.0 | 59.8 | 569 |
| Living-in | 62.5 | 23.3 | 14.2 | 100.0 | 37.5 | 1,905 |
| Formally married | 75.4 | 17.8 | 6.8 | 100.0 | 24.6 | 1,100 |
| Separated/Widowed | 49.5 | 30.1 | 20.4 | 100.0 | 50.5 | 93 |
| Total | 62.6 | 22.1 | 15.3 | 100.0 | 37.4 | 3,678 |

Note: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Excludes 11 cases with missing information
use among the sexually active, indicates a high level of unmet need for contraception among the youth. This finding corroborates persistent findings from the NDHS surveys that show the women in the youngest childbearing ages having very high levels of unmet need. Addressing unmet need is made even more imperative by
the finding that more than 1 in 10 ever pregnant women have tried to terminate pregnancy early.

Other significant findings are the persistent gap in the preferred number of children between the sexes, with men wanting more children compared with women. The fertility-related behaviors and attitudes of

Table 8.9 Percent of ever-pregnant females who did something to end pregnancy early by age group and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Females age 15-19 years |  | Females age 20-24 years |  | Females age 15-24 years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Did something to end pregnancy early | No. of females who have ever been pregnant | Did something to end pregnancy early | No. of females who have ever been pregnant | Did something to end pregnancy early | No. of females who have ever been pregnant |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 16.5 | 103 | 22.1 | 195 | 20.1 | 298 |
| Living-in | 10.7 | 525 | 12.7 | 1,133 | 12.1 | 1,658 |
| Formally married | 11.9 | 134 | 7.6 | 952 | 8.2 | 1,087 |
| Separated/Widowed | (11.5) | 26 | 15.9 | 113 | 15.1 | 139 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 8.1 | 37 | 7.9 | 101 | 7.9 | 139 |
| Cagayan Valley | 6.5 | 31 | 8.1 | 86 | 7.7 | 117 |
| Central Luzon | 5.7 | 87 | 3.8 | 316 | 4.2 | 403 |
| CALABARZON | 13.0 | 69 | 11.4 | 281 | 11.7 | 351 |
| MIMAROPA | (8.7) | 23 | 13.0 | 77 | 11.1 | 99 |
| Bicol | 16.7 | 30 | 11.3 | 141 | 12.3 | 171 |
| Western Visayas | 23.3 | 60 | 17.2 | 163 | 18.8 | 223 |
| Central Visayas | 11.3 | 62 | 5.4 | 147 | 7.2 | 209 |
| Eastern Visayas | (13.8) | 29 | 10.3 | 117 | 11.0 | 146 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | (20.7) | 29 | 28.2 | 103 | 26.3 | 133 |
| Northern Mindanao | 7.7 | 39 | 10.1 | 129 | 9.5 | 168 |
| Davao | 15.6 | 45 | 8.4 | 143 | 10.1 | 188 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 19.4 | 36 | 14.4 | 97 | 15.8 | 133 |
| CAR | (11.1) | 18 | 7.1 | 56 | 8.2 | 73 |
| ARMM | (9.1) | 22 | 3.7 | 82 | 4.9 | 103 |
| Caraga | 6.7 | 30 | 11.7 | 60 | 10.1 | 89 |
| NCR | 10.5 | 143 | 20.7 | 295 | 17.4 | 438 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 11.8 | 245 | 16.0 | 663 | 14.9 | 908 |
| Rural | 11.6 | 543 | 9.9 | 1,730 | 10.4 | 2,274 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 9.2 | 141 | 9.3 | 279 | 9.3 | 421 |
| High school undergraduate | 13.6 | 286 | 10.7 | 542 | 11.7 | 828 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 10.8 | 288 | 11.7 | 1,103 | 11.5 | 1,390 |
| College or higher | 12.3 | 73 | 13.9 | 469 | 13.7 | 542 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 10.4 | 211 | 10.1 | 622 | 10.3 | 834 |
| Second | 14.6 | 171 | 9.8 | 521 | 11.0 | 693 |
| Middle | 10.5 | 171 | 13.1 | 518 | 12.5 | 689 |
| Fourth | 8.6 | 139 | 14.8 | 453 | 13.3 | 592 |
| Highest (Richest) | 14.7 | 95 | 10.4 | 279 | 11.7 | 375 |
| Total | 11.7 | 788 | 11.6 | 2,394 | 11.6 | 3,182 |

young males is a little-explored topic for further analysis and for intervention programs to reduce the risk of teen pregnancy. Again, the issue of the gender gap in male and female fertility-related beliefs, attitudes, and behavior is one area that needs to be further explored.
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# Reproductive Health 

Maria Paz N. Marquez Arnisson Andre C. Ortega

According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2006), reproductive health (RH) refers to the total well-being in all aspects of reproduction (i.e., physical, emotional, behavioral, and social). This term gained greater prominence after the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development that saw a historic shift in paradigm from family planning to the broader concept of RH. RH is part of the UN Millennium Development Goals, with a specific target of achieving universal access to RH by 2015. But greater emphasis is given to addressing RH concerns of the youth, since they face specific health-related issues such as early sexual initiation and early and risky pregnancies. In the Philippines, the passage of the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act of 2012, more commonly known as the RH Law, underscores the importance of providing universal access to RH. One of the key features of the RH Law is the provision of ageand development-appropriate RH education to adolescents.

RH encompasses a broad range of issues. The Department of Health has adopted 10 core service elements of RH since 1996 to effectively provide the necessary care and services (Commission on Population, 2003). Under the RH Law, these elements have been expanded to 12: (1) family planning information and services; (2) maternal, infant, and child health and nutrition, including breastfeeding; (3) proscription of abortion and management of abortion complications; (4) adolescent and youth RH guidance and counseling; (5) prevention,
treatment, and management of reproductive tract infections, HIV and AIDS, and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs); (6) elimination of violence against women and children and other forms of sexual and gender-based violence; (7) education and counseling on sexuality and RH; (8) treatment of breast and reproductive tract cancers and other gynecological conditions and disorders; (9) male responsibility and involvement and men's RH; (10) prevention, treatment, and management of infertility and sexual dysfunction; (11) RH education for the adolescents; and (12) mental health aspect of RH care.

Earlier chapters covered contraception and abortion. This chapter examines the Filipino youth's milestones in pubertal development, experience of RH problems, and awareness and knowledge of STIs, including HIV/AIDS.

## Pubertal development

Puberty is the phase of development when boys and girls begin their physical transition to adulthood. It is the stage when the body transitions to sexual maturity and full reproductive ability. At this stage, young people experience physical changes, which can pose challenges for them as they assume the corresponding roles and responsibilities that such changes entail. This section focuses on young people's knowledge of these physical changes and the physiological milestones they experience as they traverse this transition.

## Knowledge of physical changes at puberty

The YAFS4 survey asked male respondents to enumerate the physical changes they know that boys go through during the transition from childhood to adolescence. Similarly, female respondents were asked to mention spontaneously the changes that girls experience during this developmental stage. The data revealed universal knowledge of physical changes among Filipino youth. Less than 1 percent of males and females were unable to cite any physical change that happens to young people during puberty.

Table 9.1 presents the percentage of males and females who mentioned the physical changes specific to their sex. For males, the most cited physical change is body growth (79.7\%), followed by growth of hair in underarms and pubic area (57.1\%) and change in voice (55.2\%). At the other end of the spectrum, the least cited are penile discharge (5.4\%) and enlargement of the scrotum ( $7.3 \%$ ). For females, the most frequently reported physical changes are the onset of menstrual period (75.7\%) and development of breasts (72.9\%). Very few females (5.6\%) are aware of vaginal discharge as a physical change that girls experience at puberty.

As expected, older youth (20-24 years old) are more knowledgeable of these physical changes. Among males, this pattern is most pronounced in change of voice ( $53.8 \%$ for $15-19$-year-olds vs. $57.3 \%$ for $20-24$-year-olds) and enlargement of scrotum ( $6.4 \%$ vs. $8.8 \%$ ). Among females, this age differential is most notable in development of breasts ( $70.8 \%$ vs. $75.7 \%$ ) and onset of menstrual period ( $74.7 \%$ vs. 77.2\%). While there are no evident urban-rural and socioeconomic status differentials, a clear education pattern is apparent, with a generally increasing level of knowledge with increasing educational attainment.

Comparing responses across regions, the patterns of responses are generally similar for both males and females. However, some deviations can be observed. Among ARMM youth, a significantly lower proportion of youth
cited body growth ( $46.5 \%$ for males and $36 \%$ for females) and growth of hair in the underarms and pubic area ( $25.6 \%$ for males and $19.4 \%$ for females). Meanwhile, a substantially higher proportion of Central Luzon female youth mentioned body growth (72.7\%), development of breasts ( $91.3 \%$ ), and onset of menstrual period (89.2\%) compared with other regions.

## Circumcision

Male circumcision is a traditional practice in Filipino culture. Male teenagers undergo the ritual before entering their adult years (Lee, 2006). More than a cultural rite of passage, male circumcision is now recognized as an efficacious intervention for the prevention of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), the virus that causes the acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS; WHO \& UNAIDS, 2007).

The YAFS4 data show that this practice remains highly prevalent, as nearly all (98.6\%) Filipino males aged 15-24 reported that they are circumcised (Table 9.2). Circumcision is a universal practice in all regions in the country except for ARMM, where 16.7 percent reported that they are not circumcised.

The mean age at circumcision is 11.0 years. Only around 0.1 percent (data not shown) had undergone circumcision at birth, a practice that is more widespread in Western countries. The lowest mean age of 9.3 years is recorded in Central Visayas, Northern Mindanao, and Davao Region, while ARMM has the highest mean age at circumcision of 12.9 years. There are no substantial differences in the mean age at circumcision by age, place of residence, education, and socioeconomic status.

Apart from age at circumcision, it is also important to examine the person who performed the circumcision, as those without medical training may practice unhygienic procedures or perform the circumcision in an unsanitary environment that can lead to infections. Table 9.2 shows the proportion of circumcised males whose circumcision procedure was done by a medical professional, which includes doctors,
Table 9.1 Percent of males and females who mentioned the physical changes that happen to a young person during the transition to adulthood by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of males who mentioned: |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males | Percent of females who mentioned: |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Body growth | Growth of hair in underarms and pubic area | Penile discharge | Skin becoming oily and development of pimples | Change in voice | Enlargement of Adam's apple | Enlargement of scrotum |  | Body growth | Growth of hair in underarms and pubic area | Vaginal discharge | Skin becoming oily and dev't of pimples | Development of breasts | Onset of menstrual period |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 79.7 | 56.5 | 5.2 | 24.1 | 53.8 | 28.5 | 6.4 | 5,743 | 55.6 | 35.9 | 5.2 | 26.5 | 70.8 | 74.7 | 5,641 |
| 20-24 | 79.7 | 58.0 | 5.7 | 24.4 | 57.3 | 30.2 | 8.8 | 3,580 | 56.1 | 36.6 | 6.2 | 26.4 | 75.7 | 77.2 | 4,145 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 91.5 | 59.4 | 2.1 | 16.1 | 65.2 | 21.2 | 1.3 | 472 | 49.9 | 50.7 | 1.9 | 26.9 | 70.4 | 77.8 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 85.7 | 77.8 | 6.1 | 30.0 | 67.6 | 36.7 | 7.3 | 343 | 49.7 | 42.0 | 9.6 | 32.4 | 73.1 | 88.9 | 324 |
| Central Luzon | 84.9 | 77.3 | 14.5 | 45.9 | 74.4 | 51.4 | 26.6 | 953 | 72.7 | 48.6 | 6.9 | 26.4 | 91.3 | 89.2 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 79.6 | 50.7 | 0.2 | 15.8 | 33.6 | 25.9 | 1.6 | 1,228 | 53.8 | 23.7 | 1.2 | 18.7 | 68.9 | 75.1 | 1,295 |
| MIMAROPA | 87.3 | 47.0 | 2.1 | 23.4 | 55.7 | 30.0 | 2.5 | 283 | 67.0 | 29.7 | 2.9 | 27.6 | 59.7 | 86.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 85.2 | 57.2 | 1.3 | 14.2 | 53.0 | 22.9 | 1.2 | 520 | 60.4 | 37.3 | 2.1 | 22.2 | 75.5 | 79.8 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 82.8 | 62.3 | 4.9 | 17.5 | 45.9 | 32.1 | 15.6 | 760 | 57.3 | 33.5 | 8.0 | 26.0 | 75.0 | 82.7 | 723 |
| Central Visayas | 65.9 | 55.9 | 3.1 | 14.8 | 59.9 | 18.7 | 4.0 | 742 | 53.9 | 30.6 | 2.5 | 29.4 | 70.5 | 56.8 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 86.6 | 55.4 | 7.0 | 22.8 | 61.5 | 27.1 | 6.3 | 425 | 59.0 | 39.7 | 2.5 | 23.3 | 66.4 | 86.6 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 76.1 | 55.3 | 4.6 | 21.5 | 59.1 | 30.4 | 2.2 | 368 | 50.0 | 38.1 | 4.8 | 35.1 | 71.2 | 65.7 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 74.3 | 61.7 | 20.1 | 46.1 | 73.2 | 40.3 | 22.4 | 447 | 35.3 | 26.8 | 4.7 | 36.6 | 78.3 | 73.2 | 473 |
| Davao | 77.8 | 62.1 | 4.5 | 29.6 | 54.8 | 21.8 | 1.8 | 446 | 64.9 | 47.2 | 19.6 | 36.7 | 77.9 | 76.1 | 515 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 80.4 | 51.8 | 8.7 | 28.1 | 53.4 | 29.9 | 2.7 | 438 | 49.5 | 36.7 | 11.1 | 33.7 | 70.5 | 71.8 | 457 |
| CAR | 83.2 | 52.3 | 4.0 | 9.3 | 52.3 | 22.1 | 2.3 | 173 | 57.9 | 50.0 | 15.3 | 29.6 | 82.1 | 66.8 | 196 |
| ARMM | 46.5 | 25.6 | 5.4 | 36.2 | 68.0 | 38.1 | 3.2 | 316 | 36.0 | 19.4 | 6.3 | 25.4 | 57.1 | 72.0 | 350 |
| Caraga | 70.9 | 43.8 | 6.4 | 27.2 | 61.9 | 24.9 | 4.6 | 265 | 41.5 | 31.0 | 15.9 | 43.3 | 54.8 | 58.9 | 253 |
| NCR | 83.1 | 51.4 | 2.1 | 19.2 | 44.0 | 20.7 | 3.0 | 1,145 | 57.5 | 37.4 | 2.3 | 17.7 | 74.9 | 70.4 | 1,354 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 81.4 | 57.2 | 4.1 | 23.6 | 51.1 | 27.9 | 7.0 | 2,389 | 58.6 | 40.8 | 5.3 | 24.5 | 74.8 | 73.7 | 2,827 |
| Rural | 79.1 | 57.0 | 5.8 | 24.4 | 56.6 | 29.6 | 7.4 | 6,934 | 54.7 | 34.3 | 5.8 | 27.2 | 72.1 | 76.6 | 6,959 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 76.3 | 49.3 | 4.2 | 23.0 | 48.7 | 24.0 | 4.8 | 1,718 | 44.7 | 27.3 | 5.9 | 20.3 | 63.5 | 72.8 | 921 |
| High school undergraduate | 78.5 | 56.4 | 5.4 | 24.0 | 54.6 | 27.7 | 6.5 | 3,514 | 54.7 | 32.2 | 5.0 | 26.3 | 68.4 | 74.9 | 3,491 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 80.6 | 56.6 | 5.4 | 25.0 | 57.4 | 34.2 | 9.2 | 2,408 | 55.7 | 35.2 | 5.0 | 28.1 | 74.2 | 75.5 | 3,040 |
| College or higher | 84.2 | 67.0 | 6.5 | 24.4 | 59.8 | 30.2 | 8.7 | 1,681 | 62.1 | 46.8 | 7.3 | 26.9 | 81.7 | 78.4 | 2,334 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 76.7 | 54.6 | 6.7 | 26.6 | 55.3 | 28.1 | 7.8 | 1,878 | 49.0 | 28.7 | 6.4 | 28.7 | 64.8 | 73.7 | 1,945 |
| Second | 78.6 | 52.6 | 4.4 | 22.4 | 55.0 | 28.1 | 6.3 | 1,909 | 54.2 | 33.2 | 5.3 | 28.9 | 71.9 | 75.0 | 2,017 |
| Middle | 80.4 | 58.3 | 5.3 | 21.8 | 53.2 | 30.0 | 5.9 | 2,087 | 58.6 | 36.2 | 5.2 | 24.9 | 71.6 | 73.9 | 2,078 |
| Fourth | 79.7 | 58.3 | 5.1 | 27.4 | 57.3 | 28.9 | 7.6 | 1,930 | 55.8 | 41.3 | 5.2 | 25.4 | 76.6 | 77.7 | 2,061 |
| Highest (Richest) | 83.7 | 62.3 | 5.5 | 22.6 | 55.5 | 31.0 | 9.6 | 1,519 | 62.2 | 42.0 | 6.2 | 24.0 | 80.5 | 78.9 | 1,686 |
| Total | 79.7 | 57.1 | 5.4 | 24.2 | 55.2 | 29.1 | 7.3 | 9,323 | 55.8 | 36.2 | 5.6 | 26.4 | 72.9 | 75.7 | 9,785 |

nurses, midwives, and barangay health workers. The data show that two in three males were circumcised by a health professional. More than half (51.4\%) of circumcisions were performed by a physician.

Circumcisions performed by health professionals are more prevalent among younger youth, urban residents, more educated youth, and more affluent youth. A high prevalence of circumcision by health professionals is also observed in NCR, Central Luzon, and Ilocos, where more than four in five males were circumcised by medical personnel. A cause for concern, however, is the low prevalence in CALABARZON, Western Visayas, and ARMM,
where about half of the males were circumcised by non-health professionals.

## Menarche

Menarche refers to the onset of menstruation and marks the start of puberty in females. It also signals the beginning of females' capacity for reproduction. Almost all females aged 15-24 (99.7\%) said they had already experienced menarche (Table 9.3). Only 0.3 percent have not started menstruating yet, all of whom belong to the 15-19 age group.

The mean age at menarche is 13.0 years, with a range of 7 to 22 years (Table 9.3). More than 1 in 10 women experienced menstruation

Table 9.2 Percent distribution of males by age at circumcision, mean age at circumcision, and percentage circumcised by medical professional by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age at circumcision (in years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males | Circumcised by medical personnela ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | No. of males who have been circumcised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 and over | Not circumcised | Total | Mean |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 26.6 | 15.6 | 12.3 | 19.8 | 23.8 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 10.9 | 5,760 | 71.2 | 5,607 |
| 20-24 | 25.8 | 14.7 | 11.1 | 20.2 | 27.7 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 11.2 | 3,582 | 61.6 | 3,547 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 20.5 | 15.8 | 15.6 | 19.8 | 27.2 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 11.2 | 474 | 84.3 | 460 |
| Cagayan Valley | 14.5 | 17.7 | 12.5 | 22.3 | 31.9 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 11.7 | 345 | 69.5 | 334 |
| Central Luzon | 22.2 | 19.2 | 14.2 | 27.0 | 22.8 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 952 | 86.5 | 934 |
| CALABARZON | 11.3 | 11.1 | 14.3 | 29.5 | 31.3 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 11.9 | 1,242 | 51.8 | 1,205 |
| MIMAROPA | 11.7 | 12.1 | 13.1 | 27.3 | 34.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 11.9 | 282 | 30.2 | 278 |
| Bicol | 15.5 | 14.0 | 10.0 | 24.8 | 35.1 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 11.7 | 521 | 30.1 | 515 |
| Western Visayas | 9.7 | 10.4 | 9.1 | 20.5 | 48.9 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 12.4 | 761 | 52.7 | 748 |
| Central Visayas | 58.0 | 15.5 | 6.7 | 10.8 | 8.9 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 9.3 | 742 | 75.8 | 741 |
| Eastern Visayas | 40.5 | 19.0 | 6.8 | 16.6 | 16.2 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 10.1 | 427 | 59.2 | 422 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 48.8 | 16.4 | 9.1 | 13.4 | 11.5 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 9.8 | 373 | 60.1 | 368 |
| Northern Mindanao | 56.5 | 15.0 | 7.2 | 11.4 | 9.6 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 9.3 | 446 | 79.8 | 446 |
| Davao | 55.0 | 17.3 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 10.8 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 9.3 | 444 | 77.7 | 444 |
| soccsksargen | 11.7 | 17.1 | 20.0 | 26.3 | 24.7 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 10.4 | 436 | 73.8 | 428 |
| CAR | 21.8 | 12.1 | 9.8 | 27.3 | 32.8 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 11.5 | 174 | 63.1 | 168 |
| ARMM | 9.0 | 8.7 | 5.4 | 12.5 | 47.8 | 16.7 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 312 | 52.9 | 261 |
| Caraga | 52.8 | 15.8 | 7.5 | 11.3 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 9.6 | 265 | 63.1 | 100 |
| NCR | 11.7 | 17.1 | 20.0 | 26.3 | 24.7 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 11.5 | 1,149 | 89.2 | 1,143 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 21.8 | 17.9 | 15.7 | 22.3 | 22.0 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 17.0 | 2,394 | 84.0 | 2,379 |
| Rural | 27.8 | 14.4 | 10.5 | 19.1 | 26.4 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 6,949 | 61.7 | 6,775 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 23.6 | 14.7 | 6.6 | 17.1 | 35.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 11.4 | 1,724 | 50.6 | 1,671 |
| High school undergraduate | 27.0 | 14.8 | 11.9 | 20.3 | 24.1 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 10.9 | 3,523 | 68.3 | 3,431 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 27.0 | 15.8 | 13.6 | 18.6 | 24.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 2,410 | 68.0 | 2,381 |
| College or higher | 26.4 | 16.3 | 14.6 | 23.8 | 18.6 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 10.8 | 1,686 | 82.0 | 1,669 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 29.6 | 13.7 | 7.5 | 15.6 | 30.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 1,880 | 49.9 | 1,810 |
| Second | 27.9 | 13.3 | 9.1 | 21.2 | 26.9 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 1,911 | 57.6 | 1,869 |
| Middle | 24.7 | 14.6 | 11.7 | 21.2 | 27.0 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 2,088 | 68.5 | 2,060 |
| Fourth | 24.7 | 17.5 | 14.6 | 19.6 | 23.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 1,941 | 77.6 | 1,917 |
| Highest (Richest) | 24.2 | 17.8 | 17.4 | 22.3 | 17.2 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 10.8 | 1,523 | 86.6 | 1,498 |
| Total | 26.3 | 15.3 | 11.8 | 19.9 | 25.3 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 9,342 | 67.5 | 9,159 |

Note: : Includes doctors, nurses, midwives, and barangay health workers (BHWs)
before age 12, 26.1 percent at age $12,25.7$ percent at age $13,19.6$ percent at age 14 , and 15.2 percent at age 15 and older.

Across the regions, the youngest mean age at menarche is reported in NCR at 12.7 years, while the oldest, reported in ARMM, is 13.6 years. Nearly half (48.1\%) of the women in NCR and two in five women in Ilocos, Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon, CALABARZON, Western Visayas, and Central Visayas had their first menstrual period before they turned 13 years old. Menstruation occurs later among rural females than their urban counterparts, with a mean age at menarche of 13.1 and 12.8 years, respectively.

By educational attainment, the mean age at menarche consistently decreases as education
increases, although the range is not very wide (from 12.8 years among the college educated to 13.3 years among those with no schooling/ elementary education). The same pattern is apparent for socioeconomic status. The mean age at menarche is lowest among women belonging to the highest quintile ( 12.7 years) and highest among women from the lowest quintile (13.2 years). These patterns are not unexpected since higher educational attainment and socioeconomic status are associated with better nutrition and health practices which in turn are determinants of earlier onset of menarche (Osteria, 1983; Rah, et al., 2009).

Table 9.3 Percent distribution of females by age at menarche, and mean age at menarche by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age at menarche (in years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 and below | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 and over | Not menstruating yet | Total |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.4 | 9.5 | 26.8 | 27.3 | 20.2 | 12.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 5,637 |
| 20-24 | 4.0 | 9.4 | 25.2 | 23.5 | 18.7 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 4,157 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 3.2 | 10.5 | 27.6 | 30.1 | 16.2 | 12.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 3.4 | 8.6 | 30.3 | 21.1 | 23.5 | 12.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 327 |
| Central Luzon | 4.8 | 12.1 | 26.3 | 27.0 | 15.1 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 2.3 | 11.5 | 26.3 | 24.4 | 20.2 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 1,295 |
| MIMAROPA | 1.8 | 8.6 | 25.5 | 23.7 | 25.9 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 574 |
| Bicol | 3.5 | 4.5 | 22.5 | 27.9 | 22.8 | 18.3 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 13.3 | 724 |
| Western Visayas | 4.7 | 9.4 | 27.9 | 25.8 | 19.5 | 12.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 673 |
| Central Visayas | 4.0 | 10.4 | 26.4 | 24.8 | 20.2 | 13.4 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 403 |
| Eastern Visayas | 0.7 | 7.2 | 24.8 | 25.3 | 21.8 | 19.4 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 13.3 | 355 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 2.0 | 7.9 | 23.1 | 26.5 | 22.5 | 17.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.2 | 473 |
| Northern Mindanao | 1.1 | 8.7 | 22.0 | 26.8 | 23.5 | 16.9 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 13.2 | 515 |
| Davao | 2.9 | 9.3 | 27.6 | 25.0 | 21.6 | 13.4 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 461 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 3.3 | 6.9 | 28.2 | 31.7 | 18.2 | 11.3 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 1,354 |
| CAR | 3.0 | 8.1 | 22.8 | 29.4 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 197 |
| ARMM | 2.6 | 3.7 | 12.9 | 25.1 | 28.9 | 25.1 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 13.6 | 350 |
| Caraga | 2.7 | 7.1 | 27.1 | 24.3 | 19.6 | 18.4 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 255 |
| NCR | 7.0 | 11.5 | 29.5 | 22.9 | 14.4 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.7 | 278 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 5.7 | 11.1 | 28.8 | 24.7 | 16.1 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.8 | 2,825 |
| Rural | 2.8 | 8.8 | 25.0 | 26.1 | 20.9 | 15.9 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 6,969 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 2.9 | 4.9 | 19.1 | 28.2 | 26.5 | 17.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 13.3 | 918 |
| High school undergraduate | 3.1 | 8.8 | 26.7 | 27.9 | 20.3 | 12.6 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 3,501 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 2.7 | 9.7 | 27.5 | 23.6 | 17.7 | 18.6 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 3,046 |
| College or higher | 6.0 | 11.9 | 26.0 | 24.1 | 18.1 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.8 | 2,329 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 1.7 | 5.8 | 24.2 | 27.1 | 22.8 | 17.5 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 13.2 | 1,950 |
| Second | 2.4 | 9.3 | 22.7 | 25.5 | 22.6 | 17.1 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 3.4 | 7.5 | 28.3 | 25.2 | 19.9 | 15.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 2,080 |
| Fourth | 3.8 | 12.4 | 28.0 | 24.4 | 17.0 | 14.3 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 2,057 |
| Highest (Richest) | 7.7 | 12.5 | 27.4 | 26.4 | 14.9 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.7 | 1,685 |
| Total | 3.7 | 9.5 | 26.1 | 25.7 | 19.6 | 15.2 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 9,794 |

## Trends in pubertal development

Figure 9.1 shows the trends from 1994 to 2013 of the two indicators of pubertal development discussed earlier. The mean age at circumcision remained stable at 11.0 years during the 20 -year period. The mean age at menarche, however, followed a slight downward trend from 13.3 years in 1994 to 13.0 years in 2013.

## RH problems

Young people cannot reach their full potential if they are saddled with illnesses that can exact a toll on their everyday lives. Diseases related to their RH, in particular, can affect their reproductive lives, particularly their ability to bear children and to engage in healthy sexual relationships. The YAFS4 survey asked the young people if they have experienced symptoms related to RH problems. Symptoms such as abnormal genital discharge, genital warts, and swollen testicles are seen as possible indications of more serious diseases that require medical attention, such as STIs.

Tables 9.4 and 9.5 show the proportions of males and females who reported ever experiencing a given symptom. Among these symptoms are abnormal genital discharge, blood in urine, genital warts, itching in the genital area, and painful urination. Except for painful urination, which more females (28.5\%) than males (19.9\%) reported, the experience of symptoms of RH problems is about the same for men and women, and all symptoms have a
relatively low level of prevalence. In addition to these symptoms common to males and females, the study also inquired about gender-specific symptoms such as erectile dysfunction for males and dysmenorrhea for females.

The most common RH complaints of males are painful urination (19.9\%), genital itching (11.1\%), and infection from circumcision (9\%). There is no distinct pattern of difference in post-circumcision infection by age and other background characteristics, but there is a wide variability across regions. The proportion of males who experienced post-circumcision infection is lowest at 0.1 percent in Central Luzon, followed by Bicol (2.1\%) and MIMAROPA (2.9\%). At the other extreme, the proportion is highest in SOCCSKSARGEN (42.9\%), followed by Zamboanga Peninsula (26.4\%) and Northern Mindanao (23.9\%).

Among females, menstruation-related complaints are the most prevalent RH problems. Nearly half (47.6\%) of females reported painful menstruation, while 31.6 percent have experienced irregular menstrual period. Sexrelated problems are also quite common, more so among females than males. Low sex drive and painful sexual intercourse were reported by one in five females. Among males, young as they are, nearly 4 percent have also experienced impotence or erectile dysfunction.

In all, 36.5 percent of males and 73 percent of females have experienced any RH problem. The high level of RH problems among females can be attributed to the high prevalence of dysmenorrhea.

Figure 9.1 Trends in mean age at circumcision and age at menarche: 1994, 2002, and 2013

Table 9.4 Percent of males who experienced reproductive health (RH) problems and percentage who consulted a health professional for any RH problem by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Abnormal penile discharge | Blood in urine | Genital warts | Itching in the genital area | Painful urination | Reddish and swollen testicles | Infection from circumcision ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Libido/ sex drive | Impotence/ Erectile dysfunction | Any RH problem | No. of males | Consulted a medical professional for any RH problem experienced | No. of males who experienced any RH problem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 11.9 | 19.8 | 3.0 | 9.2 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 36.7 | 5,766 | 24.0 | 2,082 |
| 20-24 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 9.8 | 20.1 | 3.0 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 4.1 | 36.2 | 3,591 | 33.1 | 1,285 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 3.5 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 11.1 | 19.3 | 3.1 | 9.1 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 35.6 | 8,191 | 26.6 | 2,865 |
| Ever married | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 11.2 | 24.1 | 2.5 | 8.8 | 14.1 | 5.4 | 42.9 | 1,166 | 32.2 | 503 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 1.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 17.8 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 28.0 | 472 | 27.8 | 133 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.3 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 7.3 | 16.2 | 0.9 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 24.2 | 345 | 24.1 | 87 |
| Central Luzon | 0.4 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 9.6 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 10.8 | 952 | 38.1 | 113 |
| CALABARZON | 10.8 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 23.3 | 29.5 | 9.8 | 6.4 | 12.7 | 9.2 | 52.7 | 1,243 | 32.1 | 629 |
| MIMAROPA | 2.1 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 11.3 | 20.5 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 29.9 | 283 | 24.7 | 89 |
| Bicol | 1.9 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 20.0 | 27.6 | 3.7 | 2.1 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 43.3 | 520 | 21.9 | 219 |
| Western Visayas | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 10.3 | 0.7 | 5.7 | 4.6 | 2.2 | 24.1 | 764 | 33.3 | 159 |
| Central Visayas | 3.1 | 4.2 | 1.3 | 5.5 | 12.8 | 2.2 | 4.3 | 6.3 | 3.5 | 26.4 | 741 | 32.3 | 195 |
| Eastern Visayas | 2.1 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 8.5 | 13.8 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 26.4 | 427 | 28.8 | 111 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 1.3 | 3.0 | 8.4 | 6.7 | 27.2 | 1.6 | 26.4 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 52.0 | 372 | 21.1 | 194 |
| Northern Mindanao | 5.6 | 3.6 | 6.7 | 10.7 | 28.9 | 1.8 | 23.9 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 53.6 | 447 | 25.3 | 237 |
| Davao | 3.4 | 2.2 | 4.5 | 8.1 | 22.9 | 2.0 | 13.0 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 44.2 | 446 | 26.0 | 192 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 2.1 | 1.8 | 4.3 | 8.2 | 19.3 | 2.0 | 42.9 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 53.3 | 439 | 15.6 | 225 |
| CAR | 2.3 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 11.0 | 33.5 | 0.6 | 12.6 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 43.9 | 173 | 18.7 | 75 |
| ARMM | 2.5 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 6.3 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 24.8 | 317 | 14.1 | 85 |
| Caraga | 7.2 | 3.0 | 5.7 | 12.1 | 21.1 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 7.9 | 3.8 | 39.9 | 265 | 22.4 | 107 |
| NCR | 3.0 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 18.1 | 21.9 | 4.9 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 4.9 | 44.6 | 1,150 | 32.1 | 514 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 2.8 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 12.6 | 19.1 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 3.9 | 38.2 | 2,398 | 31.4 | 917 |
| Rural | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 10.6 | 20.2 | 2.8 | 9.4 | 5.4 | 3.7 | 35.9 | 6,958 | 26.0 | 2,450 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 9.3 | 20.0 | 4.0 | 8.7 | 4.9 | 4.3 | 35.9 | 1,730 | 31.2 | 628 |
| High school undergraduate | 3.7 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 12.6 | 20.8 | 2.4 | 10.0 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 38.9 | 3,528 | 22.3 | 1,356 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 3.4 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 10.7 | 20.2 | 2.9 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 3.9 | 35.2 | 2,412 | 31.6 | 836 |
| College or higher | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 10.3 | 17.4 | 3.5 | 9.1 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 34.1 | 1,687 | 29.6 | 547 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 9.6 | 20.2 | 2.8 | 12.5 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 37.6 | 1,884 | 24.4 | 712 |
| Second | 3.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 10.1 | 21.2 | 2.8 | 9.5 | 6.2 | 4.6 | 38.5 | 1,916 | 24.9 | 719 |
| Middle | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 11.8 | 19.5 | 3.8 | 7.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 | 34.7 | 2,089 | 27.2 | 727 |
| Fourth | 2.4 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 10.6 | 20.0 | 2.2 | 6.6 | 7.2 | 3.6 | 36.1 | 1,941 | 30.7 | 688 |
| Highest (Richest) | 5.1 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 13.7 | 18.4 | 3.5 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 3.7 | 35.7 | 1,526 | 31.2 | 522 |
| Total | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 11.1 | 19.9 | 3.0 | 9.0 | 6.4 | 3.7 | 36.5 | 9,356 | 27.4 | 3,367 |

[^11]Table 9.5 Percent of females who experienced reproductive health (RH) problems and percentage who consulted a health professional for
any RH problem by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of females who experienced the following RH problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females | Consulted a medical professional for any RH problem experienced | No. of females who experienced any RH problem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Abnormal vaginal discharge | Blood in urine | Genital warts | Itching in the genita area | Painful urination | Dysmenorrhea ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Irregular menștrual period ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Breast mass | Low libido/ sex drive | Painful sexual intercourse ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Any RH problem |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 2.1 | 10.0 | 27.3 | 46.5 | 30.3 | 2.8 | 18.2 | 25.1 | 70.4 | 5,646 | 27.7 | 3,909 |
| 20-24 | 6.2 | 5.1 | 2.5 | 14.0 | 30.2 | 49.0 | 33.3 | 4.6 | 20.6 | 21.1 | 76.4 | 4,159 | 42.3 | 3,120 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 11.0 | 25.1 | 51.1 | 31.6 | 3.3 | 22.7 | 30.3 | 71.6 | 6,478 | 27.3 | 4,561 |
| Ever married | 6.6 | 6.3 | 2.2 | 13.1 | 35.1 | 40.6 | 31.5 | 4.1 | 19.4 | 20.7 | 75.6 | 3,328 | 47.0 | 2,468 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 2.4 | 5.4 | 1.7 | 11.2 | 30.7 | 49.9 | 25.8 | 2.6 | 19.3 | 24.1 | 71.9 | 467 | 34.1 | 317 |
| Cagayan Valley | 1.2 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 10.2 | 31.4 | 49.4 | 27.4 | 2.5 | 21.9 | 29.3 | 72.0 | 325 | 33.3 | 228 |
| Central Luzon | 1.2 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 5.5 | 21.8 | 28.9 | 24.7 | 3.7 | 11.3 | 8.5 | 54.6 | 1,097 | 49.7 | 573 |
| CALABARZON | 3.9 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 17.0 | 30.2 | 50.0 | 37.3 | 3.3 | 17.3 | 27.5 | 79.1 | 1,303 | 35.7 | 1,026 |
| MIMAROPA | 3.6 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 11.1 | 29.7 | 38.6 | 36.4 | 1.8 | 17.5 | 24.6 | 70.9 | 279 | 36.0 | 197 |
| Bicol | 2.4 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 10.6 | 31.9 | 47.5 | 36.1 | 2.8 | 31.6 | 31.8 | 77.5 | 573 | 35.8 | 438 |
| Western Visayas | 6.5 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 11.5 | 25.9 | 50.8 | 40.3 | 2.1 | 27.3 | 23.1 | 76.7 | 723 | 39.2 | 541 |
| Central Visayas | 5.3 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 8.6 | 32.2 | 61.6 | 40.6 | 2.7 | 33.3 | 27.2 | 84.9 | 674 | 25.3 | 566 |
| Eastern Visayas | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 12.2 | 26.3 | 34.0 | 27.0 | 3.5 | 16.8 | 17.9 | 67.6 | 403 | 34.3 | 271 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 4.2 | 5.6 | 2.5 | 11.3 | 25.9 | 47.6 | 25.4 | 5.9 | 7.7 | 18.1 | 63.8 | 355 | 24.7 | 223 |
| Northern Mindanao | 7.6 | 5.9 | 3.2 | 11.0 | 23.5 | 47.8 | 26.8 | 4.7 | 19.0 | 14.7 | 72.1 | 474 | 26.3 | 338 |
| Davao | 5.7 | 4.9 | 1.0 | 9.9 | 22.4 | 54.6 | 22.0 | 4.5 | 8.9 | 13.8 | 65.9 | 514 | 27.0 | 333 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.8 | 6.9 | 32.2 | 42.7 | 13.3 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 11.8 | 62.7 | 461 | 25.6 | 277 |
| CAR | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 13.2 | 43.7 | 55.3 | 26.4 | 1.5 | 22.3 | 35.1 | 80.0 | 197 | 46.4 | 153 |
| ARMM | 5.7 | 2.6 | 5.7 | 15.1 | 33.6 | 61.5 | 18.9 | 4.6 | 7.5 | 11.9 | 76.6 | 350 | 13.7 | 262 |
| Caraga | 5.1 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 9.8 | 32.3 | 48.8 | 28.0 | 3.1 | 23.6 | 30.2 | 76.0 | 254 | 28.8 | 191 |
| NCR | 7.2 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 16.1 | 28.9 | 50.3 | 41.6 | 3.5 | 29.6 | 30.5 | 80.9 | 1,357 | 38.8 | 1,093 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 5.9 | 5.5 | 2.1 | 14.2 | 28.3 | 50.4 | 36.2 | 3.8 | 22.8 | 25.0 | 76.2 | 2,829 | 37.4 | 2,124 |
| Rural | 4.1 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 10.7 | 28.6 | 46.4 | 29.7 | 3.5 | 18.7 | 21.1 | 71.6 | 6,976 | 32.8 | 4,906 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 4.8 | 5.5 | 2.2 | 8.7 | 30.8 | 35.9 | 26.5 | 2.0 | 13.9 | 22.2 | 64.4 | 921 | 30.9 | 579 |
| High school undergraduate | 4.4 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 10.0 | 27.2 | 41.0 | 30.9 | 2.2 | 18.3 | 20.4 | 68.1 | 3,498 | 29.8 | 2,359 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 4.6 | 4.7 | 1.8 | 12.0 | 28.6 | 47.1 | 31.6 | 4.4 | 20.9 | 21.3 | 74.6 | 3,052 | 38.2 | 2,225 |
| College or higher | 5.0 | 4.7 | 2.7 | 15.0 | 29.6 | 62.5 | 34.5 | 5.1 | 23.9 | 26.6 | 81.6 | 2,333 | 35.9 | 1,865 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 4.0 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 8.9 | 29.7 | 41.4 | 27.3 | 3.7 | 17.7 | 21.6 | 68.3 | 1,954 | 27.7 | 1,316 |
| Second | 4.4 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 9.8 | 29.4 | 46.1 | 31.5 | 2.8 | 19.6 | 20.5 | 71.0 | 2,018 | 31.4 | 1,409 |
| Middle | 4.9 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 13.0 | 27.2 | 47.2 | 31.3 | 3.8 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 74.3 | 2,080 | 34.3 | 1,520 |
| Fourth | 4.7 | 4.5 | 2.0 | 11.9 | 29.4 | 49.3 | 32.1 | 3.4 | 20.1 | 25.0 | 75.4 | 2,062 | 37.3 | 1,537 |
| Highest (Richest) | 5.2 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 15.2 | 26.8 | 54.7 | 36.1 | 4.3 | 23.6 | 25.5 | 75.9 | 1,691 | 40.5 | 1,248 |
| Total | 4.6 | 4.5 | 2.3 | 11.7 | 28.5 | 47.6 | 31.6 | 3.6 | 19.9 | 22.2 | 73.0 | 9,805 | 34.2 | 7,029 |

Survey respondents who experienced a specific RH problem were asked if they consulted a doctor or a health professional for their problem. Of those who experienced any symptom of RH problems, more females ( $34.2 \%$ ) consulted a medical professional than did males (27.4\%). The older youth ( $20-24$ years old), the ever married, urban residents, and richer youth tend to engage the assistance of medical personnel more than their counterparts do. For both males and females, Central Luzon and ARMM posted the highest and the lowest proportions, respectively, of youth who sought medical attention for their RH problem. Interestingly, while health utilization among females from CAR is among the highest, the reverse is true for their male counterparts, suggesting the need to further encourage health-seeking behavior among male youth in CAR.

## STIs and HIV/AIDS

Addressing STIs is a major step in ensuring the RH of the youth. STIs are infections that are transmitted through sexual contact. According to the WHO (2015), there are more than 30 bacteria, viruses, and parasites that can be spread through person-to-person sexual contact. The most common diseases that these bacteria cause are chlamydia, gonorrhea, hepatitis, syphilis, human papilloma virus, and HIV.

Among the STIs, HIV/AIDS is one of the most serious public health concerns. HIV can be transmitted not only through sexual intercourse but also through mother-to-child transmission, blood transfusion, and intravenous drug use. HIV, however, cannot be transmitted through casual contact (e.g., kissing, shaking hands, or sharing food, clothing, or toilet seats), nor can it be spread by mosquitoes.

Unlike most parts of the world, the Philippines is one of the few countries with an accelerating increase of new HIV cases (UNAIDS, 2014). Once described as having a "low and slow" prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS, the number of HIV cases in the country is now rising at a "fast and furious" rate. In recent years, the Department
of Health has noted an alarming increase in the number of Filipinos infected with HIV. From 1984 to June 2015, there have been 26,456 diagnosed HIV/AIDS cases in the country, of which 22,032 or 83 percent were reported in the past five years (Department of Health, 2015). Young people aged 15-24 are considered a vulnerable sector for HIV/AIDS, as they account for more than a quarter of Filipinos living with HIV. This vulnerable population is predominantly male, with male-to-male sexual contact as the primary mode of transmission.

## Awareness of STIs and HIV/AIDS

To assess the Filipino youth's awareness of STIs and HIV/AIDS, the survey asked whether the respondents know about infections or diseases that are associated with sex or with having sex (STIs). Regardless of their response to this question, the respondents were also asked if they have heard of an illness called AIDS.

Results reveal a generally high level of awareness of AIDS among Filipino youth (83.3\%), with no notable variation by sex (Table 9.6). Interestingly, awareness of the more general STIs is considerably lower, with less than half (47.4\%) reporting knowing of STIs. Differentials in the awareness of STIs and AIDS are similar, with higher awareness found among the older cohort of youth, the urban residents, those with higher educational attainment, and those with higher socioeconomic status. Geographic differences also exhibit similar patterns, with NCR, Davao Region, and Central Luzon youth ranked the highest in terms of awareness of STIs and AIDS. The least aware of these diseases are the youth from ARMM, where only 43.8 percent have heard of AIDS and 15.8 percent are aware of STIs.

Respondents who have heard of AIDS were further asked if they think AIDS is curable. Additionally, they were asked a direct question: "What are the chances that a person like you will get AIDS?" Young Filipinos' knowledge of HIV/ AIDS is still shrouded in misinformation, as only 4 in 10 believe that AIDS is curable, with more males and older youth subscribing to this belief.

Table 9.6 Percent of youth who are aware and know STIs and HIV/AIDS by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Know STIs | Have heard of AIDS | No. of youth | Think that AIDS is curable | Think that there is no chance of them getting HIV | No. of youth who have heard of AIDS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 50.5 | 81.9 | 9,362 | 43.1 | 72.4 | 7,644 |
| Female | 44.5 | 84.7 | 9,807 | 36.6 | 80.3 | 8,240 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 43.3 | 79.8 | 11,414 | 38.5 | 76.4 | 9,061 |
| 20-24 | 53.5 | 88.5 | 7,753 | 41.3 | 76.7 | 6,825 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 47.9 | 82.7 | 14,672 | 39.1 | 76.0 | 12,082 |
| Ever married | 45.9 | 85.3 | 4,495 | 41.8 | 78.2 | 3,805 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 49.2 | 81.8 | 942 | 42.7 | 83.4 | 770 |
| Cagayan Valley | 41.2 | 76.6 | 671 | 44.8 | 79.5 | 502 |
| Central Luzon | 60.9 | 89.6 | 2,049 | 38.5 | 89.7 | 1,832 |
| CALABARZON | 44.1 | 86.7 | 2,545 | 42.7 | 74.6 | 2,199 |
| MIMAROPA | 49.6 | 85.9 | 562 | 47.8 | 85.7 | 482 |
| Bicol | 45.0 | 80.6 | 1,093 | 48.5 | 85.8 | 880 |
| Western Visayas | 43.5 | 79.4 | 1,487 | 35.6 | 71.5 | 1,161 |
| Central Visayas | 46.9 | 83.3 | 1,415 | 36.9 | 61.9 | 1,175 |
| Eastern Visayas | 36.6 | 73.0 | 829 | 40.6 | 76.9 | 597 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 30.4 | 80.1 | 728 | 39.8 | 71.8 | 581 |
| Northern Mindanao | 30.9 | 79.1 | 920 | 36.5 | 58.1 | 726 |
| Davao | 52.4 | 90.8 | 960 | 26.6 | 75.8 | 863 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 34.1 | 76.5 | 899 | 33.1 | 60.7 | 679 |
| CAR | 51.5 | 86.2 | 370 | 34.2 | 83.7 | 319 |
| ARMM | 15.8 | 43.8 | 672 | 35.8 | 70.7 | 290 |
| Caraga | 40.8 | 87.5 | 520 | 44.4 | 65.1 | 455 |
| NCR | 70.5 | 94.8 | 2,508 | 42.3 | 83.0 | 2,376 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 63.0 | 92.0 | 5,227 | 38.9 | 80.8 | 4,787 |
| Rural | 41.5 | 80.1 | 13,941 | 40.1 | 74.6 | 11,098 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 26.9 | 58.4 | 2,651 | 44.8 | 72.2 | 1,537 |
| High school undergraduate | 40.4 | 79.9 | 7,028 | 38.2 | 76.2 | 5,582 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 51.7 | 90.5 | 5,465 | 43.6 | 77.5 | 4,925 |
| College or higher | 67.4 | 95.9 | 4,023 | 34.9 | 77.3 | 3,844 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 28.1 | 68.8 | 3,838 | 38.0 | 71.8 | 2,627 |
| Second | 40.3 | 79.3 | 3,935 | 42.7 | 75.1 | 3,094 |
| Middle | 47.5 | 85.7 | 4,172 | 42.1 | 77.6 | 3,558 |
| Fourth | 58.9 | 90.9 | 4,003 | 38.4 | 78.5 | 3,629 |
| Highest (Richest) | 64.6 | 92.9 | 3,220 | 36.9 | 78.5 | 2,977 |
| Total | 47.4 | 83.3 | 19,167 | 39.7 | 76.5 | 15,887 |

In addition, about 8 in 10 think that there is no chance of them getting AIDS in the future, a manifestation of a general feeling of invincibility among the youth. While no age differential was found, there is a clear gender disparity, with more females (80.3\%) than males (72.4\%) thinking there is no chance of them getting infected with HIV.

Trends in the awareness and knowledge of HIV/ AIDS

One of the most worrisome findings in YAFS4 is the evidence of a decline in the awareness of HIV/AIDS (Figure 9.2). In 1994, 95 percent of the youth expressed awareness of HIV and AIDS. This remained largely the same in 2002. However, in 2013, the level dropped to only 83.3 percent. The decrease is steeper among males (from 94.5\% in 1994 to $81.9 \%$ in 2013) than among females (from 95\% in 1994 to 84.7\% in 2013). This declining trend is corroborated by the results of the series of National Demographic and Health Surveys, which documented a similar drop in the awareness of AIDS not only among the 15-24 age group but also among all women of reproductive age (15-49 years; National Statistics Office \& ORC Macro, 2004; Philippine Statistics Authority \& ICF International, 2014). If the declining level of HIV/AIDS awareness among our young people is a driving force behind the dramatic upsurge in HIV cases in the country, then this drop in awareness warrants a more indepth investigation.

## Knowledge of HIV/AIDS

One of the key indicators of the HIV/ AIDS response to Millennium Development Goal 6 (to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases) is the proportion of the population aged 15-24 with comprehensive knowledge of HIV. Comprehensive knowledge of HIV is defined as correctly identifying the two major ways of preventing the sexual transmission of HIV (i.e., using condoms and limiting sex to one faithful, uninfected partner), rejecting the two most common local misconceptions about HIV transmission, and knowing that a healthylooking person can be HIV positive (UNAIDS, 2009). In the YAFS4 survey, respondents were asked whether they agreed with each of the following five knowledge statements on HIV prevention and local misconceptions:

1. The risk of HIV transmission can be reduced by having sex with only one uninfected partner who has no other sexual partners.
2. A person can reduce the risk of getting infected with HIV by using a condom every time they have sex.
3. A healthy-looking person can have HIV.
4. A person can get HIV from mosquito bites.
5. A person can get HIV by sharing food with someone who is infected.
The last two statements were reverse coded to reflect the correct information. A person who agrees with all five statements is

Figure 9.2 Percent of youth who have heard of HIV/AIDS by sex: 1994, 2002, 2013

deemed to have comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS.

Table 9.7 shows the proportion with correct knowledge for each of the five statements and the proportion with comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS. Overall, only 16.8 percent of Filipino youth have comprehensive knowledge of HIV/ AIDS, a level far below the 95 percent target set at the 2001 United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV and AIDS (United Nations, 2001). The proportion with comprehensive knowledge is higher among males, the older cohort, the urban residents, the higher educated, and those of higher socioeconomic status. Across the regions, the highest proportions with comprehensive knowledge are the youth from CAR (24\%), NCR (22\%), and Central Luzon (20.9\%), while the regions with the lowest levels are ARMM (6.1\%) and Northern Mindanao (9.1\%).

A comparison of results across the five statements indicates that the proportion with correct knowledge is lowest for the statement "A person cannot get HIV by sharing food with someone who is infected" (41.8\%). On the other hand, the highest proportion at 68.2 percent was posted for the statement that the risk of HIV can be reduced by maintaining a monogamous sexual relationship. Also worth noting is that two in three Filipino youth correctly answered that mosquito bites cannot transmit HIV.

## Summary and conclusions

This chapter discussed several aspects of youth RH, such as milestones in pubertal development, experience of RH problems, and the awareness and knowledge of STIs including HIV/ AIDS. In terms of pubertal development, trends in mean age at circumcision, mean age at first nocturnal emission, and mean age at menarche have largely remained the same over the past two decades. When it comes to RH problems, there is a gender disparity in both experience and consultation with medical professionals. Compared with their male counterparts, a higher percentage of females have experienced
any RH problem (73\%) and have consulted a medical professional (34.2\%). But the most worrisome finding in YAFS4 is the decline in the level of awareness of HIV/AIDS among the youth, with a more significant decline among males than females. This issue is further exacerbated by a very low level of comprehensive knowledge, pegged at 16.8 percent. This level is dismally lower than the 95 percent target set by the United Nations (2001).

Given these findings, much is needed to address various reproductive concerns of the Filipino youth, from access to medical professionals to information and dissemination about sexual health. While the recently passed RH Law promises to improve adolescent RH and provide RH education for the youth, more concrete and strategic steps are needed to address youth access to information and RH services. Perhaps the most pressing issue that needs immediate programmatic response is increasing the youth's awareness and knowledge of HIV/AIDS. Given the existing societal stigma surrounding HIV/AIDS, a critical intervention is needed in various sectors. Among the youth, education has an important role in reaching comprehensive knowledge. Since the proportion of those with comprehensive knowledge is lower among females, the younger cohort, rural residents, the lower educated, and those of lower socioeconomic status, educational programs and information campaigns might be needed to reach these sectors of the youth population.

Table 9.7 Percent of youth who correctly reject local misconceptions about HIV/AIDS and percent with comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of youth who say that: |  |  |  |  | With comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | No. of youth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The risk of HIV transmission can be reduced by having sex with only one uninfected partner who has no other sexual partners | A person can reduce the risk of getting infected with HIV by using a condom everytime they have sex | A healthylooking person can have HIV | A person cannot get HIV from mosquito bites | A person cannot get HIV by sharing food with someone who is infected |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 68.3 | 62.8 | 60.1 | 61.8 | 40.0 | 17.7 | 9,315 |
| Female | 68.1 | 55.3 | 59.4 | 68.3 | 43.4 | 16.0 | 9,745 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 63.6 | 53.7 | 55.5 | 61.9 | 39.4 | 14.5 | 11,352 |
| 20-24 | 75.0 | 66.7 | 66.0 | 69.9 | 45.3 | 20.2 | 7,709 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 67.0 | 58.0 | 59.3 | 64.5 | 41.6 | 16.7 | 14,586 |
| Ever married | 72.1 | 62.1 | 61.3 | 67.3 | 42.1 | 17.3 | 4,474 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 64.2 | 53.5 | 56.3 | 64.8 | 45.8 | 18.3 | 935 |
| Cagayan Valley | 63.4 | 54.5 | 51.8 | 54.1 | 36.5 | 12.0 | 661 |
| Central Luzon | 81.9 | 71.6 | 67.1 | 72.8 | 42.9 | 20.9 | 2,040 |
| CALABARZON | 70.1 | 61.0 | 69.3 | 66.0 | 40.6 | 18.2 | 2,538 |
| MIMAROPA | 72.8 | 58.1 | 49.4 | 66.5 | 39.6 | 12.7 | 561 |
| Bicol | 67.7 | 58.4 | 43.6 | 66.2 | 38.9 | 13.7 | 1,092 |
| Western Visayas | 59.2 | 53.0 | 61.4 | 60.7 | 44.1 | 17.1 | 1,470 |
| Central Visayas | 64.0 | 55.2 | 60.5 | 71.1 | 42.6 | 16.6 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 59.3 | 52.3 | 56.5 | 51.6 | 33.6 | 12.9 | 827 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 67.6 | 63.9 | 59.3 | 52.7 | 39.2 | 14.8 | 724 |
| Northern Mindanao | 53.4 | 43.1 | 48.0 | 59.7 | 41.9 | 9.1 | 917 |
| Davao | 69.5 | 60.0 | 65.4 | 65.7 | 49.8 | 16.5 | 945 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 60.7 | 51.8 | 57.9 | 52.5 | 40.8 | 18.5 | 878 |
| CAR | 67.5 | 63.2 | 62.7 | 69.4 | 50.8 | 24.0 | 367 |
| ARMM | 34.6 | 26.2 | 27.4 | 28.4 | 21.9 | 6.1 | 674 |
| Caraga | 69.0 | 56.8 | 60.1 | 66.3 | 39.9 | 13.1 | 519 |
| NCR | 84.1 | 73.2 | 67.7 | 82.5 | 46.8 | 22.0 | 2,494 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 79.4 | 69.7 | 67.9 | 75.6 | 45.9 | 21.1 | 5,194 |
| Rural | 64.0 | 54.9 | 56.7 | 61.2 | 40.2 | 15.2 | 13,866 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 46.7 | 40.3 | 38.1 | 41.4 | 26.8 | 8.4 | 2,636 |
| High school undergraduate | 62.2 | 53.3 | 54.0 | 61.0 | 37.9 | 12.7 | 6,982 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 75.5 | 65.5 | 65.2 | 72.1 | 46.2 | 19.6 | 5,431 |
| College or higher | 82.9 | 72.3 | 76.7 | 78.4 | 52.4 | 25.7 | 4,006 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 53.2 | 45.2 | 46.4 | 49.7 | 33.7 | 11.1 | 3,818 |
| Second | 62.0 | 51.7 | 54.9 | 59.4 | 40.0 | 13.9 | 3,908 |
| Middle | 70.1 | 61.3 | 62.4 | 67.0 | 41.6 | 17.0 | 4,152 |
| Fourth | 76.5 | 67.3 | 65.7 | 73.9 | 45.3 | 19.0 | 3,983 |
| Highest (Richest) | 80.8 | 70.8 | 70.8 | 77.1 | 49.2 | 24.4 | 3,199 |
| Total | 68.2 | 59.0 | 59.8 | 65.1 | 41.8 | 16.8 | 19,060 |

Note: a Comprehensive knowledge means knowing that consistent use of condoms during sexual intercourse and having just one HIV-negative and faithful partner can reduce the chances of getting HIV, knowing that a healthy-looking person can have HIV, and rejecting the two most common local misconceptions about AIDS can reduce the chances of getting Hiv, knowing that a healthy-looking person can have Hiv, and rejecting the two mos mis mion and prevention, i.e., knowing that a person cannot get HIV from mosquito bites and a person cannot get HIV by sharing food with someone who is not transmiss
infected.
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# Knowledge and Sources of Information about Sex and Reproduction 

Maria Midea M. Kabamalan

The YAFS surveys gather information that can provide possible explanatory factors for the variations in sexual and non-sexual risk behaviors of the youth. In relation to the sexual behaviors and their outcomes, YAFS4 asked about the youth's level of knowledge about sex and reproduction and their self-perceived adequacy of knowledge about sex. It also asked about their sources of information on sex and their preferences as to whom to consult if they have questions at home and in school regarding sex.

## Perceived adequacy of knowledge about sex

To get a sense of their perceived adequacy of knowledge about sex, the respondents were asked a direct question: "Do you think you have enough knowledge aboutsex?" Only 27.4 percent of Filipino youth think they have enough knowledge about sex, with a higher proportion among males (30.9\%) than females (24.1\%) and among the older ( $41.9 \%$ and $33.2 \%$ for males and females, respectively) than the younger youth ( $24 \%$ and $17.4 \%$ for males and females, respectively; Table 10.1).

By region, NCR has the highest percentage of youth who think they have enough knowledge about sex ( $51.7 \%$ among males and $36.1 \%$ among females), while ARMM has the lowest (15.5\% among males and $12.7 \%$ among females). In most of the regions, more males than females think they have enough knowledge about sex. In particular, the proportion of males in NCR,

Central Visayas, Ilocos, and Bicol who think they have enough knowledge about sex is at least 14 percentage points higher than that of their female counterparts. In contrast, more females than males in Caraga, Cagayan Valley, and Eastern Visayas think they have enough knowledge about sex, with a difference of at least five percentage points. Not surprisingly, more youth from urban areas reported having enough knowledge about sex compared with those from rural areas.

In terms of educational background, results show an education gradient, with an increasing proportion who think they have adequate knowledge about sex as the education level rises. However, the percentage among the college educated who think they have adequate knowledge is not high (only $41.3 \%$ for males and $31.5 \%$ for females), indicating a general selfperception of inadequate knowledge among the youth regardless of education level. A similar gradient is found with regard to socioeconomic status (SES), with the proportion who think they have adequate knowledge increasing as SES improves. This pattern is more pronounced among males than females.

Comparing the percentage of youth who think they have enough knowledge about sex in the three YAFS surveys (1994, 2002, and 2013), Figure 9.1 shows that this percentage has not improved over the past 20 years, with the 2013 level the same as that in 1994. In all three rounds, more males thought they had enough knowledge about sex compared with the females.

Table 10.1 Percent distribution of youth who said they have enough knowledge about sex by background characteristics and by sex

| Background Characteristics | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent who said they have enough knowledge about sex | Number | Percent who said they have enough knowledge about sex | Number |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 24.0 | 5,748 | 17.4 | 5,630 |
| 20-24 | 41.9 | 3,582 | 33.2 | 4,142 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 29.7 | 471 | 15.6 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 24.0 | 339 | 29.4 | 321 |
| Central Luzon | 24.4 | 951 | 25.7 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 35.7 | 1,243 | 24.9 | 1,301 |
| MIMAROPA | 28.5 | 281 | 30.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 29.8 | 519 | 15.9 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 39.0 | 760 | 31.0 | 711 |
| Central Visayas | 34.4 | 739 | 19.1 | 671 |
| Eastern Visayas | 20.1 | 426 | 25.1 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 26.9 | 371 | 17.8 | 354 |
| Northern Mindanao | 19.4 | 446 | 18.6 | 471 |
| Davao | 23.1 | 445 | 16.3 | 513 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 18.8 | 436 | 19.0 | 457 |
| CAR | 32.2 | 171 | 21.7 | 197 |
| ARMM | 15.5 | 318 | 12.7 | 348 |
| Caraga | 17.4 | 265 | 23.8 | 255 |
| NCR | 51.7 | 1,150 | 36.1 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 40.7 | 2,395 | 31.5 | 2,822 |
| Rural | 27.5 | 6,935 | 21.1 | 6,950 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 23.5 | 1,719 | 16.1 | 916 |
| High school undergraduate | 26.6 | 3,522 | 16.7 | 3,482 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 35.2 | 2,406 | 29.3 | 3,041 |
| College or higher | 41.3 | 1,684 | 31.5 | 2,332 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 21.8 | 1,875 | 20.3 | 1,946 |
| Second | 24.0 | 1,909 | 19.4 | 2,004 |
| Middle | 31.3 | 2,086 | 22.5 | 2,077 |
| Fourth | 37.9 | 1,936 | 25.9 | 2,055 |
| Highest (Richest) | 41.3 | 1,522 | 33.9 | 1,690 |
| Total | 30.9 | 9,330 | 24.1 | 9,772 |

Figure 10.1 Trend in percentage of youth who said they have enough knowledge about sex: 1994, 2002 and 2013


## Knowledge about reproduction

To test for actual knowledge, the respondents were asked several questions. One set of questions, adapted from the National Demographic and Health Survey, tested their knowledge of the timing of conception. Respondents were also asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following series of statements about reproduction:

1. A girl can get pregnant before she experiences her first menstruation.
2. A woman can get pregnant from one unprotected sexual intercourse.
3. A girl can get pregnant if she engages in sexual intercourse any time during her menstrual cycle.
4. A woman cannot get pregnant if her partner did not ejaculate during sexual intercourse.
Results in Tables 10.2 and 10.3 show an overall poor level of knowledge about human reproduction among both males and females. Only 12 percent of males and 18.1 percent of females correctly identified the time during the menstrual cycle when a woman is most likely to conceive if she has sexual relations. Of the four statements above, only the second statement was correctly answered by a sizable majority (73.1\% of males and $78.3 \%$ of females). The percentages who gave a correct answer to the three remaining statements ( 1,3 , and 4 ) are all below 36 percent.

Comparing by age group, place of residence, education, and SES among males, the results in Table 10.2 indicate that, in general, a
slightly higher percentage of older youth, those residing in urban areas, the more educated, and those who come from richer households gave correct answers to the questions/statements on human reproduction. The ranking of the regions according to the percentage who gave the correct answers varies depending on the knowledge item considered. None of the regions consistently ranked lowest or highest for all or most of the knowledge items.

For females, the older youth and the more educated generally have a higher percentage of correct answers (Table 10.3). Unlike the male pattern, urban residents do not always outperform rural residents in the percentage of correct answers among females. The differential by SES does not follow a distinct pattern; those who belong to the higher SES groups do not necessarily know better. In contrast to the patterns found among males by region,

Table 10.2 Percent distribution of males by knowledge of when pregnancy is likely to occur by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent who correctly identified the time when a woman is most likely to get pregnant if she has sexual relations. | Percent who correctly answered that that a girl can get pregnant before she experiences her first menstruation. | Percent who correctly answered that a woman can get pregnant from one unprotected sexual intercourse. | Percent who correctly answered that a woman can get pregnant even if her partner did not ejaculate during sexual intercourse. | Number of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 11.6 | 26.9 | 69.9 | 35.3 | 5,730 |
| 20-24 | 12.8 | 31.8 | 78.1 | 36.1 | 3,567 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 12.1 | 22.5 | 57.3 | 32.8 | 471 |
| Cagayan Valley | 5.2 | 30.8 | 61.6 | 39.8 | 338 |
| Central Luzon | 13.6 | 45.2 | 78.7 | 30.9 | 945 |
| CALABARZON | 12.6 | 34.7 | 80.4 | 46.3 | 1,240 |
| MIMAROPA | 9.9 | 27.5 | 72.8 | 30.8 | 282 |
| Bicol | 16.3 | 31.7 | 64.4 | 27.5 | 515 |
| Western Visayas | 11.0 | 21.7 | 69.1 | 33.4 | 746 |
| Central Visayas | 19.1 | 17.4 | 66.7 | 41.9 | 740 |
| Eastern Visayas | 14.5 | 20.0 | 65.6 | 12.9 | 425 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 10.1 | 19.6 | 80.1 | 29.9 | 371 |
| Northern Mindanao | 12.8 | 24.7 | 75.7 | 37.5 | 447 |
| Davao | 8.7 | 28.3 | 77.0 | 38.2 | 444 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 8.5 | 20.9 | 73.0 | 47.9 | 436 |
| CAR | 7.3 | 22.8 | 63.4 | 36.8 | 170 |
| ARMM | 5.7 | 30.0 | 54.8 | 33.8 | 318 |
| Caraga | 7.8 | 27.0 | 73.2 | 44.6 | 265 |
| NCR | 12.3 | 33.9 | 85.7 | 32.3 | 1,144 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 14.2 | 33.6 | 80.7 | 35.4 | 2,385 |
| Rural | 11.3 | 27.2 | 70.5 | 35.7 | 6,913 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 9.5 | 25.6 | 63.4 | 34.0 | 1,713 |
| High school undergraduate | 12.1 | 27.8 | 70.1 | 35.2 | 3,516 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 12.0 | 29.3 | 77.3 | 37.0 | 2,386 |
| College or higher | 14.6 | 33.6 | 83.3 | 36.3 | 1,683 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 10.1 | 25.2 | 65.7 | 33.9 | 1,880 |
| Second | 11.1 | 25.4 | 68.3 | 37.0 | 1,911 |
| Middle | 12.9 | 28.2 | 72.4 | 37.5 | 2,089 |
| Fourth | 12.1 | 31.7 | 79.5 | 33.4 | 1,938 |
| Highest (Richest) | 14.5 | 34.7 | 80.8 | 36.3 | 1,525 |
| Total | 12.0 | 28.8 | 73.1 | 35.6 | 9,297 |

two regions-Central Luzon and CAR-are consistently in the top six, while Eastern Visayas is at the bottom of the list in three statements.

Altogether, these results show that Filipino youth are generally not knowledgeable about human reproduction. What is most surprising is that the percentage who gave correct answers to four of the five knowledge items is extremely low among the college educated. For instance, only 14.6 percent of college-educated males and
21.9 percent of college-educated females could correctly identify the time during the menstrual cycle when a woman is most likely to get pregnant if she has sexual relations.

## Sources of information about puberty

Given these levels of knowledge, one could ask, "What could be the youth's sources of information in matters pertaining to sexuality?"

Table 10.3 Percent distribution of females by knowledge of when pregnancy is likely to occur by background characteristics
$\left.\begin{array}{lllll} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Percent who correctly } \\ \text { identified the time } \\ \text { when a woman is most } \\ \text { Bikely to get pregnant } \\ \text { if she has sexual } \\ \text { relations. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Percent who agrees } \\ \text { that a girl can get } \\ \text { pregnant before she } \\ \text { experiences her first } \\ \text { menstruation. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Percent who agrees } \\ \text { that a woman can get } \\ \text { pregnant from one } \\ \text { unprotected sexual } \\ \text { intercourse. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Percent who agrees } \\ \text { that a woman can } \\ \text { get pregnant if her } \\ \text { partner did not } \\ \text { ejaculate during } \\ \text { sexual intercourse. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Number of cases }\end{array}\right]$

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Father | Mother | Brother/ Sister | Other relatives | Friends | Others | Total | No. of Males | None | Father | Mother | "Brother/ Sister" | Other relatives | Friends | Others | Total | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 27.3 | 17.5 | 23.7 | 4.1 | 4.8 | 17.2 | 5.6 | 100.0 | 5,727 | 7.1 | 1.5 | 70.5 | 6.6 | 8.2 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 5,615 |
| 20-24 | 30.2 | 17.5 | 20.0 | 4.9 | 4.4 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 | 3,568 | 9.2 | 1.4 | 72.4 | 4.7 | 7.4 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 4,145 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 50.3 | 12.5 | 9.1 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 13.4 | 10.0 | 100.0 | 471 | 7.9 | 1.5 | 68.8 | 6.6 | 9.0 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 29.4 | 23.7 | 24.0 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 12.2 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 337 | 9.6 | 1.9 | 73.6 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 322 |
| Central Luzon | 27.4 | 32.8 | 13.2 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 14.2 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 951 | 4.9 | 1.7 | 81.0 | 3.6 | 6.4 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 24.9 | 14.3 | 21.1 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 22.4 | 9.0 | 100.0 | 1,239 | 10.3 | 0.7 | 67.6 | 9.0 | 6.0 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 1,304 |
| MIMAROPA | 19.0 | 25.0 | 27.1 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 15.5 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 284 | 5.8 | 1.8 | 78.0 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 277 |
| Bicol | 17.4 | 16.1 | 31.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 21.1 | 4.8 | 100.0 | 522 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 72.8 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 570 |
| Western Visayas | 28.3 | 16.7 | 29.9 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 12.0 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 756 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 71.3 | 4.3 | 7.7 | 4.9 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 27.4 | 12.8 | 27.0 | 3.8 | 9.2 | 17.4 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 742 | 5.2 | 1.9 | 74.6 | 5.8 | 8.6 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 672 |
| Eastern Visayas | 30.8 | 13.6 | 23.8 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 17.9 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 425 | 15.5 | 1.5 | 60.5 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 5.8 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 400 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 48.5 | 14.9 | 12.5 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 369 | 14.7 | 0.6 | 67.7 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 22.6 | 11.0 | 37.0 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 18.8 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 446 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 76.1 | 4.9 | 7.4 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 472 |
| Davao | 29.5 | 8.6 | 34.2 | 3.4 | 8.8 | 14.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 444 | 13.6 | 1.4 | 68.9 | 4.2 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 501 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 31.9 | 16.2 | 18.1 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 16.2 | 10.2 | 100.0 | 432 | 8.2 | 1.8 | 75.2 | 3.8 | 8.2 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 452 |
| CAR | 44.4 | 15.2 | 8.2 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 15.8 | 9.4 | 100.0 | 171 | 6.1 | 1.5 | 70.4 | 9.7 | 6.6 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 196 |
| ARMM | 63.2 | 15.5 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 11.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 310 | 24.0 | 1.4 | 57.7 | 6.3 | 8.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 350 |
| Caraga | 19.0 | 16.0 | 30.8 | 2.7 | 6.5 | 20.9 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 263 | 5.1 | 1.6 | 74.0 | 6.7 | 7.1 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 254 |
| NCR | 15.0 | 20.6 | 20.7 | 8.7 | 4.9 | 24.3 | 5.8 | 100.0 | 1,136 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 69.4 | 5.4 | 11.4 | 4.7 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 1,348 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 21.4 | 19.3 | 21.5 | 6.6 | 4.3 | 20.7 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 2,376 | 4.9 | 1.7 | 71.9 | 5.6 | 8.8 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 2,811 |
| Rural | 30.8 | 16.8 | 22.6 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 16.4 | 5.1 | 100.0 | 6,921 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 71.1 | 5.9 | 7.4 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 6,949 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 37.1 | 18.1 | 21.2 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 13.3 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 1,713 | 18.7 | 1.3 | 62.0 | 4.9 | 9.0 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 919 |
| High school undergraduate | 28.6 | 16.6 | 22.9 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 17.5 | 5.8 | 100.0 | 3,515 | 7.6 | 1.7 | 69.5 | 6.8 | 8.3 | 3.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 3,480 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 25.4 | 18.1 | 20.9 | 4.8 | 6.2 | 18.7 | 6.0 | 100.0 | 2,397 | 7.8 | 1.4 | 72.7 | 5.9 | 7.6 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 3,040 |
| College or higher | 23.4 | 17.9 | 24.0 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 20.2 | 7.0 | 100.0 | 1,668 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 75.9 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 2,320 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 33.9 | 17.1 | 23.3 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 14.7 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 1,865 | 12.1 | 1.3 | 69.9 | 5.2 | 6.9 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 1,948 |
| Second | 37.5 | 16.0 | 22.5 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 17.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 1,904 | 9.7 | 1.2 | 71.3 | 5.8 | 7.1 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 2,009 |
| Middle | 27.1 | 16.3 | 22.6 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 19.6 | 5.4 | 100.0 | 2,082 | 7.0 | 1.3 | 72.9 | 5.9 | 8.0 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 2,066 |
| Fourth | 25.2 | 20.4 | 20.8 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 17.2 | 5.9 | 100.0 | 1,935 | 6.1 | 2.1 | 70.5 | 5.9 | 8.1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 2,055 |
| Highest (Richest) | 23.6 | 17.7 | 22.2 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 18.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 | 1,506 | 4.9 | 1.2 | 71.9 | 6.4 | 9.3 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 1,682 |
| Total | 28.4 | 17.5 | 22.3 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 17.5 | 5.3 | 100.0 | 9,295 | 8.0 | 1.5 | 71.3 | 5.8 | 7.8 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 9,760 |

There are several questions in YAFS4 designed to elicit information on the sources of information, including both persons and materials.

One question asked about the main person/s most helpful to the respondents in what they know about puberty. Table 10.4 shows that among males, 22.3 percent reported this person to be their mother, 17.5 percent cited their father, and another 17.5 percent mentioned their friends. However, almost 3 out of every 10 males said there is no particular person most helpful to them in what they know about puberty. Among females, about 7 in 10 reported this person to be their mother. Only 8 percent said that no particular person has been helpful to them.

Among male youth, the mother is more commonly mentioned by the younger youth, the college educated, and the rural residents. By region, mothers are mentioned by at least 25 percent of youth in MIMAROPA, Bicol, Western and Central Visayas, Northern Mindanao, Caraga, and Davao Region. Among female youth, the mother is more often mentioned by older youth and those with higher education. At least 75 percent of female youth in Central Luzon, MIMAROPA, CentralVisayas, Northern Mindanao, and SOCCSKSARGEN reported their mother as their source of information about puberty.

Differences in the characteristics of those who reported having no one who was most helpful to them in what they know about puberty

Figure 10.2a Percent distribution of male youth's top five persons most helpful to them on what they know about puberty: 2002 and 2013


Figure 10.2b Percent distribution of female youth's top five persons most helpful to them on what they know about puberty: Females 2002 and 2013

are also important to highlight if programs are to be designed for these youth. More of the older youth, the rural residents, and those with lower educational attainment among both males and females belong to this category. Across regions, male youth in ARMM, Ilocos, and Zamboanga Peninsula and female youth in ARMM, Eastern Visayas, and Zamboanga Peninsula have the highest proportion who said no one was helpful to them in what they know about puberty.

Compared with data from 2002 and focusing on the five most commonly mentioned persons, Figures 10.2 a and 10.2 b show that for both males and females, fewer youth in 2013 reported their parents, teachers, friends, and other relatives as the most helpful persons to them in what they know about puberty. The proportion who reported that no one was helpful to them rose alarmingly over the past decade.

Respondents were also asked what their most important sources of information about puberty were (see Table 10.5). What is most striking about the results presented in Table 10.5 is that 45.7 percent of males and 43.4 percent of females reported no sources of information about puberty in the form of materials. Of those who did mention material sources of information, books and television are the most common answers, with more females mmentioning books and more males mentioning television. By age, slightly more of the older youth reported having no material
sources compared with the younger youth. More of the older males mentioned television while more of the younger males mentioned books.

Across the regions, 78.1 percent of the males and 79.7 percent of the females in ARMM reported no material sources of information about puberty, the highest among the regions. Male youth in Central Luzon and Bicol and female youth from CAR and NCR have the lowest percentage (though still high at close to 30\%) who reported no source. Among males, books are most frequently mentioned by residents of Western Visayas (22.5\%) and Bicol (20.6\%), while television is most commonly mentioned in Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon, and Bicol (higher than 30\%). Among females, books are most popular among residents of Cagayan Valley and Bicol (both at 36.9\%) and Western Visayas (36.1\%), and television is most popular among those in Central Luzon (18.5\%), Caraga (17.5\%), and NCR (17.3\%). In CAR, 18.9 percent of males and 21 percent of females relied on school charts/ films; this source was also popular among Caraga males (19.8\%) and Zamboanga Peninsula females (20.4\%). Not surprisingly, males and females in NCR reported the highest percentages who relied on the Internet for information about puberty.

In terms of urban-rural differences, more youth in rural than urban areas reported no material source of information about puberty. Technology-based sources such as television and

Figure 10.3a. Percent distribution of male youth's top five material sources of information on puberty: 2002 and 2013


| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Books | Television | School charts/ <br> films | Internet | Magazines | Others | Total | No. of Males | None | Books | Television | $\begin{aligned} & \text { School } \\ & \text { charts/ } \\ & \text { films } \end{aligned}$ | Internet | Magazines | Others | Total | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 44.9 | 16.2 | 20.0 | 7.5 | 5.6 | 1.5 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 5,691 | 42.7 | 24.3 | 11.9 | 11.0 | 5.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 5,566 |
| 20-24 | 46.9 | 11.0 | 22.7 | 7.5 | 4.7 | 2.3 | 4.9 | 100.0 | 3,540 | 44.4 | 23.3 | 13.3 | 10.9 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 4,100 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 67.5 | 13.2 | 8.9 | 1.7 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 471 | 54.1 | 23.4 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 40.6 | 11.9 | 31.3 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 6.9 | 100.0 | 335 | 41.9 | 36.9 | 10.0 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 320 |
| Central Luzon | 28.8 | 13.5 | 32.5 | 10.3 | 6.9 | 2.1 | 5.9 | 100.0 | 933 | 38.0 | 15.6 | 18.5 | 18.4 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 1,090 |
| calabarzon | 43.5 | 16.1 | 25.8 | 6.7 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 1,232 | 48.4 | 23.1 | 10.3 | 10.8 | 4.1 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 1,301 |
| mimaropa | 36.9 | 19.9 | 25.2 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 282 | 35.4 | 31.4 | 15.5 | 9.7 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 277 |
| Bicol | 29.8 | 20.6 | 34.4 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 520 | 35.7 | 36.9 | 14.8 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 569 |
| Western Visayas | 42.8 | 22.5 | 17.4 | 8.2 | 1.1 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 746 | 42.3 | 36.1 | 10.3 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 679 |
| Central Visayas | 57.7 | 16.4 | 6.8 | 3.3 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 737 | 44.2 | 27.7 | 8.7 | 6.9 | 6.0 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 667 |
| Eastern Visayas | 44.2 | 14.0 | 26.6 | 6.4 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 421 | 41.1 | 28.5 | 14.1 | 9.6 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 5.0 | 100.0 | 397 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 58.5 | 13.3 | 11.7 | 10.8 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 369 | 30.6 | 28.6 | 10.5 | 20.4 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 353 |
| Northem Mindanao | 48.5 | 12.4 | 14.4 | 16.0 | 3.2 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 100.0 | 443 | 55.2 | 17.8 | 11.4 | 10.1 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 466 |
| Davao | 56.2 | 6.4 | 21.2 | 4.6 | 5.7 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 100.0 | 438 | 61.8 | 12.0 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 498 |
| soccsksargen | 56.6 | 15.0 | 15.5 | 7.6 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 433 | 49.7 | 23.9 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 439 |
| car | 47.9 | 13.6 | 5.3 | 18.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 8.3 | 100.0 | 169 | 25.6 | 34.9 | 7.7 | 21.0 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 5.1 | 100.0 | 195 |
| ARMM | 78.1 | 5.2 | 10.0 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 310 | 79.7 | 13.7 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 350 |
| Caraga | 39.9 | 10.3 | 21.7 | 19.8 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 100.0 | 263 | 39.4 | 22.3 | 17.5 | 12.0 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 251 |
| NCR | 36.9 | 9.8 | 23.9 | 8.4 | 15.7 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 1,130 | 29.8 | 18.6 | 17.3 | 16.4 | 14.4 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 1,351 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 38.4 | 12.8 | 23.2 | 8.5 | 11.1 | 1.9 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 2,354 | 34.5 | 20.4 | 15.7 | 14.9 | 9.5 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2,788 |
| Rural | 48.1 | 14.7 | 20.3 | 7.1 | 3.3 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 6,877 | 47.0 | 25.3 | 11.2 | 9.3 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 6,878 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 62.3 | 8.3 | 19.3 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 100.0 | 1,716 | 66.2 | 11.7 | 12.1 | 4.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 911 |
| High school undergraduate | 46.0 | 15.7 | 20.1 | 8.5 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 3,497 | 46.9 | 22.9 | 11.4 | 10.5 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 3,464 |
| High school graduat/Vocational | 41.9 | 13.1 | 24.1 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 5.4 | 100.0 | 2,369 | 43.7 | 23.1 | 14.0 | 11.5 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 3,001 |
| College or higher | 32.8 | 18.8 | 20.5 | 10.1 | 10.8 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 1,650 | 28.8 | 31.1 | 12.2 | 13.6 | 8.6 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 2,291 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 56.6 | 14.0 | 14.7 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 1,865 | 58.8 | 19.4 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 1,926 |
| Second | 48.3 | 12.8 | 21.9 | 6.0 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 6.0 | 100.0 | 1,889 | 47.4 | 24.3 | 12.5 | 9.0 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 1,987 |
| Middle | 42.8 | 14.7 | 23.2 | 9.1 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 2,068 | 41.6 | 26.6 | 13.2 | 10.6 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 2,044 |
| Fourth | 41.7 | 14.4 | 22.4 | 7.9 | 8.3 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 1,923 | 35.8 | 25.6 | 13.6 | 12.6 | 7.2 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 2,039 |
| Highest (Richest) | 37.7 | 15.4 | 23.1 | 7.7 | 10.6 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 1,488 | 32.4 | 23.3 | 15.6 | 13.9 | 9.7 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 1,668 |
| Total | 45.7 | 14.2 | 21.0 | 7.5 | 5.3 | 1.8 | 4.5 | 100.0 | 9,231 | 43.4 | 23.9 | 12.5 | 10.9 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 9,666 |

the Internet are reported by more youth in urban than rural areas. The patterns by education follow expectations that a higher percentage of less educated youth would report no sources compared with those with higher education; this is true for both males and females. Patterns by SES also indicate that higher percentages of youth from poorer families than youth from richer households reported having no sources of information.

A comparison of 2013 YAFS results with those from 2002 shows a shift in material sources (see Figures 10.3a and 10.3b). Mention of traditional media forms such as books and magazines, school charts or films, and television as sources of information declined from 2002 to 2013, while the percentage who cited the Internet as a material source of information increased sharply between the two periods.

## Sources of information about sex

The youth were also asked to mention all their material sources of information about sex. As shown in Table 10.6, the most commonly mentioned among male youth are television (22.3\%), the Internet (18.3\%), and books (12.5\%). The same sources were frequently mentioned by females but with a slightly different ranking: books (22.7\%), television (18.5\%), and the Internet (14.3\%). In 2013, more than 4 in 10 youth ( $40.4 \%$ of males and $42.8 \%$ of females) mentioned no material sources of information on sex.

By age, more of the older males (24.7\%) and females (20.3\%) than their younger counterparts ( $20.8 \%$ for males and $17.2 \%$ for females) mentioned television, while more of the younger youth mentioned books, partly because most $15-19$-year-olds are still in school. The Internet was reported by a higher percentage of younger females and older males. Similar to the patterns found earlier for sources of information about puberty, fewer youth from rural areas than urban areas reported the Internet as their source of information about sex. This is also validated by the higher percentages of youth from the more urbanized regions (NCR, CALABARZON, and Central Visayas) reporting the Internet as a source. Likewise, patterns found by education and SES reflect the association of access to the Internet for information about sex with higher education and higher SES.

The regions of NCR and ARMM again reveal a stark contrast with regard to sources of information about sex. In ARMM, 74.8 percent of males and 79.6 percent of females reported having no material sources of information on sex; in NCR, the corresponding percentages are 20 percent for males and 23.3 percent for females.

Trend data indicate that mention of the Internet as a source of information on sex has become more frequent over time, while mention of magazines declined from 1994 to 2013 (Figures 10.4a and 10.4b). There is no clear trend on the use of television, books, and school charts or films. A cause for concern is the steady

Figure 10.4a. Percent distribution of male youth's top five material sources of information about sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013

Table 10.6 Percent distribution of youth's (material) sources of information about sex by background characteristics and by sex

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Books | Television | School charts/ films | Internet | Magazines | Radio | Movies | Others | No. of Males | None | Books | Television | School charts/ films | Internet | Magazines | Radio | Movies | Others | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 41.0 | 13.2 | 20.8 | 5.2 | 17.7 | 5.5 | 2.7 | 6.0 | 10.2 | 5,744 | 42.9 | 23.7 | 17.2 | 6.7 | 14.9 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 7.5 | 5,622 |
| 20-24 | 39.6 | 11.3 | 24.7 | 3.2 | 19.3 | 6.8 | 3.2 | 6.6 | 11.8 | 3,587 | 42.8 | 21.4 | 20.3 | 4.5 | 13.5 | 8.2 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 10.5 | 4,143 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ilocos | 63.4 | 10.7 | 13.1 | 1.1 | 15.3 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 5.7 | 471 | 49.4 | 22.8 | 10.4 | 4.8 | 11.6 | 6.7 | . 6 | . 7 | 4.7 | 467 |
| Cagayan Valley | 38.9 | 12.8 | 31.5 | 2.9 | 7.4 | 10.9 | 2.3 | 17.2 | 9.1 | 342 | 43.4 | 32.4 | 16.5 | 1.6 | 8.5 | 6.7 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 9.5 | 323 |
| Central Luzon | 21.3 | 10.6 | 39.2 | 6.7 | 15.4 | 7.0 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 10.8 | 949 | 40.9 | 22.8 | 23.1 | 5.8 | 12.4 | 6.6 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 9.8 | 1,095 |
| CALABARZON | 35.7 | 13.0 | 21.0 | 2.5 | 23.8 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 11.6 | 11.7 | 1,237 | 46.3 | 19.2 | 12.9 | 5.3 | 13.9 | 8.7 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 8.3 | 1,294 |
| MIMAROPA | 33.5 | 14.8 | 28.7 | 3.4 | 14.2 | 10.7 | 1.8 | 8.9 | 13.0 | 282 | 35.5 | 25.8 | 21.0 | 4.5 | 9.7 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 10.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 24.7 | 17.8 | 40.3 | 1.7 | 14.3 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 9.7 | 11.7 | 516 | 34.9 | 30.7 | 30.8 | 3.2 | 11.2 | 8.7 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 9.3 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 46.8 | 14.7 | 19.6 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 8.5 | 5.3 | 3.0 | 11.2 | 761 | 45.3 | 29.7 | 16.7 | 2.9 | 8.4 | 10.2 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 8.6 | 716 |
| Central Visayas | 51.7 | 17.4 | 6.2 | 1.2 | 16.5 | 7.1 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 9.8 | 741 | 43.3 | 23.4 | 13.1 | 3.3 | 17.1 | 7.8 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 11.3 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 39.8 | 13.7 | 31.7 | 2.7 | 14.7 | 7.3 | 3.5 | 13.3 | 9.7 | 427 | 41.1 | 20.3 | 23.9 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 7.3 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 12.4 | 401 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 53.7 | 13.2 | 17.4 | 8.0 | 9.6 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 5.5 | 371 | 34.6 | 32.7 | 17.9 | 12.2 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 14.3 | 354 |
| Northern Mindanao | 48.9 | 6.9 | 22.2 | 11.8 | 11.6 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 447 | 56.7 | 11.8 | 15.0 | 2.9 | 9.0 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 7.4 | 470 |
| Davao | 54.1 | 5.5 | 21.3 | 2.6 | 19.2 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 10.0 | 10.9 | 444 | 62.8 | 15.8 | 13.9 | 6.5 | 9.2 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 7.4 | 510 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 58.0 | 13.7 | 16.2 | 6.1 | 7.4 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 6.3 | 440 | 53.5 | 22.8 | 15.0 | 9.2 | 5.2 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 7.8 | 456 |
| CAR | 49.5 | 14.2 | 13.1 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 7.0 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 11.3 | 172 | 25.5 | 32.7 | 17.8 | 15.6 | 12.5 | 10.4 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 23.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 74.8 | 6.8 | 10.5 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 5.6 | 315 | 79.6 | 10.0 | 5.2 | 1.2 | 4.3 | 1.2 | . 0 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 347 |
| Caraga | 39.0 | 8.3 | 26.0 | 12.3 | 12.0 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 8.8 | 265 | 35.8 | 27.4 | 23.6 | 4.6 | 8.2 | 6.3 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 9.3 | 255 |
| NCR | 20.0 | 12.6 | 18.0 | 4.3 | 49.2 | 6.7 | 2.9 | 5.2 | 18.6 | 1,150 | 23.3 | 20.8 | 26.6 | 8.6 | 37.0 | 6.9 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 6.2 | 1,356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 26.7 | 12.2 | 21.5 | 5.3 | 37.0 | 6.2 | 2.6 | 5.6 | 14.9 | 2,392 | 31.7 | 23.2 | 22.8 | 7.0 | 27.0 | 7.3 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 8.9 | 2,819 |
| Rural | 45.2 | 12.6 | 22.6 | 4.1 | 11.9 | 5.9 | 3.0 | 6.5 | 9.4 | 6,940 | 47.4 | 22.5 | 16.8 | 5.3 | 9.2 | 6.8 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 6,946 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 59.4 | 6.8 | 19.2 | 1.3 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 8.3 | 1,723 | 65.8 | 9.8 | 15.8 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 8.4 | 912 |
| High school undergraduate | 42.2 | 12.4 | 22.0 | 5.6 | 15.1 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 5.6 | 10.5 | 3,522 | 48.5 | 20.8 | 15.5 | 6.5 | 9.7 | 4.7 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 7.4 | 3,486 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 34.7 | 11.4 | 26.0 | 4.1 | 19.2 | 7.4 | 4.3 | 7.4 | 14.1 | 2,399 | 41.9 | 21.5 | 21.6 | 4.0 | 12.0 | 6.8 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 11.0 | 3,039 |
| College or higher | 25.7 | 19.9 | 20.9 | 5.7 | 38.3 | 9.3 | 2.0 | 7.2 | 9.3 | 1,687 | 26.5 | 32.2 | 20.1 | 8.7 | 28.8 | 12.4 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 8.0 | 2,327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 57.4 | 9.4 | 16.9 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 7.6 | 1,865 | 58.2 | 17.2 | 12.6 | 3.9 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 8.5 | 1,926 |
| Second | 45.8 | 11.8 | 24.9 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 7.2 | 11.2 | 1,889 | 47.2 | 23.0 | 18.8 | 4.9 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 10.4 | 1,987 |
| Middle | 38.0 | 14.0 | 23.9 | 4.4 | 17.3 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 10.9 | 2,068 | 44.4 | 21.6 | 19.1 | 6.2 | 11.5 | 5.6 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 8.9 | 2,044 |
| Fourth | 31.2 | 12.8 | 24.6 | 4.4 | 26.3 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 6.6 | 13.2 | 1,923 | 33.7 | 24.8 | 22.6 | 6.6 | 22.2 | 7.7 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 8.7 | 2,039 |
| Highest (Richest) | 27.8 | 14.8 | 20.8 | 5.0 | 39.1 | 7.9 | 1.8 | 6.6 | 10.9 | 1,488 | 29.3 | 27.3 | 19.3 | 7.5 | 27.5 | 10.9 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 6.9 | 1,668 |
| Total | 40.4 | 12.5 | 22.3 | 4.4 | 18.3 | 6.0 | 2.9 | 6.2 | 10.8 | 9,332 | 42.8 | 22.7 | 18.5 | 5.8 | 14.3 | 6.9 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 8.8 | 9,765 |

increase from 1994 to 2013 in the percentage of youth who said they had no material sources of information on sex.

## Persons to consult for questions on sex

When asked about the persons the youth would most likely consult for questions about sex, half of the males reported they would consult their friends, 15.2 percent said they would consult their father, and 11.1 percent said they would consult their mother (Table 10.7). Among females, 43.1 percent said they would consult their mother, and 25.9 percent said they would consult their friends. More of the 15-19-year-olds would consult their father or mother compared with the older youth. Almost a fourth (23.7\%) of the males and a fifth (19.6\%) of the females reported they would consult no one for questions about sex.

By region, the majority of male youth from CALABARZON (64.2\%) and NCR (59.3\%) reported they would consult their friends. In Central Luzon, 24.3 percent of the male youth said they would consult their father, while in Bicol, 20.6 percent of the male youth said they would consult their mother. Around 11 percent each from MIMAROPA, Northern Mindanao, and NCR said they would also consult health professionals. Among female youth, one eighth each from MIMAROPA and CALABARZON reported they would consult their father, 58.3 percent from Central Luzon said they would consult their mother, and 36.7 percent and 35.3

Figure 10.5a. Percent distribution of male youth's top five persons to consult for questions about sex: 2002 and 2013


| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Father | Mother Br | rother | Sister | Other relatives | Spouse/ <br> Partner/ BF/GF | Friends | Doctor/ Nurse/ Midwife | Others | No. of Males | None | Father | Mother B | Brother | Sister | Other relatives | Spouse/ <br> Partner/ BF/GF | Friends | Doctor/ Nurse/ Midwife | Others | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 23.1 | 17.0 | 12.6 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 49.5 | 6.9 | 4.5 | 5,761 | 19.2 | 8.3 | 48.4 | 1.2 | 9.0 | 7.2 | 3.4 | 25.7 | 7.7 | 5.0 | 5,627 |
| 20-24 | 24.5 | 12.2 | 8.6 | 5.4 | 0.8 | 3.6 | 5.1 | 50.9 | 9.5 | 2.7 | 3,593 | 20.1 | 3.7 | 35.9 | . 5 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 14.3 | 26.0 | 15.1 | 2.4 | 4,151 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 46.2 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 2.6 | 43.3 | 4.9 | 1.1 | 472 | 22.3 | 5.0 | 36.4 | 1.5 | 8.3 | 6.5 | 10.4 | 27.8 | 7.3 | 3.0 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 35.4 | 19.2 | 8.8 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 6.7 | 3.0 | 42.3 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 344 | 25.2 | 6.2 | 41.6 | . 8 | 4.1 | 6.2 | 8.9 | 22.2 | 10.2 | 3.4 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 19.5 | 24.3 | 9.4 | 5.3 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 2.6 | 47.2 | 9.1 | 2.2 | 953 | 17.8 | 3.4 | 58.3 | . 7 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 9.5 | 18.2 | 10.7 | 3.1 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 14.4 | 13.3 | 8.8 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 64.2 | 4.1 | 6.4 | 1,239 | 20.8 | 12.4 | 46.2 | 1.2 | 8.0 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 20.2 | 9.5 | 3.8 | 1,288 |
| MIMAROPA | 21.4 | 18.7 | 15.1 | 4.8 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 45.3 | 11.8 | 4.0 | 283 | 11.5 | 12.0 | 54.9 | 2.2 | 9.8 | 6.2 | 6.9 | 19.0 | 12.9 | 4.9 | 279 |
| Bicol | 14.0 | 17.8 | 20.6 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 48.6 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 520 | 11.9 | 9.1 | 53.0 | . 5 | 14.8 | 8.1 | 4.7 | 35.3 | 9.9 | 5.3 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 32.2 | 11.6 | 14.1 | 7.7 | 0.9 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 36.3 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 764 | 23.3 | 2.9 | 41.4 | . 7 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 25.7 | 5.6 | 2.5 | 716 |
| Central Visayas | 17.2 | 13.1 | 12.0 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 5.3 | 4.5 | 56.5 | 9.9 | 2.0 | 741 | 11.7 | 6.2 | 40.9 | . 0 | 5.6 | 6.5 | 10.5 | 31.9 | 13.7 | 4.1 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 23.9 | 15.4 | 13.2 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 54.4 | 8.8 | 3.7 | 427 | 23.9 | 5.7 | 28.7 | 1.5 | 7.9 | 6.7 | 11.5 | 28.2 | 11.3 | 3.9 | 401 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 33.2 | 9.4 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 51.1 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 372 | 25.3 | 4.3 | 41.1 | 1.0 | 8.7 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 23.0 | 11.9 | 4.5 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 17.4 | 12.4 | 16.0 | 5.4 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 45.8 | 10.8 | 1.9 | 447 | 23.5 | 4.4 | 37.0 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 20.2 | 14.6 | 4.0 | 473 |
| Davao | 30.9 | 8.7 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 1.7 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 54.7 | 8.6 | 4.6 | 445 | 29.5 | 5.0 | 31.5 | . 3 | 11.3 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 31.7 | 11.5 | 6.1 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 27.9 | 18.4 | 12.7 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 38.6 | 8.1 | 9.5 | 440 | 27.0 | 3.5 | 40.3 | 1.3 | 6.8 | 2.9 | 8.3 | 18.5 | 15.9 | 4.8 | 460 |
| CAR | 29.7 | 11.5 | 3.8 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 47.1 | 8.8 | 3.4 | 172 | 12.0 | 4.1 | 38.2 | . 2 | 12.3 | 6.0 | 10.8 | 32.2 | 20.3 | 4.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 58.5 | 12.4 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 23.5 | 9.5 | 2.2 | 320 | 53.2 | . 8 | 24.8 | . 4 | 10.0 | 1.2 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 347 |
| Caraga | 19.8 | 11.5 | 14.3 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 49.4 | 6.1 | 3.6 | 265 | 14.8 | 6.3 | 36.0 | 1.2 | 8.8 | 5.0 | 7.9 | 31.3 | 11.6 | 2.2 | 255 |
| NCR | 13.0 | 20.9 | 14.0 | 6.6 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 59.3 | 11.6 | 4.1 | 1,151 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 44.8 | 1.0 | 9.4 | 11.1 | 9.1 | 36.7 | 11.4 | 4.2 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 16.9 | 18.7 | 12.7 | 6.3 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 53.8 | 10.1 | 4.4 | 2,396 | 13.1 | 6.7 | 45.1 | 1.1 | 8.9 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 31.5 | 10.9 | 4.5 | 2,822 |
| Rural | 26.0 | 14.0 | 10.5 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 3.1 | 48.8 | 7.2 | 3.6 | 6,957 | 22.3 | 6.2 | 42.2 | . 8 | 8.2 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 23.6 | 10.8 | 3.6 | 6,956 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 32.6 | 14.2 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 40.9 | 5.4 | 1.1 | 1,726 | 32.3 | 2.2 | 34.2 | . 7 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 11.7 | 18.4 | 7.1 | 1.8 | 909 |
| High school undergraduate | 24.9 | 15.0 | 11.6 | 5.4 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 49.5 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 3,529 | 22.4 | 8.3 | 45.5 | . 9 | 8.4 | 6.0 | 5.7 | 20.6 | 8.3 | 4.2 | 3,492 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 19.5 | 16.5 | 10.9 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 54.0 | 9.2 | 3.3 | 2,411 | 17.6 | 5.4 | 41.9 | . 7 | 8.8 | 6.7 | 11.1 | 26.6 | 12.3 | 2.4 | 3,043 |
| College or higher | 17.9 | 14.8 | 11.4 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 55.0 | 12.6 | 6.3 | 1,687 | 13.2 | 6.2 | 44.5 | 1.3 | 8.8 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 35.7 | 14.4 | 6.2 | 2,334 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 30.6 | 13.5 | 10.2 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 43.4 | 6.4 | 2.6 | 1,884 | 30.2 | 3.7 | 36.5 | . 4 | 5.6 | 4.4 | 9.7 | 19.6 | 9.6 | 2.1 | 1,949 |
| Second | 25.8 | 15.0 | 13.0 | 4.6 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 48.1 | 7.4 | 3.3 | 1,913 | 21.2 | 6.7 | 43.0 | . 7 | 7.9 | 5.8 | 8.6 | 22.7 | 10.9 | 3.1 | 2,009 |
| Middle | 22.5 | 13.6 | 10.1 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 52.0 | 7.1 | 4.8 | 2,090 | 17.7 | 7.3 | 44.9 | . 8 | 9.2 | 5.4 | 8.1 | 25.1 | 11.0 | 5.0 | 2,075 |
| Fourth | 20.0 | 16.0 | 10.8 | 6.2 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 54.3 | 9.2 | 3.8 | 1,941 | 14.0 | 7.1 | 46.6 | 1.6 | 9.1 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 30.6 | 11.7 | 4.8 | 2,057 |
| Highest (Richest) | 18.7 | 18.5 | 11.4 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 52.6 | 9.9 | 4.5 | 1,526 | 14.7 | 6.9 | 44.3 | 1.3 | 10.4 | 7.6 | 5.6 | 32.1 | 10.9 | 4.5 | 1,689 |
| Total | 23.7 | 15.2 | 11.1 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 50.0 | 7.9 | 3.8 | 9,354 | 19.6 | 6.3 | 43.1 | . 9 | 8.4 | 6.3 | 8.0 | 25.9 | 10.9 | 3.9 | 9,778 |

Osias of the Commission on Population requested for the addition of one question on the youth's preferred sources of information on sex and reproduction. The question was as follows: "Ifyou had a choice, would you like to learn about sex and reproduction from ...?" A list of possible persons was given, to which the respondent could answer yes or no. From a programmatic standpoint, this will be useful information so that programs will be better targeted.

Table 10.8 shows that the youth most commonly preferred to learn about sex and reproduction from friends of the same sex ( $64.7 \%$ for males and 54.5\% for females). Half of the females and 33.8 percent of the males would like to learn from medical professionals. Parents still play a role, especially for females, half of whom said they would like to learn from their mother. For males, 29 percent would like to learn from their father, and 18.5 percent would like to learn from their mother. Again, there is a segment of youth who, given the choice, would still not want to learn about sex and reproduction from any person, consistently giving an answer of "no" to all the persons mentioned. They constitute about 20 percent of the youth, more of them from the rural areas, those with lower education, and those belonging to the poorer households.

By region, at least 70 percent of males from CALABARZON, Central Luzon, SOCCSKSARGEN, and NCR prefer to learn from their male friends. At least 55 percent of females from NCR, CAR, and Central Luzon prefer to learn from their mother. It is notable that 24 percent of the male youth from ARMM would like to learn about sex
and reproduction from their imam or religious leaders. Among the regions, ARMM youth have the highest percentage who prefer none of the given choices as sources of information on sex and reproduction (36.2\% for males and 49.3\% for females).

## Discussion of sex at home

It is often argued in the Philippine context that knowledge and values about sex should begin to be inculcated in the home for the youth to get proper guidance from their parents. Data in Table 10.9 show that despite such pronouncements, only 10 percent reported that sex was ever discussed at home while they were growing up; the proportion was higher among older youth, urban residents, the more educated, and those from richer households. Across the regions, the highest proportion who discussed sex at home while growing up is in the NCR (20\% among males and $16 \%$ among females), while the lowest is in ARMM (3.1\% among males and 6.3\% among females).

Trend data in Figure 10.6 show that the proportion of youth who ever discussed sex at home while growing up has declined in the last 10 years, with the percentage for males and females converging at 10 percent in 2013.

## Persons to help with sex-related problems in school

The youth who were still in school at the time of the survey were asked if there was

Figure 10.6 Percent of youth who ever discussed sex at home by sex: 1994, 2002 \& 2013



|  | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Background characteristics | Father Mother Brother |  |  | Sister | Friends of same sex | Friends of opposite sex | School teachers | Imam/ Religious leaders | Medical professionals | None | No. of Males | Father | Mother Brother |  | Sister | Friends of same sex | Friends of opposite sex | School teachers | Imam/ Religious leaders | Medical professionals | None | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 28.5 | 18.2 | 19.8 | 6.6 | 63.2 | 20.0 | 17.9 | 7.8 | 31.1 | 23.1 | 5,741 | 14.0 | 50.1 | 8.5 | 32.4 | 51.7 | 12.6 | 30.6 | 16.2 | 47.8 | 25.5 | 5,629 |
| 20-24 | 30.0 | 19.0 | 24.8 | 8.7 | 67.0 | 26.4 | 20.8 | 9.7 | 38.2 | 21.4 | 3,584 | 12.4 | 49.5 | 8.2 | 36.0 | 58.3 | 15.1 | 28.6 | 15.6 | 55.6 | 20.4 | 4,144 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 10.8 | 5.7 | 10.3 | 1.8 | 50.7 | 11.9 | 6.1 | 1.3 | 17.3 | 42.4 | 471 | 7.7 | 39.6 | 6.3 | 22.4 | 46.5 | 9.6 | 18.0 | 8.2 | 42.2 | 29.4 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 22.4 | 9.0 | 15.6 | 2.1 | 55.0 | 10.3 | 13.1 | 6.8 | 16.7 | 31.7 | 344 | 14.3 | 44.7 | 6.8 | 21.2 | 41.6 | 8.7 | 20.5 | 10.0 | 37.1 | 34.3 | 324 |
| Central Luzon | 41.3 | 17.3 | 25.2 | 6.0 | 71.9 | 13.2 | 18.5 | 3.1 | 26.0 | 14.4 | 953 | 11.6 | 68.2 | 6.0 | 38.6 | 54.3 | 7.4 | 28.6 | 13.2 | 50.4 | 14.2 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 24.8 | 14.2 | 17.2 | 5.9 | 74.7 | 28.1 | 20.1 | 7.7 | 27.9 | 17.8 | 1,222 | 17.0 | 53.5 | 9.5 | 39.4 | 54.2 | 13.3 | 36.8 | 18.7 | 63.1 | 22.6 | 1,297 |
| MIMAROPA | 37.3 | 25.7 | 29.3 | 12.4 | 54.2 | 22.6 | 21.2 | 13.0 | 41.9 | 30.7 | 283 | 19.7 | 54.1 | 15.0 | 38.9 | 48.8 | 14.6 | 33.4 | 21.0 | 55.0 | 27.1 | 279 |
| Bicol | 36.6 | 27.0 | 31.6 | 8.9 | 68.6 | 24.0 | 24.4 | 11.9 | 54.9 | 14.0 | 519 | 19.4 | 53.0 | 14.2 | 42.5 | 63.9 | 16.6 | 36.0 | 21.5 | 56.9 | 17.3 | 571 |
| Western Visayas | 29.2 | 22.6 | 22.8 | 7.6 | 61.5 | 15.7 | 13.9 | 5.8 | 28.5 | 23.0 | 761 | 10.4 | 45.4 | 8.1 | 30.8 | 53.7 | 13.9 | 26.3 | 8.9 | 43.7 | 27.6 | 717 |
| Central Visayas | 26.0 | 20.2 | 20.7 | 9.9 | 63.1 | 23.1 | 11.5 | 5.5 | 36.5 | 19.7 | 736 | 14.4 | 51.8 | 6.7 | 30.6 | 51.8 | 13.3 | 28.6 | 14.0 | 56.3 | 24.8 | 671 |
| Eastern Visayas | 20.8 | 14.3 | 18.1 | 7.0 | 59.7 | 26.7 | 13.3 | 5.6 | 29.5 | 28.2 | 427 | 12.8 | 38.9 | 6.7 | 30.1 | 59.7 | 11.2 | 23.1 | 10.9 | 43.8 | 24.5 | 401 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 21.5 | 9.2 | 17.9 | 3.9 | 66.4 | 17.0 | 14.9 | 6.1 | 30.6 | 21.5 | 372 | 8.1 | 34.9 | 4.8 | 27.1 | 39.8 | 9.8 | 24.0 | 5.9 | 42.0 | 41.5 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 30.3 | 23.4 | 18.8 | 9.9 | 53.4 | 23.9 | 18.2 | 7.2 | 33.6 | 28.3 | 447 | 13.6 | 41.9 | 9.2 | 24.1 | 36.4 | 9.9 | 23.5 | 15.5 | 36.2 | 34.7 | 472 |
| Davao | 20.1 | 14.7 | 20.2 | 9.0 | 65.4 | 27.9 | 21.0 | 11.1 | 44.1 | 24.8 | 445 | 9.2 | 45.1 | 4.9 | 31.5 | 60.0 | 14.4 | 24.7 | 14.3 | 44.8 | 22.6 | 510 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 36.1 | 26.1 | 23.1 | 7.5 | 70.5 | 26.0 | 25.7 | 11.6 | 35.3 | 18.3 | 440 | 9.2 | 45.2 | 6.8 | 24.0 | 36.5 | 7.9 | 13.3 | 8.5 | 34.9 | 32.6 | 459 |
| CAR | 20.1 | 12.8 | 23.3 | 5.7 | 66.2 | 19.2 | 19.5 | 9.5 | 36.3 | 22.5 | 171 | 9.1 | 56.7 | 7.7 | 45.2 | 68.2 | 14.6 | 30.2 | 15.8 | 58.0 | 14.2 | 196 |
| ARMM | 20.3 | 3.8 | 20.2 | 1.2 | 38.3 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 24.0 | 24.6 | 36.2 | 321 | 1.0 | 28.5 | 1.2 | 25.2 | 24.3 | 2.4 | 7.1 | 1.3 | 21.7 | 49.3 | 347 |
| Caraga | 24.4 | 22.0 | 25.4 | 13.6 | 67.8 | 32.9 | 16.6 | 11.3 | 26.7 | 23.4 | 264 | 11.9 | 40.6 | 5.2 | 32.2 | 57.5 | 11.1 | 23.1 | 11.9 | 40.6 | 22.3 | 254 |
| NCR | 40.0 | 28.3 | 27.0 | 10.6 | 70.0 | 34.9 | 35.6 | 13.6 | 51.0 | 18.7 | 1,149 | 18.4 | 55.0 | 12.9 | 42.0 | 77.7 | 28.1 | 49.5 | 32.9 | 70.8 | 8.6 | 1,356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 36.6 | 24.3 | 25.9 | 9.6 | 69.4 | 30.4 | 29.9 | 12.2 | 44.8 | 18.6 | 2,392 | 15.6 | 53.5 | 9.8 | 36.6 | 66.3 | 20.4 | 40.5 | 24.7 | 61.1 | 15.1 | 2,821 |
| Rural | 26.4 | 16.5 | 20.3 | 6.7 | 63.0 | 19.7 | 15.3 | 7.3 | 30.1 | 23.7 | 6,932 | 12.4 | 48.4 | 7.8 | 32.9 | 49.8 | 10.9 | 25.4 | 12.4 | 47.1 | 26.7 | 6,952 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 24.8 | 14.9 | 22.9 | 6.6 | 57.4 | 14.4 | 8.6 | 6.0 | 20.0 | 31.8 | 1,725 | 7.6 | 37.0 | 5.7 | 25.4 | 36.0 | 6.0 | 13.4 | 5.9 | 28.1 | 39.9 | 916 |
| High school undergraduate | 27.4 | 18.4 | 20.4 | 6.8 | 60.8 | 19.5 | 16.9 | 7.0 | 30.2 | 25.0 | 3,517 | 13.2 | 46.5 | 8.5 | 31.6 | 47.3 | 11.6 | 26.2 | 13.8 | 43.7 | 29.1 | 3,487 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 29.3 | 17.7 | 23.7 | 8.3 | 70.7 | 24.2 | 19.6 | 8.2 | 35.7 | 18.0 | 2,398 | 13.5 | 53.2 | 9.1 | 37.8 | 57.5 | 13.2 | 29.3 | 15.1 | 56.0 | 19.4 | 3,041 |
| College or higher | 36.6 | 23.7 | 20.8 | 8.2 | 71.7 | 34.4 | 33.2 | 14.9 | 52.9 | 13.9 | 1,684 | 15.5 | 55.6 | 8.2 | 35.6 | 68.6 | 20.3 | 42.2 | 24.3 | 65.0 | 13.5 | 2,328 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 23.5 | 15.3 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 57.8 | 14.1 | 10.9 | 6.8 | 24.7 | 28.3 | 1,889 | 8.3 | 41.2 | 5.9 | 26.6 | 40.2 | 7.1 | 17.0 | 7.5 | 36.3 | 35.7 | 1,954 |
| Second | 27.6 | 18.5 | 21.5 | 8.3 | 63.8 | 21.3 | 14.7 | 7.6 | 29.1 | 23.3 | 1,916 | 12.1 | 48.6 | 7.5 | 32.1 | 49.2 | 9.3 | 22.9 | 11.5 | 44.0 | 26.9 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 27.1 | 16.0 | 20.4 | 6.6 | 63.1 | 18.6 | 17.0 | 6.7 | 33.3 | 24.6 | 2,091 | 13.0 | 50.1 | 7.3 | 35.4 | 54.4 | 13.0 | 30.2 | 16.4 | 53.6 | 21.5 | 2,081 |
| Fourth | 32.2 | 21.6 | 25.9 | 8.1 | 69.5 | 27.8 | 25.9 | 9.9 | 39.2 | 18.5 | 1,942 | 15.8 | 52.2 | 10.5 | 35.1 | 61.8 | 17.5 | 37.3 | 20.7 | 59.0 | 18.9 | 2,061 |
| Highest (Richest) | 36.5 | 22.1 | 23.3 | 8.3 | 70.3 | 32.6 | 28.3 | 12.7 | 45.0 | 16.0 | 1,527 | 17.9 | 58.2 | 11.0 | 41.3 | 68.7 | 22.5 | 43.0 | 24.8 | 64.1 | 12.7 | 1,692 |
| Total | 29.0 | 18.5 | 21.7 | 7.4 | 64.7 | 22.5 | 19.0 | 8.5 | 33.8 | 22.4 | 9,365 | 13.3 | 49.9 | 8.4 | 33.9 | 54.5 | 13.7 | 29.8 | 16.0 | 51.1 | 23.4 | 9,809 |

anybody in their school who could help them with a sex-related problem in case they were confronted with one. Half of them answered in the affirmative (44.1\% among males and 58.8\% among females; Table 10.10). Asked to identify who these persons are, 75.4 percent of the males and 72.5 percent of the females reported that the person would be a classmate/friend (Table 9.10). Other persons mentioned were teachers (57.4\%

Table 10.9 Percent of youth who ever discussed 'sex' at home by background characteristics and by sex

| Background Characteristics | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent of youth who ever discussed 'sex' at home | Number | Percent of youth who ever discussed 'sex' at home | Number |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 8.7 | 5,745 | 9.0 | 5617 |
| 20-24 | 10.9 | 3,584 | 11.2 | 4143 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 4.7 | 470 | 6.9 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 5.8 | 342 | 9.5 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 8.6 | 952 | 9.5 | 1,094 |
| CALABARZON | 12.9 | 1,237 | 10.0 | 1,298 |
| MIMAROPA | 13.8 | 283 | 11.5 | 279 |
| Bicol | 9.8 | 520 | 10.5 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 7.5 | 748 | 8.2 | 709 |
| Central Visayas | 7.2 | 741 | 10.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 6.6 | 427 | 8.5 | 390 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 7.5 | 371 | 5.9 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 5.1 | 447 | 8.5 | 472 |
| Davao | 4.0 | 445 | 6.6 | 513 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 8.2 | 438 | 5.5 | 458 |
| CAR | 5.8 | 171 | 16.2 | 197 |
| ARMM | 3.1 | 320 | 6.3 | 348 |
| Caraga | 9.4 | 265 | 12.2 | 255 |
| NCR | 20.0 | 1,151 | 16.0 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 16.5 | 2,395 | 13.5 | 2,823 |
| Rural | 7.1 | 6,933 | 8.5 | 6,936 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 6.2 | 1,719 | 7.6 | 912 |
| High school undergraduate | 8.0 | 3,515 | 7.5 | 3,483 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 10.2 | 2,411 | 9.5 | 3,031 |
| College or higher | 15.2 | 1,685 | 15.1 | 2,332 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 5.7 | 1,879 | 7.6 | 1,940 |
| Second | 7.6 | 1,903 | 6.0 | 2,009 |
| Middle | 7.5 | 2,088 | 10.0 | 2,067 |
| Fourth | 11.5 | 1,938 | 12.1 | 2,054 |
| Highest (Richest) | 17.0 | 1,522 | 14.5 | 1,692 |
| Total | 9.6 | 9,329 | 9.9 | 9,760 |

among males and 70.4\% among females) and guidance counselors (36.3\% for males and 43.2\% for females). One third reported that the person would be the school doctor or nurse (33.3\% for males and $35.5 \%$ for females).

Since only half of those still in school reported that they have someone in school who can help them with problems about sex, it should therefore be emphasized that the other half reported that no one in their school can help them with a sex-related problem should they ever face one (Table 10.11). Also worth noting is that this percentage is higher among the 15-19-year-olds, the rural residents, those with lower educational attainment, and the poorer youth. Special mention should also be made of ARMM, since the majority ( $93.1 \%$ of males and $83.6 \%$ of females) are in this category.

Figure 10.7 shows the trend from 1994 to 2013 in the percentage who reported that there is someone in school who can help them with a sex-related problem. In general, the percentage has been on a steady decline, from 67 percent in 1994 to 52 percent in 2013.

Figure 10.7 Percentage of youth in school who said there is somebody in school who can help with a sex-related problem: 1994, 2002 \& 2013
 1994

Table 10.10 Percent distribution of youth in school by persons in school who can help them for problems about sex by background characteristics and by sex

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Classmate/ Friend | Teacher/ Professor/ Adviser | Guidance Counselor | School Doctor/ Nurse | Others | No. of Males | Classmate/ Friend | Teacher/ Professor/ Adviser | Guidance Counselor | School Doctor/ Nurse | Others | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 76.3 | 58.1 | 36.5 | 33.8 | 5.1 | 1,267 | 73.4 | 70.5 | 42.9 | 35.3 | 8.3 | 1,866 |
| 20-24 | 70.1 | 53.5 | 34.7 | 30.7 | 3.9 | 216 | 64.1 | 69.8 | 46.4 | 37.9 | 1.4 | 216 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ilocos | 80.7 | 62.5 | 34.6 | 35.4 | 7.4 | 49 | 73.5 | 65.6 | 34.1 | 36.6 | 7.3 | 115 |
| Cagayan Valley | 81.2 | 68.7 | 55.4 | 54.7 | 5.8 | 37 | 61.8 | 40.6 | 15.5 | 7.9 | . 0 | 54 |
| Central Luzon | 65.8 | 34.1 | 26.9 | 24.3 | 1.0 | 110 | 67.0 | 75.3 | 42.4 | 32.8 | . 0 | 155 |
| CALABARZON | 87.8 | 68.6 | 57.1 | 55.0 | 18.3 | 156 | 80.6 | 81.5 | 62.7 | 50.2 | 31.1 | 341 |
| MIMAROPA | 91.4 | 82.2 | 73.1 | 67.3 | 7.7 | 57 | 82.3 | 82.8 | 61.7 | 56.7 | 9.4 | 75 |
| Bicol | 75.4 | 53.2 | 28.0 | 26.2 | . 9 | 126 | 77.2 | 66.2 | 18.6 | 17.4 | 1.9 | 144 |
| Western Visayas | 63.7 | 71.1 | 61.6 | 45.1 | 16.5 | 105 | 72.0 | 83.7 | 55.7 | 44.5 | 13.5 | 115 |
| Central Visayas | 63.2 | 40.4 | 12.6 | 3.0 | . 0 | 101 | 63.8 | 53.4 | 11.1 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 183 |
| Eastern Visayas | 56.5 | 36.3 | 9.1 | 6.3 | 1.4 | 65 | 60.5 | 59.4 | 12.2 | 11.6 | . 5 | 83 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 88.2 | 59.0 | 46.3 | 45.2 | 3.5 | 60 | 64.2 | 80.7 | 52.3 | 49.6 | 1.6 | 54 |
| Northern Mindanao | 59.7 | 52.9 | 29.8 | 16.1 | 1.6 | 82 | 47.8 | 47.6 | 41.4 | 15.7 | . 0 | 101 |
| Davao | 82.9 | 63.3 | 41.0 | 48.1 | 2.0 | 59 | 71.9 | 66.9 | 46.3 | 41.0 | 3.3 | 68 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 68.1 | 61.0 | 27.9 | 28.9 | 1.4 | 89 | 85.6 | 82.3 | 78.1 | 65.3 | 8.7 | 69 |
| CAR | 85.5 | 63.3 | 43.8 | 50.4 | . 4 | 33 | 81.5 | 72.4 | 63.3 | 58.2 | 2.7 | 53 |
| ARMM | 89.0 | 55.6 | 55.6 | 66.6 | 13.9 | 5 | 77.6 | 60.6 | 41.9 | 44.0 | 8.0 | 17 |
| Caraga | 55.0 | 67.1 | 28.1 | 27.0 | 4.8 | 39 | 62.7 | 62.7 | 25.3 | 18.4 | 1.1 | 50 |
| NCR | 83.3 | 57.3 | 29.7 | 30.1 | 1.8 | 311 | 76.6 | 74.0 | 48.6 | 42.8 | . 9 | 407 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 80.0 | 57.5 | 34.3 | 33.8 | 3.3 | 512 | 74.3 | 73.4 | 48.9 | 41.4 | 5.1 | 734 |
| Rural | 72.9 | 57.4 | 37.3 | 33.1 | 5.8 | 971 | 71.4 | 68.8 | 40.2 | 32.4 | 8.9 | 1,348 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 75.7 | 55.9 | 25.9 | 27.0 | 2.3 | 62 | 58.0 | 68.7 | 19.7 | 19.0 | 2.0 | 39 |
| High school | 74.0 | 59.5 | 32.9 | 32.0 | 5.0 | 850 | 71.6 | 70.3 | 40.0 | 32.7 | 8.8 | 1,180 |
| College or higher level | 77.1 | 53.0 | 42.9 | 35.2 | 5.1 | 493 | 74.6 | 70.1 | 50.1 | 40.8 | 6.3 | 793 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 69.8 | 58.5 | 36.8 | 33.9 | 4.1 | 187 | 70.4 | 62.1 | 37.3 | 29.3 | 7.5 | 260 |
| Second | 68.0 | 59.9 | 36.3 | 30.6 | 3.2 | 244 | 73.0 | 63.1 | 38.3 | 28.9 | 7.0 | 379 |
| Middle | 80.8 | 58.4 | 33.0 | 30.9 | 4.2 | 282 | 75.9 | 70.6 | 40.5 | 34.6 | 6.2 | 432 |
| Fourth | 77.5 | 52.1 | 32.2 | 29.5 | 6.5 | 396 | 72.5 | 78.1 | 47.9 | 40.2 | 8.5 | 512 |
| Highest (Richest) | 76.6 | 60.2 | 42.8 | 40.7 | 5.3 | 374 | 70.1 | 72.3 | 47.7 | 39.8 | 8.2 | 499 |
| Total | 75.4 | 57.4 | 36.3 | 33.3 | 4.9 | 1,483 | 72.5 | 70.4 | 43.2 | 35.5 | 7.6 | 2,083 |

## Summary and conclusions

As admitted by the youth themselves, only a small percentage have enough knowledge about sex. Actual knowledge about sex is very poor overall, as measured by the extremely low percentages who correctly identified the time during the menstrual cycle when a woman is most likely to conceive if she has sexual relations. Sadly, having higher education does not necessarily translate to being knowledgeable

Table 10.11 Percent distribution of youth in school who reported there is no one in school who can help with matters related to sex, by sex

| Background Characteristics | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | No. of Males | Percent | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 56.2 | 2,896 | 41.1 | 3,171 |
| 20-24 | 53.9 | 467 | 41.4 | 371 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 71.0 | 167 | 41.4 | 196 |
| Cagayan Valley | 69.3 | 120 | 54.7 | 118 |
| Central Luzon | 48.3 | 213 | 31.9 | 228 |
| CALABARZON | 63.2 | 424 | 32.5 | 504 |
| MIMAROPA | 47.5 | 109 | 31.5 | 109 |
| Bicol | 37.7 | 203 | 36.6 | 227 |
| Western Visayas | 62.8 | 282 | 53.6 | 250 |
| Central Visayas | 62.1 | 266 | 35.9 | 286 |
| Eastern Visayas | 58.5 | 156 | 38.8 | 135 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 55.1 | 134 | 59.2 | 132 |
| Northern Mindanao | 51.9 | 170 | 46.3 | 187 |
| Davao | 62.9 | 159 | 61.5 | 177 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 58.5 | 214 | 63.8 | 190 |
| CAR | 40.9 | 56 | 18.9 | 65 |
| ARMM | 93.1 | 69 | 83.6 | 107 |
| Caraga | 61.5 | 100 | 52.0 | 105 |
| NCR | 40.2 | 521 | 22.5 | 525 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 47.9 | 984 | 32.1 | 1,081 |
| Rural | 59.2 | 2,379 | 45.2 | 2,461 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 68.1 | 194 | 64.1 | 110 |
| High school | 58.4 | 2,229 | 44.7 | 2,261 |
| College or higher | 47.5 | 940 | 32.1 | 1,171 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 64.6 | 529 | 55.4 | 583 |
| Second | 58.6 | 589 | 44.4 | 684 |
| Middle | 61.7 | 736 | 40.4 | 725 |
| Fourth | 48.1 | 763 | 36.8 | 810 |
| Highest (Richest) | 49.9 | 746 | 32.5 | 740 |
| Total | 55.9 | 3,363 | 41.2 | 3,542 |

about human reproduction. This brings to the fore the importance of learning about the youth's sources of information about human reproduction.

The sources of information of the youth in 2013 are mainly their parents (usually fathers for males and mothers for females), their friends (of the same sex), and some professionals in their current environment, namely teachers (among those still in school) and medical professionals. For material sources, the Internet has become a popular source, whereas print materials (e.g., books and magazines), presumably because they can also be read from the Internet, have become less popular sources. The trend in terms of television as a source of information is unclear but remains important.

What is alarming, however, is the high percentage of youth who reported having no material sources of information about human reproduction, especially among the males, the older youth, the rural residents, the poorer youth, and those with lower educational attainment. Patterns by region are difficult to summarize, but what is clear is that NCR and ARMM represent the two contrasting poles.

The increasing absence of material sources is accompanied by increasing reports of having no one to consult for information on puberty, sex, and reproduction. The high percentage of youth who reported having no one at school to help them with sex-related problems and the very low percentage who reported having discussed sex at home (which has also declined since 1994) should serve as an eye-opener for policy makers and program managers. If the youth's preferred sources are their friends, with whom they share the same characteristics, then the kind of information the youth will get should be a cause for concern.

# Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation 

Christian Joy P. Cruz

Adolescence is a time for exploration and discovery. During this time, individuals develop a sense of identity and autonomy. Adolescence is also a time when young people learn how to have relationships and build the relationship patterns that they will often carry into adulthood. Developing a stable sense of oneself and one's role in society is a key feature of healthy adolescent development. A strong sense of self prepares an individual for intimacy in young adulthood. This chapter will discuss two facets of identity that influence one's sexuality: gender identity and sexual orientation. It will also cover the youth's exposure to sexual minorities and the problems they face in relation to their gender and sexuality.

Gender identity refers to a person's internal sense of being male, female, or something else, whereas gender expression refers to the way a person communicates gender identity to others through behavior, clothing, hairstyle, voice, or body characteristics. Sex is different from gender. Sex is the biological status of being male or female assigned at birth and based primarily on physical attributes, while gender refers to the socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given culture considers appropriate for boys and men or girls and women (American Psychological Association, 2011). Related to gender identity is the term cisgender, which refers to a person whose gender identity conforms to his or her sex assignment at birth. While the vast majority of people are cisgender, there are people who consider themselves transgender; this is an
umbrella term for persons whose gender identity, gender expression, or behavior does not conform to those typically associated with the sex they were assigned at birth (American Psychological Association, 2011).

On the other hand, sexual orientation refers to each person's capacity for profound emotional, affectional, and sexual attraction to, and intimate and sexual relations with, individuals of a different gender, the same gender, or more than one gender ("Yogyakarta Principles," 2007). Sexual orientation is believed to range along a continuum, but it is generally discussed in terms of attraction to the opposite sex (heterosexual), attraction to the same sex (homosexual/gay among males and lesbian among females), and attraction to both sexes (bisexual).

Conceptually, sexual orientation has three major dimensions: (a) sexual identity - how one identifies one's sexual orientation (heterosexual/ straight, gay, lesbian, or bisexual); (b) sexual attraction - the sex or gender of individuals to whom one feels attracted; and (c) sexual behavior - the sex of sex partners (i.e., individuals of the same sex, opposite sex, or both sexes; Gagnon \& Simon, 1973; Sexual Minority Assessment Research Team [SMART], 2009).

All young people, including sexual minorities, face certain developmental challenges such as developing social skills, thinking about career choices, and fitting into a peer group. Like most heterosexual youth, most lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youths are healthy individuals who have significant attachments to
and make contributions to their families, peers, schools, and religious institutions. However, these young sexual minorities must also cope with the prejudice, discrimination, and violence against them in society and, in some cases, in their own families, schools, and communities. Such marginalization negatively affects their health in general and their mental health in particular.

## Gender identity

Information on gender identity from YAFS4 is based on the question "If you could choose your sex, what would you want it to be? Male or female?" The response categories are "same sex," "opposite sex," and "it does not matter." Results of the YAFS4 show that the overwhelming majority of respondents would prefer their current sex, while a minority (6.2\%) signified their desire to be the opposite sex (see Table 11.1). This crossgender desire is more apparent among females (9.7\%) than males (2.5\%).

No notable difference in cross-gender desires across age groups was observed, implying that age does not have a differentiating effect on cross-gender desires. However, disparities can be observed across the regions. ARMM has the highest proportion of males who want to be females (4.7\%), while Bicol and Zamboanga Peninsula have the lowest $(0.4 \%$ and $0.5 \%$, respectively). NCR has the highest proportion of young females who want to be males (17.5\%), whereas ARMM has the lowest (1.7\%).

In terms of place of residence, more young males from the urban areas compared with their rural counterparts ( $3.9 \%$ vs. $2.1 \%$ ) want to be the opposite sex. The same observation holds for females but with a wider difference between the proportion from urban and rural areas who have cross-gender desires ( $13.9 \%$ vs. $8 \%$ ).

Results show an increasing level of cross-gender desires as the level of education increases, regardless of the respondent's sex. Among those with a college education, 3.6 percent of males and 12.3 percent of females want to be the opposite sex, compared with 1.9
percent of males and 6.8 percent of females with the lowest educational attainment. In terms of socioeconomic status, there is an increasing proportion of females who want to be males as one goes up the socioeconomic ladder (5.9\% from the lowest socioeconomic status vs. 12.5\% from the highest socioeconomic status).

The same question was also asked in the YAFS2 and YAFS3, thus permitting a comparison of results from the three rounds, each conducted about 10 years apart. Figure 11.1 shows that the proportion of young people who want to be the opposite sex declined between 1994 and 2013, from 11.3 to 6.2 percent. The difference in cross-gender desires between males and females is negligible at less than 1 percent, but both exhibited a declining pattern, from 11.5 percent to 6.0 percent among males and from 10.9 percent to 6.6 percent among females during the same period. Similarly, there is a declining proportion with cross-gender desires among both the younger and older youth. The decline is steeper among the 20-24-year-olds, where the proportion expressing cross-gender desires is also higher to begin with.

Wanting to be the same or opposite sex does not always connote a sexual dimension, as males or females may be attracted to other aspects of gender identity, such as power or influence for the male gender identity. There is a need to evaluate the reasons for these crossgender desires to determine if they are within the bounds of the transgender identity. Moreover, to verify the sexual dimension of the responses to the gender identity question, they should be cross validated with answers to related questions on sexual orientation and sexual attraction-an analysis that is beyond the scope of this chapter.

## Sexual orientation

## Sexual identity

The direct question "How would you best describe yourself?" was used to gauge the identity dimension of sexual orientation. The response categories are straight/heterosexual,

Table 11.1 Same gender and cross gender desires of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males who want to be (when they could choose their sex): |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females who want to be (when they could choose their sex): |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | same sex | opposite sex | ```it does not matter what sex``` |  |  | same sex | opposite sex | ```it does not matter what sex``` |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 94.4 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 100 | 5744 | 89.9 | 9.6 | 0.5 | 100 | 5625 |
| 20-24 | 94.7 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 100 | 3576 | 89.6 | 9.9 | 0.5 | 100 | 4139 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 96.8 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 100 | 472 | 91.6 | 8.1 | 0.2 | 100 | 467 |
| Cagayan Valley | 98.8 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 100 | 345 | 92.3 | 7.1 | 0.6 | 100 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 95.6 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 100 | 942 | 92.8 | 6.9 | 0.3 | 100 | 1090 |
| CALABARZON | 88.2 | 1.4 | 10.5 | 100 | 1241 | 88.6 | 10.4 | 1.0 | 100 | 1296 |
| MIMAROPA | 98.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 100 | 281 | 88.5 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 100 | 279 |
| Bicol | 99.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100 | 520 | 92.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 95.4 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 100 | 754 | 89.5 | 10.2 | 0.3 | 100 | 713 |
| Central Visayas | 96.6 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 100 | 742 | 87.8 | 11.8 | 0.4 | 100 | 672 |
| Eastern Visayas | 92.4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 100 | 423 | 90.8 | 8.4 | 0.7 | 100 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 98.1 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 100 | 372 | 92.9 | 6.3 | 0.9 | 100 | 351 |
| Northern Mindanao | 97.5 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 100 | 448 | 92.6 | 7.0 | 0.4 | 100 | 474 |
| Davao | 90.8 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 100 | 446 | 87.1 | 11.9 | 1.0 | 100 | 512 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 95.9 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 100 | 436 | 94.7 | 4.8 | 0.4 | 100 | 454 |
| CAR | 96.5 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 100 | 172 | 92.9 | 6.6 | 0.5 | 100 | 197 |
| ARMM | 95.3 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 100 | 319 | 96.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100 | 344 |
| Caraga | 97.4 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 100 | 265 | 92.2 | 7.5 | 0.4 | 100 | 255 |
| NCR | 91.6 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 100 | 1144 | 82.5 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 100 | 1356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 92.5 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 100 | 2387 | 85.7 | 13.9 | 0.4 | 100 | 2826 |
| Rural | 95.3 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 100 | 6934 | 91.4 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 100 | 6938 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 96.6 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 100 | 1725 | 92.6 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 100 | 915 |
| High school undergraduate | 94.3 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 100 | 3513 | 90.8 | 8.7 | 0.5 | 100 | 3484 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 94.9 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 100 | 2402 | 89.8 | 9.8 | 0.5 | 100 | 3035 |
| College or higher | 92.3 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 100 | 1681 | 87.2 | 12.3 | 0.4 | 100 | 2327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 95.4 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 100 | 1878 | 93.4 | 5.9 | 0.7 | 100 | 1940 |
| Second | 94.0 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 100 | 1908 | 90.3 | 9.3 | 0.3 | 100 | 2006 |
| Middle | 95.5 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 100 | 2083 | 90.6 | 9.1 | 0.3 | 100 | 2070 |
| Fourth | 94.7 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 100 | 1936 | 87.4 | 12.2 | 0.4 | 100 | 2056 |
| Highest (Richest) | 92.6 | 2.6 | 4.7 | 100 | 1517 | 86.9 | 12.5 | 0.7 | 100 | 1692 |
| Total | 94.5 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 100 | 9320 | 89.8 | 9.7 | 0.5 | 100 | 9764 |

lesbian, gay, and bisexual. The results in Table 10.2 indicate that an overwhelming majority of males (95.8\%) and females (96.6\%) describe themselves as heterosexual. Only 2.4 percent of males identify as gay and 1.9 percent of males identify as bisexual, regardless of age group. For females, the proportion of 20-24-year-olds who self-describe as lesbian is 2.5 percent, which is higher than that of their 15-19-yearold counterparts at 1.3 percent. In contrast, a
slightly higher proportion of the 15-19-year-old females (2\%) identify as bisexual compared with the 20-24-year-olds (1.1\%).

The region with the highest proportion of males who consider themselves gay ( $4.2 \%$ ) and bisexual (4.2\%) is NCR. The regions with the next highest proportion of males who self-identify as gay are Central Luzon (3.7\%) and Eastern Visayas (3.5\%). The region with the second highest proportion who self-identify as bisexual

Figure 11.1 Trends in cross gender desires by sex and age group: 1994, 2002 and 2013

is Davao (3.2\%). At the other end of the spectrum is ARMM, where none of the male youth consider themselves gay.

For females, the region with the highest proportion who self-identify as lesbian is Eastern Visayas (2.7\%), followed by Western Visayas and NCR (both at 2.4\%). The highest proportion who self-reported as bisexual was found in Central Visayas (2.7\%) and Western Visayas (2.6\%). ARMM youth registered the lowest proportion of males and females who identify as nonheterosexual (i.e., gay, lesbian, or bisexual).

In terms of place of residence, slightly more males ( $3.6 \%$ vs. $1.9 \%$ ) and females ( $2.2 \%$ vs. $1.6 \%$ ) from the urban areas compared with their rural counterparts self-identify as gays and lesbians, respectively. Bisexual identity among males ( $3.2 \%$ for urban vs. 1.4\% for rural) and females ( $2.2 \%$ for urban vs. 1.4\% for rural) also exhibited a slight difference across place of residence.

Education-wise, results show that among males, the level of gay and bisexual identities increases with the level of education. Specifically, 3.6 percent and 3.7 percent of males with a college education identify as gay and bisexual, respectively, compared with the 1.1 percent who identify as gay and 0.4 percent who identify as bisexual among the males with the lowest educational attainment. The same pattern is observed among males across socioeconomic status; an increasing proportion of males identify as gay and bisexual as socioeconomic
status increases. About 3 percent of males from the highest socioeconomic status identify as either gay or bisexual compared with about 1 percent from the lowest socioeconomic status.

The pattern among males of an increasing proportion expressing homosexual and bisexual identities across education and socioeconomic status was not observed among females. While the lowest socioeconomic status has the lowest proportion of females who self-identify as lesbian ( $1.3 \%$ ) and bisexual ( $0.8 \%$ ), the highest proportion of females with lesbian (2.4\%) and bisexual (2.3\%) identities are found in the fourth socioeconomic quintile, not the richest quintile.

The direct question on sexual identity also provided for an 'Others' category for respondents who do not fit in any of the three categories provided, namely straight/heterosexual, lesbian, gay, and bisexual. The respondents who chose this category were asked to specify what best describe themselves, and two respondents reported that they have an identity crisis.

## Sexual attraction

Attraction is a vital dimension of sexual orientation, especially in the study of young people and others who are not yet sexually active (Saewyc et al., 2004). Some have claimed that attraction is the essence of sexual orientation; hence, it is an important dimension in research on psychological and developmental aspects, such as those focused on suicide ideation and

| Background Characteristics | Percent of males who identify as: |  |  |  |  | Percent of females who identify as: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Heterosexual | Gay | Bisexual | Total | No. of males | Heterosexual | Lesbian | Bisexual | Total | No. of females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 95.9 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 5761 | 96.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 5645 |
| 20-24 | 95.6 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 3591 | 96.4 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 4152 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 95.6 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 473 | 96.8 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 97.7 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 345 | 96.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 93.9 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 953 | 95.4 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 1094 |
| CALABARZON | 95.8 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 1243 | 97.8 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 1301 |
| MIMAROPA | 98.2 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 282 | 96.8 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 280 |
| Bicol | 97.7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 521 | 96.7 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 96.8 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 760 | 95.0 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 96.6 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 742 | 96.6 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 674 |
| Eastern Visayas | 94.6 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 426 | 96.0 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 98.4 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 370 | 97.7 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 354 |
| Northern Mindanao | 97.1 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 447 | 95.6 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 473 |
| Davao | 94.1 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 444 | 96.7 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 97.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 439 | 98.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 459 |
| CAR | 97.1 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 171 | 98.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 99.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 321 | 99.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 351 |
| Caraga | 97.0 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 265 | 96.9 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 255 |
| NCR | 91.7 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 1150 | 95.4 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 1357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 93.2 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 2397 | 95.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 2825 |
| Rural | 96.7 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 6954 | 97.0 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 6971 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 98.5 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 1726 | 96.6 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 919 |
| High school undergraduate | 96.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 3528 | 96.3 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 3498 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 94.6 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 2412 | 96.7 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 3046 |
| College or higher | 92.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 1686 | 96.9 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 2334 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 98.0 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 1881 | 97.8 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 1953 |
| Second | 95.7 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 1915 | 97.2 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2018 |
| Middle | 96.8 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 2090 | 96.6 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2077 |
| Fourth | 94.2 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 1941 | 95.3 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 2059 |
| Highest (Richest) | 93.6 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 1527 | 96.0 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 1689 |
| Total | 95.8 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 9352 | 96.6 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 9796 |

attempts (Cochran \& Mays, 2000; Russell \& Joyner, 2001).

To capture the attraction component of sexual orientation, the respondents were asked two questions: one on feelings of attraction and another on their preferred sexual partner. The first question on feelings of attraction to males and/or females is as follows:

Which describes your feelings of attraction? Are you...

Only attracted to males?
Mostly attracted to males?
Equally attracted to males and
females?
Mostly attracted to females?
Only attracted to females?
The categories were read out to the respondents. To help them describe their feelings of attraction, a flashcard containing the question and categories was shown.

Results show that while the majority of youth describe their feelings of attraction as exclusively toward the opposite sex, this proportion was higher among females (79\%) compared with males (68.8\%; see Table 11.3). Interestingly, a sizable proportion reported being attracted mostly but not exclusively to the opposite sex, with a much higher proportion among the male ( $25.6 \%$ ) than the female ( $8.6 \%$ ) youth. Meanwhile, a higher proportion of female youth (10.5\%) compared with male youth (2.6\%) expressed being equally attracted to males and females. Two percent of males are attracted only to males, while less than 1 percent of females are attracted only to females.

In terms of age, a slightly higher proportion of the $20-24$-year-old males ( $2.6 \%$ ) compared with the 15-19-year-olds (1.6\%) expressed being attracted only to males. The same age pattern was observed among females, but the levels are lower at 0.7 percent among the $15-19$-year-old females and 1.1 percent among the 20-24-yearolds. More among the 15-19-year-olds of both sexes expressed being equally attracted to males and females.

Looking at the differentials by region of residence, Central Luzon has the highest proportion of males who are attracted only to males (4\%), while MIMAROPA and Bicol have the lowest (both at $0.4 \%$ ). NCR has the highest proportion of males who are attracted equally to both sexes (7\%), while ARMM has the lowest (0.3\%). Surprisingly, ARMM has the highest proportion of women who reported being attracted equally to males and females (21.7\%), while Northern Mindanao has the lowest (4.9\%). Ilocos has the highest proportion of females who reported being attracted only to females (2.2\%). In CAR and CALABARZON, none of the female respondents reported being attracted only to females.

A consistent pattern of responses by educational attainment was observed for both males and females in the proportion who reported being exclusively attracted to the opposite sex: The proportion exclusively attracted to the opposite sex tends to decrease as educational attainment increases. While an education gradient is also observed for the response "equally attracted to males and females" for the male youth, this is in the opposite direction: The bisexual attraction tends to increase as education increases. Likewise, an increasing proportion of male youth equally attracted to males and females is noted as socioeconomic status improves.

The second question on sexual attraction is "Who are your preferred sexual partners?" The response categories are exclusively males, exclusively females, and either male or female. Table 11.4 presents the preferred sexual partners of the male and female respondents. It indicates that a great majority of youth prefers someone from the opposite sex; 92.7 percent of males and 96.8 percent of females prefer a partner who is exclusively of the opposite sex. The difference between males and females is more pronounced in that more males either exclusively prefer a sexual partner of the same sex (3.3\% for males vs. $1.8 \%$ for females) or want either a male or female partner ( $4 \%$ for males vs. $1.5 \%$ for females).
Table 11.3 Feelings of attraction of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males who are attracted: |  |  |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females who are attracted: |  |  |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Only to males | Mostly to males | Equally <br> to males and females | Mostly to females | Only to females |  |  | Only to males | Mostly to males | Equally to males and females | Mostly to females | Only to females |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 25.8 | 68.5 | 100.0 | 5705 | 78.7 | 8.6 | 11.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 5604 |
| 20-24 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 25.4 | 69.2 | 100.0 | 3556 | 79.4 | 8.7 | 9.5 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 4142 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 1.3 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 10.6 | 83.4 | 100.0 | 470 | 79.7 | 7.8 | 9.5 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 464 |
| Cagayan Valley | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 36.3 | 60.1 | 100.0 | 336 | 82.7 | 6.2 | 8.3 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 324 |
| Central Luzon | 4.0 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 44.6 | 47.9 | 100.0 | 936 | 84.6 | 7.3 | 5.7 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 1089 |
| CALABARZON | 1.5 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 21.7 | 74.4 | 100.0 | 1235 | 75.7 | 10.8 | 12.3 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1302 |
| MIMAROPA | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 36.1 | 61.4 | 100.0 | 277 | 81.3 | 5.8 | 10.8 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 278 |
| Bicol | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 21.5 | 75.6 | 100.0 | 520 | 78.1 | 9.3 | 10.8 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 572 |
| Western Visayas | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 16.4 | 79.1 | 100.0 | 761 | 82.7 | 4.6 | 10.4 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 2.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 34.7 | 60.8 | 100.0 | 737 | 78.5 | 15.3 | 5.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 2.9 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 15.2 | 77.9 | 100.0 | 420 | 77.2 | 8.1 | 11.6 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 395 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 14.9 | 82.1 | 100.0 | 369 | 72.6 | 13.4 | 12.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 350 |
| Northern Mindanao | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 40.6 | 55.8 | 100.0 | 446 | 81.6 | 10.2 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 472 |
| Davao | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.5 | 11.7 | 79.7 | 100.0 | 443 | 84.6 | 4.7 | 9.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 507 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 30.4 | 64.6 | 100.0 | 418 | 90.0 | 3.3 | 6.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 452 |
| CAR | 2.4 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 20.1 | 75.7 | 100.0 | 169 | 78.8 | 6.6 | 12.1 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 198 |
| ARMM | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 51.9 | 45.6 | 100.0 | 316 | 72.3 | 4.9 | 21.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 350 |
| Caraga | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 44.2 | 50.2 | 100.0 | 265 | 76.8 | 12.6 | 8.3 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 254 |
| NCR | 2.8 | 1.4 | 7.0 | 11.4 | 77.4 | 100.0 | 1144 | 72.7 | 9.7 | 16.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 1345 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 3.1 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 19.8 | 71.2 | 100.0 | 2383 | 75.8 | 10.1 | 12.4 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2804 |
| Rural | 1.6 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 27.7 | 67.9 | 100.0 | 6879 | 80.3 | 8.1 | 9.7 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 6942 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 1.7 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 25.8 | 70.3 | 100.0 | 1692 | 82.8 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 906 |
| High school undergraduate | 1.1 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 25.8 | 70.1 | 100.0 | 3490 | 80.6 | 7.0 | 10.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 3469 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 3.3 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 26.6 | 66.6 | 100.0 | 2398 | 78.8 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 3039 |
| College or higher | 2.1 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 23.8 | 67.4 | 100.0 | 1681 | 75.4 | 9.8 | 13.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2328 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 27.9 | 69.0 | 100.0 | 1854 | 82.7 | 7.1 | 8.5 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 1935 |
| Second | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 25.8 | 68.7 | 100.0 | 1888 | 79.7 | 8.4 | 9.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 2016 |
| Middle | 1.9 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 27.3 | 67.9 | 100.0 | 2078 | 81.3 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 2064 |
| Fourth | 2.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 22.5 | 70.9 | 100.0 | 1922 | 74.9 | 10.4 | 12.3 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2052 |
| Highest (Richest) | 2.6 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 24.2 | 67.1 | 100.0 | 1519 | 76.2 | 9.9 | 12.3 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 1679 |
| Total | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 25.6 | 68.8 | 100.0 | 9262 | 79.0 | 8.6 | 10.5 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 9746 |

Young males from the highly urbanized areas of NCR and its neighbors CALABARZON and Central Luzon have the highest proportion who prefer same-sex sexual partners or want either male or female partners. The same pattern is observed among females in Ilocos, NCR, and Western Visayas.

When grouped according to their place of residence, more males and females from urban areas than rural areas express preference for same-sex sexual partners. There is a contrasting result across education between males and females: While males who have at least a high school education have the highest proportion of same-sex sexual partner preference, the highest proportion among females was reported among those with an elementary or lower education. Across wealth quintiles, males belonging to the richest quintile and females belonging to the fourth quintile registered the highest proportion who prefers sexual partners from the same sex or either sex.

## Sexual behavior

The behavioral dimension of sexual orientation is imperative for studies on sexual and other health topics (Pathela, Blank, Sell, \& Schillinger, 2006). In YAFS4, sexual behavior was gauged through two questions: The first is a proxy for sexual behavior with the opposite sex, and the second is a proxy for sexual behavior with the same sex. The two questions are gender specific. For males, the questions were "Did you ever have a girlfriend?" and "Sometimes, boys also have a romantic relationship with another boy. Did you ever have a boyfriend?" For females, the questions were "Did you ever have a boyfriend?" and "Sometimes, girls also have a romantic relationship with another girl. Did you ever have a girlfriend?"

The other indicator of the behavioral dimension of sexual orientation was derived from several questions that directly asked the respondents for the sex of the person or persons with whom they have engaged in sexual activities (e.g., first sexual experience, extramarital sex,
regular non-romanticsex, casual sex, commercial sex, and coerced sex).

Results in Table 11.5 show that close to a quarter of young males and females have never had any romantic relationship. About 7 in 10 ( $71.7 \%$ of males and $72.2 \%$ of females) have had romantic relationships only with someone of the opposite sex. A low proportion ( $1.5 \%$ each for males and females) have had a romantic relationship only with someone of the same sex. More females (4.3\%) than males (2.8\%) reported having had romantic relationships with both sexes.

As expected, more of the 15-19-year-olds have not yet experienced a romantic relationship compared with the $20-24$-year-olds. Among males, slightly more among the older males have had a romantic relationship only with another male ( $1.9 \%$ vs. $1.3 \%$ among the younger youth) and with both sexes $(4.1 \%$ for those aged $20-$ 24 vs. $2 \%$ for those aged 15-19). A similar age pattern is observed among females, with 2.2 percent of those aged $20-24$ and 1.0 percent of those aged 15-19 having had a romantic relationship only with someone of the same sex. However, more among the 15-19-yearolds (4.6\%) reported having had relationships with persons of both sexes compared with the 20-24-year-olds (3.9\%).

Comparing by region, the youth in ARMM have the highest proportion who have never had a romantic relationship (55.5\% of males and $56.2 \%$ of females). The prevalence of romantic relationships with someone of the same sex or persons of both sexes is practically nil in ARMM. In contrast, in NCR, only about 16 percent of either males or females have never had a romantic relationship-the lowest among all regions. The proportion of male and female youth who have ever had a homosexual romantic relationship in NCR was the highest of all the regions. For bisexual relationships, the region with the highest reported prevalence is Northern Mindanao for males (7.2\%) and NCR and Davao for females (both at 6.8\%).

Across the type of residence, more males and females from urban areas have had

Table 11.4 Preferred sexual partners of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males whose preferred sexual partner is: |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females whose preferred sexual partner is: |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exclusively males | Exclusively females | Either male or female |  |  | Exclusively males | Exclusively females | Either male or female |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.3 | 92.6 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 5754 | 97.0 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 5625 |
| 20-24 | 3.5 | 92.8 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 3591 | 96.4 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 4136 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 3.8 | 92.1 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 469 | 96.4 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 467 |
| Cagayan Valley | 2.6 | 94.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 345 | 96.3 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 5.5 | 90.1 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 951 | 95.9 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 1094 |
| CALABARZON | 2.8 | 90.7 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 1243 | 97.3 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 1302 |
| MIMAROPA | 2.5 | 94.7 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 281 | 97.1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 1.2 | 95.7 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 517 | 97.9 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 3.3 | 95.3 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 762 | 94.8 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 706 |
| Central Visayas | 2.0 | 96.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 741 | 97.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 3.7 | 92.3 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 427 | 95.4 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 395 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 1.4 | 96.8 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 370 | 97.4 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 351 |
| Northern Mindanao | 3.4 | 94.4 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 447 | 96.0 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 472 |
| Davao | 3.8 | 91.5 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 446 | 96.1 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 511 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 3.7 | 92.2 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 437 | 98.5 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 456 |
| CAR | 3.5 | 93.0 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 171 | 98.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 1.6 | 96.0 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 321 | 99.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 346 |
| Caraga | 3.4 | 94.0 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 265 | 98.4 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 254 |
| NCR | 4.9 | 88.7 | 6.4 | 100.0 | 1150 | 96.2 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 1357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 4.6 | 90.6 | 4.8 | 100.0 | 2394 | 96.2 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 2823 |
| Rural | 2.9 | 93.4 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 6952 | 97.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 6938 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 2.0 | 95.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 1728 | 96.7 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 915 |
| High school undergraduate | 2.6 | 93.6 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 3520 | 96.7 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 3488 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 4.9 | 90.5 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 2410 | 96.9 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 3030 |
| College or higher | 4.1 | 91.4 | 4.5 | 100.0 | 1686 | 96.7 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 2.1 | 95.2 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 1879 | 98.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 1943 |
| Second | 3.7 | 92.3 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 1913 | 97.3 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 2000 |
| Middle | 3.4 | 92.4 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 2085 | 97.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2069 |
| Fourth | 3.2 | 92.5 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 1940 | 95.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 2057 |
| Highest (Richest) | 4.5 | 90.9 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 1526 | 96.6 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 1690 |
| Total | 3.3 | 92.7 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 9345 | 96.8 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 9761 |

romantic relationships with persons of the same sex and of both sexes. On the other hand, when grouped according to their highest educational attainment, the proportion of males who have had a romantic relationship with another male rises as educational attainment increases. Among females, those with the lowest education posted the highest proportion who have had a romantic relationship with another female, while the high school undergraduates have the highest proportion who have had romantic relationships
with both sexes. In terms of socioeconomic status, males belonging to the richest quintile have the highest proportion who have had homosexual and bisexual romantic relationships; among females, the highest proportion is registered for the fourth socioeconomic quintile.

Table 11.6 presents the percentage of males and females who have ever had sexual contact with males, females, and both sexes. In all, 63.5 percent of males and 59.5 percent of females have never had sex; 33.6 percent of
Table 11.5 Romantic relationships of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males whose romantic relationships are with: |  |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females whose romantic relationships are with: |  |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | only females | $\begin{gathered} \text { only } \\ \text { males } \end{gathered}$ | both sexes | neither sexes (never had any romantic relationship) |  |  | only males | $\begin{gathered} \text { only } \\ \text { females } \end{gathered}$ | both sexes | neither sexes (never had any romantic relationship) |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 64.5 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 32.2 | 100.0 | 5768 | 61.3 | 1.0 | 4.6 | 33.1 | 100.0 | 5640 |
| 20-24 | 83.4 | 1.9 | 4.1 | 10.6 | 100.0 | 3591 | 87.0 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 6.9 | 100.0 | 4160 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 73.2 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 22.1 | 100.0 | 470 | 74.0 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 21.5 | 100.0 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 76.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 21.5 | 100.0 | 344 | 76.4 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 17.2 | 100.0 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 75.0 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 19.6 | 100.0 | 953 | 78.8 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 15.4 | 100.0 | 1096 |
| CALABARZON | 76.2 | 1.8 | 3.8 | 18.2 | 100.0 | 1244 | 74.8 | 0.8 | 4.8 | 19.6 | 100.0 | 1304 |
| MIMAROPA | 77.0 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 21.3 | 100.0 | 282 | 69.9 | 1.1 | 6.5 | 22.6 | 100.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 70.7 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 26.8 | 100.0 | 522 | 68.5 | 1.4 | 4.9 | 25.2 | 100.0 | 571 |
| Western Visayas | 68.2 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 29.3 | 100.0 | 765 | 72.3 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 23.0 | 100.0 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 74.7 | 0.9 | 3.8 | 20.6 | 100.0 | 742 | 76.1 | 0.7 | 4.8 | 18.4 | 100.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 62.0 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 35.2 | 100.0 | 426 | 71.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 24.1 | 100.0 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 74.5 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 22.5 | 100.0 | 373 | 72.4 | 0.8 | 4.2 | 22.5 | 100.0 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 64.2 | 1.6 | 7.2 | 27.1 | 100.0 | 447 | 68.8 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 25.9 | 100.0 | 474 |
| Davao | 73.9 | 1.6 | 4.7 | 19.8 | 100.0 | 444 | 72.2 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 19.2 | 100.0 | 515 |
| SOCcsksargen | 67.9 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 31.0 | 100.0 | 439 | 63.1 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 33.8 | 100.0 | 458 |
| CAR | 63.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 35.7 | 100.0 | 171 | 76.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 21.2 | 100.0 | 198 |
| ARMM | 43.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 55.5 | 100.0 | 321 | 42.9 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 56.2 | 100.0 | 354 |
| Caraga | 69.8 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 26.4 | 100.0 | 265 | 69.4 | 0.8 | 4.7 | 25.1 | 100.0 | 255 |
| NCR | 77.5 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 15.7 | 100.0 | 1150 | 74.5 | 2.6 | 6.8 | 16.1 | 100.0 | 1358 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 76.1 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 17.6 | 100.0 | 2396 | 73.6 | 1.9 | 5.6 | 18.8 | 100.0 | 2829 |
| Rural | 70.2 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 26.1 | 100.0 | 6963 | 71.6 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 23.2 | 100.0 | 6970 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 61.4 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 35.1 | 100.0 | 1730 | 66.8 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 27.1 | 100.0 | 920 |
| High school undergraduate | 67.0 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 29.7 | 100.0 | 3528 | 60.6 | 1.1 | 4.9 | 33.4 | 100.0 | 3497 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 80.4 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 13.8 | 100.0 | 2411 | 83.7 | 1.7 | 4.6 | 10.0 | 100.0 | 3047 |
| College or higher | 80.0 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 14.8 | 100.0 | 1686 | 76.7 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 18.4 | 100.0 | 2334 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 61.4 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 35.4 | 100.0 | 1887 | 68.2 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 28.0 | 100.0 | 1951 |
| Second | 68.0 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 27.8 | 100.0 | 1915 | 70.3 | 1.0 | 4.5 | 24.1 | 100.0 | 2020 |
| Middle | 73.8 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 22.2 | 100.0 | 2090 | 74.0 | 1.2 | 4.5 | 20.3 | 100.0 | 2078 |
| Fourth | 79.6 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 15.9 | 100.0 | 1942 | 74.0 | 2.7 | 5.4 | 17.9 | 100.0 | 2062 |
| Highest (Richest) | 76.3 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 17.4 | 100.0 | 1526 | 74.6 | 1.6 | 4.3 | 19.5 | 100.0 | 1688 |
| Total | 71.7 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 23.9 | 100.0 | 9358 | 72.2 | 1.5 | 4.3 | 22.0 | 100.0 | 9801 |

males and 39.4 percent of females have had sexual relations with someone of the opposite sex. Below one percent of either males or females said they have ever had a sexual relationship with someone of the same sex. More males (2\%) than females ( $0.7 \%$ ) have sexual experience with both male and female partners.

When grouped by age, a higher proportion of the older youth reported having had sex with a person of the opposite sex and with persons of both sexes. Across region of residence, Northern Mindanao has the highest proportion of young males who reported having sexual experience with another male (2.9\%), while NCR has the highest proportion of young males who reported having sexual experience with partners from both sexes (4.1\%). Among females, youth from Cagayan Valley have the highest proportion who had sex with another female (1.2\%), while Caraga youth have the highest proportion that reported having bisexual sex experience (1.2\%). Still, across all regions, the proportion that have had sex with the same sex or with both sexes is generally low.

Similar to the other dimensions of sexual orientation, more male and female urban residents reported having homosexual and bisexual sex experience. A positive relationship between education and homosexual sex experience among males was also observed; the proportion of males who have had sex with another male increases as educational attainment rises. There is no observed pattern among females across education, but those with the lowest education posted the highest proportion who have had sex with another female and with persons of both sexes. Likewise, in terms of socioeconomic status, there is no consistent pattern.

## Non-heteronormative personal contacts

Another important aspect of studying sexual orientation is the exposure to sexual minorities. As established in several studies, knowing someone who is gay or lesbian fosters more accepting attitudes toward many of the issues surrounding gay and lesbian relations
(Herek, 1984; Morales, 2009). In the YAFS4, the respondents were asked if they have family members and friends who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual. In general, a higher proportion of youth reported having close friends rather than family members who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Of the three types of sexual minorities, the most commonly mentioned is gay (i.e., homosexual men).

More female youth reported having family members and close friends they know to be gay, lesbian, or bisexual. A comparison by age groups shows that more of the older youth of both sexes reported knowing a family member who belongs to the sexual minority (Table 11.7a). The same pattern was observed in the proportion who reported knowing a close friend who is gay, lesbian, or bisexual (Table 11.7b).

The regions with the highest proportion of male youth who reported having family members who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual are Central Luzon, NCR, Eastern Visayas, and Zamboanga Peninsula. Among females, the corresponding regions are NCR, Western Visayas, Central Visayas, and Cagayan Valley. The lowest proportions were reported in ARMM, Central Visayas, and CAR for males and in Ilocos, Central Visayas, and ARMM for females.

More urban residents than rural residents know members of the sexual minority among their family members and close friends. In terms of educational attainment, the proportion with a family member and close friend in the sexual minority is highest among those with a college education; the proportion decreases consistently as educational attainment decreases. The same positive relationship is observed for socioeconomic status, with the highest proportion among youth in the richest quintile and the lowest among youth in the poorest quintile.

## Problems experienced

Respondents who have cross-gender desires and those who identified as nonheterosexual (gay, lesbian, or bisexual) were
asked if they have encountered problems because of their gender and sexuality, namely confusion regarding gender, discrimination, rejection by family and friends, verbal abuse, physical assault, and sexual abuse. The list of possible problems was read out to the respondent.

Results in Table 11.8 show that among youth who expressed cross-gender desires or who self-identified as homosexual or bisexual, more males experienced problems related to their gender and sexuality compared with females. Gender confusion, discrimination, and verbal abuse were the more commonly reported problems, more so among males than females.

A higher proportion of males was sexually abused and was rejected by family. Some of the respondents were rejected by friends and experienced physical assault, but there is no significant difference in the proportion of males and females who encountered these two problems.

## Summary and conclusions

This chapter discussed gender identity and sexual orientation, which are two important facets of youth sexuality. It also provided information on the youth's exposure to gays,

Table 11.6 Sexual behavior of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males who ever had sexual contact with: |  |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females who ever had sexual contact with: |  |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Males | Females | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Both } \\ & \text { sexes } \end{aligned}$ | Never had sex |  |  | Males | Females | Both sexes | Never had sex |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 0.7 | 17.5 | 1.2 | 80.5 | 100.0 | 5770 | 18.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 80.5 | 100.0 | 5654 |
| 20-24 | 1.2 | 59.4 | 3.2 | 36.2 | 100.0 | 3593 | 67.4 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 30.8 | 100.0 | 4161 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 0.8 | 35.8 | 1.5 | 61.9 | 100.0 | 472 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 64.0 | 100.0 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.3 | 30.4 | 0.9 | 68.4 | 100.0 | 345 | 42.6 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 55.2 | 100.0 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 1.3 | 39.9 | 2.2 | 56.7 | 100.0 | 953 | 43.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 55.2 | 100.0 | 1097 |
| CALABARZON | 0.6 | 32.0 | 2.7 | 64.7 | 100.0 | 1243 | 33.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 65.5 | 100.0 | 1304 |
| MIMAROPA | 0.7 | 32.5 | 1.4 | 65.4 | 100.0 | 283 | 40.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 59.3 | 100.0 | 280 |
| Bicol | 0.4 | 29.1 | 1.3 | 69.2 | 100.0 | 522 | 36.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 62.8 | 100.0 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 0.5 | 27.2 | 1.4 | 70.8 | 100.0 | 765 | 38.3 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 60.3 | 100.0 | 723 |
| Central Visayas | 1.2 | 38.3 | 1.2 | 59.2 | 100.0 | 741 | 38.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 61.2 | 100.0 | 675 |
| Eastern Visayas | 0.9 | 27.9 | 0.7 | 70.4 | 100.0 | 426 | 43.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 55.5 | 100.0 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 0.5 | 35.9 | 1.1 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 373 | 43.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 56.2 | 100.0 | 356 |
| Northern Mindanao | 2.9 | 29.8 | 3.1 | 64.1 | 100.0 | 446 | 39.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 60.1 | 100.0 | 474 |
| Davao | 0.7 | 36.8 | 2.2 | 60.3 | 100.0 | 446 | 42.9 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 55.9 | 100.0 | 515 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 0.2 | 28.0 | 0.9 | 70.9 | 100.0 | 440 | 36.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 63.0 | 100.0 | 460 |
| CAR | 0.0 | 30.1 | 1.2 | 68.8 | 100.0 | 173 | 47.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 51.5 | 100.0 | 198 |
| ARMM | 0.0 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 73.8 | 100.0 | 320 | 38.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.6 | 100.0 | 354 |
| Caraga | 1.5 | 34.3 | 1.1 | 63.0 | 100.0 | 265 | 40.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 58.4 | 100.0 | 255 |
| NCR | 1.6 | 39.7 | 4.1 | 54.7 | 100.0 | 1150 | 41.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 56.5 | 100.0 | 1356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 1.2 | 39.8 | 3.3 | 55.8 | 100.0 | 2398 | 39.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 58.9 | 100.0 | 2831 |
| Rural | 0.8 | 31.4 | 1.5 | 66.2 | 100.0 | 4613 | 39.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 59.7 | 100.0 | 6982 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 0.6 | 32.8 | 1.9 | 64.6 | 100.0 | 1733 | 54.8 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 43.4 | 100.0 | 922 |
| High school undergraduate | 0.6 | 22.3 | 1.6 | 75.6 | 100.0 | 3531 | 27.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 71.8 | 100.0 | 3503 |
| High school graduate Vocational | 1.3 | 45.2 | 2.6 | 51.0 | 100.0 | 2412 | 53.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 44.6 | 100.0 | 3053 |
| College or higher | 1.4 | 41.4 | 2.1 | 55.1 | 100.0 | 1689 | 32.3 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 66.8 | 100.0 | 2335 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 0.7 | 28.4 | 1.6 | 69.3 | 100.0 | 1889 | 49.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 49.6 | 100.0 | 1955 |
| Second | 0.9 | 27.3 | 1.5 | 70.3 | 100.0 | 1917 | 39.6 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 59.4 | 100.0 | 2022 |
| Middle | 0.7 | 34.7 | 2.2 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 2092 | 40.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 58.8 | 100.0 | 2081 |
| Fourth | 1.2 | 40.7 | 1.8 | 56.3 | 100.0 | 1941 | 35.1 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 63.5 | 100.0 | 2063 |
| Highest (Richest) | 1.1 | 37.3 | 3.0 | 58.6 | 100.0 | 1527 | 32.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 66.9 | 100.0 | 1693 |
| Total | 0.9 | 33.6 | 2.0 | 63.5 | 100.0 | 9364 | 39.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 59.5 | 100.0 | 9813 |

lesbians, bisexual men, and bisexual women, as well as the problems faced by the youth who have cross-gender desires and those who identify as members of the sexual minority. In terms of gender identity, trends in cross-gender desires exhibited a declining pattern over the past two decades. While there was no gender disparity in cross-gender desires in the last three YAFS rounds, a significant but narrowing difference across age groups was observed. A higher proportion of the youth who are urban residents, more educated, and belong to a higher socioeconomic status have cross-gender desires. Further analysis on the reasons for these
cross-gender desires is needed to determine if these young people fall under the transgender category.

The identity, attraction, and behavioral dimensions of sexual orientation were explored in this chapter. Youth who belong to the older age group, are urban residents, and reside in the highly urbanized regions of the country, namely NCR and Central Luzon, consistently have the highest proportion who belong to the sexual minority across the identity, attraction, and behavior indicators. ARMM youth consistently have the lowest levels across these three dimensions. The proportion of youth who belong

Table 11.7a Percent of males and females with family members who are gays, lesbians, bisexual man and bisexual woman by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males with family members who are: |  |  |  | No. of males | Percent of females with family members who are: |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gay | Lesbian | Bisexual man | Bisexual woman |  | Gay | Lesbian | Bisexual man | Bisexual woman |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 12.0 | 5.8 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 5750 | 17.7 | 11.6 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 5612 |
| 20-24 | 11.8 | 8.2 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 3579 | 22.3 | 14.2 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 4139 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 7.9 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 470 | 9.9 | 4.5 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 11.6 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 344 | 28.3 | 19.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 19.4 | 10.2 | 3.7 | 0.7 | 950 | 30.2 | 21.4 | 4.9 | 2.0 | 1091 |
| CALABARZON | 10.4 | 7.3 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 1242 | 17.7 | 10.8 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1298 |
| MIMAROPA | 10.2 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 283 | 12.5 | 9.3 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 279 |
| Bicol | 9.1 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 519 | 14.0 | 7.3 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 13.6 | 6.5 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 756 | 31.3 | 15.8 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 691 |
| Central Visayas | 6.1 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 741 | 7.6 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 14.4 | 7.6 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 423 | 18.4 | 11.5 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 16.0 | 6.5 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 369 | 22.4 | 9.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 12.5 | 4.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 447 | 16.7 | 8.9 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 472 |
| Davao | 14.1 | 6.6 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 440 | 15.0 | 9.7 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 11.7 | 5.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 437 | 11.4 | 6.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 458 |
| CAR | 4.1 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 172 | 15.2 | 9.1 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 3.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 319 | 10.5 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 351 |
| Caraga | 13.2 | 3.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 265 | 13.4 | 9.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 254 |
| NCR | 13.4 | 13.6 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1150 | 27.8 | 23.4 | 8.3 | 4.7 | 1355 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 14.4 | 10.4 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 2388 | 24.2 | 18.4 | 5.8 | 3.5 | 2821 |
| Rural | 11.0 | 5.5 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 6940 | 17.8 | 10.4 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 6932 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 8.5 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1725 | 16.7 | 10.1 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 918 |
| High school undergraduate | 12.4 | 7.0 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 3519 | 17.5 | 10.7 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 3481 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 11.8 | 7.4 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 2403 | 21.4 | 14.2 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 3035 |
| College or higher | 14.3 | 7.3 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 1682 | 21.8 | 14.8 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2317 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 9.0 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1878 | 14.1 | 7.9 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1946 |
| Second | 11.3 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1910 | 17.9 | 10.0 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 2007 |
| Middle | 11.1 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 2081 | 20.6 | 13.5 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 2068 |
| Fourth | 13.0 | 10.0 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 1935 | 20.8 | 17.1 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 2050 |
| Highest (Richest) | 15.9 | 9.7 | 3.1 | 0.6 | 1523 | 25.6 | 15.0 | 4.7 | 2.3 | 1682 |
| Total | 11.9 | 6.7 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 9329 | 19.7 | 12.7 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 9752 |

to the sexual minority in terms of identity, attraction, and behavior increases as education and socioeconomic status increase.

It must be noted that sexual identity is not always congruent with sexual attraction or behavior (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, \& Michaels, 1994; Saewyc et al., 2004). For example, it is possible that people reporting only samesex attraction and/or behavior will self-identify as heterosexual or bisexual. The incongruence between these three dimensions might be attributed to factors such as stigma, laws, cultural values, partner selection opportunities, and even economic reasons (SMART, 2009).

In YAFS4, only 10 percent of the youth found it sometimes/always acceptable for two males or two females to have a romantic relationship. The fact that romantic relationships between two males and between two females are still generally unacceptable among the Filipino youth may be related to their low level of exposure to gays, lesbians, bisexual men, and bisexual women. Several studies have found that persons with negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians are less likely to have had personal contact with them (Herek, 1984).

The sexual minority among the youth in the country is confronted with problems

Table 11.7b Percent of males and females with close friends who are gays, lesbians, bisexual man and bisexual woman by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males with close friends who are: |  |  |  | No. of males | Percent of females with close friends who are: |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gay | Lesbian | Bisexual man | Bisexual woman |  | Gay | Lesbian | Bisexual man | Bisexual woman |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 39.2 | 25.2 | 9.2 | 4.0 | 5715 | 59.9 | 38.8 | 9.3 | 6.7 | 5635 |
| 20-24 | 44.6 | 30.8 | 12.2 | 6.2 | 3578 | 56.7 | 39.0 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 4139 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 29.8 | 20.0 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 471 | 53.8 | 29.5 | 7.7 | 5.2 | 465 |
| Cagayan Valley | 21.2 | 9.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 345 | 53.2 | 36.3 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 56.4 | 34.0 | 25.5 | 6.9 | 943 | 60.8 | 40.8 | 8.2 | 4.9 | 1093 |
| CALABARZON | 45.5 | 27.2 | 13.3 | 8.4 | 1221 | 61.2 | 36.4 | 8.4 | 6.8 | 1300 |
| MIMAROPA | 32.5 | 24.4 | 7.8 | 4.2 | 283 | 51.4 | 31.2 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 279 |
| Bicol | 44.2 | 21.9 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 520 | 50.2 | 34.2 | 7.7 | 6.1 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 31.8 | 20.7 | 5.4 | 3.3 | 760 | 56.0 | 39.6 | 6.3 | 3.8 | 712 |
| Central Visayas | 29.1 | 17.9 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 741 | 58.2 | 37.6 | 5.1 | 3.4 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 37.0 | 27.7 | 13.0 | 4.0 | 424 | 57.4 | 40.4 | 15.2 | 8.0 | 401 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 42.1 | 22.6 | 6.5 | 2.7 | 368 | 54.4 | 29.6 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 356 |
| Northern Mindanao | 41.6 | 30.9 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 447 | 55.2 | 38.2 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 474 |
| Davao | 61.5 | 44.2 | 18.6 | 8.2 | 441 | 66.3 | 43.6 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 34.3 | 26.3 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 438 | 45.5 | 25.9 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 459 |
| CAR | 25.7 | 12.2 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 172 | 42.3 | 25.5 | 6.2 | 3.6 | 196 |
| ARMM | 6.0 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 320 | 29.3 | 16.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 351 |
| Caraga | 35.6 | 25.3 | 6.8 | 4.9 | 265 | 60.2 | 33.5 | 6.3 | 4.7 | 255 |
| NCR | 59.4 | 48.5 | 20.1 | 11.4 | 1137 | 77.2 | 61.1 | 26.4 | 18.9 | 1349 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 56.5 | 42.9 | 20.6 | 9.9 | 2379 | 70.1 | 51.0 | 17.0 | 12.6 | 2819 |
| Rural | 36.0 | 22.0 | 6.8 | 3.1 | 6914 | 53.9 | 34.0 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 6955 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 27.5 | 18.8 | 5.7 | 2.5 | 1722 | 36.5 | 23.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 919 |
| High school undergraduate | 36.8 | 23.7 | 8.3 | 3.4 | 3493 | 54.7 | 35.5 | 7.4 | 5.1 | 3487 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 46.3 | 29.9 | 11.6 | 4.9 | 2402 | 59.2 | 43.5 | 10.2 | 7.5 | 3040 |
| College or higher | 57.4 | 40.3 | 17.6 | 10.1 | 1676 | 72.1 | 44.0 | 13.2 | 9.0 | 2327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 29.2 | 17.8 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 1879 | 40.8 | 26.8 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 1949 |
| Second | 33.6 | 21.3 | 6 | 2.1 | 1904 | 53.2 | 33.3 | 4.4 | 3.2 | 2012 |
| Middle | 42.1 | 26.8 | 8.9 | 3.7 | 2078 | 59.5 | 40.7 | 10.3 | 6.4 | 2075 |
| Fourth | 47.6 | 35.1 | 16.1 | 8.1 | 1927 | 67.7 | 48.3 | 13.6 | 9.8 | 2050 |
| Highest (Richest) | 56.7 | 38 | 19.1 | 10 | 1505 | 73.1 | 45.8 | 15.1 | 11.8 | 1687 |
| Total | 41.3 | 27.4 | 10.4 | 4.8 | 9293 | 58.5 | 38.9 | 9.1 | 6.4 | 9773 |

Table 11.8 Problems experienced by males and females because of their gender and sexuality

| Problems | Male | Female |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Confusion regarding gender | 51.2 | 39.4 |
| Discrimination | 45.5 | 14.6 |
| Rejection by family | 11.0 | 7.5 |
| Rejection by friends | 4.8 | 7.7 |
| Verbal abuse | 34.8 | 12.6 |
| Physical assault | 6.5 | 5.7 |
| Sexual abuse | 5.5 | 1.3 |
| Did not experience any problem | 11.5 | 35.0 |
| No. of youth who are non-heterosexual or who have cross-gender desires | 418 | 855 |

surrounding their gender and sexual orientation. They experience confusion regarding their gender, are discriminated against, and experience verbal abuse. Apart from being rejected by their family and friends, some of these sexual minorities also reported experiencing physical assault and sexual abuse. While facing developmental challenges, these young people have also had to cope with this marginalization, which negatively affects their general well being.
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# Summary of Findings, Policy and Program Directions 

Josefina N. Natividad

The results of the 2013 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Survey present a current picture of the conditions of today's cohort of young adults in the traditional topic areas tracked by the YAFS series: sexual and non-sexual risk behaviors, as well as in some newly introduced topics like diet and lifestyle and an expanded section on gender identity, among others. Using the background factors of age, sex, highest educational attainment, urbanrural residence, socioeconomic status measured as wealth quintiles and region of residence, the overall results show that these background characteristics remain influential factors in explaining variability in the prevalence of risk behaviors as well as the other outcome measures discussed in the various chapters.

Compared with the results of YAFS surveys on earlier cohorts of Filipino youth we can draw, in broad strokes some of the notable areas of change in the conditions of today's young adults compared with the 1994 and 2002 cohorts. Among the most striking is the change in marriage patterns, notably a dramatic increase in the percentage of young people in a consensual union, commonly called living in, over the last decade with corresponding decline in the proportion who are formally married. In fact, over the last three YAFS rounds covering 20 years, there is evidence of a continuous decline in the proportion never married among the youth, accompanied by a similar decline in the proportion who are formally married, while the proportion who are living in has risen steadily, quite dramatically so in the last decade.

The shifting marriage pattern echoes, albeit weakly, the trend in other parts of the world, notably in western societies, of the decreasing proportions of couples in formal union and increase in consensual arrangements.

We also documented an increase in the prevalence of premarital sexual activity, with an evident narrowing of the gender gap such that the percentage of males and females who have engaged in premarital sex have now become almost equal, compared to 1994 and 2002 when the percentage was markedly higher among males. Despite the higher prevalence of premarital sexual activity however, the use of contraception among the youth remained very low and almost unchanged from the 1994 level. The net effect is a dramatic rise in teen pregnancy, more than doubling in the past 10 years, from 6 percent to 13 percent of 15-19 year old women who have begun childbearing in 2002 and 2013, respectively.

Unprotected premarital sex is considered in the YAFS surveys as risky because of the heightened likelihood of ending up with an unwanted pregnancy or of contracting a sexually transmitted infection. Generally, we found that most of the risky sexual activities are unprotected. Other forms of risky sex have been documented in this latest YAFS round, including a type of sexual relationship with a regular partner that is nonromantic in nature. In general there is evidence of increase in the prevalence of having multiple sexual partners but a decrease in commercial sex activity. Still, on the whole despite evidence of increase ,
the levels of the prevalence of risky sexual behaviors remain relatively low (all way below 50 percent) compared to the levels reported in developed countries although, under the local mores that prescribe no premarital sex at all, such levels may still be considered high.

Despite these documented changes in the behaviors of youth that suggest an increasing break from traditionally strict codes of sexual conduct, their attitudes and beliefs nonetheless reflect relatively high levels of adherence to such conservative beliefs as the importance of virginity before marriage for a woman and low levels of approval of premarital sexual activity also for a woman. A possible drift toward less conservative views is evident in the increasing proportions of youth who expressed the belief that a woman who gets pregnant out of wedlock should keep the baby without marrying the child's father. This is a significant shift from the attitudes and practices of earlier generations when an out-of-wedlock pregnancy had to be legitimized by formal marriage, regardless of the circumstances that led to the pregnancy. Such evidence of acceptance seen in the 2013 YAFS data is probably related to the rise of consensual unions among today's youth. In general, these results indicate that actual behaviors of the youth are changing faster than the norms of the larger society.

Moreover, while the prevalence of premarital sexual activity and other risky sexual behaviors are increasing, the level of knowledge about reproductive health in general, about conception in particular have remained poor as many of the youth are unable to correctly answer the survey questions designed to gauge level of knowledge about conception, even among those with college education. Even more alarming is the finding that the proportion of youth who are aware of STIs in general and of HIV in particular declined between 2002 and 2013. Moreover the proportion of youth who have comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS is only 17 percent. The picture is even more dire when one considers
the fact that between 2002 and 2013 the HIV infection rate in the Philippines has ballooned to epidemic proportions, fueled mainly by the risk behavior of men having sex with other men.

Overall, the youth appear to have limited access to credible material sources of information on puberty or on reproductive health. Asked to identify their most important material source of information on puberty, 46 percent said none. However, of those who mentioned a material source of information, the 2013 results showed a significant increase in the mention of the internet alongside television and books.

While there is evidence of increase in sexual risk behaviors, the trend in the nonsexual risk behaviors of smoking, drinking and drug use indicate a positive shift toward decreasing prevalence of these risk behaviors, more pronounced for smoking than for drinking. The decrease in the prevalence of smoking and drinking cannot be attributed to the passage of the law in 2013 increasing "sin" taxes for tobacco and liquor because the data collection phase of YAFS preceded the implementation of the law. More likely, the youth have become more conscious of the risks attributed to smoking and drinking such that fewer in this cohort took up these behaviors compared to their 1994 and 2002 counterparts. Furthermore, the prevalence of ever use of drugs documented in earlier survey rounds to be at a low level, has gone even lower in 2013.

But there are other forms of non-sexual risks that the youth are exposed to such as the experience of physical violence, both as victim and aggressor and the little researched risk behavior of suicide, proxied in the survey by suicidal ideation and suicide attempt.

Another significant development that the 2013 YAFS results has documented is the changing patterns of use of mass media by the youth. While television remains the most commonly subscribed media form, the use of the internet has supplanted other forms, particularly printed materials. Fewer youth
in 2013 read any form of printed material compared with earlier cohorts, be they books, comics, magazines or newspapers. The 2013 YAFS also documents the phenomenal increase in the pervasiveness of the use of the internet, from a mere 2 percent in 2002 to 59 percent of current users in 2013.

In the field of communications technologies in general, the 2013 YAFS has documented the remarkable increase in the prevalence of ownership of a cellular phone and its pervasive use in many aspects of the young people's lives. The personal cell phone has become a tool to widen one's social circles through virtual friends. It has also become a way to meet other young people for hook ups. Together, the cell phone and the internet has transformed the lives of today's youth to the point where most of their leisure activities are now technology-driven, but sadly, also more sedentary.

Amidst all these developments in telecommunications which are reshaping the lives of today's young people, there remains a significant variability in access to these technologies, evident in the Report when the youth are subdivided by education, socioeconomic status, urban-rural residence and by the region where they reside. Differentials in access remain, showing that those who have lower education, belong to the lower wealth quintiles, rural residents and residing in regions that are less developed are disadvantaged by having fewer of them able to use the internet or own a cell phone.

## Policy and program implications

From the beginning of the YAFS surveys in 1982, the enduring impetus for conducting these studies on the Filipino youth has been the need to provide the evidence base for programs and policies aimed at this sector. A recognition of the fast pace of change because of modernization, technological innovations, changing values, lifestyles and influences, the
fluidity of youth itself calls for a constant and regular updating of our knowledge about the youth so that policies and programs remain attuned to the realities on the ground. Not really by design, the YAFS surveys have been carried out every ten years, on average. Many planners in government and in the development community now recognize that a 10 -year interval between YAFS rounds is too long and some incipient developments that can have profound consequences at a later time may be missed if the data is updated only every 10 years. Thus, the first policy implication is the call for a regular YAFS survey, with a shorter interval, ideally 5 years.

There are many specific findings either already outlined in this Report or that can be generated from further mining of the 2013 YAFS data that can guide specific programs for the youth, over a very wide range of program intervention areas. Some of these specific recommendations for program planners can be found in the summary and conclusions section of each chapter beginning with chapter 2.

Some examples of the policy and program implications of the 2013 YAFS findings are:

1. The persistence of poor levels of knowledge about reproductive health, the lack of sources or even the interest to consult sources call for specific programs of action to raise the knowledge level of today's youth regarding matters related to sexuality and reproductive health, especially since many are already engaged in risky sexual behaviors. The historic passage of the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act of 2012 (RA 10354) presents the golden opportunity to come up with a comprehensive sexuality education at the basic education level that will help overturn this current situation. The YAFS results provide the concrete evidence of the dire consequences of a general lack of a working knowledge on reproductive health among a sector already engaged in risky sexual behaviors, consequences
like the high teen pregnancy rates and an unacceptably high HIV infection rate. The YAFS results can likewise help identify the appropriate strategies for reaching out to this sector. For one, the use of reading materials for information dissemination may be less effective because of the low level of consumption of traditional print media. Information dissemination for the youth may be more effective if delivered via the internet or the cell phone.
2. While risk behaviors are the main focus of the YAFS surveys, there are other areas of intervention to enhance overall youth welfare and development that need attention, such as the promotion of healthy diets and lifestyles. Already, there is evidence of a decline in smoking and drinking among the youth, a positive development that needs reinforcing. The next area to address is the promotion of healthy nutrition and a healthy lifestyle, to prevent at this early stage in the life of the youth the later onset of lifestyle diseases brought about by poor diets and lack of physical activity.

In conclusion, as with previous rounds of the Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality studies, the 2013 YAFS results will continue to be mined further to help shed light on other aspects that may need an empirical evidence to guide programs for young people. The breadth and depth of information that the data can yield is barely scratched in this Report. We expect that the data will be mined further as new questions and new proposals for youth programs are planned, until it is felt that too much time has passed and it is time again to conduct a new YAFS survey.
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# Studying the Filipino Youth 

Josefina N. Natividad

Youth or young adulthood is best regarded as a period of transition from the dependence of childhood to the independence of adulthood. It is often considered a critical period, a time when one's future lies ahead with much promise and also much risk. Demographically, youth is a period of many critical transitions: school leaving, taking on the first job, entering into the first serious relationship, first marriage, first pregnancy and other crucial life changes that can have lifelong consequences on an individual's future life trajectory. Many young people fall into a path of problematic behaviors at this stage of their lives, making choices that have adverse consequences, both in the short and the long term. Preventing these problematic behaviors and promoting positive youth development is an investment into the future of the nation. After all, the youth of today are the future of a society. Understanding the youth is an important first step toward creating the path to promoting positive youth development. For this, there is need for empirical evidence, specifically data on a representative sample of this subpopulation, gathered using rigorous methods of inquiry.

The 2013 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study (YAFS4) is the fourth round in a series of surveys on a nationally representative sample of Filipino young adults or the youth. It follows the United Nations (UN) definition of young adults as persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years. ${ }^{1}$ Based on the 2010 Philippine
census, young adults constitute 19.6 percent of the Philippine population, a proportion that has been fairly constant for the past 50 years (i.e., since the 1960 Philippine census). In 2013, we estimated the young adult Filipino population to be 19.2 million. Of these, 10.2 million were aged 15-19 and 9 million were aged 20-24.

The first YAFS survey, the 1982 Young Adult Fertility Study (YAFS1), was the initial attempt to conduct such a study on young people with a nationally representative sample in the Philippines. At that time, the emphasis of most demographic studies was fertility. Thus, YAFS1 covered only young women. Unlike the National Demographic and Health Survey which is a national survey on women of reproductive age (15-49) conducted every five years since 1968 and centered mostly on fertility and its determinants and correlates, YAFS1 included the additional topics of premarital sex, dating and courtship, and attitudes toward virginity, marriage, and family formation. YAFS1 utilized a multistage cluster stratified sampling design that yielded a national probability sample of 5,204 married and unmarried females 15-24 years of age. YAFS1 was conducted by the University of the Philippines Population Institute, with funding from the Commission on Population (PopCom) through the Population Center Foundation.

The second YAFS (YAFS2) survey was conducted in 1994. It was the first survey in the YAFS series to cover both males and females. In

[^12]YAFS2, the term "sexuality" was added to the title for the first time to reflect the change in perspective from a fertility-centered survey to one with a broader scope covering other young adult behaviors. This survey was conducted by the Demographic Research and Development Foundation, Inc. (DRDF), ${ }^{2}$ with funding support from the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and technical support from the EastWest Center Program on Population. YAFS2 had a nationally representative sample of 10,849 respondents ( 5,257 males and 5,622 females). While fertility remained one of its themes, the YAFS2 questionnaire was expanded to include new emerging topics of interest pertinent to young adults, specifically sexuality, awareness and knowledge of HIV/AIDS, and the non-sexual risk behaviors of smoking, drinking, and drug use.

The 2002 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study (YAFS3) was the second national survey of young adults, both male and female. In this round, the age coverage was expanded by three years (i.e., 15-27) because the study intended to analyze the consequences of marital behavior. It was deemed that by age 24 , the number of cases that could be analyzed for this purpose would be small. Expanding the sample to age 27 was expected to yield more cases for analysis. Because of the expanded age coverage, YAFS3 had 19,728 respondents. The YAFS3 sample aged $15-24$ was 16,964 cases. YAFS3 was the first YAFS round where a regionally representative sample of the Muslim youth was included. It also used qualitative data gathering techniques such as focus group discussions and key informant interviews to provide a deeper understanding of the survey results. Some qualitative data collection was also done before the survey to help frame the survey questionnaires. The approach for the design of YAFS3 was more interdisciplinary than YAFS2 with participation of experts from disciplines other than demography like sociology, anthropology, psychology, adolescent medicine and mass communication.

YAFS3 was conducted by the DRDF and UPPI with funding support from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, a United States-based grant-giving institution. YAFS3 was undertaken primarily to update the national and regional database on sexuality and reproductive health knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of young adults in the country. With this series of YAFS surveys, it became possible to establish trends in important reproductive health events of young adults in the Philippines such as premarital sex, sexual risk behaviors like unprotected sex, and non-sexual risk behaviors like smoking, drinking, and substance use. YAFS3 featured for the first time questions on other risk behaviors like suicidal ideation and suicide attempts.

YAFS4, conducted in 2013, used the same set of questions as YAFS3 to allow for the analysis of trends. Additionally, it contains new questions about developments affecting young people that were not yet existent in previous survey rounds, such as widespread cell phone and Internet use. Furthermore, the YAFS4 questionnaire contains a new block on health and lifestyle (e.g., diet, height, weight, exercise, body image), and self-assessed well-being (life satisfaction and happiness). New sections were added to existing blocks, such as depressive symptoms, experience of violence, and harassment using technology including cyberbullying. Funding support for YAFS4 came from the Australian government through the UNFPA and the Department of Health which released funds through the Health System Research Management Grants under the Philippine Council for Health Research and Development (PCHRD).

As with the three previous rounds, the overall objective of YAFS4 is to generate updated estimates of indicators of adolescent reproductive health such as the adolescent fertility rate, sexual and non-sexual risk behaviors of young people, and their determinants and consequences at the national and regional levels. But YAFS offers much more than information on these traditional domains.

[^13]It is also a rich data source on other aspects of young people's lives, such as schooling, employment, parental influences, values, and attitudes. Hence, YAFS4 data can be continually mined to gain further insights into this critical period of life for this current cohort of Filipino youth.

## Research design

The YAFS is designed to be a crosssectional survey of young adults aged 15-24. Results are considered representative of the Filipino youth at the national and regional levels.

## Sampling design

The survey employed a two-stage sampling design with the region as the domain and the barangay as the primary sampling unit. At 5 percent risk with 5 percent margin of error, the minimum sample size required if simple random sampling will be used is about 343 cases per domain. Since the survey followed a two-stage sampling design, the sample size was doubled to account for the design effect of 2. Hence, the target sample size was doubled to 686 cases per region. Should there be other sources of inefficiency, it is assumed that stratification in the sampling design will negate this. However, the possibility of encountering uncooperative eligible respondents as well as inaccessible locations led to further adjustment of the sample size to 800 cases per region. Finally, to allow for a more detailed analysis of the results at the regional level, the target sample size was raised to around 1,000 cases per region.

With the regions as domains, the first step was to determine the sample barangays per region. The number of sample barangays was computed based on an estimate of 15 households per barangay that can be reasonably completed by a survey team in a given day. To account for the possibility of inclusion of inaccessible barangays in the sample, a 15 percent oversampling allowance was applied to the number of sample barangays.

To determine the number of households per region, the average number of target respondents per household was computed for each region. The sample size was proportionally allocated in subsequent stratifications. Once a sample household was selected, all eligible youth respondents (aged 15-24) in that household were interviewed.

## Sample selection

To select the sample barangays in the region, barangays were first stratified into three strata (small, medium, and large), with the size of the youth population as the stratification variable. Once the three strata were formed, the number of sample barangays for the region was proportionally allocated. Within each stratum, the sample barangays were selected with probability proportional to their population size in the 2010 Census of Population. This method of selecting the barangays will result in a greater likelihood of distributing the sample barangays to all provinces.

Consequently using this method, all provinces in the country, except for three small provinces (Batanes, Siquijor, and Dinagat), were eventually included in the sample.

The urban-rural dimension was not considered in stratifying barangays since the use of population size in the stratification will implicitly consider urban-rural grouping (i.e., urban barangays have bigger population sizes, while most rural barangays have smaller population sizes). Thus, the design could guarantee the adequacy of samples for analyses made with the urban-rural dimension.

The sample barangays were divided into enumeration areas (EAs). An EA consists of around 500 households and is determined by natural and man-made boundaries like roads, bridges, and streets. In each sample barangay, one EA was selected using simple random sampling. For each barangay, a representative sample of 15 households was selected using systematic sampling, with the sampling interval derived by dividing the total number of households in
the barangay or EA by 15. All eligible members of the sample household (i.e., those 15-24 years old) were interviewed.

The population counts and the survey sample sizes for the complete YAFS4 sample (all regions) are summarized in Table 1.

In all, YAFS4 covered the 17 regions of the country: 78 provinces, 681 cities and municipalities, and 1,141 barangays. The total sample size is 19,178 cases, 9,353 males and 9,825 females.

## Survey weights

The data was weighted to ensure that the results are representative of the country's youth population and its regional distribution. The weights at the barangay level were computed using the Horvitz-Thompson estimator formula: w_hi=1/p_hi , where p_hi refers to the selection probability of ith sample barangay in stratum $h$. At the household level, the weights were adjusted based on the proportion of sample households to the total number of households in the barangay.

At the respondent level, weight adjustment was done by considering the response rate (i.e., the proportion of interviewed respondents to the total number of eligible respondents). The resulting weights were then scaled down to reflect the survey sample size.

## Survey instruments

In all, YAFS4 used a total of 10 survey instruments: 8 Main Individual Respondents Questionnaire, the Household Questionnaire, and the Community Questionnaire.

The Household Questionnaire is administered in the household that has been selected to be part of the sample regardless of whether or not the household has a member 1524 years old (eligible youth respondent). The respondent to the Household Questionnaire can be the head of the household, the spouse of the household head or any knowledgeable member of the household aged 18 years or above. The Household Questionnaire asks for information about all members of that household. Response

Table 1.1 YAFS4 sample size per region

| Region | 2010 Census of Population |  |  |  |  | 2013 YAFS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Household population | No. of barangays | No. of households | No. of youth | No. of youth per household | No. of barangays | No. of households | No. of respondents |
| 1 | 4,743,067 | 3,265 | 1,050,605 | 885,934 | 0.84 | 73 | 1,091 | 1,202 |
| 2 | 3,225,761 | 2,310 | 727,327 | 631,068 | 0.87 | 71 | 1,060 | 1,099 |
| 3 | 10,118,478 | 3,102 | 2,239,011 | 1,928,626 | 0.86 | 71 | 1,068 | 1,182 |
| 4A | 12,583,009 | 4,011 | 2,833,595 | 2,396,690 | 0.85 | 73 | 1,088 | 1,137 |
| 4B | 2,731,928 | 1,458 | 602,131 | 528,813 | 0.88 | 70 | 1,048 | 1,084 |
| 5 | 5,411,521 | 3,471 | 1,111,753 | 1,030,147 | 0.93 | 66 | 993 | 1,010 |
| 6 | 7,089,739 | 4,050 | 1,526,587 | 1,398,701 | 0.92 | 67 | 1,004 | 1,082 |
| 7 | 6,784,538 | 3,003 | 1,487,710 | 1,331,228 | 0.89 | 69 | 1,028 | 1,037 |
| 8 | 4,089,734 | 4,388 | 865,657 | 780,378 | 0.90 | 68 | 1,021 | 1,122 |
| 9 | 3,397,838 | 1,904 | 726,272 | 686,024 | 0.94 | 65 | 974 | 1,118 |
| 10 | 4,284,594 | 2,022 | 917,840 | 866,299 | 0.94 | 65 | 975 | 1,387 |
| 11 | 4,452,549 | 1,162 | 1,011,943 | 903,278 | 0.89 | 69 | 1,031 | 1,272 |
| 12 | 4,103,105 | 1,194 | 916,038 | 847,274 | 0.92 | 66 | 995 | 1,113 |
| CAR | 1,611,669 | 1,176 | 352,403 | 348,271 | 0.99 | 62 | 931 | 928 |
| ARMM | 3,248,787 | 2,490 | 538,941 | 634,937 | 1.18 | 52 | 781 | 1,056 |
| CARAGA | 2,424,788 | 1,310 | 504,257 | 488,958 | 0.97 | 63 | 949 | 1,259 |
| NCR | 11,796,873 | 1,704 | 2,759,829 | 2,360,131 | 0.86 | 72 | 1,076 | 1,090 |
| Total | 92,097,978 | 42,020 | 20,171,899 | 18,046,757 |  | 1,141 | 17,111 | 19,178 |

to the questionnaire is the basis for identifying eligible respondents in the household.

The Household Questionnaire gathers information about each member of the household such as relationship to household head, age, sex, highest grade completed, main activity, occupation, whether the household member is working abroad, and marital status. It also asks about the amenities owned by members of the household, the tenure status on the lot, and housing conditions (e.g., type of toilet facilities, source of water, housing materials) - information that is used to compute for the socioeconomic status index, the basis for determining the socioeconomic status of the household.

There are eight variants of the individual questionnaire: (1) Main single female, (2) Main married female, (3) Main single male, (4) Main married male, (5) Muslim single female, (6) Muslim married female, (7) Muslim single male, and (8) Muslim married male.

The majority of questions in the Main and the Muslim questionnaires are identical. Deviations from the Main Questionnaires were made in the sections on religion and religious practices and marriage and marriage practices and in some of attitude questions in block K (See blocks of the questionnaire below). For example, the section on religious practices in the Main Questionnaires asked for attendance in religious services such as the mass. For the Muslim questionnaires, the questions referred to practices in the Islamic faith such as fasting during Ramadan. The structure and wording of the questionnaires were designed to minimize interviewer bias and maximize clarity of response.

The Main Questionnaire contains the following blocks:

[^14]| Block H | Marriage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Block I | Puberty, Dating, and Sex |
| Block J | Fertility and Contraception |
| Block K | Knowledge and Attitudes |
|  | toward Marriage, Sex, and <br>  <br> Related Issues |
| Block L | Reproductive Health |

The Main Individual Respondents Questionnaires were administered to all members of the household aged 15-24.

The 10th instrument is the Community Questionnaire administered to the barangay captain or a person in the barangay who was knowledgeable about the community. Data from the Community Questionnaire can provide insights into the immediate environment of the young adult outside the household. The Community Questionnaire has the following sections:

| Section A | Background of the barangay <br> Communication and |
| :--- | :--- |
| Section B | Entertainment Facilities |
| Section C | Reproductive Health <br> Services |
| Section D | Economic Activities <br> Section E |
| Organizations in the <br> Barangay <br> Section F | Youth-Related Concerns <br> Section G |
| Collective Efficacy |  |

The YAFS4 questionnaires built on the core instruments used in the previous rounds and incorporated new developments that were not yet evident in 2002. As a preliminary step to developing the YAFS4 questionnaires, the DRDF team first conducted several focus group discussions with young people to better capture the prevailing conditions surrounding young adults and to frame the questions in the language that is appropriate for them. A consultative workshop participated by experts from the academe, government, non-government organizations and other stakeholders was later convened to further refine the questionnaires.

After the main questionnaires were completed, the questions that were to be revised for the Muslim version of the instrument were identified. Experts on Muslim culture were consulted in the development of the Muslimspecific questions. Focus group discussions were conducted to inquire on the propriety of asking certain questions being considered in the study.

The questionnaires were first prepared in English then translated into six major languages in the country, namely Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilonggo, Waray, Ilocano and Bicol. They were then back translated to English to ensure that the translations remained faithful to the original version. A translation into the Maguindanao language was prepared later, following a request from the Maguindanao area field team.

## Informed consent

The consent of respondents was sought before an interview could be conducted. A standard informed consent form was first read to the potential respondent. Only if he/she indicated agreement to be interviewed under the conditions read to him/her by signing the form did the actual interview proceed. For respondents who were below 18 at the interview date, a parental informed consent form was used. It was first read to the youth's parent/guardian. Only after the parent consented for the youth to be interviewed did we proceed to read the informed consent form to the selected respondent. Unlike youth older than 18, the minor respondents signed an assent form, which is part of the parental consent form.

The procedure for securing informed consent was recommended by the Ethics Review Board of PCHRD which reviewed the ethical dimensions of the survey protocol.

## Data collection

For the data collection, academe-based Regional Coordinators and Field Supervisors recruited from regional universities and organizations (Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University for Ilocos, Cagayan State

University for Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon State University for Central Luzon, UP Los Baños for CALABARZON and MIMAROPA, Ateneo de Naga for Bicol, UP Iloilo for Western Visayas, Office of Population Studies of the University of San Carlos for Central Visayas, UP Tacloban for Eastern Visayas, Xavier University for Northern Mindanao and Caraga, Western Mindanao State University for Zamboanga Peninsula, and Family Planning Organization of the Philippines for Davao and SOCCSKSARGEN) co-supervised the data collection activities in most of the regions, while the DRDF team supervised data collection in the NCR, CAR and ARMM. Field Supervisors from the DRDF were deployed for monitoring and spot checking of field activities. Field Interviewers were recruited from each region.

All field personnel underwent a 4-day training on the questionnaires, the sampling methodology, interviewing techniques, and field methods. A national training was held in December 2012 participated in by Regional Coordinators and Field Supervisors and conducted by the DRDF central team. This was followed by 14 training sessions of the regional field teams, each conducted by two or three representatives of the central team. Each regional field team consisted of at least 2 Field Supervisors and 20 Field Interviewers.

Data was gathered through face-to-face interviews. The interviewer should be of the same sex as the respondent because of the sensitive nature of some of the questions, especially on sexuality.

Data collection started in the National Capital Region after the December 2012 training. In the regions, field work began as soon as the regional training was completed, starting in January 2013. Altogether data collection was from December 2012 to May 2013 with an average duration of 3 months per region.

## Data processing

Data processing began in April 2013 even as the field work was still being completed in some study areas. Some form of data processing
occurred during field work, with field supervisors going over each completed questionnaire to ensure that these were filled in properly and that mistakes could be addressed while the teams were still in the field. Data processing in the central office consisted of office editing, coding and encoding, and data editing. A total of 72 personnel were involved in the various stages of data processing.

The Census and Survey Processing System (CSPro), a software package developed by the United States Census Bureau, was used for data entry and verification. IBM SPSS Statistics was employed for data editing and generation of statistical tables

## Organization of the book

This report presents results of the survey in main themes covered by the study. The description of results across the chapters follow a common format in that each presents the results differentiated along the same set of background characteristics, namely sex, age (classified into two categories: 15-19 and 20-24), region of residence, urban-rural residence, educational attainment at the time of the survey, and the socioeconomic status of the household to which the youth belongs. Urban-rural classification is based on the 2003 official definition of urban and rural barangays used by the then National Statistics Office (National Statistics Office, 2013). The socioeconomic status is derived from the wealth index, a composite index that categorizes households into quintiles ranging from 1 (the lowest quintile or the poorest) to 5 (the highest quintile or the wealthiest). The wealth index in turn employed information on ownership of household amenities and vehicles, and housing characteristics such as source of drinking water and type of toilet facilities in order to categorize households into the appropriate quintile following the methodology of Rutstein and Johnson (2008) that is used in demographic and health surveys (DHS) worldwide. These six basic characteristics are often used in the research literature to explain variability in individual behavior and can help us
understand better the differences and similarities among young people of today.

Furthermore, starting from Chapter 3 up to Chapter 11, findings are presented as a series of bivariate crosstabulations between a given basic characteristic and a given outcome variable. These give the reader some insights into the possible association between each background characteristic and each outcome variable. For example, for the variable smoking, the results will show the difference in smoking behavior between men and women, between the younger (15-19) and older (20-24) cohort, between urban and rural residents, across the wealth quintiles and the 17 regions of the country. In this monograph it is not the intent to test for the combined effects of the background variables. Thus, multivariate analysis is neither conducted nor presented here. That will be the subject of further studies on the YAFS4 data.

Where the data allow, each chapter also presents trends in specific outcome variables, such as the prevalence of premarital sex, drinking, smoking, and substance use, to show how these may have changed over the years. These trend data provide insights into changing behavioral patterns among the different cohorts of youth and how, at the macro level, Philippine society may also be changing.
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# Filipino Youth through the Years 

Nimfa B. Ogena<br>Grace T. Cruz

## Demography of the Filipino Youth

The number and share of the youth in the world's population is close to reaching its historical peak, a point that will mark the largest number and share of young people the world will ever see (Lam, 2007; Nugent, 2005). After this, we expect a period of decreasing share of the world's youth population owing largely to the effects of the global decline in fertility. Estimates show that the size of the youth population has reached its maximum in all regions except Africa (United Nations, 2015).

Still, there is an observed diversity in the demography of the youth population across regions and countries. In the Philippines, the number of young people aged $15-24$ is increasing, with the momentum expected to be sustained
in the coming decades (Figure 1.1). As of 2010, there were around 18 million young adults in the country, 3.4 times its size 50 years earlier (i.e., 5.3 million in 1960). It is projected to expand to a maximum size of 22.2 million in 2040, after which it will start to shrink. This projected trend is based on the Philippine medium-term population projection assumptions, which set replacement fertility to be attained in 2035.

The current structure of the youth population shows a higher number in the younger (15-19 years old) than in the older cohort (20-24 years old). This will continue until 2040, after which a reversal is projected, with the 20-24 age group exceeding the size of the 15-19 age group.

In terms of sex composition, there are currently more male than female youth as indicated by the youth sex ratio of 103 in 2010

Figure 2.1 Youth population size (in millions) and growth, Philippines: 1960-2045

(or 103 males per hundred females). This difference is expected to heighten in the future as the youth sex ratio is projected to increase to 106 in 2045. The increasing proportion of males in the youth population is a reversal of the past trend characterized by more females. In 1970, for example, there were 94 male youth for every 100 female youth, a pattern that persisted until a balanced sex ratio was registered in 2000 (Table 2.1). The main driver to the increase in the sex ratio is the improvement in infant mortality over the preceding decades resulting in higher survivorship for all infants. Since the sex ratio at birth is usually above 100 , improving infant mortality has resulted in more male babies surviving to early adulthood than had in previous times.

Similar to all other age groups, the youth population is increasing but at a decelerating pace. Its highest growth rate was posted in 1960-1970 at 3.1 percent, exceeding that of the total population growth rate of 3.0 percent, which at that time was the peak of growth of the Philippine population (Figure 2.2). Since the 1990s, the youth population has been growing at a lower rate relative to the total population. It is expected to sustain this trajectory of positive growth until 2040-2045, when it is projected to register a negative rate of growth for the first time. This negative growth rate will follow the same trajectory as that of the youngest cohort

Table 2.1 Sex ratio of youth 15-24: 1970-2045

| Year | $\mathbf{1 5 - 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 - 2 4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | 95 | 94 | 94 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | 95 | 93 | 94 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | 100 | 99 | 99 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 103 | 102 | 103 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 4 5 *}$ | 106 | 106 | 106 |

Note: *Based on projections using medium assumption.
(i.e., $<15$ years old), the first age group in the country projected to register a negative rate of growth. Due to slowly declining fertility, the youngest age group has consistently been the lowest growing sector in the country since the 1960s.

While the size of the population 15-24 has been increasing over time, its percent share of the total population has remained more or less steady at 20 percent. The percent share reached its peak at 20.5 percent from 1980-1990 but is expected to decline to 16.2 percent in 2040, when the youth population will have achieved its maximum size (Figure 2.3). Studies show that the peak of the youth share of the total population (population 12-24 as a percentage of the total population) occurs at around 25-30 percent of the population for most countries (Lam, 2007).

Figure 2.2 Population growth rates by age group, Philippines: 1960-2045


Figure 2.3 Population 15-24 as a percentage of the total population and growth rate: 1960-2045


At present, the Philippine population displays a characteristic "youth bulge", that is, the bulk of the population both in 1970 and 2010 are in the age groups below 25 . But unlike other countries that show the temporary character of the youth bulge (Xenos \& Kabamalan, 2002), that of the Philippines will likely persist for a relatively prolonged period owing to the slow demographic transition in the county.

The pace of the demographic transition can be discerned from Figure 2.4 which traces the trend in fertility and infant mortality in the Philippines. While fertility rates are declining, the pace of decline has slackened in recent years. This is evident in the total fertility rate (TFR), which dropped from 6 children per woman in
the 1970s to about 3 at present (Figure 2.4). It took two decades (1973-1993) to reduce the TFR from 6 to 4, or approximately one child per decade, but 20 years (1993-2013) to reduce the TFR further by another birth (Cruz, 2014). In comparison, mortality, measured in terms of the infant mortality rate (IMR), declined more rapidly than fertility, resulting in a high rate of natural increase. The highest natural increase was observed in the 1970s, coinciding with the highest population growth rate in the country. This high population growth rate translated to an increasing volume of population increments that resulted in the large cohort of the young adult population that we observe in the country today.

Figure 2.4 TFR and IMR, Philippines: 1973-2013


Population growth momentum is the other driver of the youth bulge. Population momentum refers to the inertia that is inherent in population dynamics because childbearing takes place two to three decades after birth (Lam, 2007; Shryock et al., 1975). With the higher increments in population size, we expect the childbearing population to continue to increase despite the declining fertility rate because the youth of today who are the parents of the future have already been born. Herrin and Costello (1996) estimated that 66 percent of the country's population growth from 1995 through 2020 is due to population momentum, while unwanted (16\%) and wanted fertility (18\%) accounted for the remaining third.

The foregoing overview of the demography of the Filipino youth underscores the significance of the youth sector on the country's future. Their sheer volume alone will have distinct socioeconomic consequences that should be recognized by development planners. For example, their economic implication is evident in the ratio of the youth population to the working age group 25-64 or 25-59 which shows the youth population having a substantial share of the total working age population (Figure 2.5). In 1970, there were 61 youth aged 15-24 for every 100 adults aged $25-64$. In 2010, there were 46 youth for every 100 adults aged 25-64. Although
the ratio had declined, the trend still portrays a very youthful potential labor force.

The high proportion of the youth in the labor force has been hailed as a possible boon to a country's development if their economic potential is harnessed through gainful employment. On the other hand, if they lack the skills for gainful participation, a high proportion of the youth who end up unemployed or unemployable can present problems to the country as a whole (Emoju, 2014, Kumar, 2013) .

In the foregoing discussion, we have established that there is a sizable proportion of the Philippine population who belong to the youth age group. We have also established the projected trajectories of the growth in size of this sector relative to the total population. In order to make appropriate plans for this sector it is important to establish a clearer understanding of who the youth are, beyond their sheer size, projected growth trajectories and relative position in the overall landscape of the Philippine population. The YAFS series of surveys has been one of the more prominent sources of data on the youth in the Philippines. Past YAFS results have been used extensively by government agencies like the Commission on Population, Department of Health and Department of Education as guides in crafting policies and programs targeting this age sector.

Figure 2.5 Ratio of the population 15-24 to population 25-59 and 25-64, Philippines: 1960-2045


| 1960 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

The Youth in Context: Family, School, Peers, Work, and Community

In the following discussion, we present a description of the Filipino youth based on the results of the 2013 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study. In particular, we situate the youth within the major sources of influences in their lives: family, school, peers, work and the community. In so doing, the chapter aims to provide an overall profile of the Filipino youth of today that will help facilitate our understanding of who they are.

## A basic profile of the youth

Beginning in 1994, the YAFS study series was designed to capture a representative sample of the Filipino youth aged 15-24. Expectedly, the study sample must project a profile that closely resembles that of the total population it represents. Results of the last three survey rounds (1994, 2002, and 2013) show an almost equal gender split in the study population. Specifically, the males constitute anywhere between a 47 and 49 percent share, signifying a smaller number of males compared with the
females (Table 2.2). In the 2010 census, there is a slight numeric male edge among the youth in the country, although the difference between the census and the sample population is not significant.

In terms of age composition, the sample aptly captures the age structure of the country's youth population, as both show a higher proportion of the younger (15-19) than the older cohort (20-24). The age structure of the study sample has been more or less stable over the three survey rounds, with the younger cohort constituting around 60 percent of the youth population in the 2013 YAFS. The stability in the age structure over the three survey rounds is also evident in the consistent mean age (about 19 years) of the samples over the three YAFS rounds. Thus, the age and sex composition of the current study closely approximates the age-sex distribution of the Philippine population based on Census data, as did the three previous YAFS rounds. This bolsters the stand that the sample is representative of the Filipino youth in general, hence, the other characteristics of the sample also represent that of the population of Filipino youth of today.

Table 2.2 Percent distribution of YAFS sampled youth: 1994, 2002, and 2013

| Background characteristics | 1994 |  | 2002 |  | 2013 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | No. of cases | Percent | No. of cases | Percent | No. of cases |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 48.3 | 5,257 | 47.4 | 8,042 | 48.8 | 9,365 |
| Female | 51.7 | 5,622 | 52.6 | 8,922 | 51.2 | 9,813 |
| Both sexes | 100.0 | 10,879 | 100.0 | 16,964 | 100.0 | 19,178 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 58.2 | 6,336 | 60.3 | 10,236 | 59.6 | 11,424 |
| 20-24 | 41.8 | 4,543 | 39.7 | 6,728 | 40.4 | 7,754 |
| 15-24 | 100.0 | 10,878 | 100.0 | 16,964 | 100.0 | 19,178 |
| Mean age | 18.9 | 10,878 | 18.8 | 16,964 | 18.9 | 19,178 |

The modal highest educational attainment (36.7\%) is high school undergraduate, mainly because many of those in the age group 15-19 are still in the last years of high school (Table 2.3). About 28 percent completed high school, 21 percent attained college-level education, and 13.8 percent had elementary-level schooling. An almost negligible proportion ( $0.4 \%$ ) had no schooling at all, which leads to the conclusion that practically all Filipino youth have undergone some formal schooling. A gender variation in educational attainment is evident, with the females registering a somewhat better education profile relative to the males. For example, 23.8 percent of females attained college-level education compared with 18 percent of the males.

As to their main activity three months prior to the survey, 36.3 percent reported that they were in school while 25.3 percent were currently working. About one in five (19.8\%), predominantly female, were doing housework. A minority of 8.8 percent were idle, that is, not doing any of the following: studying, working, looking for work, doing housework, or doing unpaid family work. There is a notable gender difference in main activity, with more males reporting themselves to be working and more females in school or doing housework.

The majority of the youth have never been married (76.6\%). The remainder is either in a consensual union (13.8\%) or formally married (8.5\%); a small proportion (1.1\%) are separated, divorced, or widowed (Table 2.3). Compared with past YAFS results, what is striking about the 2013 YAFS sample is the high proportion of youth who are in a living-in arrangement, which exceeds those in a legal union. Living-in is more common among females (20\%) than males (8\%). Likewise, more females are in a formal union, suggesting that they enter union formation earlier than males. Given the greater proportion of females in a marital union, it is not surprising that more of them reported being separated (2\%) compared with males ( $0.3 \%$ ), although the levels are very low for both sexes.

Comparing the marital status composition from the past three YAFS rounds with the
current survey, there is ample evidence that the marital profile of the Filipino youth has undergone dramatic changes, most evidently during the last decade. For one, the proportion of never married Filipino youth declined from 83.9 percent in 2002 to 76.6 percent in 2013, yet the proportion of formally married youth also declined from 9.8 percent in 2002 to 8.5 percent in 2013 (Figure 2.6 ). On the other hand, there is a striking increase in the proportion who are in a living-in arrangement from only 4.7 percent in 1994 to 13.8 percent in 2013. Also In 2013, the proportion of the youth who are separated, widowed, or divorced, although small at 1.1 percent, increased from 0.3 percent in 1994.

In terms of geographic location, more than a third of the youth reside in the biggest regions of the country, namely CALABARZON, NCR, and Central Luzon, with a combined share of 37 percent of the total youth population in the country.

Consistent with the acknowledged dominance of the Catholic faith in the country, 79.4 percent of the youth reported themselves to be Catholics, with the remainder distributed among other Christian and non-Christian religions. One in 20 youth (5\%) are followers of Islam, a proportion that closely resembles the relative share of Muslim Filipinos to the total country population. Despite almost all youth professing to have a religion, only 34.7 percent report that they take part in religious ceremonies. About 44 percent said their parents or guardians required them to attend religious services while they were growing up, while 30.4 percent reported that their family attends religious services together. More among the female youth and the younger cohort attend religious ceremonies compared with their respective counterparts.

## The family context

## Persons who raised the youth

Family support plays a crucial role in the youth's developmental journey. In particular, the family provides a solid foundation for the

Table 2.3 Percent distribution of youth by sex, age group, and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  |  | Female |  |  | Both sexes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15-19 | 20-24 | 15-24 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 15-24 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 15-24 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 96.7 | 72.8 | 87.5 | 84.7 | 40.7 | 66.1 | 90.8 | 55.6 | 76.6 |
| Living-in | 2.6 | 16.5 | 7.9 | 11.5 | 30.3 | 19.5 | 7.0 | 23.9 | 13.8 |
| Formally married | 0.6 | 10.0 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 25.8 | 12.7 | 1.8 | 18.5 | 8.5 |
| Separated/Widowed/Divorced | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| Educational Attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 18.2 | 19.0 | 18.5 | 9.3 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 13.8 | 13.9 | 13.8 |
| High school undergraduate | 49.1 | 19.4 | 37.7 | 49.8 | 16.5 | 35.7 | 49.5 | 17.8 | 36.7 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 18.8 | 36.9 | 25.8 | 21.6 | 44.0 | 31.1 | 20.2 | 40.7 | 28.5 |
| College or higher | 13.8 | 24.7 | 18.0 | 19.3 | 30.0 | 23.8 | 16.5 | 27.5 | 21.0 |
| Type of School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 85.8 | 82.5 | 84.5 | 84.0 | 79.9 | 82.3 | 84.9 | 81.2 | 83.4 |
| Private | 13.9 | 16.9 | 15.1 | 15.8 | 19.5 | 17.4 | 14.8 | 18.3 | 16.2 |
| Catholic | 8.6 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 9.6 | 8.8 | 9.7 | 9.2 |
| Protestant | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Arabic (Eastern) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Mixed Eastern and Western | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Non-sectarian | 4.2 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 7.6 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 7.1 | 5.7 |
| Main Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 11.5 | 7.0 | 9.8 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 8.8 |
| Student | 50.8 | 12.9 | 36.3 | 56.5 | 8.9 | 36.3 | 53.6 | 10.8 | 36.3 |
| Unemployed, looking for work | 5.6 | 14.1 | 8.9 | 3.6 | 7.6 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 10.6 | 7.0 |
| Housework | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 21.9 | 50.3 | 34.0 | 13.4 | 29.1 | 19.8 |
| Unpaid family worker | 3.8 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 2.8 |
| Working (domestic helper included) | 23.1 | 56.8 | 36.0 | 8.9 | 23.6 | 15.1 | 16.1 | 38.9 | 25.3 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 5.2 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Cagayan Valley | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| Central Luzon | 9.8 | 10.8 | 10.2 | 9.6 | 13.3 | 11.2 | 9.7 | 12.2 | 10.7 |
| CALABARZON | 13.4 | 13.0 | 13.3 | 13.9 | 12.5 | 13.3 | 13.6 | 12.7 | 13.3 |
| MIMAROPA | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Bicol | 5.8 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 5.7 |
| Western Visayas | 8.6 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.7 |
| Central Visayas | 7.8 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 5.9 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 7.4 |
| Eastern Visayas | 4.7 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.3 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 3.8 |
| Northern Mindanao | 5.2 | 4.1 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 4.8 |
| Davao | 4.5 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 5.0 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 5.2 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 4.7 |
| CAR | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| ARMM | 3.1 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.5 |
| CARAGA | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.7 |
| NCR | 11.4 | 13.7 | 12.3 | 14.0 | 13.6 | 13.8 | 12.7 | 13.6 | 13.1 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 24.7 | 27.1 | 25.6 | 28.7 | 29.0 | 28.8 | 26.7 | 28.2 | 27.3 |
| Rural | 75.3 | 72.9 | 74.4 | 71.3 | 71.0 | 71.2 | 73.3 | 71.8 | 72.7 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 21.3 | 18.3 | 20.2 | 19.7 | 20.2 | 19.9 | 20.5 | 19.3 | 20.0 |
| Second | 21.4 | 18.9 | 20.5 | 21.3 | 19.7 | 20.6 | 21.3 | 19.3 | 20.5 |
| Middle | 22.2 | 22.5 | 22.3 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.7 | 21.8 | 21.8 |
| Fourth | 19.3 | 23.1 | 20.7 | 21.0 | 21.1 | 21.0 | 20.1 | 22.0 | 20.9 |
| Highest (Richest) | 15.8 | 17.1 | 16.3 | 16.8 | 17.8 | 17.2 | 16.3 | 17.5 | 16.8 |
| Religion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catholic | 79.0 | 80.5 | 79.6 | 78.7 | 79.9 | 79.2 | 78.9 | 80.2 | 79.4 |
| Other Christian | 15.6 | 13.7 | 14.9 | 15.2 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 15.4 | 14.0 | 14.8 |
| Islam | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.0 |
| Others/none | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Religiosity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take part in any religious ceremonies/ activities | 30.4 | 27.7 | 29.4 | 42.4 | 36.2 | 39.7 | 36.3 | 32.3 | 34.7 |
| Parents/guardian require $\mathbf{R}$ to attend mass/religious services, activities | 38.8 | 35.5 | 37.5 | 50.7 | 48.0 | 49.5 | 44.7 | 42.2 | 43.7 |
| R's family attend religious activities/ services together | 29.0 | 27.6 | 28.4 | 30.6 | 34.4 | 32.2 | 29.8 | 31.2 | 30.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| N | 5,771 | 3,594 | 9,365 | 5,653 | 4,161 | 9,813 | 11,424 | 7,754 | 19,178 |
| The questions on religiosity are: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A19 Do you take part in any religious ceremonies/activities: such as fasting on Ramadan, Tarawi, Eid-ul Fitr, Eid-ul Adha? like prayer rallies, fellowship, bible study or healing sessions? A21A Did your parents/guardian require you to attend: religious activities such as Ramadan, etc.? mass or religious services regularly? <br> A21B Does your family attend religious: activities such as Ramadan, Tarawi, Eid-ul Fitr, Eid-ul Adha? services together? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 2.6 Marital status of Filipino youth: 1994, 2002, and 2013

growth and development of its members. A vital building block to understanding one's family support system is identifying the person who mostly raised the youth from birth until they reached the age of majority, i.e., age 18. In the Philippines, the age of majority is when a person becomes legally qualified and responsible for all his/her civil acts (Republic Act No. 6809 of 1989). Before then, parents or guardians are expected to direct or guide the youth to become responsible members of society. The normative expectation in Philippine society is for children to be raised by both parents.

In general this expectation continues to be met as about four of five Filipino youth said they were raised by both their mother and father (Figure 2.7). Slightly more among males (85.4\%) than females (79.8\%) (Table 2.4). About 9 percent were raised by either the mother only or the mother and someone else, while 2.2 percent were raised either by the father only or the father and another person. Surrogate parents, like grandparents and other relatives raised 6.3 percent of the youth.

Being raised by both parents is more common in rural than urban areas. By region, NCR has the lowest proportion of youth raised by both parents ( $75.2 \%$ for males and $69.4 \%$ for females), while Northern Mindanao has the highest $(90.6 \%$ for males and $89.4 \%$ for females). Interestingly, the proportion raised
by both parents increases as the education level of the youth increases. This pattern is true for both males and females. In contrast, the proportion raised by both parents declines as socioeconomic status increases. This pattern is more pronounced among female than male youth.

## Parenting style of parent/guardian

Among the topics explored in YAFS4 is the type of discipline enforced in the family while the young person was growing up, as well as the types of activities that the persons raising the child approved or disapproved of. These are elements of a collection of parental behaviors that characterize parenting styles, which may later influence the youth's behaviors.

In one such question, a list of activities that young people may engage in-which could be allowed or disallowed by parents or guardians depending on how strict or liberal they arewas read to the respondents. The respondents were asked if their parents or guardians allowed them to engage in each activity. Cognizant of the possibility that the persons raising the child may impose different standards (e.g., the father may be stricter than the mother), the question was asked in reference to each of the two main persons who raised the respondent. These two persons could be any of the following: the mother,

Figure 2.7. Person who raised the youth by sex

the father, other immediate family members, or others. For both sexes, the most commonly identified first person who raised them is the father, while the second person is the mother. Results are shown in Tables 2.5 and 2.6.

For males, staying out late is the most commonly disapproved behavior by both the father ( $84.3 \%$ ) and the mother (89.4\%), followed by going out at night with friends ( $84 \%$ for the father, $89.1 \%$ for the mother). In contrast, for females, the most commonly disapproved behaviors by the father are having a boyfriend before age 18 ( $76.4 \%$ ) and going to a party at short notice ( $76.3 \%$ ). Mothers most commonly disapprove of going to a party at short notice (83.2\%).

Respondents were further asked what the usual reactions of the father and the mother were when they did something wrong or something the parent/guardian disapproved of. This is an indicator of the style of discipline practiced in the home as the youth was growing up. According to the males, when they misbehaved, the three most commonly mentioned usual reactions of fathers were physical punishment (84.3\%), grounding (83.8\%), and counseling or talking to them (83.3\%). In contrast, the top three usual reactions of mothers to male youth's
disapproved behavior were counseling (89.9\%), silent treatment (89.6\%), and verbal abuse (88.7\%).

For females, the usual reactions of the father and mother when they misbehaved was completely different in pattern from that reported by the males. The two most commonly mentioned usual reactions of the mother are counseling (84.3\%) and physical punishment (84\%), while for the father the most common reaction is to not react at all ( $79.6 \%$ ). Taken together, these indicate discernible differences in the way parents raise a male child from a female child in the Filipino home. Both male and female children can be physically punished for misbehaving, but who gives the punishment depends on the sex of the child. Males get punished by their father, whereas females are punished by their mother.

Another indicator of parenting style is how closely the parents/guardians are involved in their child's social development, as gauged from their knowledge of and meeting their child's close friends. The results in Table 2.6 show that most youth, males and females alike, reported that their fathers and mothers know of and have met their close friends. For males, about 83 percent said their fathers know of and have met their friends, while 89.8 percent said their mothers
Table 2.4 Percent distribution of youth by person who raised them until age 18 and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Persons who raised male Rs until age 18 |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males | Persons who raised female Rs until age 18 |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father only | Mother only | Both father and mother | Father and Others | Mother and Others | Others |  | Father only | Mother only | Both father and mother | Father and Others | Mother and Others | Others |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 1.1 | 5.4 | 85.0 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 5.0 | 5,771 | 1.5 | 6.5 | 80.0 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 7.6 | 5,653 |
| 20-24 | 1.0 | 5.9 | 85.9 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 4.4 | 3,593 | 1.2 | 7.7 | 79.5 | 0.7 | 3.0 | 7.8 | 4,162 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 0.6 | 2.8 | 89.8 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 472 | 2.6 | 6.4 | 78.3 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 9.0 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 2.6 | 6.1 | 85.8 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 4.3 | 345 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 81.6 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 7.1 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 0.4 | 5.6 | 87.7 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 5.7 | 952 | 0.9 | 6.1 | 81.5 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 8.1 | 1,096 |
| calabarzon | 1.1 | 7.3 | 83.7 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 1,241 | 1.2 | 12.6 | 76.8 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 6.5 | 1,303 |
| mimaropa | 0.4 | 3.5 | 87.6 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 6.0 | 283 | 1.8 | 5.4 | 83.5 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 7.2 | 279 |
| Bicol | 1.0 | 4.8 | 88.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 3.1 | 522 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 85.7 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 7.0 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 1.0 | 5.4 | 87.3 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 4.8 | 765 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 83.7 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 7.6 | 722 |
| Central Visayas | 1.5 | 3.0 | 86.6 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 741 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 85.3 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 7.4 | 674 |
| Eastern Visayas | 1.9 | 4.4 | 81.3 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 8.2 | 427 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 78.6 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 7.5 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 1.3 | 4.0 | 87.9 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 5.1 | 373 | 2.0 | 9.0 | 76.6 | 2.0 | 3.4 | 7.0 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 0.7 | 4.3 | 90.6 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 447 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 89.4 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 4.9 | 473 |
| Davao | 1.3 | 9.2 | 80.5 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 6.3 | 446 | 2.7 | 9.7 | 75.6 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 9.5 | 516 |
| soccsksargen | 2.1 | 3.2 | 89.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 439 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 87.2 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 5.2 | 460 |
| CAR | 1.2 | 2.9 | 90.1 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 172 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 83.9 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 6.5 | 199 |
| ARMM | 1.2 | 4.0 | 91.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 321 | 1.4 | 7.1 | 82.2 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 6.5 | 353 |
| Caraga | 0.8 | 4.2 | 86.8 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 4.9 | 265 | 2.0 | 7.8 | 79.2 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 5.9 | 255 |
| NCR | 0.4 | 9.4 | 75.2 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 1,151 | 1.6 | 8.6 | 69.4 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 11.0 | 1,356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.4 | 8.1 | 80.5 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 6.0 | 2,398 | 1.5 | 8.0 | 74.6 | 1.6 | 4.9 | 9.4 | 2,831 |
| Rural | 1.3 | 4.7 | 87.0 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 6,967 | 1.3 | 6.6 | 82.0 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 7.0 | 6,981 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 1.6 | 5.1 | 84.1 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 5.8 | 1,731 | 2.3 | 8.8 | 74.1 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 10.2 | 922 |
| High school undergraduate | 1.2 | 5.4 | 84.8 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 4.8 | 3,532 | 1.9 | 7.3 | 78.2 | 1.3 | 2.9 | 8.4 | 3,502 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 0.7 | 5.3 | 86.2 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 5.4 | 2,412 | 1.0 | 6.7 | 81.8 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 7.4 | 3,053 |
| College or higher | 0.8 | 6.6 | 86.6 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 1,687 | 0.6 | 6.4 | 82.0 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 6.1 | 2,336 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 1.2 | 5.2 | 86.9 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 1,888 | 1.7 | 7.3 | 81.4 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 6.7 | 1,953 |
| Second | 1.5 | 4.4 | 86.8 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 1,916 | 1.3 | 5.1 | 83.2 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 6.9 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 1.2 | 6.3 | 85.2 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 4.9 | 2,092 | 1.3 | 7.6 | 79.7 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 7.8 | 2,082 |
| Fourth | 0.7 | 5.7 | 85.2 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 1,942 | 1.4 | 7.6 | 78.2 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 8.6 | 2,064 |
| Highest (Richest) | 0.7 | 6.4 | 81.9 | 1.2 | 3.9 | 6.0 | 1,527 | 1.1 | 7.6 | 76.1 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 8.7 | 1,692 |
| Total | 1.1 | 5.6 | 85.4 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 9,365 | 1.4 | 7.1 | 79.8 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 7.7 | 9,813 |

know of and have met their close friends. For females, 74.7 percent said their fathers know of and have met their friends, and 83.8 percent said their mothers know of and have met their friends. Seemingly, more parents know of and have met
the close friends of their sons than those of their daughters, as reported by the youth.

While transitioning to adulthood, it is normal to encounter problems in various aspects of one's life. Respondents were asked with whom they were most likely to share or talk

Table 2.5 Percent distribution of male youth by parenting style of persons who raised them until age 18

| Background characteristics | 1st Person who raised male Rs until age 18 |  |  |  | No. of males | 2nd Person who raised male Rs until age 18 |  |  |  | No. of males |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father | Mother | Other immediate family members | Others |  | Father | Mother | Other immediate family members | Others |  |
| Activities disapproved by Person who raised $\mathbf{R}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Going out of town with friends | 83.2 | 11.8 | 4.8 | 0.2 | 9,258 | 4.5 | 88.2 | 6.1 | 1.2 | 8,502 |
| Staying out late | 84.3 | 10.2 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 9,253 | 3.5 | 89.4 | 5.6 | 1.5 | 8,499 |
| Spending overnight at a friend's house | 83.7 | 10.9 | 5.0 | 0.4 | 9,252 | 4.2 | 88.6 | 5.7 | 1.4 | 8,495 |
| Going to a party at short notice | 83.8 | 11.2 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 9,251 | 4.3 | 88.8 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 8,489 |
| Going out on a single date | 83.2 | 11.5 | 4.9 | 0.4 | 9,254 | 4.5 | 88.1 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 8,498 |
| Having a BF/GF before age 18 | 82.4 | 12.5 | 4.6 | 0.5 | 9,259 | 4.3 | 88.3 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 8,497 |
| Living away from home | 83.3 | 12.0 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 9,251 | 4.5 | 88.9 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 8,485 |
| Going out at night with friends | 84.0 | 10.9 | 4.7 | 0.4 | 9,250 | 4.0 | 89.1 | 5.1 | 1.8 | 8,490 |
| Usual reaction to R's disapproved behavior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Counsel/talk | 83.3 | 12.1 | 4.3 | 0.3 | 9,348 | 3.9 | 89.9 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 8,476 |
| Ground me | 83.8 | 9.8 | 5.1 | 1.3 | 9,347 | 4.9 | 86.3 | 6.0 | 2.7 | 8,475 |
| Withhold allowance | 74.2 | 15.2 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 9,348 | 5.6 | 79.6 | 9.3 | 5.6 | 8,475 |
| Give me a scolding | 81.8 | 12.9 | 5.1 | 0.2 | 9,348 | 5.7 | 87.8 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 8,476 |
| Verbally abuse me | 82.7 | 12.1 | 4.8 | 0.3 | 9,348 | 3.5 | 88.7 | 4.7 | 3.1 | 8,475 |
| Physically punish me | 84.3 | 10.4 | 5.1 | 0.2 | 9,349 | 4.8 | 88.4 | 5.6 | 1.2 | 8,477 |
| Give me the silent treatment | 77.7 | 15.4 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 9,346 | 1.9 | 89.6 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 8,475 |
| No reaction | 77.1 | 19.5 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 9,349 | 12.1 | 76.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 8,475 |
| Who knows any of R's close friend | 83.4 | 11.9 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 9,335 | 4.1 | 89.8 | 4.7 | 1.4 | 8,507 |
| Who have met any of R's close friend | 83.2 | 12.1 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 9,324 | 4.1 | 89.8 | 4.8 | 1.3 | 8,498 |

Table 2.6 Percent distribution of female youth by parenting style of persons who raised them until age 18

| Background characteristics | 1st Person who raised female Rs until age 18 |  |  |  | No. of females | 2nd Person who raised female Rs until age 18 |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Father | Mother |  | Others |  | Father | Mother | $\qquad$ | Others |  |
| Activities disapproved by Person who raised R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Going out of town with friends | 75.3 | 16.3 | 8.1 | 0.2 | 9,799 | 8.6 | 81.3 | 8.5 | 1.5 | 8,599 |
| Staying out late | 75.7 | 16.6 | 7.5 | 0.2 | 9,804 | 8.2 | 82.4 | 7.9 | 1.5 | 8,592 |
| Spending overnight at a friend's house | 75.7 | 16.4 | 7.7 | 0.2 | 9,803 | 8.2 | 82.5 | 7.6 | 1.6 | 8,596 |
| Going to a party at short notice | 76.3 | 16.2 | 7.3 | 0.2 | 9,802 | 8.0 | 83.2 | 7.1 | 1.6 | 8,592 |
| Going out on a single date | 75.8 | 16.4 | 7.6 | 0.2 | 9,792 | 8.2 | 82.4 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 8,584 |
| Having a BF/GF before age 18 | 76.4 | 15.6 | 7.9 | 0.2 | 9,800 | 8.7 | 81.7 | 8.1 | 1.4 | 8,597 |
| Living away from home | 75.3 | 16.5 | 8.0 | 0.2 | 9,793 | 8.1 | 82.2 | 8.3 | 1.4 | 8,583 |
| Going out at night with friends | 75.7 | 16.9 | 7.2 | 0.2 | 9,797 | 8.1 | 82.6 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 8,584 |
| Usual reaction to R's disapproved behavior |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Counsel/talk | 76.7 | 16.0 | 7.1 | 0.2 | 9,802 | 6.8 | 84.3 | 7.7 | 1.3 | 8,584 |
| Ground me | 74.6 | 17.8 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 9,801 | 5.4 | 81.5 | 12.5 | 0.6 | 8,585 |
| Withhold allowance | 67.7 | 26.2 | 4.6 | 1.5 | 9,801 | 8.7 | 80.4 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 8,584 |
| Give me a scolding | 73.2 | 18.7 | 7.9 | 0.2 | 9,802 | 8.2 | 83.3 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 8,585 |
| Verbally abuse me | 72.6 | 20.2 | 7.0 | 0.2 | 9,801 | 5.4 | 83.8 | 8.0 | 2.8 | 8,586 |
| Physically punish me | 72.2 | 19.4 | 8.3 | 0.1 | 9,802 | 7.5 | 84.0 | 7.2 | 1.3 | 8,584 |
| Give me the silent treatment | 71.3 | 19.3 | 9.1 | 0.4 | 9,802 | 5.7 | 82.3 | 8.9 | 3.2 | 8,585 |
| No reaction | 79.6 | 8.9 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 9,802 | 16.0 | 60.0 | 19.2 | 4.8 | 8,585 |
| Who knows any of R's close friend | 74.7 | 18.1 | 7.0 | 0.2 | 9,794 | 7.6 | 83.8 | 7.3 | 1.3 | 8,608 |
| Who have met any of R's close friend | 74.7 | 18.1 | 7.0 | 0.1 | 9,789 | 7.6 | 83.8 | 7.4 | 1.3 | 8,606 |

about problems they experienced when they were growing up, classified into school-related problems (e.g., bullying), financial problems, problems regarding relationships with family members, problems regarding relationships with friends, and problems with intimate relationships. Table 2.7 shows that when it comes to schoolrelated and financial problems, the youth most commonly consult their mother but when it comes to problems regarding relationships, they most commonly consult close friends. Among males, over a third (36.3\%) said they do not confide in anyone when it comes to problems regarding intimate relationships. The corresponding percentage for females is 23.5 percent.

It appears that the father is not a common choice for a confidante for either male or female youth, not even for problems that may not be so personal in nature, such as school-related and financial concerns. In this regard, the youth appear to be more connected to the mother. Moreover, in keeping with the more prominent role of peers in this age group as part of the normal development process, close friends also play a prominent role as confidantes, especially
for more personal concerns like intimate relationships.

## Siblings

The Filipino youth typically come from a large family. In all, three out of four youth have three or more siblings (Table 2.8), 14.7 percent have two siblings, 7.2 percent have one sibling, and 1.9 percent are only child. The three regions with the highest proportion of youth with three or more siblings are ARMM (89\%), Bicol (87.9\%), and Caraga (87.1\%). The region with the lowest proportion with three or more siblings is Central Luzon (66.8\%).

Table 2.8 also shows that the number of siblings is negatively associated with education and socioeconomic status. The higher the educational attainment, the lower the average number of siblings. In the same manner, the proportion of youth with three or more siblings declines as socioeconomic status increases. Slightly more youth from the rural areas (77.9\%) than from the urban areas (71.6\%) come from a family with three or more siblings.

Table 2.7 Percent distribution of male and female youth by persons they are most likely to share or talk their problems with

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No one | Father | Mother | Siblings/ relatives | Close friends | Others |  |
| With whom most likely to share or talk problem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regarding relationship with family members | 15.4 | 9.9 | 30.8 | 10.1 | 28.8 | 4.9 | 9,353 |
| Regarding relationship with friends | 25.4 | 6.1 | 19.7 | 7.4 | 38.2 | 3.2 | 9,357 |
| Regarding intimate relationships | 36.3 | 4.4 | 15.6 | 5.5 | 35.7 | 2.5 | 9,355 |
| School-related problems | 10.1 | 12.5 | 53.5 | 4.2 | 10.8 | 8.7 | 9,356 |
| Financial problems | 7.6 | 22.2 | 54.5 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 7.4 | 9,354 |
|  | Female |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females |
|  | No one | Father | Mother | Siblings/ relatives | Close friends | Others |  |
| With whom most likely to share or talk problem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regarding relationship with family members | 6.9 | 3.3 | 30.4 | 14.4 | 41.2 | 3.8 | 9,807 |
| Regarding relationship with friends | 16.4 | 1.9 | 30.2 | 16.9 | 31.8 | 2.9 | 9,810 |
| Regarding intimate relationships | 23.5 | 1.2 | 21.2 | 12.0 | 40.7 | 1.4 | 9,781 |
| School-related problems | 5.9 | 7.0 | 62.0 | 7.9 | 12.2 | 5.0 | 9,809 |
| Financial problems | 4.6 | 16.0 | 62.7 | 6.1 | 5.0 | 5.7 | 9,809 |

The majority (77.6\%) reported getting along well with all their siblings. There are slight differences in this proportion by sex, age, and socioeconomic status. More males, the older cohort, and those from the higher income quintiles reported getting along well with all siblings compared with their respective counterparts.

## The school context

Human capital investment in the youth by the family is key to their social and economic mobility in later life. Parents and guardians generally provide the motivation and support to ensure that their children complete schooling. Figure 2.8 shows that 36.4 percent of Filipino youth were in school in the three months preceding the survey, while 63.2 percent were

Table 2.8 Percent distribution of Filipino youth by number of siblings and by getting along status with their siblings

| Background Characteristics | No. of siblings |  |  |  |  | No. of Cases | Percent who get along well with (all) siblings | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 or more | Total |  |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 2.0 | 7.7 | 15.6 | 74.7 | 100.0 | 9,345 | 79.7 | 9,155 |
| Female | 1.8 | 6.7 | 13.9 | 77.6 | 100.0 | 9,798 | 75.7 | 9,658 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 2.3 | 8.4 | 16.1 | 73.3 | 100.0 | 11,399 | 76.5 | 11,207 |
| 20-24 | 1.4 | 5.3 | 12.8 | 80.4 | 100.0 | 7,742 | 79.3 | 7,606 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 2.1 | 7.3 | 19.5 | 71.1 | 100.0 | 934 | 82.7 | 913 |
| Cagayan Valley | 1.9 | 10.2 | 19.5 | 68.4 | 100.0 | 668 | 74.2 | 635 |
| Central Luzon | 2.9 | 8.2 | 22.1 | 66.8 | 100.0 | 2,049 | 84.9 | 2,001 |
| CALABARZON | 1.8 | 7.7 | 14.3 | 76.2 | 100.0 | 2,547 | 86.0 | 2,545 |
| MIMAROPA | 1.2 | 5.3 | 13.2 | 80.2 | 100.0 | 561 | 82.1 | 559 |
| Bicol | 1.1 | 3.5 | 7.5 | 87.9 | 100.0 | 1,093 | 81.9 | 1,092 |
| Western Visayas | 2.2 | 9.4 | 12.2 | 76.3 | 100.0 | 1,481 | 80.2 | 1,451 |
| Central Visayas | 1.7 | 6.7 | 13.1 | 78.5 | 100.0 | 1,412 | 70.1 | 1,398 |
| Eastern Visayas | 1.6 | 4.1 | 8.6 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 828 | 82.8 | 812 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 2.1 | 7.6 | 15.0 | 75.4 | 100.0 | 727 | 73.9 | 716 |
| Northern Mindanao | 1.8 | 6.4 | 14.0 | 77.7 | 100.0 | 921 | 61.6 | 910 |
| Davao | 1.7 | 9.0 | 15.3 | 74.0 | 100.0 | 959 | 71.8 | 929 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 2.5 | 10.1 | 14.8 | 72.6 | 100.0 | 897 | 66.2 | 858 |
| CAR | 1.6 | 4.1 | 10.5 | 83.8 | 100.0 | 370 | 77.7 | 358 |
| ARMM | 1.0 | 3.1 | 6.8 | 89.0 | 100.0 | 672 | 75.8 | 641 |
| Caraga | 1.5 | 3.1 | 8.3 | 87.1 | 100.0 | 520 | 62.2 | 518 |
| NCR | 2.0 | 7.6 | 18.3 | 72.0 | 100.0 | 2,504 | 77.1 | 2,480 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 2.0 | 8.0 | 18.3 | 71.6 | 100.0 | 5,224 | 77.2 | 5,153 |
| Rural | 1.9 | 6.8 | 13.4 | 77.9 | 100.0 | 13,918 | 77.8 | 13,660 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 0.8 | 3.0 | 7.9 | 88.3 | 100.0 | 2,645 | 74.7 | 2,580 |
| High school undergraduate | 1.9 | 6.7 | 13.4 | 78.0 | 100.0 | 7,019 | 75.6 | 6,900 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 1.4 | 6.4 | 15.5 | 76.7 | 100.0 | 5,460 | 80.7 | 5,377 |
| College or higher | 3.3 | 11.8 | 20.6 | 64.3 | 100.0 | 4,016 | 79.0 | 3,953 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 1.0 | 4.6 | 10.0 | 84.3 | 100.0 | 3,832 | 75.4 | 3,746 |
| Second | 1.7 | 5.2 | 10.9 | 82.2 | 100.0 | 3,929 | 75.4 | 3,869 |
| Middle | 1.7 | 6.4 | 15.4 | 76.6 | 100.0 | 4,164 | 77.8 | 4,096 |
| Fourth | 2.7 | 8.0 | 17.6 | 71.9 | 100.0 | 4,000 | 78.4 | 3,937 |
| Highest (Richest) | 2.7 | 12.6 | 20.6 | 64.0 | 100.0 | 3,216 | 81.8 | 3,163 |
| Total | 1.9 | 7.2 | 14.7 | 76.2 | 100.0 | 19,143 | 77.6 | 18,813 |

not in school but had been in school before. Less than 1 percent ( $0.4 \%$ ) have never been to school. There is no gender differential in schooling status, but among those in school, a slightly higher proportion of females (32.8\%) than males (27.6\%) have a college education (Figure 2.9).

There appears to be a positive association between socioeconomic status and being in school. Nearly half of the youth (46.6\%) in the richest quintile were in school compared with less than a third of the youth in the poorest quintile (29.4\%; Table 2.9).

To further explore the bivariate relationship between socioeconomic status and various dimensions of the school experience, Table 2.10 cross tabulates school characteristics by socioeconomic status among the youth who were in school at the time of the survey. Results indicate that the proportion of youth who attend public schools has a socioeconomic gradient. As socioeconomic status increases, the proportion enrolled in a public school decreases. The proportion of in-school youth who assessed their school performance as excellent/very good is highest among youth in the highest quintile and lowest among youth from the poorest quintile, but there is no monotonic increase as socioeconomic status improves.

Among those who have left school, the median age at school leaving is 16 years (Table 2.11). There are no large differentials by sex, age, urban/rural residence, and socioeconomic

Table 2.9 Percent distribution of Filipino youth by Schooling status in the past 3 months

|  | Schooling status in the past 3 months |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Figure 2.8. Schooling status in the past three months by sex


Table 2.10 Percent distribution of Filipino youth who are currently in school in the past $\mathbf{3}$ months by school characteristics

| School characteristics | Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  | Total | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lowest (Poorest) | Second | Middle | Fourth | Highest (Richest) |  |  |
| Type of school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 18.3 | 20.6 | 21.9 | 22.4 | 16.8 | 100.0 | 5,571 |
| Private | 7.9 | 10.8 | 17.7 | 23.8 | 39.7 | 100.0 | 1,415 |
| Catholic | 7.3 | 11.5 | 16.2 | 23.3 | 41.8 | 100.0 | 811 |
| Protestant | 20.9 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 18.6 | 41.9 | 100.0 | 43 |
| Arabic (Eastern) | (20.0) | (40.0) | (40.0) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 5 |
| Mixed Eastern and Western | 21.9 | 12.5 | 18.8 | 31.3 | 15.6 | 100.0 | 32 |
| Non-sectarian | 7.0 | 9.2 | 20.0 | 25.1 | 38.7 | 100.0 | 501 |
| Expected highest schooling to be attained |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | (71.4) | (7.1) | (3.6) | (10.7) | (7.1) | 100.0 | 28 |
| High school undergraduate | 34.0 | 14.0 | 18.0 | 10.0 | 24.0 | 100.0 | 50 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 30.1 | 26.0 | 20.8 | 15.6 | 7.6 | 100.0 | 1,214 |
| College or higher | 12.8 | 17.1 | 21.2 | 24.4 | 24.5 | 100.0 | 5,676 |
| Subjective assessment of school performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Excellent | 18.5 | 19.3 | 22.2 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 100.0 | 379 |
| Very good | 12.3 | 15.1 | 23.5 | 24.0 | 25.1 | 100.0 | 2,016 |
| Good | 16.5 | 19.0 | 19.9 | 23.5 | 21.1 | 100.0 | 3,888 |
| Fair | 24.4 | 25.9 | 20.3 | 16.2 | 13.3 | 100.0 | 656 |
| Poor | 32.4 | 27.0 | 13.5 | 16.2 | 10.8 | 100.0 | 37 |
| Total | 16.2 | 18.6 | 21.1 | 22.7 | 21.5 | 100.0 | 6,986 |

status. Across regions, the median age at school leaving is one year earlier in ARMM (15 years) and one year later (17 years) in MIMAROPA, Western Visayas, CAR, Caraga, and NCR. For those who left school with an elementary education, the median age at school leaving is 13 years.

Nearly two of every three youth who have left school plan to return to school. The proportion is higher among the youth in the 15-19 age group, urban residents, high school
graduates or higher, and those of higher socioeconomic status.

## Participation in school organizations

School organizations provide the youth with varied opportunities for developing accountability, responsibility, and skills such as leadership and socializing. Table 2.12 shows the proportion who participate in school

Figure 2.9. Level of schooling of the currently in school youth by sex

Table 2.11 Percent distribution of youth formerly in school by age left school, plan to return to school, and expected highest level of schooling to be completed

| Background Characteristics | Median Age left school | No. of cases | Plan to return to school |  | No. of cases | Expected highest level of schooling to be completed |  |  |  |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Yes | No |  | Elementary | High school | Vocational | College | Post graduate |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 16.0 | 5,810 | 62.5 | 37.5 | 5,862 | 0.3 | 11.9 | 7.6 | 40.3 | 1.8 | 5,907 |
| Female | 16.0 | 6,125 | 62.9 | 37.1 | 6,158 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 45.1 | 3.4 | 6,196 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 16.0 | 5,190 | 75.8 | 24.2 | 5,224 | 0.3 | 15.3 | 7.1 | 51.5 | 1.0 | 5,251 |
| 20-24 | 17.0 | 6,745 | 52.7 | 47.3 | 6,797 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 7.6 | 36.0 | 3.9 | 6,853 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 16.0 | 565 | 69.0 | 31.0 | 568 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 10.4 | 49.9 | 1.9 | 569 |
| Cagayan Valley | 16.0 | 428 | 59.2 | 40.8 | 426 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 46.0 | 4.0 | 428 |
| Central Luzon | 16.0 | 1,585 | 61.4 | 38.6 | 1,586 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 9.8 | 45.0 | 1.6 | 1,599 |
| calabarzon | 16.0 | 1,596 | 60.6 | 39.4 | 1,602 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 7.4 | 38.3 | 3.2 | 1,599 |
| MIMAROPA | 17.0 | 337 | 63.6 | 36.4 | 338 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 8.6 | 42.8 | 1.8 | 339 |
| Bicol | 16.0 | 658 | 65.8 | 34.2 | 661 | 0.5 | 13.8 | 8.8 | 39.8 | 2.9 | 661 |
| Western Visayas | 17.0 | 925 | 64.4 | 35.6 | 939 | 0.1 | 10.6 | 6.6 | 45.2 | 1.4 | 944 |
| Central Visayas | 16.0 | 860 | 65.6 | 34.4 | 860 | 0.5 | 12.6 | 6.3 | 44.7 | 1.5 | 862 |
| Eastern Visayas | 16.0 | 516 | 57.0 | 43.0 | 523 | 1.3 | 14.7 | 5.3 | 31.8 | 3.2 | 529 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 16.0 | 457 | 51.4 | 48.6 | 459 | 0.2 | 7.2 | 2.6 | 39.3 | 1.7 | 461 |
| Northern Mindanao | 16.0 | 551 | 69.7 | 30.3 | 555 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 9.2 | 45.9 | 3.1 | 555 |
| Davao | 16.0 | 615 | 61.6 | 38.4 | 614 | 0.6 | 7.1 | 9.3 | 41.4 | 2.3 | 621 |
| soccsksargen | 16.0 | 450 | 55.5 | 44.5 | 463 | 0.2 | 7.8 | 3.9 | 38.4 | 2.3 | 487 |
| car | 17.0 | 245 | 66.9 | 33.1 | 245 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 9.3 | 45.1 | 5.7 | 246 |
| ARMM | 15.0 | 402 | 37.2 | 62.8 | 435 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 28.6 | 2.7 | 448 |
| Caraga | 17.0 | 310 | 71.4 | 28.6 | 311 | 0.3 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 50.5 | 2.9 | 313 |
| NCR | 17.0 | 1,435 | 71.8 | 28.2 | 1,434 | 0.1 | 10.5 | 8.0 | 48.3 | 4.4 | 1,443 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 17.0 | 3,107 | 68.9 | 31.1 | 3,107 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 48.3 | 4.0 | 3,130 |
| Rural | 16.0 | 8,828 | 60.6 | 39.4 | 8,913 | 0.2 | 9.6 | 7.3 | 40.8 | 2.2 | 8,973 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 13.0 | 2,206 | 43.8 | 56.2 | 2,238 | 1.0 | 22.2 | 2.3 | 17.3 | 0.4 | 2,260 |
| High school undergraduate | 16.0 | 2,734 | 60.7 | 39.3 | 2,753 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 5.0 | 33.3 | 0.4 | 2,766 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 17.0 | 5,131 | 69.7 | 30.3 | 5,163 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 11.8 | 55.9 | 1.3 | 5,187 |
| College or higher | 19.0 | 1,864 | 69.3 | 30.7 | 1,867 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 4.9 | 50.8 | 12.1 | 1,890 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 15.0 | 2,610 | 53.8 | 46.2 | 2,648 | 0.4 | 14.3 | 5.6 | 32.4 | 0.6 | 2,671 |
| Second | 16.0 | 2,565 | 61.6 | 38.4 | 2,595 | 0.3 | 10.1 | 8.4 | 41.0 | 1.2 | 2,614 |
| Middle | 16.0 | 2,669 | 65.0 | 35.0 | 2,682 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 7.7 | 46.4 | 1.8 | 2,692 |
| Fourth | 17.0 | 2,385 | 67.4 | 32.6 | 2,388 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 8.9 | 48.2 | 3.0 | 2,414 |
| Highest (Richest) | 17.0 | 1,706 | 68.1 | 31.9 | 1,708 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 6.0 | 48.3 | 8.9 | 1,712 |
| Total | 16.0 | 11,935 | 62.7 | 37.3 | 12,020 | 0.2 | 9.2 | 7.4 | 42.8 | 2.7 | 12,103 |

Table 2.12 Participation in school organizations among the youth by highest education attainment and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of youth that participated in school organizations |  |  |  |  |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elementary | High School | Vocational | College | Graduate | Total |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 10.1 | 61.4 | 7.1 | 21.3 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 9,327 |
| Female | 5.6 | 61.5 | 6.4 | 26.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 9,760 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 8.4 | 69.4 | 3.6 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 11,369 |
| 20-24 | 6.8 | 49.1 | 11.6 | 32.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 7,717 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 5.8 | 61.0 | 7.0 | 25.8 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 940 |
| Cagayan Valley | 7.5 | 58.0 | 4.3 | 29.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 4.2 | 57.5 | 9.6 | 28.6 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2,038 |
| CALABARZON | 7.0 | 63.2 | 8.8 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2,546 |
| MIMAROPA | 9.2 | 62.3 | 8.5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 562 |
| Bicol | 10.4 | 65.5 | 4.9 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1,092 |
| Western Visayas | 6.9 | 66.7 | 7.0 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1,479 |
| Central Visayas | 10.7 | 68.3 | 3.8 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1,414 |
| Eastern Visayas | 16.6 | 57.5 | 4.6 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 822 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 10.9 | 53.0 | 6.5 | 29.1 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 724 |
| Northern Mindanao | 6.8 | 68.7 | 6.0 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 920 |
| Davao | 11.4 | 61.5 | 6.9 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 953 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 10.4 | 68.7 | 3.8 | 16.8 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 873 |
| CAR | 4.4 | 55.8 | 7.8 | 32.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 367 |
| ARMM | 14.9 | 60.7 | 3.6 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 666 |
| Caraga | 8.1 | 70.6 | 3.9 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 519 |
| NCR | 3.4 | 53.2 | 7.7 | 35.5 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2,504 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 4.4 | 54.4 | 7.7 | 33.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 5,208 |
| Rural | 9.3 | 64.6 | 6.3 | 19.8 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 13,878 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2,639 |
| High school undergraduate | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 7,006 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 0.0 | 77.7 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 5,434 |
| College or higher | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 99.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 4,008 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 20.3 | 70.4 | 2.0 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 3,818 |
| Second | 9.8 | 72.0 | 5.8 | 12.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 3,920 |
| Middle | 5.5 | 68.8 | 6.2 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 4,153 |
| Fourth | 3.4 | 54.9 | 9.6 | 32.0 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 3,981 |
| Highest (Richest) | 2.5 | 43.3 | 9.0 | 44.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 3,212 |
| Total | 7.8 | 61.5 | 6.7 | 23.9 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 19,089 |

organizations, according to the level of education. Generally, participation in school organizations peaks at the high school level (61.5\%). This is to be expected, as most youth with this level of education are still in school. Rural residents registered a higher proportion participating in high school organizations than urban youth. Expectedly, participation is higher among the $15-19$-year-olds, most of whom are still in school. The top three regions in terms of the level
of participation in high school organizations are Caraga (70.6\%), SOCCSKSARGEN (68.7\%), and Northern Mindanao (68.7\%).

About a fourth (23.9\%) of the youth participate in college organizations. Higher proportions of participation in college organizations are noted for the 20-24 age group, females, urban residents, and those of higher socioeconomic status. The top three regions in terms of the proportion participating in college
organizations are NCR (35.5\%), CAR (32\%), and Zamboanga Peninsula (29.1\%).

## Friends

The dynamics of the social life of the youth are often framed by friendships. While the quantity and quality of relationships with friends is difficult to capture, the number of the youth's close friends may be another indicator of social connectedness. In YAFS4, respondents were asked if they had any close friends; if they did, they were asked to give the number of close friends, broken down by sex. Table 2.13 shows that 90.2 percent of the youth have close friends, more among males (95.1\%) than females (85.6\%) and more among the younger (93.7\%) than older (85.1\%) cohort. The median number of close friends is 6 , with males having more males as their close friends and females likewise having more females for close friends, although both sexes have close friends of the opposite sex. The youth in NCR reported the highest median number of close friends (8), while the youth in ARMM have the lowest (4.6). Those with college education, those of higher socioeconomic status, and urban residents have a higher median number of friends.

Fraternities/sororities or gangs also provide a space for youth social development, albeit many parents may not prefer these options. Table 2.14 shows that only 5 percent of the Filipino youth are members of fraternities or sororities. Membership in fraternities is higher among the $15-19$-year-olds, urban residents, those with at least a high school education, and those of higher socioeconomic status. The top three regions in terms of youth membership in fraternities and sororities are NCR (9 \%), Zamboanga Peninsula (7.9\%), and MIMAROPA (6.8\%).

Only 2.3 percent of the youth are members of gangs. The proportion of youth who reported being members of a gang is higher among males, urban residents, and those with high school or lower education. The top three regions in terms of membership in gangs are NCR (6.3\%),

Table 2.13 Percent distribution of youth with close friends and median number of friends

| Background Characteristics | Who have close friends | No. of Cases | Median number of friends |  |  | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Males | Females | Total |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 95.1 | 9,363 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 7.0 | 8,889 |
| Female | 85.6 | 9,813 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 8,393 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 93.7 | 11,421 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 10,68 |
| 20-24 | 85.1 | 7,753 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 6,594 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 86.1 | 940 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 808 |
| Cagayan Valley | 88.2 | 670 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 589 |
| Central Luzon | 91.4 | 2,049 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 1,873 |
| CALABARZON | 91.4 | 2,547 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 2,327 |
| MIMAROPA | 93.6 | 562 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 526 |
| Bicol | 93.2 | 1,095 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 1,021 |
| Western Visayas | 89.3 | 1,487 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 1,324 |
| Central Visayas | 93.4 | 1,415 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 1,321 |
| Eastern Visayas | 90.5 | 830 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 750 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 74.2 | 729 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 539 |
| Northern Mindanao | 89.7 | 921 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 825 |
| Davao | 92.2 | 960 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 883 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 87.1 | 898 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 780 |
| CAR | 88.6 | 370 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 327 |
| ARMM | 72.4 | 675 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.6 | 487 |
| Caraga | 92.5 | 520 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 481 |
| NCR | 96.6 | 2,507 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 2,421 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 93.6 | 5,228 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 7.0 | 4,889 |
| Rural | 89.0 | 13,946 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 12,393 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 89.0 | 2,653 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 2,357 |
| High school undergraduate | 93.3 | 7,031 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 6,549 |
| High school graduate/ Vocational | 86.2 | 5,465 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 4,711 |
| College or higher | 91.1 | 4,022 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 3,663 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 86.8 | 3,840 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 3,327 |
| Second | 89.2 | 3,938 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 3,508 |
| Middle | 90.6 | 4,173 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 3,772 |
| Fourth | 92.4 | 4,004 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3,696 |
| Highest (Richest) | 92.5 | 3,219 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 2,978 |
| Total | 90.2 | 19,176 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 17,281 |

SOCCSKSARGEN (3.4\%), and Davao (3.1\%), although these numbers are generally low.

## Work

Participation in economic activities in general signifies a crossing over to a more adult role. This role shift may entail greater responsibility, but it also opens up opportunities for economic independence and the widening of social networks. Altogether, 63 percent of Filipino youth have ever worked for pay, in cash

Table 2.14 Percent distribution of youth by membership in fraternities, sororities or gangs

| Background Characteristics | Who are members of |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fraternities or sororities | No. of cases | Gangs | No. of cases |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 8.1 | 9,350 | 3.4 | 9,324 |
| Female | 2.0 | 9,775 | 1.2 | 9,765 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.4 | 11,395 | 2.1 | 11,376 |
| 20-24 | 7.2 | 7,729 | 2.6 | 7,713 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 4.3 | 938 | 0.5 | 929 |
| Cagayan Valley | 2.8 | 667 | 0.6 | 667 |
| Central Luzon | 5.0 | 2,049 | 0.8 | 2,033 |
| CALABARZON | 5.3 | 2,547 | 1.4 | 2,545 |
| MIMAROPA | 6.8 | 562 | 2.7 | 561 |
| Bicol | 6.4 | 1,092 | 1.9 | 1,092 |
| Western Visayas | 4.0 | 1,482 | 1.9 | 1,482 |
| Central Visayas | 3.3 | 1,414 | 2.8 | 1,414 |
| Eastern Visayas | 3.9 | 818 | 1.6 | 818 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 7.9 | 723 | 1.4 | 725 |
| Northern Mindanao | 3.5 | 920 | 2.1 | 920 |
| Davao | 3.3 | 957 | 3.1 | 957 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 3.3 | 888 | 3.4 | 888 |
| CAR | 0.5 | 366 | 0.5 | 365 |
| ARMM | 2.1 | 672 | 0.4 | 669 |
| Caraga | 2.9 | 520 | 1.9 | 519 |
| NCR | 9.0 | 2,507 | 6.3 | 2,506 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 7.0 | 5,223 | 4.1 | 5,213 |
| Rural | 4.2 | 13,902 | 1.6 | 13,876 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 3.5 | 2,639 | 2.2 | 2,635 |
| High school undergraduate | 4.4 | 7,018 | 3.0 | 7,013 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 5.6 | 5,454 | 2.1 | 5,430 |
| College or higher | 6.0 | 4,010 | 1.4 | 4,009 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 2.5 | 3,821 | 1.3 | 3,818 |
| Second | 3.5 | 3,925 | 2.0 | 3,923 |
| Middle | 5.1 | 4,165 | 2.0 | 4,158 |
| Fourth | 6.9 | 3,998 | 3.4 | 3,987 |
| Highest (Richest) | 7.2 | 3,214 | 2.9 | 3,205 |
| Total | 5.0 | 19,125 | 2.3 | 19,089 |

or in kind, but only 28.8 percent worked for at least one hour in the week prior to the survey (Table 2.15) or were considered employed. The percentage who have worked for pay is higher among males, 20-24-year-olds, high school graduates, and those with less than high school education. The median age when the youth started working is 17 years (Table 2.16). For their first job, 59.1 percent received cash compensation, 1 percent received compensation in kind, and 2.6 percent received compensation both in cash and in kind.

A small percentage (5.8\%) reported having a business in the week preceding the survey and were thus also considered employed (Table 2.15 ). On the other hand, 10.6 percent looked for work or tried to establish a business during the same reference period; these youth can be considered unemployed.

The proportion who have a business is higher among females, those with college or higher education, those of higher socioeconomic status, and urban residents, while the proportion looking for work or trying to establish a business in the week before the survey is higher among the 20-24-year-olds, those with at least a high school education, those of higher socioeconomic status, and urban residents. The top regions with high youth unemployment are NCR (13.1\%), Northern Mindanao (13\%), and Central Luzon and Davao (both at 12.9\%). About three in 10 (30.8\%) youth expected to work within the next three months. The top regions in terms of the proportion expecting to work in the next three months are Northern Mindanao (40.2\%), NCR (38.5\%), and MIMAROPA (35.5\%).

## Community

The youth were also asked whether they participated in community activities in the past three months and what type of activities they participated in. Table 2.16 shows the generally low levels of participation of the youth in community activities. Only 23.8 percent of the Filipino youth participated in community activities in the past three months, 17.8 percent

Table 2.15 Percent distribution of youth by selected work-related variables

| Background Characteristics | Percent of youth who |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ever worked for pay, in cash or in kind | worked for at least one hour during the past week | have business during the past week | look for work or try to establish a business during the past week | No. of cases | expect to work during the next three months | No. of Cases |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 67.6 | 41.2 | 4.4 | 10.6 | 9,364 | 26.0 | 9,259 |
| Female | 58.6 | 16.9 | 7.1 | 10.6 | 9,812 | 35.3 | 9,739 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 48.4 | 21.0 | 5.1 | 8.7 | 11,423 | 29.7 | 11,301 |
| 20-24 | 84.5 | 40.1 | 6.7 | 13.3 | 7,754 | 32.3 | 7,696 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 64.4 | 31.6 | 2.9 | 6.9 | 941 | 25.2 | 931 |
| Cagayan Valley | 70.3 | 33.7 | 4.9 | 6.1 | 670 | 20.2 | 657 |
| Central Luzon | 73.5 | 31.5 | 4.4 | 12.9 | 2,049 | 29.6 | 2,032 |
| CALABARZON | 63.1 | 31.4 | 6.6 | 10.8 | 2,547 | 33.2 | 2,531 |
| MIMAROPA | 66.4 | 32.4 | 6.6 | 9.3 | 562 | 35.5 | 561 |
| Bicol | 62.7 | 28.6 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 1,095 | 28.9 | 1,088 |
| Western Visayas | 63.1 | 28.8 | 5.0 | 9.5 | 1,487 | 28.8 | 1,463 |
| Central Visayas | 64.7 | 25.9 | 6.9 | 10.2 | 1,415 | 31.6 | 1,401 |
| Eastern Visayas | 60.9 | 27.6 | 5.7 | 8.8 | 829 | 33.9 | 817 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 55.8 | 24.6 | 7.4 | 11.3 | 729 | 27.8 | 723 |
| Northern Mindanao | 58.8 | 23.3 | 4.8 | 13.0 | 921 | 40.2 | 917 |
| Davao | 66.8 | 30.4 | 6.3 | 12.9 | 960 | 25.2 | 947 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 47.6 | 23.0 | 4.2 | 8.8 | 900 | 19.6 | 878 |
| CAR | 74.3 | 44.9 | 3.5 | 7.8 | 370 | 21.7 | 369 |
| ARMM | 37.8 | 23.4 | 7.7 | 10.5 | 674 | 29.4 | 669 |
| Caraga | 66.7 | 25.2 | 4.6 | 10.0 | 520 | 30.8 | 519 |
| NCR | 62.8 | 27.2 | 7.6 | 13.1 | 2,507 | 38.5 | 2,494 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 63.9 | 28.0 | 7.0 | 12.6 | 5,229 | 34.1 | 5,192 |
| Rural | 62.7 | 29.1 | 5.3 | 9.8 | 13,948 | 29.5 | 13,806 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 75.0 | 44.5 | 4.0 | 8.4 | 2,652 | 22.7 | 2,628 |
| High school undergraduate | 48.2 | 20.4 | 4.6 | 6.5 | 7,034 | 27.6 | 6,953 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 80.0 | 35.6 | 6.5 | 15.9 | 5,465 | 36.2 | 5,416 |
| College or higher | 57.8 | 23.8 | 7.9 | 11.8 | 4,023 | 34.3 | 3,998 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 65.6 | 29.5 | 4.5 | 9.4 | 3,841 | 29.5 | 3,791 |
| Second | 65.8 | 30.2 | 5.5 | 9.2 | 3,938 | 29.0 | 3,893 |
| Middle | 65.5 | 28.5 | 5.8 | 10.6 | 4,173 | 32.1 | 4,139 |
| Fourth | 62.2 | 28.6 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 4,005 | 32.6 | 3,980 |
| Highest (Richest) | 54.3 | 26.6 | 7.2 | 11.7 | 3,220 | 30.4 | 3,196 |
| Total | 63.0 | 28.8 | 5.8 | 10.6 | 19,177 | 30.8 | 18,999 |

Table 2.16 Percent distribution of youth participation in community activities in the past 3 months by selected characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of youth who |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | participated in community activities in the past 3 months | No. of Cases | are members of youth organizations | No. of Cases | have ever done volunteer work | No. of Cases |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 28.4 | 9,363 | 19.4 | 9,339 | 37.2 | 9,349 |
| Female | 19.4 | 9,798 | 16.2 | 9,777 | 20.6 | 9,790 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 25.4 | 11,414 | 20.7 | 11,382 | 28.2 | 11,396 |
| 20-24 | 21.4 | 7,747 | 13.5 | 7,734 | 29.4 | 7,744 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 23.2 | 941 | 12.4 | 939 | 32.7 | 939 |
| Cagayan Valley | 24.8 | 669 | 13.3 | 668 | 43.6 | 667 |
| Central Luzon | 16.3 | 2,045 | 13.6 | 2,036 | 23.4 | 2,045 |
| CALABARZON | 19.9 | 2,547 | 13.4 | 2,542 | 27.6 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 29.5 | 562 | 19.4 | 561 | 33.6 | 562 |
| Bicol | 24.9 | 1,095 | 19.8 | 1,088 | 33.8 | 1,093 |
| Western Visayas | 28.3 | 1,486 | 18.4 | 1,480 | 32.6 | 1,479 |
| Central Visayas | 19.8 | 1,414 | 21.0 | 1,413 | 31.2 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 17.2 | 829 | 20.0 | 824 | 28.3 | 827 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 22.9 | 728 | 16.5 | 727 | 14.3 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 37.6 | 921 | 29.8 | 920 | 28.9 | 918 |
| Davao | 35.7 | 959 | 31.4 | 958 | 32.9 | 957 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 27.4 | 897 | 24.4 | 897 | 19.9 | 894 |
| CAR | 32.7 | 370 | 23.2 | 367 | 46.2 | 370 |
| ARMM | 10.9 | 672 | 7.3 | 671 | 15.5 | 672 |
| Caraga | 41.0 | 520 | 36.2 | 519 | 31.7 | 518 |
| NCR | 21.6 | 2,507 | 11.1 | 2,506 | 27.9 | 2,506 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 21.0 | 5,223 | 14.0 | 5,209 | 27.4 | 5,221 |
| Rural | 24.8 | 13,937 | 19.2 | 13,908 | 29.2 | 13,918 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 17.3 | 2,650 | 11.9 | 2,642 | 24.1 | 2,646 |
| High school undergraduate | 24.4 | 7,024 | 17.3 | 6,999 | 25.7 | 7,016 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 23.9 | 5,463 | 18.3 | 5,455 | 29.4 | 5,455 |
| College or higher | 26.8 | 4,023 | 21.7 | 4,016 | 36.2 | 4,020 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 22.3 | 3,836 | 16.2 | 3,827 | 24.9 | 3,829 |
| Second | 25.6 | 3,934 | 19.7 | 3,925 | 29.0 | 3,934 |
| Middle | 25.2 | 4,169 | 18.8 | 4,159 | 29.1 | 4,163 |
| Fourth | 23.5 | 4,002 | 17.4 | 3,992 | 30.2 | 3,998 |
| Highest (Richest) | 21.8 | 3,219 | 16.3 | 3,212 | 30.5 | 3,217 |
| Total | 23.8 | 19,162 | 17.8 | 19,117 | 28.7 | 19,141 |

are members of youth organizations, and 28.7 percent have ever done volunteer work.

The community activities in which the youth most commonly participated are sportsrelated (10.6\%) and environment-related activities (7.8\%), as shown in Figure 1.10. A breakdown by sex reveals that participation in sports activities is dominated by males. Slightly more males participated in environmental activities, while slightly more females participated in religious activities.

The percentage who have ever done volunteer work is higher among males, the 20-24-year-olds, and rural residents (Table 2.16). Youth from CAR (46.2\%) and Cagayan Valley ( $43.6 \%$ ) have the highest proportion who have ever done volunteer work; the regions with the lowest are Zamboanga Peninsula (14.3\%) and ARMM (15.5\%).

## Summary and conclusions

The YAFS4 sample closely follows the age and sex composition of the Filipino youth in the total population, as did the samples of the three previous YAFS rounds, because the samples are intended to represent the total youth population in the country. One of the striking
findings regarding the profile of today's youth is the changing composition in terms of marital status, with the proportion who are currently in a consensual union or living-in rising to an unprecedented level, triggering a shift in the proportions of the never married and formally married. The education profile indicates that almost all youth, except for a negligible minority of 0.4 percent, have had formal schooling. Schoolleaving data, however, show that many young people also leave school without completing secondary education.

YAFS4 contains data on the circumstances surrounding the youth while they were growing up, such as parenting styles, sibling relationships, and communication with family and friends; these can be explored as possible explanatory factors for later behaviors when further analysis of YAFS4 data is undertaken. Likewise, involvement in prosocial activities such as community organizations and volunteer work can be explored further in future analysis as a counterpoint to the risk behaviors that have often been the focus of YAFS analysis and reporting.

Figure 2.10 Percent who participated in community activities by type of activity and sex
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# Media and Information Communication Technology Use 

Elma P. Laguna

The rapid expansion in information and communication technologies (ICTs) has changed the communication environment of today's young people, much more than in previous generations. Earlier rounds of the YAFS consistently cited the role of mass media in shaping young people's behaviors and attitudes, but none foresaw how the development of ICTs in the past decade would vastly expand young peoples' sources of information. ICTs provide the youth with greater connection to ideas and to other people around the world. The adoption of these technologies leads to new patterns of communication and expression. Communication technologies include a range of communication media and devices including print, telephone, fax, radio, television, video, audio, computer, and the Internet (Neto, Kenny, Janakiram, \& Watt, 2005).

Both young and old alike subscribe to traditional mass media forms (i.e., they watch television and listen to the radio). However, the new forms of information technologies such as the Internet tend to attract the younger generation. Across countries, younger age groups dominate the use of ICTs. In 2005, young people constituted 43 percent of all Internet users aged 15 and older in China. More than half of Internet users in Armenia, Bolivia, and Egypt also belong to the youth category (McKenzie, 2007).

There have been various attempts to study the younger generation's use of ICT. In the late 1990s, Tapscott (1998) first came up with the concept of a "Net Generation" to
refer to those born between January 1977 and December 1997, the period that coincided with the digital revolution. "Digital natives," a term coined by Prensky in 2001, refers to the generation of young people who are considered "native speakers" of the digital language of computers, video games, and the Internet (Prensky, 2001, p. 1). Particularly in the Western context, the digital natives are considered the first generation to have grown up with the new technology. Their childhood is immersed in a media-rich environment, where toys and tools of the digital age are considered an integral part of their lives (Prensky, 2001). As young adults, they use digital space for social interaction and identity formation. They are also active producers of media content. Unlike Tapscott, however, Prensky did not define digital natives in terms of birth year. Rather, he distinguished them from their predecessors, the "digital immigrants"-those who may have adopted the new technology but nonetheless keep "their foot in the past" (Prensky, 2001, p. 2). In the case of the United States, Prensky considered those born before 1980 as digital immigrants.

Several more concepts associated with digital natives have emerged in recent years, such as generation next, born digital, millennials, and Google generation. This suggests the growing interest among academicians, policy makers, marketers, and communicators, among others, to understand not only how young people born in the digital age are growing up using communication technologies, but also how these
technologies are shaping the way they socialize, interact, and form their identity as young adults (International Telecommunication Union, 2013).

The YAFS series has tracked exposure to the traditional media forms of print, radio, television, and movies. In the 2013 round, it added the use of the Internet and cell phones, technologies that have become additional sources of information for today's young people. This chapter describes the level and pattern of ICT use among young Filipinos. It explores how levels of use vary according to different background characteristics of the youth.

## Use of traditional media

Both YAFS2 in 1994 and YAFS3 in 2002 found almost universal exposure of young Filipinos to the traditional media forms, especially broadcast media. The 2013 YAFS looked at regularity of media use. Findings presented here refer to the use of mass media on a daily basis in the three months preceding the survey.

In terms of print media consumption, only 11.7 percent of young people read any form of print media (newspapers, tabloids, magazines, and books other than textbooks) on a daily basis. The level is higher among females (14.2\%) than males (9.1\%) and among the younger than the older cohort ( $14.2 \%$ vs. $8.1 \%$ ). Daily reading is more prevalent among the college educated and high school undergraduates, the majority of whom are still in school. Among the regions, reading daily is most prevalent in Bicol (17.4\%), Eastern Visayas (15.9\%), and NCR (15.8\%) and least prevalent in Davao (7.7\%), Cagayan Valley (8.2\%), and Ilocos (8.6\%; Table 3.1). The proportion that reads print media daily is uniformly low across socioeconomic status.

Listening to the radio every day was reported by 35.1 percent of the young people. This is slightly more common among the females than the males ( $37.3 \%$ vs. $32.8 \%$ ). Similarly, the older age group (20-24) exhibited a slightly higher percentage of daily radio use than the younger age group (15-19). Across regions, daily
radio listening is common among the youth from Western Visayas, Central Luzon, Ilocos, Davao, and NCR.

Of all the traditional media, television remains the most popular. In all, 67.5 percent watch television every day, with the level slightly higher among females (68.8\%) than males ( $66.2 \%$ ). There is no difference between the younger and older cohorts. The proportion increases monotonically as education level increases, from 50.7 percent among those with elementary education to 72.7 percent among those with college education. Similarly, the proportion that watches television daily consistently increases as socioeconomic status improves. In the poorest quintile, 39.9 percent watch TV daily, while the comparative percentage for the richest quintile is 81.4 percent. Across the regions, watching TV daily is most prevalent in NCR (85.8\%), Central Luzon (82.6\%), and CALABARZON (80.2\%) and least prevalent in ARMM (33.9\%), Zamboanga Peninsula (47.9\%), and CAR (48.1\%).

Finally, 14.7 percent of all young people reported that they watch movies every day. Slightly more males than females, as well as youth from urban areas than rural areas, watch movies daily. There is no discernible pattern by education and socioeconomic status. More young people from NCR (21.9\%), Eastern Visayas (20.7\%), Northern Mindanao (17.7\%), CALABARZON (17\%), and Caraga (16.2\%) watch movies daily compared with the national average. Unlike the other traditional media forms, movies can be accessed through various means, such as in a movie house, through television, through video equipment, or on the Internet. The YAFS4 questionnaire did not specifically ask for the means through which movies are accessed. Figure 3.1 below compares daily media use of young males and females.

## Cell phone use

| The deregulation of | the |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| telecommunications industry in | 1995 |
| following the passage of Republic Act | 7925 |


| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  | No. of Males | Female |  |  |  | No. of Females | Both sexes |  |  |  | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Print | Radio | TV | Movie |  | Print | Radio | TV | Movie |  | Print | Radio | TV | Movie |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 10.8 | 30.3 | 66.4 | 15.7 | 5,769 | 17.6 | 35.8 | 68.4 | 13.4 | 5,648 | 14.2 | 33.0 | 67.4 | 14.6 | 11,413 |
| 20-24 | 6.3 | 36.9 | 65.9 | 17.3 | 3,593 | 9.6 | 39.4 | 69.2 | 12.9 | 4,159 | 8.1 | 38.2 | 67.7 | 15.0 | 7,752 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 8.5 | 37.8 | 72.6 | 11.3 | 474 | 8.8 | 41.1 | 69.8 | 8.8 | 468 | 8.6 | 39.4 | 71.3 | 10.0 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 5.0 | 19.9 | 60.1 | 8.5 | 343 | 11.7 | 31.4 | 62.0 | 12.0 | 327 | 8.2 | 25.5 | 60.9 | 10.2 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 5.1 | 33.0 | 80.0 | 11.2 | 953 | 12.8 | 45.0 | 85.0 | 7.4 | 1,097 | 9.2 | 39.4 | 82.6 | 9.2 | 2,050 |
| calabarzon | 5.8 | 32.3 | 79.6 | 18.8 | 1,243 | 12.6 | 38.8 | 80.8 | 15.3 | 1,303 | 9.3 | 35.6 | 80.2 | 17.0 | 2,547 |
| mimaropa | 13.4 | 29.3 | 66.1 | 26.5 | 283 | 16.1 | 34.4 | 62.1 | 21.9 | 279 | 14.6 | 31.7 | 64.2 | 14.7 | 562 |
| Bicol | 14.9 | 30.3 | 50.3 | 15.7 | 521 | 19.5 | 32.6 | 59.4 | 13.1 | 574 | 17.4 | 31.5 | 55.1 | 14.4 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 9.8 | 42.4 | 65.4 | 13.9 | 764 | 15.7 | 45.3 | 67.1 | 9.7 | 722 | 12.7 | 43.8 | 66.3 | 11.9 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 8.8 | 35.8 | 59.3 | 15.0 | 742 | 11.7 | 39.2 | 63.7 | 9.8 | 673 | 10.2 | 37.5 | 61.4 | 12.5 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 14.5 | 26.1 | 56.0 | 23.0 | 427 | 17.4 | 28.6 | 58.7 | 18.4 | 402 | 15.9 | 27.4 | 57.3 | 20.7 | 829 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 6.4 | 25.9 | 50.8 | 15.0 | 372 | 15.4 | 28.7 | 45.2 | 12.1 | 355 | 10.7 | 27.4 | 47.9 | 13.6 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 10.5 | 31.6 | 52.8 | 19.0 | 447 | 10.5 | 38.3 | 55.1 | 16.7 | 474 | 10.5 | 35.1 | 54.0 | 17.7 | 921 |
| Davao | 6.1 | 38.8 | 67.2 | 13.0 | 445 | 9.1 | 39.6 | 66.7 | 11.1 | 515 | 7.7 | 39.2 | 67.0 | 12.0 | 960 |
| soccsksargen | 9.1 | 33.0 | 51.7 | 6.8 | 437 | 12.0 | 35.0 | 56.9 | 12.4 | 460 | 10.6 | 34.1 | 54.4 | 9.7 | 900 |
| CAR | 6.4 | 22.1 | 45.3 | 16.2 | 172 | 19.7 | 31.0 | 50.5 | 13.6 | 198 | 13.7 | 27.0 | 48.1 | 14.9 | 370 |
| ARMM | 5.0 | 18.5 | 30.8 | 9.7 | 321 | 21.9 | 16.5 | 36.6 | 9.4 | 355 | 13.8 | 17.4 | 33.9 | 9.5 | 671 |
| Caraga | 9.4 | 26.5 | 58.3 | 16.2 | 316 | 14.9 | 27.2 | 57.5 | 16.1 | 255 | 12.1 | 16.4 | 57.9 | 16.2 | 520 |
| NCR | 14.2 | 38.6 | 85.6 | 26.1 | 1,150 | 17.2 | 39.7 | 85.9 | 18.3 | 1,357 | 15.8 | 39.2 | 85.8 | 21.9 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 10.9 | 36.4 | 80.6 | 20.0 | 2,398 | 15.8 | 40.5 | 82.4 | 14.6 | 2,831 | 13.5 | 38.6 | 81.5 | 17.1 | 5,228 |
| Rural | 8.4 | 31.6 | 61.2 | 15.0 | 6,962 | 13.6 | 36.0 | 63.3 | 12.6 | 6,982 | 11.0 | 33.8 | 62.3 | 13.8 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 5.4 | 31.4 | 51.6 | 13.3 | 1,730 | 9.4 | 32.6 | 49.1 | 11.0 | 922 | 6.8 | 31.8 | 50.7 | 12.5 | 2,651 |
| High school undergraduate | 17.3 | 29.7 | 66.2 | 17.0 | 3,530 | 17.4 | 34.4 | 67.0 | 14.2 | 3,503 | 14.4 | 32.1 | 66.6 | 15.6 | 7,032 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 4.6 | 38.8 | 71.9 | 17.3 | 2,410 | 10.3 | 42.9 | 74.1 | 14.7 | 3,052 | 7.8 | 47.1 | 73.1 | 15.8 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 14.5 | 32.3 | 73.1 | 16.4 | 1,688 | 16.6 | 36.3 | 72.3 | 10.7 | 2,336 | 15.8 | 34.6 | 72.7 | 13.1 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 8.7 | 30.0 | 40.3 | 10.9 | 1,887 | 12.7 | 31.0 | 39.5 | 9.5 | 1,954 | 10.7 | 30.5 | 39.9 | 10.2 | 3,840 |
| Second | 8.7 | 33.0 | 60.6 | 15.8 | 1,916 | 13.6 | 38.7 | 64.3 | 13.0 | 2,022 | 11.2 | 36.0 | 62.5 | 14.4 | 3,935 |
| Middle | 9.2 | 35.7 | 73.4 | 18.4 | 2,091 | 15.4 | 36.4 | 76.9 | 14.4 | 2,082 | 12.3 | 34.0 | 75.1 | 16.4 | 4,173 |
| Fourth | 9.2 | 34.1 | 78.7 | 20.5 | 1,942 | 12.6 | 40.3 | 80.9 | 16.1 | 2,063 | 11.0 | 38.1 | 79.8 | 18.2 | 4,006 |
| Highest (Richest) | 9.6 | 32.8 | 79.4 | 15.4 | 1,527 | 17.4 | 40.4 | 83.2 | 12.6 | 1,693 | 13.7 | 37.4 | 81.4 | 13.9 | 3,219 |
| Total | 9.1 | 32.8 | 66.2 | 16.3 | 9,361 | 14.2 | 37.3 | 68.8 | 13.2 | 9,813 | 11.7 | 35.1 | 67.5 | 14.7 | 19,174 |

Figure 3.1 Daily use of traditional media by sex

(Telecommunications Policy Act) paved the way for the rapid development of ICT in the country. Today, cell phones have become the most common communication technology tool for every Filipino. Table 3.2 presents the level of Internet use and cell phone ownership among Filipino youth.

Overall, 78.3 percent of the youth own a cell phone; the level is slightly higher among females (80.8\%) than males (75.7\%) and among the older ( $83 \%$ ) than the younger ( $75.2 \%$ ) cohort. Cell phone ownership increases consistently as education level rises, from 51.3 percent among those with elementary-level schooling to 94.6 percent among the college educated. This increasing pattern is also found when the wealth index is taken into consideration. Among the lowest quintile, 58 percent reported ownership of a cell phone, increasing to 92.9 percent among the highest wealth quintile. The proportions of youth who own a cellphone are highest in CALABARZON (87.3\%), Ilocos (86.8\%), Central Luzon (85.7\%), and NCR (84.8\%) and lowest in ARMM (52.4\%).

Aside from communication, cell phone is also used as a means to meet new friends and form new relationships, some not requiring face-to-face contact. Among all youth who own a cell phone, 43.6 percent reported having text mates
whom they have not met personally (Table 3.3). This practice is more common among males (54.5\%) than females (33.9\%) and among the younger (48.3\%) than the older cohort (37.4\%). As shown in Figure 3.2, there is a reverse education and socioeconomic status gradient in this practice in that the proportion decreases as the education level and socioeconomic status rise. The prevalence of the practice is highest in Eastern Visayas (53.7\%), Caraga (52.4\%), and SOCCSKSARGEN (51.6\%) and lowest in CAR (30.9\%), NCR (35.9\%), and ARMM (37.3\%). Interestingly, more young people from rural areas than urban areas reported having text mates whom they have not personally met (45.8\% vs. 38.4\%).

While cell phones are generally used for communication (i.e., calling and sending SMS), the development of mobile phone technology, particularly the introduction of smart phones, has added a new function for cell phones. Almost half of the young people in the country use their phones for entertainment purposes, such as listening to music, playing games, and surfing the Internet, while 13.2 percent reported that their phones are used to take and store pictures and videos. These other cell phone functions are reported more by the younger age group than the older age group. Across regions, more

Figure 3.2 Percent of youth with text mates whom they have not met personally by education level and socioeconomic status

young people from CALABARZON (56\%), NCR (55.8\%), Eastern Visayas (54.4\%), and Cagayan Valley (52.3\%) are using their cell phones for entertainment. The percentage of young people reporting the use of cell phones other than for communication increases with rising educational attainment and socioeconomic status. This could be a function of access, as young people of higher socioeconomic status are more likely to own a smart phone than their less economically able counterparts (see Table 3.4).

## Internet and social media use

In 2002, when YAFS3 was conducted, the Internet was still a relatively new innovation in the Philippines. In YAFS3, Internet use among young people was only about 2 percent. In the intervening period, Internet use has grown tremendously and has since become a ubiquitous source of information and a potent communication tool for Filipinos, especially the youth. This section presents findings on Internet use for social networking, communication, entertainment, and the formation of online friendships.

In general, 58.9 percent of today's youth use the Internet (Table 3.2). The level of Internet use is slightly higher among females (61\%) than males (56.6\%) and among the younger (60.3\%) than the older (56.7\%) cohort. Expectedly, there is a distinct education gradient in Internet use, from almost universal use (91.3\%) among the college educated to a low 20.5 percent among
those with elementary education. Internet use also increases as socioeconomic status rises.

The regional profile of Internet use shows a picture of two regions at extreme ends and the rest of the regions within a narrow range in between. In the NCR, 92.3 percent use the Internet. In contrast, only 22.4 percent use the Internet in ARMM. The prevalence of Internet use in the rest of the regions falls between 40 percent to slightly below 70 percent.

The Internet serves several functions for youngpeople, butits mostfrequentuse is forsocial purposes such as social networking, checking emails, and chatting. It is also frequently used for school work and entertainment (see Figure 3.3). Among Internet users, 80.3 percent reported using the Internet for social networking; again, females have a slightly higher prevalence ( $84.5 \%$ ) than males (75.6\%). The difference by education is not so pronounced. The regions with the highest prevalence of social networking among Internet users are NCR (87.8\%), Central Luzon, Ilocos, and CALABARZON (all at about 84\%). The prevalence is lowest in ARMM (60.7\%), SOCCSKSARGEN (66.5\%), Northern Mindanao (69.2\%), and CAR (69.3\%; Table 3.5).

Next to social networking, the Internet is used for purposes such as checking emails and chatting. About four in 10 Filipino youth reported this Internet function. Following the education and socioeconomic gradient in Internet use, the proportion of young people who use the Internet for communication also increases with a rise in education and socioeconomic status. Young people from the regions of Central Luzon (53.7\%),

Table 3.2 Percent of males and females who use the internet and own a cellular phone by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  | No. of Males | Female |  | No. of Females | Both sexes |  | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Internet | Cellular phone |  | Internet | Cellular phone |  | Internet | Cellular phone |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 57.7 | 71.9 | 5,771 | 63.1 | 78.6 | 5,653 | 60.3 | 75.2 | 11,423 |
| 20-24 | 54.9 | 81.9 | 3,594 | 58.3 | 83.9 | 4,160 | 56.7 | 83.0 | 7,754 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 64.7 | 85.0 | 474 | 67.9 | 88.7 | 468 | 66.3 | 86.8 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 40.0 | 80.5 | 344 | 52.3 | 84.4 | 327 | 46.1 | 82.3 | 671 |
| Central Luzon | 70.8 | 83.2 | 953 | 65.1 | 87.0 | 1,097 | 67.8 | 85.7 | 2,050 |
| CALABARZON | 64.1 | 84.0 | 1,243 | 65.1 | 90.5 | 1,303 | 64.7 | 87.3 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 45.7 | 77.7 | 283 | 49.8 | 81.0 | 279 | 47.7 | 79.4 | 562 |
| Bicol | 38.4 | 70.3 | 521 | 41.5 | 74.5 | 574 | 40.1 | 72.5 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 37.2 | 69.6 | 764 | 51.7 | 82.3 | 722 | 44.3 | 75.8 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 63.5 | 73.8 | 742 | 70.9 | 81.7 | 673 | 67 | 77.6 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 39.6 | 67.4 | 427 | 43.7 | 65.2 | 402 | 41.6 | 66.3 | 830 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 44.2 | 68.1 | 373 | 42.1 | 71.9 | 355 | 43.2 | 70 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 47.9 | 72.3 | 447 | 61.8 | 77.6 | 474 | 55 | 75 | 921 |
| Davao | 56.2 | 71.1 | 445 | 57.1 | 78.2 | 515 | 56.7 | 74.9 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 40.5 | 68.6 | 440 | 42.7 | 62.3 | 461 | 41.6 | 65.4 | 901 |
| CAR | 38.7 | 78.5 | 172 | 56.6 | 85.8 | 198 | 48.4 | 82.2 | 371 |
| ARMM | 16.8 | 55.1 | 321 | 27.5 | 50.0 | 355 | 22.4 | 52.4 | 675 |
| Caraga | 51.7 | 68.7 | 316 | 56.1 | 73.2 | 255 | 53.9 | 71 | 520 |
| NCR | 92.8 | 81.1 | 1,152 | 91.9 | 87.8 | 1,357 | 92.3 | 84.8 | 2,508 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 84.2 | 80.9 | 2,398 | 82.9 | 87.2 | 2,831 | 83.6 | 84.3 | 5,228 |
| Rural | 47.1 | 73.9 | 6,966 | 52.2 | 78.3 | 6,982 | 49.6 | 76.1 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 21.1 | 51.4 | 1,732 | 19.3 | 51.0 | 922 | 20.5 | 51.3 | 2,651 |
| High school undergraduate | 52.6 | 71.0 | 3,531 | 51.6 | 71.8 | 3,503 | 52.1 | 71.4 | 7,032 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.4 | 87.8 | 2,412 | 61.7 | 88.8 | 3,053 | 62.5 | 88.4 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 91.9 | 93.3 | 1,688 | 90.8 | 95.7 | 2,336 | 91.3 | 94.6 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 23.9 | 56.9 | 1,889 | 29.4 | 59.0 | 1,954 | 26.7 | 58 | 3,840 |
| Second | 39.7 | 70.1 | 1,916 | 49.2 | 75.9 | 2,022 | 44.6 | 73.1 | 3,935 |
| Middle | 59.0 | 78.3 | 2,092 | 61.7 | 84.2 | 2,082 | 60.3 | 81.2 | 4,173 |
| Fourth | 75.9 | 85.0 | 1,942 | 80.0 | 91.5 | 2,063 | 78 | 88.3 | 4,006 |
| Highest (Richest) | 90.6 | 90.8 | 1,527 | 87.7 | 94.8 | 1,693 | 89.1 | 92.9 | 3,219 |
| Total | 56.6 | 75.7 | 9,363 | 61.0 | 80.8 | 9,364 | 58.9 | 78.3 | 19,177 |

Figure 3.3 Uses of the Internet by sex


SOCCSKSARGEN (53.1\%), Ilocos (51.9\%), and Davao (50.6\%) registered the highest proportion of Internet use for communication purposes.

Finally, the Internet facilitates schoolrelated work. About four in 10 reported using the Internet for this purpose. Across background characteristics, the use of the Internet for school work is higher among females (49.8\%), younger youth ( $45.7 \%$ ), those from the rural areas (42.1\%), and those from the regions of CAR (68.2\%) and Cagayan Valley (57.8\%). Meanwhile, 17 percent of the youth cited the entertainment
function of the Internet. This includes activities such as listening to music, downloading movies and TV shows, and playing online games. More males than females use the Internet for entertainment purposes (18.4\% vs. 15.7\%, respectively). The prevalence is higher among young people from urban areas and the younger age group. The proportion also increases with a rise in education and socioeconomic status. Across regions, it is highest in NCR and lowest in ARMM and CAR.

Table 3.3 Percent of younger people with textmates whom they have not met personally by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  | Female |  | Both sexes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Number of Males | Percent | Number of Females | Percent | Number of Cases |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 57.8 | 4,135 | 39.4 | 4,425 | 48.3 | 8,560 |
| 20-24 | 49.8 | 2,936 | 27.0 | 3,472 | 37.4 | 6,407 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 47.8 | 400 | 31.1 | 411 | 39.2 | 811 |
| Cagayan Valley | 53.4 | 277 | 30.5 | 275 | 42.1 | 551 |
| Central Luzon | 57.7 | 792 | 26.0 | 961 | 40.3 | 1,753 |
| CALABARZON | 56.5 | 1,043 | 35.3 | 1,181 | 45.2 | 2,224 |
| MIMAROPA | 57.5 | 219 | 35.8 | 226 | 46.5 | 445 |
| Bicol | 57.2 | 362 | 45.8 | 428 | 51.1 | 789 |
| Western Visayas | 56.7 | 527 | 33.4 | 587 | 44.4 | 1,113 |
| Central Visayas | 50.1 | 547 | 38.3 | 549 | 44.2 | 1,095 |
| Eastern Visayas | 58.0 | 286 | 49.0 | 261 | 53.7 | 547 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 50.4 | 252 | 32.3 | 254 | 41.3 | 506 |
| Northern Mindanao | 61.6 | 323 | 40.6 | 367 | 50.4 | 691 |
| Davao | 61.8 | 317 | 38.4 | 401 | 48.8 | 717 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 60.3 | 300 | 42.2 | 282 | 51.6 | 583 |
| CAR | 37.3 | 134 | 25.7 | 167 | 30.9 | 301 |
| ARMM | 42.6 | 176 | 32.0 | 175 | 37.3 | 351 |
| Caraga | 62.6 | 182 | 42.5 | 186 | 52.4 | 368 |
| NCR | 48.3 | 933 | 26.0 | 1,184 | 35.9 | 2,117 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 51.0 | 1,938 | 28.5 | 2,456 | 38.4 | 4,393 |
| Rural | 55.8 | 5,133 | 36.4 | 5,441 | 45.8 | 10,574 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 60.9 | 887 | 43.4 | 465 | 54.9 | 1,352 |
| High school undergraduate | 59.2 | 2,498 | 43 | 2,504 | 51.1 | 5,002 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.3 | 2,113 | 31.9 | 2,697 | 41.3 | 4,810 |
| College or higher | 45 | 1,572 | 24.3 | 2,230 | 32.9 | 3,803 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 58.4 | 1,066 | 40.0 | 1,145 | 48.9 | 2,210 |
| Second | 58.3 | 1,338 | 40.5 | 1,526 | 48.8 | 2,864 |
| Middle | 57.0 | 1,633 | 39.1 | 1,745 | 47.7 | 3,378 |
| Fourth | 53.1 | 1,648 | 27.4 | 1,877 | 39.4 | 3,525 |
| Highest (Richest) | 46.5 | 1,387 | 25.4 | 1,604 | 35.2 | 2,990 |
| Total | 54.5 | 7,071 | 33.9 | 7,895 | 43.6 | 14,966 |


| Background characteristics | Male |  |  | No. of | Female |  |  | No. of Females | Both sexes |  |  | No. of Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Communication | Entertainment | Others |  | Communication | Entertainment | Others |  | Communication | Entertainment | Others |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 99.1 | 48.7 | 12.5 | 4,143 | 99.3 | 50.1 | 14.5 | 4,437 | 99.2 | 49.4 | 13.5 | 8,581 |
| 20-24 | 99.1 | 45.4 | 11.7 | 2,942 | 99.6 | 44.9 | 13.9 | 3,487 | 99.6 | 45.1 | 12.9 | 6,430 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 99.8 | 51.5 | 8.7 | 402 | 99.5 | 48.2 | 12.0 | 415 | 99.6 | 49.8 | 10.4 | 817 |
| Cagayan Valley | 99.6 | 50.7 | 4.7 | 277 | 98.9 | 53.8 | 11.0 | 272 | 99.3 | 52.3 | 7.8 | 549 |
| Central Luzon | 99.6 | 42.7 | 17.2 | 797 | 99.6 | 45.8 | 17.8 | 964 | 99.6 | 44.4 | 17.5 | 1,755 |
| calabarzon | 97.9 | 49.1 | 10.7 | 1,043 | 99.2 | 62.0 | 21.1 | 1,180 | 98.6 | 56.0 | 16.2 | 2,223 |
| mimaropa | 98.2 | 44.3 | 7.3 | 219 | 98.7 | 50.9 | 15.0 | 226 | 98.4 | 47.5 | 11.4 | 446 |
| Bicol | 98.9 | 51.1 | 4.4 | 365 | 99.5 | 40.5 | 8.7 | 426 | 99.2 | 45.4 | 6.8 | 793 |
| Western Visayas | 99.8 | 44.4 | 10.9 | 532 | 99.7 | 41.3 | 8.4 | 595 | 99.7 | 42.8 | 9.6 | 1,126 |
| Central Visayas | 99.8 | 35.6 | 9.0 | 547 | 100.0 | 38.2 | 5.5 | 550 | 99.9 | 36.9 | 7.3 | 1,098 |
| Eastern Visayas | 100.0 | 57.5 | 12.8 | 288 | 99.6 | 51.0 | 25.4 | 260 | 99.8 | 54.4 | 18.8 | 548 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 99.6 | 48.4 | 12.2 | 254 | 98.0 | 35.9 | 8.2 | 256 | 99.0 | 42.0 | 10.4 | 510 |
| Northern Mindanao | 99.7 | 51.4 | 28.8 | 323 | 99.2 | 29.4 | 9.0 | 367 | 99.4 | 39.7 | 18.1 | 690 |
| Davao | 99.1 | 51.4 | 13.6 | 317 | 99.5 | 44.0 | 10.2 | 403 | 99.3 | 47.3 | 11.5 | 719 |
| soccsksargen | 99.3 | 44.2 | 13.0 | 301 | 100.0 | 35.3 | 14.3 | 286 | 99.7 | 39.9 | 13.5 | 586 |
| CAR | 99.3 | 48.9 | 5.2 | 135 | 98.2 | 37.9 | 7.1 | 169 | 98.7 | 42.8 | 6.3 | 304 |
| ARMM | 97.2 | 35.2 | 5.1 | 176 | 100.0 | 30.1 | 2.9 | 175 | 98.6 | 32.7 | 4.0 | 352 |
| Caraga | 99.5 | 59.3 | 34.4 | 183 | 99.5 | 37.4 | 11.2 | 187 | 99.2 | 48.2 | 22.6 | 368 |
| NCR | 100.0 | 49.0 | 11.1 | 932 | 99.6 | 61.2 | 19.7 | 1,192 | 99.8 | 55.8 | 15.9 | 2,125 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 99.8 | 48.7 | 12.4 | 1,939 | 99.6 | 57.0 | 18.7 | 1,468 | 99.7 | 53.4 | 15.9 | 4,406 |
| Rural | 99.1 | 46.8 | 12.0 | 5,146 | 99.3 | 43.7 | 12.2 | 5,457 | 99.2 | 45.2 | 12.1 | 10,603 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 98.8 | 40.6 | 10.3 | 889 | 99.4 | 35.3 | 8.3 | 470 | 99.0 | 38.8 | 9.7 | 1,360 |
| High school undergraduate | 99.0 | 46.2 | 12.2 | 2,506 | 99.5 | 46.1 | 11.1 | 2,513 | 99.2 | 46.1 | 11.6 | 5,019 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 99.5 | 47.6 | 13.0 | 2,117 | 99.2 | 46.0 | 15.4 | 2,706 | 99.4 | 46.7 | 14.4 | 4,824 |
| College or higher | 99.7 | 52.6 | 12.0 | 1,573 | 27.4 | 54.5 | 17.5 | 2,234 | 99.6 | 53.7 | 15.2 | 3,807 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 98.4 | 42.4 | 11.6 | 1,073 | 99.4 | 33.0 | 7.2 | 1,152 | 98.9 | 37.5 | 9.3 | 2,226 |
| Second | 99.5 | 43.1 | 12.0 | 1,342 | 99.6 | 41.9 | 10.5 | 1,528 | 99.6 | 42.5 | 11.2 | 2,871 |
| Middle | 99.3 | 46.5 | 10.5 | 1,637 | 99.5 | 42.1 | 11.7 | 1,752 | 99.3 | 44.3 | 11.1 | 3,389 |
| Fourth | 99.5 | 49.3 | 12.1 | 1,647 | 99.3 | 53.9 | 17.5 | 1,888 | 99.5 | 51.8 | 15.0 | 3,535 |
| Highest (Richest) | 99.4 | 53.8 | 14.6 | 1,386 | 99.4 | 63.1 | 21.8 | 1,605 | 99.3 | 58.8 | 18.5 | 2,991 |
| Total | 99.3 | 47.3 | 12.1 | 7,085 | 99.4 | 47.8 | 14.2 | 7,925 | 99.4 | 47.6 | 13.2 | 15,010 |

Table 3.5 Uses of Internet by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  | Both sexes |  |  |  |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entertainment | Communication | $\begin{gathered} \text { Social } \\ \text { networking } \end{gathered}$ | School work | males | Entertainment | Communication | $\begin{gathered} \text { Social } \\ \text { networking } \end{gathered}$ | School work | females | Entertainment | Communication | Social networking | School work |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 18.4 | 39.0 | 73.5 | 34.1 | 3,324 | 17.5 | 43.3 | 85.0 | 56.5 | 3,564 | 17.9 | 41.2 | 79.5 | 45.7 | 6,888 |
| 20-24 | 18.5 | 45.4 | 79.2 | 29.0 | 1,974 | 13.2 | 53.5 | 83.8 | 40.0 | 2,422 | 15.7 | 49.9 | 81.7 | 35.0 | 4,395 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 24.5 | 48.7 | 81.0 | 30.1 | 305 | 17.7 | 55.0 | 86.5 | 47.3 | 318 | 21.1 | 51.9 | 83.7 | 38.8 | 624 |
| Cagayan Valley | 9.5 | 38.7 | 67.4 | 49.6 | 138 | 10.1 | 35.9 | 76.0 | 64.1 | 171 | 9.7 | 37.3 | 72.1 | 57.8 | 308 |
| Central Luzon | 21.4 | 51.2 | 84.1 | 17.6 | 674 | 16.2 | 56.0 | 84.2 | 44.7 | 714 | 18.6 | 53.7 | 84.2 | 31.6 | 1,389 |
| calabarzon | 20.4 | 35.6 | 78.3 | 30.5 | 797 | 16.8 | 41.4 | 88.5 | 48.6 | 851 | 18.6 | 38.6 | 83.6 | 39.8 | 1,648 |
| MImAROPA | 18.4 | 41.1 | 65.9 | 46.5 | 129 | 5.8 | 32.6 | 80.4 | 52.5 | 138 | 8.2 | 36.7 | 73.4 | 49.4 | 267 |
| Bicol | 11.7 | 37.5 | 75.0 | 37.5 | 200 | 10.8 | 57.1 | 82.8 | 50.0 | 238 | 11.3 | 48.2 | 79.0 | 44.4 | 439 |
| Western Visayas | 6.8 | 41.5 | 62.7 | 39.8 | 284 | 11.9 | 51.6 | 89.5 | 58.7 | 372 | 9.2 | 47.3 | 77.9 | 50.5 | 656 |
| Central Visayas | 22.7 | 35.1 | 71.5 | 30.2 | 471 | 18.4 | 38.0 | 83.0 | 53.5 | 477 | 20.7 | 37.0 | 77.3 | 42.0 | 948 |
| Eastern Visayas | 10.1 | 47.3 | 72.2 | 34.9 | 169 | 12.9 | 52.6 | 80.6 | 40.9 | 175 | 11.5 | 49.9 | 76.5 | 38.0 | 344 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 13.7 | 49.7 | 73.9 | 32.1 | 165 | 11.0 | 51.0 | 79.2 | 55.7 | 149 | 12.4 | 50.3 | 76.7 | 43.3 | 313 |
| Northern Mindanao | 17.9 | 35.5 | 68.7 | 38.8 | 214 | 11.6 | 34.6 | 69.9 | 64.8 | 292 | 14.7 | 34.9 | 69.2 | 53.8 | 507 |
| Davao | 16.4 | 46.0 | 70.0 | 31.6 | 250 | 14.6 | 54.6 | 84.0 | 49.0 | 294 | 15.4 | 50.6 | 77.6 | 40.9 | 544 |
| soccsksargen | 12.8 | 55.1 | 63.6 | 38.6 | 176 | 8.0 | 51.3 | 69.0 | 46.2 | 297 | 10.3 | 53.1 | 66.5 | 42.7 | 373 |
| CAR | 7.5 | 34.3 | 64.2 | 61.8 | 67 | 7.6 | 45.0 | 72.3 | 71.4 | 112 | 7.6 | 41.0 | 69.3 | 68.2 | 179 |
| ARMm | 3.7 | 37.0 | 55.6 | 42.6 | 54 | 3.1 | 59.8 | 62.9 | 58.3 | 97 | 3.4 | 52.0 | 60.7 | 52.7 | 150 |
| Caraga | 16.2 | 45.3 | 75.4 | 33.3 | 138 | 11.4 | 49.0 | 79.7 | 47.9 | 143 | 13.0 | 47.0 | 77.5 | 40.7 | 280 |
| NCR | 38.1 | 36.9 | 81.6 | 32.2 | 1,066 | 31.2 | 46.8 | 93.3 | 43.2 | 1,247 | 34.3 | 42.3 | 87.8 | 38.2 | 2,314 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 30.7 | 41.4 | 79.2 | 31.5 | 2,019 | 27.3 | 50.1 | 90.2 | 48.5 | 2,348 | 28.8 | 46.1 | 85.1 | 40.6 | 4,366 |
| Rural | 14.2 | 41.4 | 73.4 | 32.7 | 3,279 | 10.9 | 45.7 | 80.8 | 50.7 | 3,639 | 12.6 | 43.7 | 77.3 | 42.1 | 6,918 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 4.3 | 27.4 | 70.1 | 7.4 | 365 | 4.0 | 35.6 | 83.1 | 14.1 | 177 | 4.2 | 30.1 | 74.4 | 9.8 | 542 |
| High school undergraduate | 15.9 | 36.0 | 73.4 | 32.1 | 1,856 | 11.5 | 40.9 | 81.3 | 52.7 | 1,806 | 13.7 | 38.4 | 77.3 | 42.2 | 3,662 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 21.5 | 43.4 | 77.5 | 24.1 | 1,527 | 15.0 | 47.1 | 87.1 | 32.6 | 1,882 | 17.9 | 45.5 | 82.8 | 28.8 | 310 |
| College or higher | 33.7 | 49.1 | 77.7 | 46.2 | 1,549 | 27.4 | 54.4 | 85.1 | 65.6 | 2,119 | 30.1 | 52.2 | 82.0 | 57.4 | 3,669 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 5.7 | 30.3 | 63.5 | 29.0 | 452 | 4.0 | 37.0 | 72.4 | 45.2 | 1,954 | 4.8 | 34.1 | 68.4 | 38.1 | 1,026 |
| Second | 9.3 | 40.4 | 71.3 | 30.8 | 760 | 10.1 | 43.1 | 79.0 | 49.4 | 2,022 | 9.7 | 41.9 | 75.6 | 41.4 | 1,753 |
| Middle | 16.3 | 41.6 | 76.6 | 28.1 | 1,233 | 14.6 | 44.7 | 84.4 | 48.9 | 2,082 | 15.4 | 43.2 | 80.6 | 38.8 | 2,516 |
| Fourth | 28.4 | 40.7 | 79.1 | 34.2 | 1,470 | 22.8 | 49.8 | 87.3 | 49.6 | 2,063 | 25.5 | 45.5 | 83.4 | 42.3 | 3,120 |
| Highest (Richest) | 35.8 | 46.0 | 77.4 | 35.6 | 1,382 | 28.5 | 54.1 | 90.0 | 52.7 | 1,693 | 32.0 | 50.2 | 83.0 | 44.5 | 2,869 |
| Total | 18.4 | 41.4 | 75.6 | 32.2 | 5,298 | 15.7 | 47.4 | 84.5 | 49.8 | 5,298 | 17.0 | 44.6 | 80.3 | 41.6 | 11,284 |

Similar to the cell phone, the Internet likewise provides a means to establish relationships without face-to-face contact, referred to as online or virtual friendships. Among Internet users, more than half (52.3\%) have online or virtual friends (i.e., friends they have not met personally). The pattern of difference by age and sex is the same as that for text mates in that more males than females ( $57.9 \%$ vs. $47.3 \%$ ) and more of the younger than the older cohort ( $53.7 \%$ vs. 50\%) have virtual
friends. There is no discernible difference by education level. In terms of regional differences, this kind of relationship is more common among young people from Central Luzon, Davao, NCR, and ARMM (Table 3.6).

## Exposure to pornography through media

The exposure of Filipino youth to pornographic materials through videos increased slightly between the 2002 YAFS and

Table 3.6 Percent of young people with online friends whom they have not met personally by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  | Female |  | Both sexes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | No. of Males | Percent | No. of Females | Percent | No. of Cases |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 58.0 | 3,310 | 49.7 | 3,547 | 53.7 | 6,857 |
| 20-24 | 57.8 | 1,967 | 43.6 | 2,410 | 50.0 | 4,376 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 49.5 | 303 | 40.4 | 317 | 44.8 | 620 |
| Cagayan Valley | 58.8 | 136 | 51.2 | 168 | 54.6 | 304 |
| Central Luzon | 69.4 | 673 | 50.9 | 713 | 59.8 | 1,387 |
| CALABARZON | 59.3 | 796 | 46.0 | 852 | 52.4 | 1,648 |
| MIMAROPA | 57.4 | 129 | 52.2 | 138 | 54.7 | 267 |
| Bicol | 52.5 | 200 | 56.3 | 238 | 54.7 | 437 |
| Western Visayas | 53.4 | 279 | 40.9 | 372 | 46.3 | 652 |
| Central Visayas | 37.1 | 469 | 40.3 | 477 | 38.7 | 946 |
| Eastern Visayas | 56.2 | 169 | 43.9 | 171 | 50.1 | 339 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 45.1 | 162 | 44.2 | 147 | 44.8 | 310 |
| Northern Mindanao | 48.8 | 213 | 44.7 | 293 | 46.3 | 505 |
| Davao | 66.8 | 250 | 52.9 | 293 | 59.3 | 543 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 60.2 | 176 | 43.8 | 192 | 51.4 | 368 |
| CAR | 50.0 | 66 | 41.4 | 111 | 44.6 | 177 |
| ARMM | 69.8 | 53 | 49.5 | 91 | 57.3 | 143 |
| Caraga | 43.1 | 137 | 47.6 | 143 | 45.4 | 280 |
| NCR | 66.7 | 1,064 | 50.6 | 1,239 | 58.1 | 2,303 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 64.3 | 2,014 | 50.7 | 2,339 | 57.0 | 4,353 |
| Rural | 54.0 | 3,263 | 45.0 | 3,617 | 49.3 | 6,879 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 56.1 | 360 | 51.4 | 175 | 54.5 | 536 |
| High school undergraduate | 54.5 | 1,843 | 46.8 | 1,791 | 50.7 | 3,634 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 57.9 | 1,526 | 46.2 | 1,876 | 51.4 | 3,402 |
| College or higher | 62.4 | 1,547 | 48.2 | 2,114 | 54.2 | 3,661 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 45.0 | 447 | 40.3 | 566 | 42.3 | 1,013 |
| Second | 50.9 | 753 | 43.1 | 986 | 46.5 | 1,739 |
| Middle | 56.6 | 1,227 | 47.2 | 1,281 | 51.8 | 2,509 |
| Fourth | 61.9 | 1,468 | 51.3 | 1,646 | 56.3 | 3,114 |
| Highest (Richest) | 63.0 | 1,381 | 48.2 | 1,477 | 55.4 | 2,859 |
| Total | 57.9 | 5,277 | 47.3 | 5,955 | 52.3 | 11,232 |

2013 YAFS. In 2002, 55 percent of the youth aged 15-24 reported having ever watched pornographic videos. This rose to 56.5 percent in 2013. The same gender difference is found in the two survey rounds (see Figure 2.4). More males have ever watched pornographic materials than females, although the percentage among females rose slightly from 36.4 percent in 2002 to 38.1 percent in 2013. A higher percentage of young people in the age group 20-24 and those with high education have ever watched pornographic materials. Exposure to pornography through videos is higher among youth from Caraga (66.7\%), followed by NCR (66.2\%). Only 21.7 percent of the youth in ARMM have ever watched pornographic materials (Table 3.7).

In contrast, there is a slight decline in the percentage of youth who have ever read pornographic materials between 2002 and 2013, from 38.5 percent to 35.6 percent. Exposure to print materials with adult content is higher among males, the older youth, and those with high education. In terms of regional differences, more young people from NCR (47.4\%), CALABARZON (45\%), and Bicol (38\%) reported having ever read pornographic materials. Again, youth from ARMM registered the lowest percentage who have ever read materials with pornographic content (11.1\%). Exposure to both print and video pornographic materials tends to increase with the level of education and socioeconomic status. Among young people with elementary education or no schooling, 20.8 percent and 49 percent have been exposed to pornography
through print and video, respectively. Among those with college or higher education, exposure to pornographic materials through both media platforms rose to 48.1 percent and 63.3 percent, respectively.

Furthermore, ICTs, particularly the Internet, offer young people the possibility to discreetly access information on issues that they may be too embarrassed to ask or talk about because of cultural reasons. Sex-related topics are one of the top search topics on the Internet (McKenzie, 2007).

Among young Filipinos who reported to be Internet users, 26.3 percent admitted to having accessed websites with sexually explicit content (Table 3.8). There is an obvious disparity between males and females, with 46.7 percent of males reporting to have accessed adult-themed websites compared with 8.3 percent among females. The prevalence is also higher among the older cohort and those living in urban areas (both $32.3 \%$ ). In terms of socioeconomic status, the proportion of young people who reported accessing adult-themed websites rose with increasing socioeconomic status. This is consistent with the pattern of Internet use. The youth from NCR (36\%) have the highest prevalence of access to websites with sexual content, while those from ARMM have the lowest (11.5\%).

Figure 3.4 Exposure to pornographic materials by sex: 2002 and 2013


Table 3.7 Percent of young people who have been exposed to pornographic materials by different media and by background characteristic

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  | Female |  |  | Both sexes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Read pornographic materials | Watch pornographic videos | N of cases | Read pornographic materials | Watch pornographic videos | N of cases | Read pornographic materials | Watch pornographic videos | N of cases |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 36.8 | 70.0 | 5,768 | 22.7 | 28.7 | 5,640 | 29.8 | 49.6 | 6,888 |
| 20-24 | 53.2 | 85.1 | 3,590 | 36.1 | 50.9 | 4,158 | 44.4 | 66.8 | 4,395 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 41.0 | 80.1 | 473 | 29.1 | 41.0 | 468 | 35.1 | 60.8 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 31.3 | 71.5 | 344 | 34.8 | 38.7 | 326 | 33.0 | 55.5 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 47.2 | 81.5 | 953 | 20.4 | 33.8 | 1,097 | 32.9 | 56.0 | 2,049 |
| CALABARZON | 60.8 | 85.0 | 1,243 | 30.0 | 39.2 | 1,304 | 45.0 | 61.5 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 34.0 | 72.4 | 283 | 28.3 | 34.4 | 279 | 31.3 | 53.6 | 562 |
| Bicol | 39.7 | 70.3 | 522 | 36.5 | 36.6 | 573 | 38.0 | 52.7 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 32.5 | 63.8 | 765 | 24.1 | 36.1 | 721 | 28.4 | 50.3 | 1,485 |
| Central Visayas | 38.4 | 76.0 | 741 | 30.2 | 47.5 | 673 | 34.5 | 62.4 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 26.8 | 59.8 | 423 | 30.8 | 32.6 | 399 | 28.7 | 46.6 | 822 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 34.9 | 74.2 | 372 | 23.3 | 32.9 | 356 | 29.3 | 54.0 | 728 |
| Northern Mindanao | 48.3 | 78.7 | 447 | 22.6 | 35.1 | 473 | 35.1 | 56.3 | 920 |
| Davao | 46.7 | 79.1 | 446 | 25.9 | 40.4 | 515 | 35.6 | 58.4 | 959 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 38.7 | 75.0 | 440 | 20.2 | 30.2 | 457 | 29.3 | 52.2 | 897 |
| CAR | 39.0 | 72.7 | 172 | 35.4 | 31.8 | 198 | 37.0 | 50.8 | 370 |
| ARMM | 8.1 | 29.1 | 320 | 13.8 | 15.0 | 353 | 11.1 | 21.7 | 673 |
| CARAGA | 38.1 | 83.8 | 265 | 27.1 | 48.8 | 254 | 32.6 | 66.7 | 519 |
| NCR | 57.3 | 87.9 | 1,150 | 38.9 | 47.8 | 1,353 | 47.4 | 66.2 | 2,502 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 54.1 | 85.6 | 2,396 | 34.8 | 44.3 | 2,826 | 43.6 | 63.3 | 5,222 |
| Rural | 39.3 | 72.4 | 6,962 | 25.8 | 35.6 | 6,972 | 32.5 | 54.0 | 13,934 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 23.3 | 60.4 | 684 | 16.3 | 27.5 | 666 | 20.8 | 49.0 | 2,648 |
| High school undergraduate | 36.9 | 70.9 | 1,025 | 20.7 | 28.9 | 2,484 | 28.8 | 50.0 | 7,021 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.5 | 85.9 | 341 | 33.3 | 45.9 | 1,651 | 42.2 | 63.5 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 61.6 | 87.3 | 214 | 38.3 | 45.9 | 1,264 | 48.1 | 63.3 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 26.9 | 61.8 | 1,886 | 21.7 | 28.3 | 1,947 | 24.2 | 44.8 | 3,833 |
| Second | 36.4 | 71.8 | 1,916 | 25.3 | 35.6 | 2,021 | 30.7 | 53.2 | 3,937 |
| Middle | 45.9 | 77.5 | 2,090 | 28.4 | 39.9 | 2,077 | 37.2 | 58.7 | 4,167 |
| Fourth | 50.2 | 83.0 | 1,941 | 31.5 | 42.1 | 2,062 | 40.6 | 62.0 | 4,003 |
| Highest (Richest) | 58.7 | 86.6 | 1,525 | 35.9 | 45.2 | 1,691 | 46.8 | 64.9 | 3,217 |
| Total | 42.1 | 75.8 | 9,363 | 28.4 | 38.1 | 9,811 | 35.6 | 56.5 | 19,156 |

## Summary and conclusions

Compared with their predecessors, today's generation of youth are exposed to a far wider range of choices in connecting with the world, as it is in their generation that advancements in ICTs have proceeded at a very rapid pace. As such, they have greater access to information and resources that were not readily available to earlier generations. The Internet and mobile
telecommunications, in particular, have not only provided young people with a means of communication but have also extended their options for entertainment and socialization. They are no longer just passive consumers of technology but can be active producers of media content.

The findings showed that young Filipinos are still using the traditional media forms, although there is greater preference on

Table 3.8 Percent of young people who have accessed website with sexually explicit content, by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  | Female |  | Both sexes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | $N$ of cases | Percent | $N$ of cases | Percent | N of cases |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 40.5 | 3,306 | 5.7 | 3,549 | 22.5 | 6,854 |
| 20-24 | 57.1 | 1,970 | 12.2 | 2,411 | 32.3 | 4,381 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 39.4 | 302 | 4.1 | 317 | 21.3 | 619 |
| Cagayan Valley | 30.4 | 135 | 7.7 | 169 | 18 | 306 |
| Central Luzon | 42.1 | 673 | 8.3 | 714 | 24.7 | 1,388 |
| CALABARZON | 53.6 | 797 | 6.8 | 852 | 29.4 | 1,649 |
| MIMAROPA | 33.3 | 129 | 5.0 | 139 | 18.7 | 268 |
| Bicol | 39.1 | 197 | 8.0 | 238 | 22 | 436 |
| Western Visayas | 32.6 | 282 | 8.7 | 368 | 19.1 | 650 |
| Central Visayas | 40.0 | 470 | 6.5 | 477 | 23.1 | 948 |
| Eastern Visayas | 37.1 | 167 | 8.6 | 174 | 22.5 | 342 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 55.8 | 163 | 8.8 | 147 | 33.2 | 310 |
| Northern Mindanao | 37.4 | 214 | 5.6 | 286 | 19.2 | 500 |
| Davao | 43.6 | 250 | 10.0 | 291 | 25.6 | 542 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 48.0 | 173 | 3.6 | 192 | 24.7 | 365 |
| CAR | 35.4 | 65 | 7.3 | 110 | 18.2 | 176 |
| ARMM | 26.4 | 53 | 3.2 | 95 | 11.5 | 148 |
| CARAGA | 40.9 | 137 | 9.8 | 143 | 24.9 | 281 |
| NCR | 63.2 | 1,065 | 12.8 | 1,246 | 36 | 2,312 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 57.1 | 2,015 | 10.9 | 2,346 | 32.3 | 4,361 |
| Rural | 40.2 | 3,262 | 6.6 | 3,613 | 22.6 | 6,874 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 33.3 | 363 | 11.4 | 156 | 26.2 | 539 |
| High school undergraduate | 37.7 | 1,843 | 4.9 | 1,711 | 21.5 | 3,541 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 49 | 1,525 | 10.2 | 1,684 | 27.6 | 3,402 |
| College or higher | 58.2 | 1,546 | 9.3 | 1,912 | 30 | 3,654 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 30.6 | 451 | 5.5 | 568 | 16.5 | 1,019 |
| Second | 33.8 | 751 | 6.0 | 980 | 18.1 | 1,731 |
| Middle | 41.5 | 1,225 | 7.4 | 1,279 | 24.1 | 2,505 |
| Fourth | 50.3 | 1,471 | 8.4 | 1,647 | 28.2 | 3,118 |
| Highest (Richest) | 59.7 | 1,378 | 11.6 | 1,485 | 34.8 | 2,863 |
| Total | 46.7 | 5,277 | 8.3 | 5,960 | 26.3 | 11,237 |

broadcast media, particularly television. But this generation of youth is at the threshold of profound change in mass media forms. With more than half of young Filipinos using the Internet and more than two thirds owning cell phones, there is a greater possibility of media use convergence as contents from traditional media have become readily accessible through the Internet. Access to pornography and adult-themed content, for example, extends to the Internet and cell phones. On the other hand, the findings also underscored
the benefits that young people get from ICT. For instance, a significant proportion use the Internet for school-related activities. However, given the vast amount of information available through the Internet, concerns have been raised about young people's ability to filter and sort through the information they retrieve from the Internet.

While access to ICTs, particularly for young people, has improved through the years, there is still an obvious digital divide
within socioeconomic status and educational attainment, as well as across regions. The regional profile of Internet use depicts a picture of two regions at opposing ends, with Internet use registered at 92.3 percent in NCR and 22.4 percent in ARMM, while the rest of the regions fall within the range in between. Regardless of how the Internet is used, the same pattern prevails, with NCR and its neighboring areas at the high end and ARMM at the bottom end.

In the same manner, Internet use and cell phone ownership show a positive association with socioeconomic status and education. Young people at the lower end of both educational and socioeconomic status have a lower prevalence of Internet use and cell phone ownership compared with their counterparts. More equitable access to technology for young people requires addressing this socioeconomic disparity.
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# Subjective Well-Being, Self-Assessed Health, and Lifestyle 

Josefina N. Natividad

I$n$ the fourth iteration of the YAFS, a new area of study on the status of the Filipino youth is added, expanding the scope of the study beyond the core topics of fertility, sexuality, and attendant risk behaviors. For YAFS4, we added a section on health and lifestyle in recognition of the growing interest in the study of chronic diseases that may originate from habits and behaviors associated with certain lifestyles that are acquired in one's early years such as the ages of $15-24$. Among these are habits related to diet, exercise, and leisure activities. YAFS4 also expanded the section on understanding how Filipino youth perceive themselves, using a variety of indicators. These self-assessments can be used as explanatory factors for variations in behaviors or can be dependent variables to be explained in future analysis. In all, this new addition to the YAFS data enriches our current understanding of the Filipino youth of today.

## Self-assessed status

Overall, the self-assessed status measures aim to capture the individual's sense of how well he/she is doing with his/her life along a number of dimensions. All these measures can be conceived of as indicators of subjective well-being in its various facets. The notion that subjective well-being-a term that broadly captures an individual's evaluation of his or her life-is an important factor for understanding psychological well-being and overall mental health is well supported in theory and research (Moksnes \& Espnes, 2013). Subjective well-
being, in turn, is often measured in terms of life satisfaction and self-esteem. While much of the literature on subjective well-being pertains to the adult population, a number of studies have looked at the adolescent years in which a multitude of biological, psychological, social, and cognitive changes are occurring, posing many challenges to the adolescent, with effects that may persist through adulthood.

Investigating the factors that may affect life satisfaction, Proctor, Linley, and Malbey (2009) reported only a very modest role played by gender and socioeconomic status among children and adolescents. Other studies that found a more pronounced gender difference generally reported boys as scoring higher on life satisfaction than girls (Goldbeck et al., 2007; Moksnes \& Espnes, 2012). Similarly, males tend to report higher self-esteem than do females. Numerous studies show the positive link between self-esteem and psychological health and well-being during adolescence. Conversely, low self-esteem has been linked to experiencing more symptoms of anxiety and depression (Orth et al., 2009).

YAFS4 contained a number of self-assessed indicators of subjective well-being. These are life satisfaction, happiness, self-esteem, and depression. Life satisfaction and happiness are measured through a straightforward question asking the respondents to rate their satisfaction with their lives or how happy they are on a 10 -point scale. Self-esteem is measured by the Rosenberg scale, while depression is
measured using a short version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression (CES-D) scale.

Table 4.1 shows the self-assessments of Filipino youth broken down by region, urbanrural residence, highest educational attainment, and socioeconomic status based on the wealth index. Because of the often-documented strong gender difference in these measures observed in other studies, Table 4.1 shows the selfassessments separately for men and women.

## Self-esteem

The mean self-esteem score for all participants is $18.5^{1}$ with no difference between men and women. There is a considerable variation in the overall mean self-esteem score across the regions, ranging from the highest mean score of 19.8 from Central Luzon to the lowest mean score of 16.7 from Northern Mindanao. Within some regions, there are observed differences in mean scores between men and women, but no consistent pattern is apparent. In some regions, women have higher mean self-esteem

Table 4.1 Mean self-perception scores by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Mean <br> Self -esteem score |  |  | Mean depression score |  |  | Mean life satisfaction rating |  |  | Mean self-rated happiness |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | All | Male | Female | All | Male | Female | All | Male | Female | All |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 18.8 | 17.8 | 18.3 | 19.2 | 20.7 | 19.9 | 7.5 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.1 |
| Cagayan Valley | 17.6 | 18.5 | 18.0 | 20.2 | 19.3 | 19.8 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Central Luzon | 19.7 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 18.1 | 17.6 | 17.8 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.3 |
| CALABARZON | 18.6 | 19.3 | 19.0 | 19.2 | 19.6 | 19.4 | 7.2 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.5 |
| MIMAROPA | 19.3 | 19.3 | 19.3 | 19.7 | 19.4 | 19.5 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| Bicol | 19.1 | 18.7 | 18.9 | 20.5 | 21.0 | 20.8 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.5 |
| Western Visayas | 18.2 | 18.6 | 18.4 | 20.0 | 20.2 | 20.1 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 7.9 |
| Central Visayas | 17.5 | 17.6 | 17.5 | 19.3 | 20.8 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 7.4 | 7.6 |
| Eastern Visayas | 17.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 18.4 | 17.7 | 18.0 | 20.0 | 21.4 | 20.7 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| Northern Mindanao | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 21.4 | 21.5 | 21.4 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 7.5 |
| Davao | 18.3 | 17.5 | 17.8 | 19.9 | 20.2 | 20.1 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 7.5 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 19.1 | 18.1 | 18.6 | 17.4 | 19.5 | 18.4 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| CAR | 18.3 | 17.8 | 18.0 | 19.8 | 21.0 | 20.5 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 7.5 |
| ARMM | 17.7 | 18.8 | 18.3 | 21.8 | 20.8 | 21.2 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.8 | 7.5 |
| Caraga | 17.0 | 16.7 | 16.8 | 21.3 | 21.5 | 21.4 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 7.3 |
| NCR | 19.6 | 19.0 | 19.3 | 19.9 | 20.3 | 20.1 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.0 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 19.2 | 18.9 | 19.0 | 19.6 | 20.0 | 19.8 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 8.0 |
| Rural | 18.2 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 19.7 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 7.8 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 17.7 | 17.5 | 17.6 | 20.1 | 20.6 | 20.3 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| High school undergraduate | 18.4 | 18.2 | 18.3 | 19.8 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 18.6 | 18.4 | 18.5 | 19.4 | 20.0 | 19.7 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| College or higher | 19.5 | 19.2 | 19.3 | 19.4 | 19.8 | 19.6 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.0 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 17.8 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 20.2 | 20.5 | 20.3 | 6.7 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| Second | 18.0 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 19.8 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 7.8 |
| Middle | 18.4 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 19.6 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Fourth | 19.0 | 18.8 | 18.9 | 19.5 | 19.9 | 19.7 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Highest (Richest) | 19.4 | 19.5 | 19.5 | 19.3 | 19.6 | 19.4 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 8.1 | 8.2 |
| Total | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 19.7 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |

[^15]scores (e.g., Cagayan Valley, CALABARZON, ARMM); in others, the men have higher scores (SOCCSKSARGEN, Zamboanga Peninsula, CAR). Still, the differences in scores between the sexes are small, rarely exceeding one point.

Youth from urban areas have higher selfesteem scores than youth from rural areas. Self-esteem also tends to increase as the level of education increases, with the college educated recording the highest mean scores for both men and women. The same pattern is observed for socioeconomic status, with a monotonic increase in the self-esteem score as the wealth quintile increases, from its lowest level among the poorest (mean of 17.7) to the highest level among the richest (mean of 19.5).

## Depressive symptoms

In measuring depressive symptoms, YAFS4 adopted a 12 -item version of the 20 -item CES-D scale, a common scale used to screen for depression in the general population. Because there are no validated cut-off scores for depression among Filipino youth for this scale, we report and compare the mean depressive symptoms in place of a classification of the study population into the depressed and not depressed. For the 12 -item scale, the range is $12-36$.

The results show that the overall mean depressive symptoms score is 19.9. It is slightly higher among women (mean of 20.1) than men (mean of 19.7). Among the regions, the highest mean depression scores are found in Northern Mindanao and Caraga, both higher than the national average, at 21.4. The lowest mean scores are found in Central Luzon (mean of 17.8) and SOCCSKSARGEN (mean of 18.4). In all regions, except Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon, MIMAROPA, Eastern Visayas, and ARMM, women have slightly higher mean depressive symptoms scores than men.

There is a very slight difference in mean depression scores between urban and rural residents, with rural residentsscoringmarginally higher (mean of 19.9) than urban residents (mean of 19.8). By educational attainment, the
mean depression score is highest among those with no schooling or with elementary education (mean of 20.3) and decreases monotonically as educational attainment increases, with the lowest mean score recorded among the college educated (mean of 19.6). The same pattern of an inverse relationship is observed for socioeconomic status, with the highest mean depression score among youth in the poorest quintile (20.3) and the lowest among youth in the richest quintile (19.4).

## Life satisfaction and happiness

Two measures of global self-assessed well-being were used in YAFS4. Each asked the respondent to give a self-assessed rating on two indicators of positive well-being: life satisfaction and happiness, both on a scale of $1-10$, with 1 rated as the least satisfactory and 10 as the most satisfactory self-assessment.

For life satisfaction, the question was "How satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days?"; for happiness, the question was "Taking all things together, would you say you are ..." Flashcards showing the numbers $1-10$ in an array, with 1 labeled "dissatisfied" or "not happy at all" and 10 labeled "satisfied" or "very happy" for life satisfaction and happiness, respectively, were presented to the respondents, who were then asked to report their self-assessments on these two measures by pointing to the appropriate number.

We tested the correlation between the two measures to check whether these are highly collinear and positively tapping the same construct. Results showed that the coefficient of correlation (Pearson's r) between the two measures is statistically significant and positive, indicating that life satisfaction and happiness are positively related. However, r is low ( $\mathrm{r}=$ .398), suggesting that the two measures are not tapping the same construct (i.e., not measuring the same thing).

Overall, the mean life satisfaction rating is 7.2, 7.1 among men and 7.2 among women. Among the regions, the life satisfaction rating is
highest at 7.6 among the youth of Central Luzon. In all, there are five regions where the mean life satisfaction rating is above the national average of 7.2. The other four are NCR (7.4) and CALABARZON,Ilocos, and ARMM, all with arating of 7.3. The lowest average life satisfaction rating is recorded in Northern Mindanao (6.7), followed by Caraga and Davao, both at 6.8. Urban residents have a slightly higher life satisfaction rating (7.4) than rural residents (7.1). Differentiating by educational attainment, those with the highest level of education also have the highest average life satisfaction rating (7.5), while those with the lowest level of education have the lowest average rating (6.9). Those with high school undergraduate education (most of whom are still in school) have a satisfaction rating equal to the national average, while those with a completed high school education scored 7.1. Meanwhile, there is a clear gradient by socioeconomic status, with the poorest reporting the lowest mean life satisfaction (6.8) and the richest reporting the highest (7.6), with a consistent rise in the mean rating as socioeconomic status improves.

For self-rated happiness, the overall average rating is higher at 7.9 than the average life satisfaction rating, which is 7.2 . The same four regions with the highest life satisfaction ratings also had the highest average happiness ratings. These are the contiguous Luzon regions of Central Luzon, NCR, CALABARZON, and Ilocos. The region with the lowest self-rated happiness is Caraga at 7.3 , while there are six regions with the next lowest happiness rating of 7.5. These are CAR, Bicol, Zamboanga Peninsula, ARMM, Northern Mindanao, and Davao.

As to the other attributes of residence, education, and socioeconomic status, the same patterns of differentials observed with life satisfaction manifest in the mean happiness rating. Urban residents, the better educated, and those with higher socioeconomic status give themselves a higher rating on happiness than their respective counterparts. There is no observed sex difference, with both men and women recording an average happiness rating of 7.9 .

## Health, diet, and exercise

## Self-rated health

Another self-assessed measure is that of the youth's health status. Respondents were asked to rate their current health status as very healthy, healthier than average, of average health, somewhat unhealthy, or very unhealthy. In Table 4.2 , very healthy and healthier than average are combined to form the category "healthier than average."

Results (see Table 4.2) show that the greatest proportion reported themselves as being healthy, either healthier than average (43\%) or of average health (49.3\%). This is to be expected, as the ages of $15-24$ are among the age groups with the lowest levels of mortality. A self-assessed status of unhealthy (somewhat or very) is thus uncommon. Only 7.6 percent overall reported being unhealthy (somewhat or very).

Focusing only on unhealthy selfassessed status (somewhat and very unhealthy combined), there are distinct regional differences. While at the national level, 7.6 percent assessed themselves to be unhealthy, the percentage ranges from a low of 4.6 percent in CAR to 12.1 percent in Northern Mindanao. The three regions with over 10 percent of youth who assessed themselves to be unhealthy are Northern Mindanao, Caraga (11.8\%), and Davao (10.2\%), while the regions with the lowest proportion who are unhealthy are CAR (4.6\%) and SOCCSKSARGEN (4.9\%).

The percentage of youth with an unhealthy self-assessed status is higher among rural (8.1\%) than urban (6.4\%) residents. It increases monotonically as the level of education decreases, with 9 percent of those with no schooling or with elementary education reporting an unhealthy status compared with only 5.4 percent among the college educated. By socioeconomic status, youth in the poorest quintile have the highest percentage with an unhealthy self-assessed status ( $9.6 \%$ ). The percentage progressively decreases to the fourth quintile (6\%) but
increases for the youth in the richest quintile (6.7\%).

## Body mass index and body image

In recent decades, low- and middle-income countries have been described as experiencing the double burden of malnutrition, a situation where a sizable proportion of the population such as children, adolescents, and childbearing women are undernourished while, at the same time, the prevalence of overweight/obesity is increasing. Under- and overnutrition are both linked to major health risks. Adults who are undernourished in infancy and early childhood face the risk of stunting, both in physical and mental development. Women who are underweight prior to pregnancy and gain little weight during pregnancy face an elevated risk of complications and death. They are also more likely to give birth to low-birth-weight babies who face a greater risk of dying in infancy. On the other hand, the health risks associated with overweight and obesity are well documented in the research literature, the most common of which are diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and heart disease.

The most common measure used to gauge the nutrition status among adults is the body mass index (BMI), ${ }^{2}$ a simple measure of weight-for-height ratio that is fairly easy to obtain. In the YAFS survey, youth respondents were asked to report their height and weight. These measures were then used to calculate the individual's BMI. The use of a self-report rather than actual measurements may be subject to bias, as some may not know their exact height or weight or may tend to underestimate their weight and overestimate their height. Nevertheless, if all respondents are similarly biased in their reporting, the results may still be used to compare across categories of youth to examine differentials.

Table 4.2 Self-assessed health by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Very healthy/ healthier than average | Average health | Somewhat unhealthy | Very nhealthy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 41.7 | 52.2 | 5.6 | 0.5 |
| Female | 44.3 | 46.5 | 8.4 | 0.8 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 42.5 | 49.9 | 6.9 | 0.6 |
| 20-24 | 43.8 | 48.3 | 7.2 | 0.6 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 41.9 | 52.2 | 5.7 | 0.2 |
| Cagayan Valley | 36.9 | 57.6 | 4.8 | 0.6 |
| Central Luzon | 42.5 | 51.0 | 6.0 | 0.6 |
| CALABARZON | 44.9 | 48.3 | 6.0 | 0.9 |
| MIMAROPA | 49.4 | 42.8 | 7.1 | 0.7 |
| Bicol | 36.3 | 55.2 | 7.8 | 0.7 |
| Western Visayas | 38.5 | 52.6 | 7.9 | 1.1 |
| Central Visayas | 40.4 | 50.9 | 8.0 | 0.7 |
| Eastern Visayas | 43.4 | 48.6 | 7.5 | 0.5 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 36.8 | 56.0 | 6.9 | 0.3 |
| Northern Mindanao | 52.6 | 35.2 | 11.7 | 0.4 |
| Davao | 33.0 | 56.8 | 9.4 | 0.8 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 35.4 | 59.7 | 4.7 | 0.2 |
| CAR | 51.2 | 44.1 | 4.1 | 0.5 |
| ARMM | 37.1 | 53.4 | 9.1 | 0.4 |
| Caraga | 44.4 | 43.8 | 11.2 | 0.6 |
| NCR | 54.1 | 39.4 | 5.9 | 0.6 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 48.9 | 44.7 | 5.8 | 0.6 |
| Rural | 40.8 | 51.0 | 7.5 | 0.6 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 33.3 | 57.6 | 8.1 | 0.9 |
| High school undergraduate | 40.7 | 50.8 | 7.7 | 0.8 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 45.8 | 46.7 | 7.0 | 0.5 |
| College or higher | 49.9 | 44.6 | 5.2 | 0.2 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 37.1 | 53.2 | 9.2 | 0.4 |
| Second | 39.1 | 51.9 | 7.9 | 1.0 |
| Middle | 42.7 | 50.4 | 6.4 | 0.5 |
| Fourth | 48.0 | 46.1 | 5.6 | 0.4 |
| Highest (Richest) | 49.3 | 44.0 | 5.9 | 0.8 |
| Total | 43.0 | 49.3 | 7.0 | 0.6 |

[^16]We computed the BMI for each respondent and classified the values according to the following cut points recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO): ${ }^{3}$

| Underweight | $<18.5$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| Normal weight | $18.5-24.9$ |
| Overweight | $25-29.9$ |
| Obese | 30 and higher |

Overall, the average BMI at 19.8 (see Table 4.3) indicates that the average Filipino youth falls within the normal range, tending toward the lower limit of the range (18.5-24.9). The general picture also indicates that overweight and obesity are not yet common among youth of this cohort, as only 4.8 percent are classified as overweight and 1.1 percent as obese. The striking finding is that over a third of Filipino youth are underweight (34.8\%) The total picture is a classic case of a population experiencing the double burden of malnutrition.

Underweight is more common among the 15-19-year-olds, while the 20-24-year-olds have a higher percentage with above-normal BMI ( 7.9 \% compared with 4.6 \% among the 15-19-yearolds). By sex, more females have above-normal BMI, ${ }^{4}$ although the difference between the sexes is not high ( $6.0 \%$ for women vs. $5.8 \%$ for men). Moreover, more women than men are underweight (37.0 \% vs. 32.5\%).

As with all the preceding self-assessed measures, there are notable regional differences. The percentage of underweight is highest among youth in Western Visayas (39.4\%), CALABARZON (38.8\%), and Ilocos (38.3\%). The region with the lowest percentage of underweight is CAR, with only 20 percent.

At the other end of the BMI range are those whose BMI is classified as either overweight or obese. Because the percentage with BMI exceeding 29 is very low, we combined overweight and obese into one category called above normal. Figure 3.1 shows the percentage with above-normal BMI by region.

Figure 4.1 shows that, at 10 percent, NCR has the highest percentage of youth with above-normal BMI. This is consistent with findings from other developing countries where overweight/obesity is more prevalent in urban areas. None of the other regions equals this level. The prevalence of above-normal BMI is lowest in Eastern Visayas (3.8\%), which is also among the poorest regions in the country.

Differentials across the other background characteristics as shown in Figure 4.2 indicate that the percentage with above-normal BMI is highest among urban residents, those with college-level education, and the youth from the richest quintile. These results corroborate what has been reported in other low- and

Figure 4.1 Percent with above-normal BMI by region


[^17]middle-income countries that are experiencing the double burden of malnutrition about the effects of urbanization and rising incomes on the nutritional status of the population. Urbanization is generally associated with increased consumption of refined sugars and animal fats, accompanied by a more sedentary lifestyle (Drewnovski \& Popkin, 1997), while higher education and socioeconomic status are associated with higher household food security
brought about by higher income and thus more access to food (Tebekaw et al., 2014).

Body image
Body image was originally defined in the 1930s as "the picture of our own body which we form in our mind" (Schilder,1978 as cited in Pallan et al., 2011, p.1). Throughout the years, the concept has evolved into a multidimensional

Table 4.3 Percent distribution of BMI by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Underweight | Normal | Overweight | Obese | Mean BMI | Very unhealthy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 32.5 | 61.7 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 19.9 | 5.8 |
| Female | 37.0 | 56.9 | 4.9 | 1.1 | 19.7 | 6.0 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 42.0 | 53.4 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 19.3 | 4.6 |
| 20-24 | 24.2 | 67.9 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 20.6 | 7.9 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 38.3 | 56.5 | 4.2 | 1.0 | 19.6 | 5.2 |
| Cagayan Valley | 27.0 | 67.6 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 20.2 | 5.4 |
| Central Luzon | 35.7 | 57.5 | 6.0 | 0.8 | 19.8 | 6.8 |
| CALABARZON | 38.8 | 56.0 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 19.5 | 5.2 |
| MIMAROPA | 37.7 | 56.4 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 19.4 | 5.9 |
| Bicol | 37.7 | 56.4 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 19.7 | 5.9 |
| Western Visayas | 39.0 | 56.7 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 19.5 | 4.3 |
| Central Visayas | 33.1 | 61.9 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 19.7 | 5.1 |
| Eastern Visayas | 33.6 | 62.6 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 19.7 | 3.8 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 31.0 | 63.6 | 4.7 | 0.7 | 19.9 | 5.4 |
| Northern Mindanao | 34.4 | 61.5 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 19.7 | 4.0 |
| Davao | 32.0 | 63.1 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 19.8 | 4.9 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 32.0 | 62.9 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 19.8 | 5.1 |
| CAR | 20.2 | 72.4 | 5.7 | 1.6 | 20.7 | 7.4 |
| ARMM | 28.7 | 64.3 | 5.7 | 1.2 | 20.3 | 7.0 |
| Caraga | 37.0 | 58.9 | 3.7 | 0.4 | 19.4 | 4.1 |
| NCR | 34.3 | 55.3 | 8.0 | 2.4 | 20.3 | 10.4 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 35.3 | 56.2 | 6.9 | 1.6 | 20.0 | 8.5 |
| Rural | 34.6 | 60.4 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 19.7 | 4.9 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 34.1 | 61.2 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 19.7 | 4.8 |
| High school undergraduate | 42.6 | 53.1 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 19.2 | 4.3 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 31.2 | 63.1 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 20.0 | 5.8 |
| College or higher | 26.8 | 63.6 | 7.6 | 2.1 | 20.6 | 9.7 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 33.0 | 63.0 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 19.7 | 4.0 |
| Second | 36.8 | 58.9 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 19.5 | 4.3 |
| Middle | 37.8 | 56.6 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 19.7 | 5.6 |
| Fourth | 34.2 | 58.9 | 5.4 | 1.5 | 19.9 | 6.9 |
| Highest (Richest) | 31.5 | 59.1 | 7.6 | 1.8 | 20.4 | 9.3 |
| Total | 34.8 | 59.3 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 19.8 | 5.9 |

construct that embodies "neurological, psychological and sociocultural elements" (Pallan, 2011, p.1). The effect of body image on quality of life is potentially extensive (Pruzinsky, 2004).

Much of the research on body image has been conducted in the area of eating disorders. A disconnect between perceived body image and actual body weight through under- or overestimation of body weight and dissatisfaction with body image can lead to inappropriate eating habits and in extreme cases can be a cause for eating disorders such as bulimia and anorexia nervosa. In YAFS4, body image was determined by asking the question "How will you describe yourself in terms of your body weight?" The respondent was then asked to choose from a set of images that depict different body types according to weight: skinny, thin, just right/ normal, chubby, and obese. This range of images roughly corresponds to the BMI classification, with skinny and thin corresponding to underweight, just right to normal, chubby to overweight, and obese to obese.

Figure 4.3 presents a comparison of the percent distribution of body image and BMI for all respondents. The distribution of responses follows the same pattern: The most commonly reported body image was just right/normal, just as most had BMI that fell within the normal range. Similarly, the next most common self-
perception was skinny/thin, just as underweight was the second most common BMI. These indicate a general congruence in self-image and BMI at the aggregate level.

Figure 4.4, on the other hand, is a cross tabulation of BMI and body image. This figure shows a more pronounced discrepancy between BMI and body image. In all, 6 in 10 of the underweight perceive their body weight to be just right/normal, while a small percentage (about $3 \%)$ of the underweight perceive themselves to be chubby/obese. Among the overweight, 4 in 10 perceive themselves to be normal in body weight, while among the obese, about 3 in 10 perceive their body weight to be normal. Such incongruences can lead to behaviors that are inappropriate and potentially unhealthy. Those who are underweight but perceive themselves as chubby may be prone to eating disorders such as anorexia nervosa or bulimia. On the other hand, those who are overweight/obese but perceive their weight as normal may persist in unhealthy eating habits that lead to further weight gain.

## Physical exercise

Among the contributory factors to overweight is the lack of physical exercise. Overall, a lifestyle with little physical activity coupled with overweight/obesity is a major risk factor for non-communicable diseases (NCDs)

Figure 4.2 Percent with above-normal BMI by background characteristics

such as hypertension and diabetes. Regular physical exercise is one of the recommendations of WHO to help prevent the onset of NCDs.

In the survey, physical exercise was measured through self-reported frequency of physical exercise by the respondent. The frequency of physical exercise is shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 shows that over 4 in 10 Filipino youth reported exercising at least twice a week. However, about a third (32.6\%) reported that they never exercise. There is a huge disparity between the sexes in exercise habits, with far less women exercising at least twice a week (34\%) than men (59.4\%). The gender difference is even more noteworthy when comparing the percentage who said they never exercise; while 19.5 percent of male youth reported that they never exercise, the corresponding percentage for female youth is a high 45.1 percent. By age
group, there is a higher percentage among the 20-24-year-olds who reported they never exercise ( $36.6 \%$ ) compared with the 15-19-yearolds (29.9\%) but only a small difference in the percentage who exercise twice a week. There is no notable difference between rural and urban residents, either in the percentage who exercise twice a week or the percentage who never exercise. For both educational attainment and socioeconomic status, there is no clear and consistent pattern to describe differences in exercise frequency, except for the finding that those with the lowest level of schooling and those who belong to the lowest income quintile have the lowest prevalence of exercising at least twice a week and the highest prevalence of never exercising.

Lastly, regional differences show that the percentage who said they never exercise is highest among youth in the Mindanao regions

Figure 4.3 Percent distribution of body image and BMI


Figure 4.4 Congruence of body image and BMI

of ARMM (49.1\%), SOCCSKSARGEN (43.7\%), and Davao (42.8\%) and lowest in Central Visayas (18.6\%), Caraga (24.7\%), and CAR (24.7\%). Exercising at least twice a week is most prevalent in CAR (57.1\%), Central Visayas (55.9\%), and Western Visayas (54.6\%), the same regions with the lowest prevalence of never exercising.

Table 4.4 Frequency of exercise by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | At least 2x a week | Once a week | Occasionally | Never |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 59.4 | 13.5 | 7.7 | 19.5 |
| Female | 34.0 | 12.6 | 8.4 | 45.1 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 47.3 | 14.7 | 8.2 | 29.9 |
| 20-24 | 45.0 | 10.6 | 7.8 | 36.6 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 49.3 | 13.8 | 7.7 | 29.3 |
| Cagayan Valley | 45.5 | 12.5 | 8.2 | 33.7 |
| Central Luzon | 44.0 | 14.1 | 3.3 | 38.6 |
| CALABARZON | 43.4 | 12.9 | 6.8 | 36.9 |
| MIMAROPA | 50.1 | 14.7 | 7.3 | 27.9 |
| Bicol | 44.5 | 16.7 | 12.9 | 25.9 |
| Western Visayas | 54.6 | 9.6 | 8.3 | 27.4 |
| Central Visayas | 55.9 | 15.8 | 9.8 | 18.6 |
| Eastern Visayas | 51.9 | 11.5 | 10.0 | 26.6 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 42.8 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 37.1 |
| Northern Mindanao | 44.1 | 13.7 | 15.0 | 27.2 |
| Davao | 39.5 | 11.4 | 6.4 | 42.8 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 40.9 | 9.9 | 5.6 | 43.7 |
| CAR | 57.1 | 11.4 | 6.8 | 24.7 |
| ARMM | 35.2 | 9.9 | 5.8 | 49.1 |
| Caraga | 40.1 | 14.5 | 20.8 | 24.7 |
| NCR | 47.6 | 13.9 | 5.9 | 32.6 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 45.3 | 14.9 | 6.4 | 33.3 |
| Rural | 46.8 | 12.3 | 8.6 | 32.3 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 43.4 | 11.2 | 6.9 | 38.4 |
| High school undergraduate | 46.8 | 14.2 | 8.0 | 31.1 |
| High school graduate/ <br> Vocational | 45.1 | 11.4 | 9.0 | 34.4 |
| College or higher | 49.4 | 14.2 | 7.3 | 29.0 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 43.5 | 10.2 | 8.8 | 37.6 |
| Second | 44.4 | 13.9 | 9.3 | 32.5 |
| Middle | 46.9 | 12.7 | 8.3 | 32.1 |
| Fourth | 49.0 | 13.3 | 6.8 | 30.8 |
| Highest (Richest) | 48.3 | 15.3 | 6.7 | 29.7 |
| Total | 46.4 | 13.0 | 8.0 | 32.6 |

## Average sleep

Table 4.5 presents the results on the average hours of sleep the youth reported getting per night. On the average, Filipino youth reported getting 8.1 hours of sleep. There is no great disparity in average sleep duration between men ( 8.2 hours) and women ( 8.1 hours) and between the younger ( 8.2 hours) and older youth ( 8.0 hours). Urban residents reported an average of 7.9 hours of sleep, lower than the 8.2 hours reported by rural residents. Youth with the lowest level of education reported a longer sleep duration at 8.3 hours as compared to those with college-level education (7.8 hours). Likewise, the youth who belong to the lowest income quintile also have the longest average sleep duration at 8.3 hours, while those from the richest income quintile have the shortest average sleep duration (7.9 hours).

Across the regions, average sleep duration ranges from a high of 8.3 hours reported in Eastern Visayas, MIMAROPA, Bicol, and Cagayan Valley, to a low of 7.8 hours reported by the youth in ARMM and CAR.

## Diet

Research on the double burden of malnutrition generally report that among the factors that contribute to the increasing prevalence of overweight amidst the still high prevalence of underweight in many low- and middle-income economies is the increasing availability and access to foods high in fats and sugar. Changing food preferences and food availability are among the factors that need to be documented to establish the evidence base for future intervention programs to combat the consequence of the double burden of malnutrition, which, in the adult population, means an increasing prevalence of overweight and obesity leading to an increase in the prevalence of diabetes and heart disease among other lifestyle diseases. Therefore, in YAFS4, a section in the questionnaire on health and lifestyle was included for the first time.

One of the components of this section is self-reported consumption of a selected list of common foods that are deemed to have unhealthy effects when consumed frequently, mostly because of their high sugar, fat, or salt content. The food consumption frequency is a proxy measure for diet. Table 4.6 shows the frequency of consumption of these selected food and drinks.

Table 4.5 Mean hours of sleep by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Mean hours of sleep |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |
| Male | 8.2 |
| Female | 8.1 |
| Age |  |
| 15-19 | 8.2 |
| 20-24 | 8.0 |
| Region |  |
| llocos | 8.2 |
| Cagayan Valley | 8.3 |
| Central Luzon | 8.2 |
| CALABARZON | 8.2 |
| MIMAROPA | 8.3 |
| Bicol | 8.3 |
| Western Visayas | 8.1 |
| Central Visayas | 8.2 |
| Eastern Visayas | 8.3 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 8.2 |
| Northern Mindanao | 8.1 |
| Davao | 8.1 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 8.1 |
| CAR | 7.8 |
| ARMM | 7.8 |
| Caraga | 8.2 |
| NCR | 7.9 |
| Place of residence |  |
| Urban | 7.9 |
| Rural | 8.2 |
| Educational attainment |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 8.3 |
| High school undergraduate | 8.2 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 8.2 |
| College or higher | 7.8 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 8.3 |
| Second | 8.2 |
| Middle | 8.2 |
| Fourth | 8.1 |
| Highest (Richest) | 7.9 |
| Total | 8.1 |

Of the list of food mentioned, chips and instant noodles are the most frequently consumed, with 37.5 percent and 28.3 percent of the youth consuming chips and instant noodles, respectively, two or more times per week. Among the drinks, coffee/tea and carbonated drinks are the most frequently consumed, with 39.1 percent drinking coffee/tea five to seven times a week and 15 percent taking carbonated drinks with the same frequency.

In Table 4.7, the percentage of youth who consumed each given food or drink at least twice a week is cross tabulated with their background characteristics. There is no distinct difference between the younger (15-19) and the older (2024) youth in their patterns of food consumption, but there are some notable differences between the sexes for some items. More women consumed chocolates/sweets at least twice a week while more men drank carbonated drinks and energy drinks with the same frequency. Similarly, more urban residents consume chips and carbonated drinks than their rural counterparts. There are other notable differences in the frequency of consumption between rural and urban residents that are more a function of availability and access than of preference. Examples are hamburgers, french fries, and fried chicken, which are more available in urban areas.

Regional comparison likewise reflects preference as well as availability. As expected, consumption of all food and drinks on the list (except instant noodles) at a frequency of twice or more per week is highest in the more urbanized regions, notably in NCR, CALABARZON, and Ilocos. Youth in the Davao Region have the highest frequency of consuming instant noodles at least twice a week. The higher frequency of consumption of items like hamburgers, french fries, and fried chicken in the urbanized regions is mostly attributed to their ready availability in fast food establishments in urban centers. Chips, instant noodles, and carbonated drinks are readily available all over the country, so the differentials in the level of consumption of these items are probably mostly affected by buying power as well as preference. It is worth noting
that in the poorer regions such as Bicol, Eastern Visayas, Caraga, and ARMM, the percentages consuming the given items on the list tend to be on the lower end.

In examining the Filipino youth's consumption patterns of these selected food items that are known to pose health risks if consumed frequently, the overall picture formed is that of consumption levels that are not yet alarmingly high. This is consistent with the findings on BMI on this same study population, which show that the level of overweight/obesity among the Filipino youth is rather low compared with the levels in developed countries. These findings also indicate that the more prevalent issue to be addressed is the high percentage of underweight. Still, the study points out certain incipient concerns when it comes to food/drink preferences and choices that are probably best addressed now that the levels of consumption are still relatively low. Among these are the comparatively high consumption levels for carbonated drinks, chips, and instant noodles, all of them processed food-two well established to have little or no nutritional value (i.e., sodas and chips) and one with high sodium content.

## Leisure

In the literature, leisure time is most commonly conceptualized as free time, that is, time not spent on work or gainful activity or other essential activities like sleeping. In the research on leisure in developed countries, there are usually seven categories under which activities undertaken during free or leisure time are classified. These are passive leisure (e.g., television viewing), active recreation (e.g., sports activities), amateur arts and crafts activity (e.g., hobbies like crochet), arts participation (as a consumer of professional arts activity like attending concerts and plays), folk life (any ethnic communal activities), informal social life (e.g., hanging out with friends, attending parties), and organized social participation (e.g., volunteering in socio-civic activities, religious activities; Peterson, 1981). The activities undertaken during one's free time can vary according to one's personal preferences and the means available with which to pursue one's interests. But there is also a large element of the social and cultural environment that directs one's choices of leisure activities. There are also

Table 4.6 Frequency of consumption of selected food and drinks

| Food and drinks | Never | Less than once a <br> week | Once a week | 2-4 times a week 5-7 times a week |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instant noodles | 9.0 | 27.8 | 35.0 | 23.6 | 4.7 |
| Chips | 13.5 | 24.0 | 25.0 | 22.1 | 15.4 |
| Hamburger | 31.3 | 30.8 | 23.9 | 11.2 | 2.8 |
| French fries | 42.1 | 28.5 | 18.9 | 7.4 | 3.2 |
| Fried chicken | 19.3 | 32.4 | 28.2 | 15.4 | 4.7 |
| Fried street food | 24.8 | 26.5 | 23.7 | 16.1 | 8.8 |
| Grilled street food | 19.9 | 28.4 | 27.2 | 17.3 | 7.1 |
| Chocolate/desserts | 22.8 | 31.4 | 24.8 | 14.1 | 6.9 |
| Coffee/tea | 16.5 | 13.9 | 13.2 | 17.2 | 39.1 |
| Carbonated/soft drinks | 9.8 | 22.5 | 28.4 | 24.3 | 15.0 |
| Sweet bottled drinks | 23.7 | 25.9 | 25.4 | 17.4 | 7.6 |
| Energy drinks | 49.7 | 21.2 | 17.1 | 8.0 | 4.0 |


| Background characteristics | Instant noodles | Chips | Hamburger | French fries | Fried chicken | Fried street food | Grilled street food | Chocolates/ desserts | Carbonated drinks | Sweet bottled drinks | Energy drinks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 29.8 | 35.0 | 13.5 | 8.7 | 18.3 | 27.6 | 26.3 | 16.3 | 43.1 | 25.8 | 18.1 |
| Female | 26.8 | 39.9 | 14.4 | 12.3 | 21.9 | 22.4 | 22.7 | 25.4 | 35.7 | 24.3 | 6.3 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 28.5 | 41.0 | 14.7 | 10.8 | 20.1 | 27.0 | 25.5 | 22.1 | 40.4 | 25.8 | 12.0 |
| 20-24 | 27.9 | 32.4 | 12.8 | 10.2 | 20.1 | 21.9 | 23.0 | 19.2 | 37.8 | 23.9 | 12.0 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 35.2 | 41.5 | 16.2 | 12.4 | 16.3 | 33.9 | 31.9 | 22.5 | 56.0 | 26.4 | 15.6 |
| Cagayan Valley | 30.6 | 41.9 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 12.4 | 27.5 | 23.0 | 16.6 | 44.1 | 25.3 | 13.3 |
| Central Luzon | 33.8 | 39.8 | 14.4 | 10.8 | 21.9 | 33.2 | 26.2 | 23.3 | 46.8 | 32.2 | 10.5 |
| CALABARZON | 30.4 | 43.1 | 20.8 | 13.7 | 25.4 | 37.1 | 30.6 | 28.5 | 38.8 | 28.4 | 13.1 |
| MIMAROPA | 23.3 | 31.3 | 14.9 | 8.7 | 14.6 | 23.7 | 19.8 | 23.3 | 27.9 | 20.6 | 9.4 |
| Bicol | 13.3 | 23.2 | 11.8 | 7.9 | 13.6 | 16.7 | 16.6 | 16.3 | 15.5 | 13.2 | 10.1 |
| Western Visayas | 24.6 | 36.5 | 11.5 | 7.8 | 19.1 | 18.5 | 25.4 | 14.9 | 43.8 | 23.7 | 13.9 |
| Central Visayas | 27.5 | 31.3 | 9.0 | 5.4 | 15.6 | 18.5 | 22.7 | 14.0 | 25.5 | 15.8 | 9.3 |
| Eastern Visayas | 28.2 | 36.4 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 15.0 | 16.9 | 23.0 | 14.0 | 25.1 | 13.9 | 11.8 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 32.8 | 37.8 | 6.9 | 4.5 | 12.4 | 16.2 | 21.0 | 14.0 | 32.9 | 20.6 | 13.6 |
| Northern Mindanao | 23.1 | 23.6 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 11.2 | 15.1 | 23.2 | 16.5 | 27.9 | 16.5 | 9.7 |
| Davao | 35.6 | 40.8 | 8.1 | 6.1 | 16.5 | 19.5 | 29.3 | 14.4 | 47.5 | 17.2 | 9.3 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 27.4 | 36.3 | 3.7 | 1.6 | 9.9 | 11.6 | 15.0 | 14.1 | 44.4 | 16.7 | 5.6 |
| CAR | 23.6 | 28.7 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 11.7 | 22.0 | 19.3 | 15.5 | 36.5 | 22.2 | 12.2 |
| ARMM | 29.3 | 33.6 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 6.0 | 9.4 | 8.8 | 14.6 | 29.8 | 21.0 | 11.1 |
| Caraga | 21.2 | 28.8 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 15.2 | 12.7 | 18.7 | 12.1 | 26.7 | 16.0 | 10.4 |
| NCR | 28.5 | 48.0 | 30.5 | 26.9 | 42.3 | 35.9 | 29.0 | 36.2 | 55.9 | 44.9 | 16.8 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 29.4 | 43.8 | 22.6 | 19.5 | 33.1 | 33.0 | 29.4 | 31.0 | 51.2 | 36.3 | 14.1 |
| Rural | 27.8 | 35.2 | 10.7 | 7.2 | 15.3 | 21.9 | 22.6 | 17.2 | 34.9 | 20.8 | 11.3 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 28.2 | 30.2 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 11.4 | 17.6 | 20.1 | 10.4 | 31.1 | 16.4 | 13.3 |
| High school undergraduate High school graduate/ | 28.5 | 38.6 | 13.8 | 8.4 | 19.0 | 26.9 | 25.3 | 20.3 | 38.8 | 23.3 | 11.9 |
| Vocational | 27.9 | 34.3 | 13.3 | 10.9 | 19.0 | 22.9 | 23.4 | 19.9 | 38.9 | 24.4 | 12.4 |
| College or higher | 28.4 | 44.9 | 20.0 | 16.7 | 29.4 | 29.1 | 27.3 | 30.6 | 46.2 | 34.7 | 10.9 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 26.7 | 28.2 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 8.3 | 13.8 | 17.7 | 11.5 | 26.1 | 13.6 | 9.6 |
| Second | 27.4 | 34.8 | 9.6 | 5.9 | 13.7 | 21.0 | 22.8 | 15.3 | 32.7 | 18.8 | 11.1 |
| Middle | 29.3 | 36.6 | 13.7 | 9.4 | 18.8 | 28.3 | 25.9 | 19.6 | 39.1 | 23.2 | 11.7 |
| Fourth | 28.9 | 42.4 | 18.7 | 13.8 | 26.6 | 31.2 | 29.5 | 26.5 | 48.1 | 32.6 | 14.9 |
| Highest (Richest) | 29.1 | 47.2 | 24.3 | 20.8 | 35.7 | 30.8 | 26.3 | 34.0 | 52.6 | 39.4 | 12.9 |
| Total | 28.3 | 37.5 | 14.0 | 10.5 | 20.1 | 24.9 | 24.5 | 21.0 | 39.3 | 25.1 | 12.0 |

intergenerational differences in the manner in which leisure time is spent.

The YAFS4 data recorded the common leisure activities of the youth of today. Comparisons with past and future rounds of the YAFS survey will thus document the prevalent leisure activities of each cohort of young adults at various historical times. In Table 4.8, we list the most common leisure activities of Filipino youth who were in the age group 15-24 in 2013. The question that elicited these activities was "What do you mainly do in your leisure time?" No prompt was given as to the possible answers. Respondents were free to mention any activity they deemed as leisure and to name as many activities as they wanted. Table 4.8 presents the seven most commonly mentioned leisure activities of the Filipino youth. In decreasing order beginning with the most commonly mentioned activity, these are television viewing, texting, listening to music, engaging in sports, meeting up with friends, surfing the Internet, and reading.

Based on the categories cited above, the top seven leisure activities of Filipino youth in 2013 fall under three categories: passive leisure (watching television, listening to music, surfing the Internet, and reading), active recreation (playing sports), and informal social life (meeting up with friends and texting). Of these seven activities, four are mediated by technology (television watching, listening to music, surfing the Internet, and texting).

Comparing across background characteristics reveals some differences as well as basic similarities in the main leisure activities of the youth. Comparing by age, the order from highest to lowest percentage of main leisure activity is the same for the younger and the older youth. Watching television remains the most prevalent form of main leisure activity, whereas reading is the least prevalent. But the comparative percentages distinctly vary for some activities. More among the 15-19-year-olds play sports and read, mainly because this age group contains many in-school youth (mostly in high school) for whom these activities are also reinforced by the school.

Comparison by sex indicates clear gender differences in leisure activities, the most notable of which is playing sports, which is the most popular leisure activity of men (the main leisure activity of $43.6 \%$ of men) and the least popular for women (only $2 \%$ reported it as their main leisure activity). Furthermore, more women read, watch television, and text. Rural-urban differences are not so striking, as the differences in percentage per activity are not very high, with the notable exception of surfing the Internet, which is the main leisure activity of 27.6 percent of urban youth but only 7.3 percent of rural youth. Differences in leisure activities by educational attainment indicate that for the technology-mediated leisure activities, there is a clear education gradient, with the percentage reporting these activities as their main pastime consistently increasing as education increases. For the non-technologymediated activities, there remains evidence of an education gradient in the reverse direction. The percentages reporting playing sports and meeting up with friends consistently decrease as educational attainment increases. For reading, there are two groups with relatively higher percentages reporting this activity: high school undergraduates and the college educated. As earlier noted, the high school undergraduates are mostly in-school youth; thus, reading for leisure may be a function of exposure to reading in school.

The pattern of differences across socioeconomic status mimics that of education differentials. The percentage who reported the technology-mediated activities as their main leisure activity consistently increases as socioeconomic status increases. This is to be expected because these leisure activities are directly affected by buying power. Meeting up with friends and playing sports show a reverse pattern, with a decreasing percentage reporting these as their main leisure activity as socioeconomic status increases.

Regional differences reflect basic differences among the regions in levels of urbanization and economic status. In the

Table 4.8 Most common leisure activities by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Watch TV | Text | Listen to music | Play sports | Meet up with friends | Go online/ Surf internet | Read |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 42.6 | 26.5 | 26.1 | 43.6 | 18.0 | 13.9 | 5.5 |
| Female | 55.6 | 33.6 | 27.8 | 2.0 | 17.4 | 11.8 | 17.2 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 48.0 | 32.9 | 27.0 | 24.6 | 18.3 | 13.6 | 13.1 |
| 20-24 | 51.2 | 26.1 | 26.9 | 19.0 | 16.7 | 11.6 | 9.0 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 54.7 | 29.1 | 29.6 | 18.2 | 13.4 | 9.4 | 7.7 |
| Cagayan Valley | 50.0 | 28.4 | 24.8 | 27.0 | 20.5 | 6.6 | 10.7 |
| Central Luzon | 63.5 | 43.7 | 29.3 | 19.1 | 10.7 | 16.7 | 7.3 |
| CALABARZON | 50.9 | 30.7 | 32.5 | 21.6 | 11.9 | 12.6 | 8.4 |
| MIMAROPA | 44.9 | 26.2 | 27.5 | 26.5 | 15.4 | 7.2 | 11.5 |
| Bicol | 48.6 | 28.3 | 26.9 | 24.7 | 18.8 | 8.4 | 17.2 |
| Western Visayas | 46.4 | 31.1 | 27.0 | 23.9 | 16.2 | 5.1 | 11.1 |
| Central Visayas | 39.2 | 27.8 | 23.2 | 27.0 | 29.2 | 10.8 | 13.0 |
| Eastern Visayas | 46.3 | 24.5 | 22.8 | 24.8 | 27.6 | 6.6 | 14.4 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 35.6 | 28.3 | 23.3 | 22.5 | 25.3 | 9.0 | 13.2 |
| Northern Mindanao | 49.7 | 32.6 | 26.8 | 23.5 | 15.5 | 5.9 | 11.1 |
| Davao | 52.7 | 30.9 | 23.9 | 22.2 | 22.8 | 11.6 | 9.7 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 45.1 | 32.1 | 18.5 | 20.8 | 21.8 | 6.6 | 13.8 |
| CAR | 42.3 | 27.1 | 24.1 | 18.4 | 26.3 | 5.7 | 19.2 |
| ARMM | 37.5 | 14.3 | 20.3 | 15.9 | 15.4 | 3.9 | 16.1 |
| Caraga | 40.3 | 26.3 | 24.3 | 28.1 | 27.2 | 6.6 | 10.0 |
| NCR | 52.9 | 27.7 | 29.9 | 20.8 | 14.0 | 34.5 | 13.0 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 54.5 | 31.3 | 29.7 | 20.3 | 14.6 | 27.6 | 11.6 |
| Rural | 47.3 | 29.7 | 25.9 | 23.1 | 18.8 | 7.3 | 11.4 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 36.9 | 17.5 | 17.8 | 29.4 | 23.3 | 2.7 | 3.3 |
| High school undergraduate | 46.1 | 29.2 | 24.2 | 25.7 | 18.8 | 10.1 | 12.0 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.9 | 33.2 | 30.3 | 19.1 | 14.9 | 11.3 | 8.4 |
| College or higher | 56.4 | 35.7 | 33.2 | 16.3 | 15.8 | 26.1 | 19.8 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 31.6 | 20.0 | 19.2 | 24.5 | 24.1 | 1.7 | 10.5 |
| Second | 47.5 | 27.6 | 25.4 | 23.2 | 18.7 | 4.7 | 11.3 |
| Middle | 55.3 | 32.4 | 26.5 | 22.7 | 16.9 | 9.9 | 11.6 |
| Fourth | 55.9 | 35.3 | 31.0 | 21.2 | 15.1 | 18.5 | 10.9 |
| Highest (Richest) | 55.6 | 35.6 | 33.3 | 19.8 | 13.3 | 32.0 | 13.3 |
| Total | 49.3 | 30.1 | 27.0 | 22.3 | 17.7 | 12.8 | 11.5 |

relatively more urbanized and more developed regions like NCR, Central Luzon, CALABARZON, and Ilocos, the proportions of youth whose main leisure activity is technology mediated and dependent on one's purchasing power tend to be the highest. The one exception is texting, which is dominated by youth from Northern Mindanao, SOCCSKSARGEN, and Western Visayas, in addition to youth from Central Luzon. On the other hand, activities that are not technology mediated like playing sports and meeting up
with friends have the highest percentages of youth from CAR, Caraga, Cagayan Valley, Eastern Visayas, and Central Visayas reporting these activities as their main leisure activities. The implication of these results is that in regions where the technology is available and more youth are able to spend for the services, leisure will be dominated by technology-mediated activities that tend to be passive and sedentary and require less face-to-face social interaction. In NCR, Ilocos, CALABARZON, and Central

Luzon, where technology-mediated leisure activities are most prevalent, the proportion of youth whose main leisure activity is meeting up with friends is the lowest.

## Traveling as leisure

One emerging form of leisure in the Philippines is traveling for pleasure. This phenomenon is partly due to the more affordable cost of air travel and probably more spending capacity for greater numbers of Filipinos compared to previous decades. To track this new type of leisure activity that before now has been largely conceived as the prerogative only of the rich or of people in the developed world, a set of questions on traveling for leisure was asked in the 2013 YAFS. Specifically, the question was "Have you ever traveled purely for leisure, within the country or abroad?" To capture recent experience of leisure travel, the same question was asked with a reference period of the past 12 months prior to the survey.

Results show that 26.5 percent of all Filipino youth said they have ever traveled purely for leisure; 26 percent have traveled within the country, while less than 1 percent have traveled abroad. Of those who have ever traveled for leisure, 65 percent traveled in the 12 months prior to the survey. They represent 17 percent of all Filipino youth.

Broken down by background characteristics, Table 4.9 shows that there is no notable difference between age groups and between the sexes in the percentage who have traveled for leisure. But distinct differences are observed with urban-rural residence, educational attainment, and socioeconomic status. More urban residents have ever traveled for leisure than rural residents. The percentage increases as education level and socioeconomic status rise, implying that traveling for leisure is probably highly correlated with the level of one's economic means (proxied by education and socioeconomic status). Still, it is worth noting that the percentages who have ever traveled for leisure among those with the lowest level of
education and those who belong to the lowest quintiles are not low, indicating that travel for leisure is not totally suppressed by the lack of economic means. Altogether, this baseline data on traveling for leisure may be indicative of a new leisure activity that is worth tracking in future rounds of YAFS, as it may indicate changes in leisure activities for Filipinos in general.

Table 4.9 Percent of Filipino youth who have ever traveled for leisure


Figure 4.5 Percent who ever traveled for leisure


In Figure 4.4, the percentage who have ever traveled by region is shown in decreasing order. As in most lifestyle indicators of the youth presented thus far, NCR is on top of the list and, at 41 percent, way above the national average of 26.5 percent. Travel for leisure is also comparatively high in Davao, Ilocos, CAR, and CALABARZON. The less developed regions of ARMM and Bicol are at the bottom of the list, at about 10 and 14 percent, respectively.

## Summary and conclusions

In the simple bivariate cross tabulation of the various indicators of subjective well-being, health, and lifestyles of Filipino youth with the basic background characteristics of age, sex, region of residence, urban-rural residence, educational attainment, and socioeconomic status measured as wealth quintiles, there are observed recurring patterns in the relationships of the background variables to the various dependent variables described in this section of the report.

In the various measures of self-assessed status, youth who reside in the more developed regions of the country, specifically NCR, Central Luzon, and CALABARZON, consistently score the highest in positive self-assessment (selfesteem, life satisfaction, and happiness), while
youth from Northern Mindanao and Caraga are consistently among the lowest scoring. Youth from these latter two regions also have the highest mean depression scores. Socioeconomic status and educational attainment also show a similar pattern in that they exhibit a characteristic direct relation with positive selfassessment: The more educated and the higher the socioeconomic status, the higher the mean scores for each of these positive self-assessment measures. The pattern is the same for selfassessed health. Conversely, the relationship is inverse when it comes to the depression score.

Indications of the so-called double burden of nutrition are abundantly evident in the findings, with a very high level of undernutrition amidst a small percentage of the overweight/ obese. The patterns suggest that overweight/ obesity is somewhat associated with higher education and socioeconomic status and with the more developed regions in the country, especially NCR. Meanwhile, the comparison of body image and BMI suggests that there may be a segment of youth who have incorrect perceptions of their bodies, which can possibly lead to equally incorrect eating and exercise habits.

Data on exercise indicate a clear gender difference, with female youth showing a very low prevalence of exercising. There is also
an evident gender difference in diet or food/ drink consumption, with more men consuming carbonated drinks and more women, chocolates/ sweets. Overall, the data on food consumption indicate relatively low levels of consumption of foods with poor nutritional value (compared with developed countries), especially processed food. The hypothesis that affordability may be partly driving the observed differentials in the consumption of these low-nutritional-value foods is supported by the consistent education and socioeconomic gradient in the consumption of the foods and drinks on our list. Generally, those who can afford these foods and drinks more (i.e., the better educated and those from the higher wealth quintiles) also have higher consumption levels.

The main leisure activities of the Filipino youth show a predominance of passive, sedentary activities and reliance on technology-mediated pastimes (texting, surfing the Internet, listening to music). An emergent form of leisure activity, traveling for leisure, is documented for the first time.

These new data on health and lifestyle gathered for the first time in the YAFS series will be the baseline data against which to measure developments in these fields, especially the health-related components. Future rounds of YAFS may consider the use of objective measures of height and weight (through body measurements with scales and tape measures) to have a more reliable measure of BMI than selfreports.
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# Beliefs and Attitudes of the Youth: Change and Continuity 

Josefina N. Natividad Maria Midea M. Kabamalan

The youth of each generation are shaped by forces that emanate from the traditions of the past as well as by factors that are unique to their current milieu. Among these traditions are normative beliefs about what is proper or acceptable, imbibed by the current generation through socialization processes that begin in the family and later radiate to other institutions as the child's social circle expands. Normative beliefs are not immutable; they can change through time as a result of forces like modernization, urbanization, economic development, and technological changes, sometimes gradually, sometimes abruptly, such as when a significant historical event occurs to disrupt long-held beliefs.

Beliefs are generally thought to affect behavior. Although abundant research literature shows that beliefs and attitudes do not directly lead to specific behaviors and that the relationship of attitudes and behavior is more nuanced than outright causation (Ajzen \& Fishbein, 1977, 1980, Schuman and Johnson, 1976), it is still worthwhile to study beliefs as they generally guide our actions. Beliefs are also a gauge of what the current generation thinks. By measuring the same beliefs over time, one can also gather insight into changing norms and guides to behavior in the wider society.

Since 1994, the YAFS series has tracked beliefs and attitudes related to the core areas of youth sexuality and fertility. These beliefs and attitudes center on premarital sex and premarital conception, marriage and cohabitation, divorce,
and abortion. In this section, we present the beliefs and attitudes of Filipino youth on these topics, broken down by background characteristics. We then present trends in beliefs and attitudes by presenting the data from the two previous rounds (1994 and 2002) compared with the results from the 2013 YAFS.

## Ideal age at marriage

In general, Filipino youth believe that the ideal age for marriage is 23.6 years for a woman and 24.6 years for a man (Table 4.1). There is a distinct gender difference: Men say that the ideal age is 23.1 years for a woman and 24 years for a man, whereas women say the ideal age is one year later (i.e., 24.1 years for women and 25.1 years for men). Rural residents give a younger ideal age at marriage for both men and women compared with urban residents. The ideal age at marriage also tends to increase with a rising level of education and improving socioeconomic status. For example, for those with elementary-level schooling, the ideal age at marriage is 23.3 and 22.2 years for a man and a woman, respectively, while for the college educated, the ideal age is 25.4 years for a man and 24.6 years for a woman. Similarly, among those from the lowest quintile, the ideal age at marriage is 23.7 years for a man and 22.6 years for a woman. The corresponding age for the youth in the richest quintile is 25.3 for a man and 24.5 for a woman.

Across the regions, the ideal age at marriage for a man is highest in the NCR, Western Visayas,
and Bicol, all at 25 years, and lowest in ARMM at 22.6 . For a woman, the highest ideal age at marriage (24 years) is reported in NCR, Western Visayas, and Ilocos. Again, the lowest ideal age at marriage for a woman is reported by youth from ARMM at 21.8 years.

Personal course of action when there is parental opposition to one's marriage plans

In the traditional Filipino family, parents exert a strong influence on a child's choice of a marital partner. Although they may not directly

Table 5.1 Percent who express specific beliefs and attitudes about marriage, cohabitation, premarital sex and premarital conception, by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Ideal age at marriage |  | Perceived personal course of action when there is parental opposition to marriage |  |  | Feel compelled to marry if got pregnant/ got someone pregnant | Approve of premarital sex |  | Feel virginity at marriage is important/ very important for a woman | Believe their own community will accept couples who are living in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | For a man | For a woman | Marry anyway | Live together | Follow parents |  | For a man | For a woman |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 24.0 | 23.1 | 52.1 | 14.2 | 33.7 | 71.4 | 38.6 | 30.2 | 77.0 | 57.8 |
| Female | 25.1 | 24.1 | 35.1 | 6.4 | 58.4 | 56.9 | 21.8 | 16.9 | 82.2 | 55.6 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 24.6 | 23.8 | 38.0 | 8.7 | 53.2 | 65.7 | 25.3 | 18.9 | 83.3 | 52.2 |
| 20-24 | 24.5 | 23.4 | 51.4 | 12.4 | 36.2 | 61.4 | 36.9 | 30.0 | 74.4 | 63.4 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 24.8 | 24.3 | 49.8 | 9.1 | 41.1 | 65.0 | 32.3 | 24.0 | 79.0 | 55.5 |
| Cagayan Valley | 23.8 | 23.1 | 50.7 | 12.0 | 37.3 | 78.0 | 34.9 | 25.1 | 83.9 | 55.0 |
| Central Luzon | 24.3 | 23.5 | 44.3 | 15.6 | 40.0 | 67.9 | 34.9 | 28.0 | 82.0 | 72.2 |
| CALABARZON | 24.6 | 23.8 | 53.2 | 5.1 | 41.6 | 69.3 | 32.7 | 27.1 | 82.4 | 59.5 |
| MIMAROPA | 24.8 | 23.6 | 41.2 | 6.4 | 52.4 | 68.1 | 22.1 | 17.6 | 83.2 | 48.0 |
| Bicol | 25.0 | 23.7 | 36.2 | 7.8 | 56.0 | 75.3 | 25.8 | 19.4 | 85.0 | 43.3 |
| Western Visayas | 25.0 | 24.2 | 42.0 | 11.2 | 46.7 | 57.6 | 33.8 | 27.7 | 83.8 | 58.1 |
| Central Visayas | 24.7 | 23.5 | 42.3 | 12.6 | 45.1 | 57.0 | 23.6 | 17.9 | 72.7 | 47.2 |
| Eastern Visayas | 24.8 | 23.6 | 38.0 | 12.7 | 49.3 | 64.4 | 32.3 | 27.0 | 81.5 | 66.8 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 24.2 | 23.0 | 43.2 | 6.2 | 50.6 | 69.6 | 37.1 | 24.3 | 86.0 | 60.3 |
| Northern Mindanao | 24.4 | 23.2 | 31.6 | 9.3 | 59.2 | 54.5 | 26.6 | 22.0 | 76.1 | 44.9 |
| Davao | 24.1 | 22.8 | 38.9 | 13.6 | 47.5 | 42.6 | 30.8 | 25.0 | 69.1 | 72.7 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 24.4 | 23.3 | 57.2 | 10.1 | 32.8 | 71.2 | 20.8 | 17.0 | 84.1 | 58.9 |
| CAR | 24.3 | 23.5 | 53.5 | 7.9 | 38.3 | 67.8 | 26.3 | 19.7 | 77.0 | 48.5 |
| ARMM | 22.6 | 21.8 | 27.8 | 2.8 | 69.3 | 64.4 | 9.1 | 3.3 | 95.8 | 7.2 |
| Caraga | 24.4 | 23.2 | 36.8 | 11.0 | 52.2 | 64.4 | 34.1 | 27.7 | 77.7 | 56.2 |
| NCR | 25.2 | 24.5 | 40.5 | 12.7 | 46.8 | 59.8 | 32.7 | 24.7 | 70.2 | 62.0 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 25.1 | 24.2 | 40.8 | 11.9 | 47.3 | 60.7 | 31.7 | 24.6 | 74.8 | 63.5 |
| Rural | 24.4 | 23.4 | 44.4 | 9.6 | 45.9 | 65.2 | 29.4 | 23.0 | 81.5 | 54.2 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 23.3 | 22.2 | 43.2 | 13.0 | 43.8 | 70.7 | 30.3 | 24.6 | 77.9 | 50.3 |
| High school undergraduate | 24.5 | 23.6 | 37.3 | 9.7 | 52.9 | 66.4 | 26.5 | 20.6 | 81.9 | 52.6 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 24.6 | 23.6 | 48.8 | 10.8 | 40.5 | 62.1 | 34.3 | 27.7 | 78.5 | 61.8 |
| College or higher | 25.4 | 24.6 | 47.0 | 8.5 | 44.3 | 57.9 | 30.1 | 21.7 | 78.4 | 61.1 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 23.7 | 22.6 | 41.0 | 9.9 | 49.0 | 66.3 | 25.8 | 20.4 | 81.4 | 48.3 |
| Second | 24.4 | 23.4 | 43.2 | 9.3 | 47.5 | 65.7 | 27.5 | 22.0 | 82.0 | 53.8 |
| Middle | 24.6 | 23.6 | 43.6 | 11.0 | 45.4 | 64.5 | 31.7 | 25.3 | 79.4 | 59.4 |
| Fourth | 24.8 | 24.1 | 43.0 | 10.8 | 46.3 | 60.7 | 31.9 | 24.5 | 77.0 | 61.2 |
| Highest (Richest) | 25.3 | 24.5 | 47.0 | 10.0 | 42.9 | 62.5 | 33.6 | 25.0 | 78.4 | 61.1 |
| Total | 24.6 | 23.6 | 43.4 | 10.2 | 46.3 | 64.0 | 30.0 | 23.4 | 79.7 | 56.7 |

choose their child's future spouse, parental acceptance of a child's potential partner is considered essential. Thus, when there is parental opposition to a proposed marriage, children are placed in a dilemma about which course of action to take. In earlier generations, the will of parents almost always prevailed when it came to choosing a life partner. In the survey, we posed the hypothetical question "If your boyfriend proposed marriage/if you had proposed marriage but your parents were opposed to your marrying, would you marry anyway, live together with boyfriend/ girlfriend, or follow parents?" The normatively acceptable answer in the traditional view is to follow one's parents.

Overall, less than half (46.3\%) said they would follow their parents' wishes, while the rest said they would defy their parents either by marrying anyway ( $43.4 \%$ ) or by living together (i.e., entering a consensual union; 10.2\%). More females (58.4\%) than males (33.7\%) and more among the younger (53.2\%) than the older (36.2\%) youth said they would follow their parents' wishes. There are no consistent patterns in responses across education and socioeconomic status. Urban residents have a slightly higher percentage who would follow their parents' wishes compared with rural residents. The regions with the highest percentages who would follow their parents are ARMM (69.3\%), Northern Mindanao (59.2\%), and Bicol (56\%); the regions with the lowest percentages are SOCCSKSARGEN (32.8\%), Cagayan Valley (37.3\%), and CAR (38.3\%; Table 5.1).

## Feeling compelled to marry because of premarital pregnancy

In earlier generations of youth, premarital conception was uncommon; if it occurred at all, the young couple was usually compelled to legitimize the pregnancy by getting formally married. In YAFS4, respondents were asked whether they would feel compelled to marry if they got pregnant (for females) or got someone pregnant (for males) out of wedlock. The results show that the majority of youth (64\%) said they
would feel compelled to marry because of a premarital pregnancy, which indicates that there is still some adherence to the traditional value of legitimizing an out-of-wedlock conception through formal marriage.

Tabulations across the categories of the background characteristics reveal some notable differences. Males (71.4\%) more than females (56.9\%) reported feeling compelled to marry under these circumstances. Slightly more rural (65.2\%) than urban residents (60.7\%) and more among those with elementary education (70.7\%) than those with other educational attainment felt compelled to marry, with the college educated (57.9\%) feeling the least compelled to marry. There is no marked distinction by socioeconomic status. Among the regions, the lowest percentage who would feel compelled to marry following a premarital pregnancy was reported by the youth from Davao Region (42.6\%), followed by the youth from Northern Mindanao (54.5\%). At the other extreme, the highest percentage was recorded in Cagayan Valley (78\%), followed by Bicol (75.3\%).

## The importance of virginity in a woman

It has often been observed that Filipino society tends to have a double standard when it comes to sexual behavior in that women are held to a higher standard than men. Among the traditional values in Philippine society is the value for virginity for a woman when she marries. To gauge how salient this value remains among today's youth, we asked the question "Nowadays, is it important for a woman to be a virgin when she gets married?" The responses are "yes, very important," "yes, important," and "no, not important."

In all, almost eight in 10 (79.7\%) were of the opinion that it is very important/important for a woman to be a virgin when she gets married (Table 5.1). More women, 15-19-year-olds, and rural residents expressed this sentiment than their respective counterparts. Belief in the importance of a woman's virginity is almost universal among youth in ARMM (95.8\%). High proportions of youth from the Zamboanga

Peninsula (86\%) and Bicol (85\%) also expressed support for this view. The regions with the lowest percentages who agreed that it is very important/ important for a woman to be a virgin when she marries are Davao (69.1\%), NCR (70.2\%), and Central Visayas (72.7\%).

## Approval of premarital sex

A related value to virginity is the prohibition of sexual activity outside of marriage. If preserving virginity is very important in a society, then no sexual activity should happen before formal marriage. Since the experience of premarital sex is one of the key variables being tracked by the YAFS series, approval of this practice is likewise one of the key values/attitudes tracked by YAFS. In the latest round, the questions asked were "Do you approve of women having sex before marriage?" and "Do you approve of men having sex before marriage?"

The results show that Filipino youth are as conservative in their views regarding premarital sexual activity as they are with virginity. In all, only 30 percent approve of men having sex before marriage and 23.4 percent approve of women doing the same. Expectedly, more men than women and more of the 20-24-year-olds than the 15-19-year-olds approve of premarital sex for men and for women. The urban-rural difference is less pronounced and in the expected direction of higher agreement among urban than rural youth. There is no clear and consistent pattern of difference by educational attainment and socioeconomic status.

In the regions, ARMM youth show the most consistent belief in the interrelated topics of virginity for a woman and premarital sex for both men and women. ARMM youth showed the lowest levels who approve of premarital sex for men (9.1\%) and women (3.3\%), which supports their almost universal agreement that virginity is very important/important for a woman when she marries. There is evidence of a double standard of morality for men and women in all regions, as manifested in the higher percentage who approve of premarital sex for a man than for a woman. The
differences are greatest in Zamboanga Peninsula, which shows the highest degree of difference in approval for premarital sex for men compared with women. It is also worth noting that although the youth from Zamboanga Peninsula are second only to ARMM in the percentage who think it is very important/important for a woman to be a virgin before she marries, the youth in Zamboanga also have the highest percentage who approve of men having premarital sex (37.1\%).

In addition to Zamboanga, the regions with the highest percentages who approve of men having sex before marriage are Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon, and Caraga. The percentages who approve of women having sex before marriage are highest in Central Luzon, Western Visayas, Caraga, CALABARZON, and Eastern Visayas. ARMM, SOCCSKSARGEN, MIMAROPA, and Central Visayas have the lowest percentages who approve of premarital sex for men and women.

## Perceived community support for couples who are living in

Given the implicit value for marriage and sexual activity within marriage in Philippine society, YAFS explored the acceptability of couples who are in a consensual union or living in. Unlike the previous questions that asked for the youth's individual beliefs or attitudes, we asked them their perception of the acceptability of live-in arrangements in the community they lived in. This question thus required them to assess community norms rather than their own individual stand on the matter. Specifically, the question was "Do you think the people in your community would accept two unmarried persons who are living in?"

Over half (56.7\%) of the youth expressed the belief that their community would accept unmarried people who are living in; the percentages were higher among the older youth, the urban residents, the better educated (high school graduates and the college educated), and those belonging to the higher socioeconomic brackets (fourth and fifth quintiles).

In general, the variations across the regions seem to reflect the degree of adherence
to traditional values on marriage, premarital sex, and consensual unions in the region. For example, youth in Davao Region have the highest percentage who expressed the belief that consensual unions are acceptable to their community. This is consistent with the finding that Davao youth also have the lowest percentage who think virginity is important when a woman marries, as well as the lowest percentage who said they would feel compelled to marry if they got pregnant or got someone pregnant out of wedlock. At the other extreme are youth in ARMM, who, through their responses to the various indicators of traditional beliefs, consistently portray more traditional values. Only 7.2 percent of youth in ARMM believe that their community will accept two unmarried people who are living in.

## Support for a bill to legalize divorce

The Philippines is the last country in the world that does not allow divorce for its citizens (with the exception of Muslims; Hundley \& Santos, 2014). In the last two rounds of YAFS, the sentiment of the youth about the introduction of a law to allow divorce has been measured by asking the direct question "If a bill to legalize divorce in the Philippines for non-Muslims is submitted in Congress, would you support the bill?" In YAFS4, 41.4 percent answered "yes" to this question, which implies that support for a divorce bill is not so high among the youth (Table 5.2).

Support for a divorce bill is somewhat higher among females, older youth, and urban residents. The percentage expressing support for a divorce bill increases steadily as education level rises. By socioeconomic status, more youth belonging to the two highest quintiles would support a divorce bill compared with youth from the poorest quintiles.

Across the regions, support for a divorce bill is highest in the NCR, although at 53.2 percent, the level is not overwhelmingly high. The other region where at least half of the youth would support a divorce bill is Bicol. Surprisingly, only 42.3 percent of the youth in ARMM would support a divorce bill even as divorce is allowed for

Muslims. The region with the lowest percentage of potential supporters of a divorce bill is CAR (29.6\%).

## Approval of abortion

Another issue for which the attitudes and opinions of Filipino youth were sought is abortion. In the Philippines, abortion is generally illegal, and a person who intentionally causes an abortion can be subjected to imprisonment. Still, although the Penal Code does not list specific exceptions to the general prohibition on abortion, under the general criminal law principles of necessity as set forth in article 11(4) of the Code, an abortion may be legally performed to save the pregnant woman's life (United Nations Population Division, n.d., p. 35).

The question on abortion has two components. The first is a global question that asks "Do you approve of a woman having an abortion?" Regardless of their answer to this global question, all respondents were asked if they would approve of abortion under a series of hypothetical circumstances. The responses to the global question indicate a prevalent opposition to the practice of abortion, as only 4.2 percent of Filipino youth answered the question in the affirmative. But when the situation is qualified and particular circumstances under which abortion may be performed are presented, the proportions expressing approval of abortion increase compared with the answer to the global question.

Under the eight circumstances presented, for which the respondents were asked if they would approve of abortion, the situation with the highest percentage of agreement is when "the life of the pregnant woman is in danger" (35.9\%). Other circumstances under which about one in 10 would approve of abortion, in decreasing order, are: when the pregnancy is a result of incest, when the child may be deformed, and when the pregnancy is a result of rape. In all eight scenarios, more men than women expressed approval of abortion, although the difference between the sexes is not so high.

Slightly more men (36.8\%) than women (35.1\%), more older youth (38.1\%) than younger youth (34.5\%), and more urban (38.1\%) than rural (35.1\%) residents approve of abortion when the mother's life is in danger. There is also an increasing prevalence of approval as education level increases. As to socioeconomic status, there are no clear patterns, but those from the two highest wealth quintiles also manifest a higher
prevalence of approval of abortion when the mother's life is in danger.

Among the regions, support for the idea of abortion when the mother's life is in danger is highest (all at above 40\%) in CALABARZON, CAR, NCR, and SOCCSKSARGEN. However, even among these regions, approval of abortion when the mother's life is in danger is not the majority idea. The highest percentage of approval is only 44.5

Table 5.2 Percent who express specific beliefs and attitudes about divorce and abortion by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Support a bill to legalize divorce | Approve of a woman having an abortion | Approve of abortion if... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | The woman is single | The couple is too young | The life of the mother is in danger | The child may be born deformed | The pregnancy is a result of rape | The pregnancy is a result of incest | The couple does not want more children | The couple has many children |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 39.8 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 36.8 | 15.4 | 14.3 | 17.4 | 8.7 | 8.4 |
| Female | 43.0 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 35.1 | 13.1 | 10.5 | 13.0 | 5.6 | 6.2 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 38.4 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 34.5 | 14.0 | 13.1 | 15.5 | 7.5 | 7.3 |
| 20-24 | 45.9 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 5.3 | 38.1 | 14.6 | 11.3 | 14.6 | 6.6 | 7.2 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 38.0 | 4.9 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 34.3 | 11.9 | 15.4 | 19.8 | 4.5 | 5.0 |
| Cagayan Valley | 34.5 | 4.7 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 26.4 | 12.8 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 7.9 | 8.6 |
| Central Luzon | 47.6 | 7.3 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 31.2 | 18.6 | 17.1 | 21.4 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| CALABARZON | 37.2 | 3.7 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 44.5 | 15.4 | 12.4 | 16.5 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| MIMAROPA | 41.9 | 3.2 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 24.7 | 13.0 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 9.4 | 8.2 |
| Bicol | 52.0 | 3.2 | 11.2 | 9.6 | 38.0 | 17.0 | 14.3 | 14.2 | 13.8 | 12.4 |
| Western Visayas | 31.9 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 34.7 | 10.3 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 4.7 | 5.1 |
| Central Visayas | 35.9 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 34.8 | 12.6 | 8.8 | 12.9 | 4.7 | 5.2 |
| Eastern Visayas | 39.9 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.8 | 35.5 | 16.7 | 12.3 | 16.3 | 7.3 | 8.1 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 40.5 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 5.2 | 32.6 | 12.4 | 12.2 | 20.8 | 5.0 | 6.2 |
| Northern Mindanao | 38.2 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 28.6 | 11.8 | 8.9 | 9.9 | 5.6 | 6.8 |
| Davao | 41.1 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 31.4 | 10.0 | 7.1 | 10.6 | 3.1 | 3.8 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 38.2 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 41.3 | 12.0 | 10.1 | 11.9 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| CAR | 29.6 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 42.4 | 14.6 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 3.8 | 4.3 |
| ARMM | 42.3 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 25.8 | 11.0 | 15.9 | 21.3 | 3.6 | 5.2 |
| Caraga | 38.7 | 4.2 | 7.7 | 9.6 | 39.5 | 15.2 | 14.8 | 13.1 | 11.5 | 11.7 |
| NCR | 53.2 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 8.0 | 42.1 | 16.4 | 15.1 | 16.9 | 9.5 | 8.9 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 47.9 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 38.1 | 15.3 | 13.2 | 16.0 | 7.8 | 7.5 |
| Rural | 39.0 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 35.1 | 13.8 | 12.1 | 14.8 | 6.9 | 7.2 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 38.4 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 32.3 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 16.8 | 8.1 | 8.7 |
| High school undergraduate | 39.4 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 6.9 | 33.1 | 14.0 | 12.9 | 14.7 | 8.0 | 7.5 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 43.7 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 36.5 | 13.2 | 11.4 | 14.9 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
| College or higher | 43.8 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 42.6 | 16.0 | 11.8 | 15.1 | 5.7 | 7.3 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 38.4 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 32.7 | 12.8 | 10.9 | 14.5 | 7.3 | 7.4 |
| Second | 38.3 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 31.7 | 13.0 | 12.2 | 13.9 | 7.1 | 6.7 |
| Middle | 39.8 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 6.1 | 37.1 | 14.2 | 12.6 | 15.4 | 7.2 | 7.9 |
| Fourth | 46.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 5.9 | 38.8 | 15.9 | 13.0 | 16.6 | 7.4 | 7.5 |
| Highest (Richest) | 45.4 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 39.9 | 15.2 | 13.4 | 15.1 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| Total | 41.4 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 35.9 | 14.2 | 12.4 | 15.1 | 7.1 | 7.3 |

percent, reported by the youth in CALABARZON. At the other end, approval is lowest (all at below $30 \%$ ) in Northern Mindanao, Cagayan Valley, ARMM, and MIMAROPA.

Of the three other conditions for abortion that were approved by more than 10 percent of the youth, there is slightly more support for the idea of abortion in the case of incest (15.1\%) than rape (12.4\%); slightly more too approve of abortion when the pregnancy is a result of incest than when the child may be born deformed (14.2\%). Support for the idea of abortion for a pregnancy that is the result of incest is highest in ARMM (21.3\%) and Zamboanga Peninsula (20.8\%).

## Trends in beliefs and attitudes

It is possible to follow how some of the preceding beliefs and attitudes have changed through the years because the same questions were asked to elicit the information in the three YAFS survey rounds with a complete youth sample of men and women (1994, 2002, and 2013). These beliefs and attitudes revolved around topics related to marriage, premarital sex, divorce, and abortion.

Beliefs about virginity and premarital sex
Perhaps the most awaited statistic produced by the YAFS series is the prevalence of premarital sex. The unspoken assumption is that sexual activity before marriage is unacceptable in the society, more so for women than for men. This further implies that for women more than men, virginity at the time of marriage is expected.

Figure 5.1 shows how belief in the importance of virginity at marriage has changed since 1994, comparing by age group and sex. Overall, there is a steady rise in the percentage who believe that virginity at marriage for a woman is not important, from 8.5 percent in 1994 to 20.3 percent in 2013. The increase in the prevalence of this belief was more steep between 2002 and 2013 than between 1994 and 2002. While the prevalence of this belief is observed among both men and women and the younger and the older youth, the highest relative increase in the percentage who believe that virginity at marriage is not important is observed among women 15-19 years old between the 2002 and 2013 survey rounds.

Figure 5.2 shows the response to the question "Would you approve of a woman having premarital sex?" Consistent with the findings of an increase in the proportion who believe that

Figure 5.1 Percent who believe it is not important for a woman to be a virgin when she marries, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013

virginity at marriage is not important, the results also show a consistent increase in the percentage who approve of premarital sex for a woman, from 12.8 percent in 1994 to 23.4 percent in 2013. This time, the increase in approval was sharper between the 1994 and 2002 YAFS than between the 2002 and 2013 YAFS.

## Ideal age at marriage

The ideal age at marriage for a man remained the same, at 25 years, from 1994 to 2013 (Figure 5.3). Broken down by sex, the ideal mean age for a man, as reported by women, is higher by one year that that given by men. On the other hand, the overall ideal age at marriage for a woman increased by one year, from 23 years in 1994 to 24 in 2013. As with the ideal age for a man, women gave an ideal age that is one year higher than that given by the men.

## Dealing with premarital conception

Respondents in each survey round from 1994 to 2013 were asked to give their opinion on what a woman who gets pregnant out of wedlock should do. The two most common responses are "keep the baby without getting married" and "try to get the father to marry her." These are two opposing views: the first is a break from traditional beliefs that premarital sex is unacceptable and therefore that all pregnancies should occur within marriage, and the second is a perpetuation of the normative belief that the pregnancy should be legitimized by formal marriage. The third and fourth options are "put the baby up for adoption" and "try to end the pregnancy," with neither view getting much support in all three rounds.

In Figures 5.4 and 5.5, we present the trend in the proportion who chose the first two options. The trend indicates a consistent rise in the percentage espousing the less conservative

Figure 5.2 Percent who approve of premarital sex for a woman, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


Figure 5.3 Ideal age at marriage for males and females, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


[^18]view (keep the baby without getting married), from 58.2 percent in 1994 to 67.8 percent in 2013. The increase is steep between 1994 and 2002 but plateaued between 2002 and 2013 for the men. For the women, a rise is observed between 2002 and 2013. In general, more women than men think that a woman should keep the baby without getting married when she gets pregnant out of wedlock.

Correspondingly, there is a consistent decline in the percentage who think that the woman should "try to get the father to marry her," the more traditional response to an out-ofwedlock pregnancy (Figure 5.5), although less marked, from 36.1 percent in 1994 to 29.6 percent in 2013. Consistently, a gender difference is observed, with more men than women espousing this view. The decline in the overall percentage is mainly attributed to the decline in the support for this view among women, even as the pattern of men's responses did not indicate a clear trend.

## Support for a divorce law in the Philippines

Around the time the 2002 YAFS was being conceptualized, the possibility of introducing a divorce law in the Philippines was also being discussed more openly than in previous years in the Philippines. Prompted by this development, a new question was introduced in the YAFS3 survey: "Should a divorce bill be introduced in the Philippines, will you support it?"

Results in Figure 5.6 indicate that only a little over a third (37.3\%) of the youth said they would support a divorce bill in the Philippines if it were introduced. The percentage was marginally higher among men than women and among younger than older youth. After 11 years, the 2013 YAFS results indicate a modest rise to 41.4 percent in the proportion who would support a divorce bill. The increase is most pronounced among young women in the age group 20-24. The increases among men, among both younger and older youth, and among 15-19-year-old women are modest.

Figure 5.4 Percent who said that a woman who gets pregnant out of wedlock should keep the baby without getting married, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


Figure 5.5 Percent who said that a woman who gets pregnant out of wedlock should try to get the father of the child to marry her, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


## Support for abortion in the Philippines

The responses to the global question "Do you approve of a woman having an abortion?" indicate that a high level of disapproval of the practice remains (see Figure 5.7). Throughout the 20-year period, the approval level fluctuated between 4 and 5 percent only.

Figure 5.8 shows the responses to the questions on specific circumstances under which the youth may approve of abortion in the three YAFS rounds. The trend in the percentages who approve shows a downward trajectory for each of the given conditions. The decline is most pronounced for the condition "The life of the pregnant woman is in danger." While half approved of abortion under this circumstance in 1994, the approval dropped to 35.9 percent in 2013.

The timing of the YAFS survey in 2013 may have contributed somewhat to the results for this question. While the field work was ongoing, the debates on the Reproductive Health Bill were at their most heated, with extensive media coverage on the opposing positions taken by the various stakeholders in the bill. The Catholic Church has taken the particularly strong position that the Reproductive Health Bill would "only promote the use of abortifacient drugs" (Macairan, 2012). Some of that probably filtered down to the consciousness of the youth, and the effect was a decline in the support for abortion, even when the life of the mother is in danger. However, the possibility of a real decline in support for
abortion under various circumstances over the 20-year period cannot be discounted, as there is consistency in the decrease, as seen even in the 2002 YAFS results.

## Summary and conclusions

Results from the 2013 YAFS indicate that generally, support remains for the traditional beliefs and values on the importance of virginity, the unacceptability of premarital sex, and the need to marry when confronted with premarital pregnancy, although the numbers indicate no overwhelming support for these norms. In general, there is also a higher prevalence of support for traditional views among the younger youth (15-19-year-olds), rural residents, those with lower educational attainment, and those who belong to the lower socioeconomic quintiles. There are considerable variations among the 17 regions in the levels of support for the traditional views. The ARMM youth stand out as consistently expressing the highest prevalence of support for the traditional values. Contrary to expectations, the NCR youth were not consistently the regional group with the lowest levels of support for the traditional values.

The trend over the past 20 years, from YAFS2 in 1994 to YAFS4 in 2013, indicates a gradual shift toward decreasing support for the traditional beliefs on virginity, premarital sex, and premarital conception among the youth. Overall, we found no evidence of high levels rejecting these beliefs; hence, the majority still espouse the normative beliefs of society on virginity and

Figure 5.6 Percent who said they would support a bill to legalize divorce in the Philippines, by age and sex: 2002 and 2013

women engaging in premarital sex. But the pace of change is uneven across these values. While most still believe in the importance of virginity and the unacceptability of premarital sex, there is a move toward greater acceptance of the decoupling of premarital pregnancy and formal marriage. The trend toward higher acceptance of the option "to keep the baby without getting married" in 2013 compared with 1994 indicates greater acceptance of the idea that a premarital pregnancy need no longer be legitimized by formal marriage.

This shift of attitude may be behind the rise in consensual unions among the youth who do not get formally married but may live together as a consequence of premarital pregnancy. It is not farfetched to surmise that the absence of a divorce law in the Philippines may partially drive the phenomenon of increasing premarital pregnancy and consensual unions and the rising tolerance for these heretofore unacceptable practices.

Figure 5.7 Percent who approve of a woman having an abortion, by age and sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


Figure 5.8 Percent who approve of abortion under specific circumstances: 1994, 2002, and 2013
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# Non-sexual Risk Behaviors 

Grace T. Cruz

This chapter examines the non-sexual risk behaviors of the Filipino youth that the Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Survey (YAFS) series has traditionally tracked. This includes smoking, drinking, drug use, suicide ideation and attempts, and the experience of physical violence. The latter two are among the new areas covered in the last two survey rounds. Monitoring these risk behaviors among the young people is important as a public health concern not only because of their long-term effects but also because they are interrelated with other health issues faced by the youth. Young people who smoke are more likely to drink, do drugs, and engage in other risky behaviors. Those who start smoking earlier are at greater risk to be hooked on the vice (Breslau, Fenn, \& Peterson, 1993; Park, et al., 2004; den Exter Blokland, et al., 2004). The close interrelationships among these non-sexual and sexual risk behaviors are clearly established in the literature (Kirby, 1999; Vallejo-Medina \& Sierra, 2015). Smoking, drinking, and drug use have been found to serve as "gateways" that lead young people to other sexual risk behaviors such as early sexual initiation, unprotected sex, and casual sex (Abbey, 2002; Jewkes, Morrell, \& Christofides, 2009; Valejo-Medina \& Sierra, 2015). They are likewise linked with the perpetration of violence and violence victimization among young people. Adolescents' involvement in life-threatening behaviors such as suicide has also been found to be mediated by poor health behavior, which includes smoking and drinking (Laukkanen, et al., 2002).

That young people subscribe to the abovementioned non-sexual risk behaviors despite their known negative implications has been a continuing challenge for health planners. Still, majority of young people exhibit some degree of resilience in spite of their subscription to these health risk behaviors. This is evident in their continuing overall health and mortality improvement. For example, life table estimates in the country suggest that in the last four decades, 15 -year-old females and males gained on average, about four and two years on life expectancy, respectively (i.e., 1970 and 2010). This means that the current cohort of young people is generally healthier than the previous generations that came before them. This extension in life expectancy, however, reflects only a partial gain, which could have been exploited to its fullest potential had their health risks been reduced, if not altogether eradicated. No doubt, efforts to address these non-sexual risk behaviors will ensure better health profiles and reduce the incidence of premature deaths among young people.

## Results

## Smoking

To assess exposure to smoking, we asked the respondents if they had ever tried smoking and if so, the timing and related circumstances of their initiation as well as the persistence of their tobacco consumption. Results show that
among all youth, 38.8 percent have ever smoked, significantly more so among the males relative to the females. However, a much lower proportion (19.7\%) are currently smoking, again more among the males than the females. The decline in the proportion who ever smoked relative to those currently smoking suggests that some smokers eventually quit the practice. The dropout rate is higher among the females, with only 4.7 percent currently smoking from among the 22.1 percent who initiated tobacco use. The corresponding
figures for the males are 35.4 percent and 56.3 percent, respectively (Table 6.1).

The good news is that tobacco use among young Filipinos in general has dropped in the last two decades. For the males in particular, the proportion who are currently smoking dropped to its lowest level since it was first monitored by YAFS in 1982 (i.e., $40.4 \%, 37.6 \%$, and $35.4 \%$ in 1994, 2002, and 2013, respectively). For their female counterparts, the corresponding proportions increased from 4.2 percent in 1994

Table 6.1 Percent of males and females who ever smoked and currently smoking by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ever smoked | Currently smoking |  | Ever smoked | Currently smoking |  | Ever smoked | Currently smoking |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 48.0 | 28.0 | 5,769 | 16.9 | 3.1 | 5,652 | 32.6 | 15.6 | 11,422 |
| 20-24 | 69.8 | 47.3 | 3,589 | 29.1 | 6.8 | 4,161 | 47.9 | 25.6 | 7,750 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ilocos | 57.5 | 33.4 | 473 | 20.9 | 3.6 | 468 | 39.3 | 18.6 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 49.0 | 30.2 | 345 | 21.4 | 3.1 | 327 | 35.5 | 17.0 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 54.1 | 45.5 | 953 | 24.7 | 6.6 | 1,096 | 38.4 | 24.7 | 2,050 |
| CALABARZON | 59.5 | 39.0 | 1,243 | 23.1 | 3.4 | 1,303 | 40.8 | 20.8 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 54.1 | 31.4 | 283 | 16.1 | 2.9 | 279 | 35.2 | 17.3 | 562 |
| Bicol | 62.3 | 37.7 | 522 | 18.3 | 2.6 | 574 | 39.3 | 19.3 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 59.9 | 40.1 | 764 | 20.8 | 2.9 | 722 | 40.9 | 22.1 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 57.5 | 33.2 | 742 | 12.9 | 2.4 | 673 | 36.3 | 18.5 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 41.3 | 23.9 | 426 | 15.1 | 2.7 | 402 | 28.6 | 13.8 | 829 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 58.0 | 34.6 | 374 | 11.5 | 1.1 | 355 | 35.3 | 18.4 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 56.6 | 27.3 | 447 | 12.9 | 0.6 | 474 | 34.1 | 13.5 | 921 |
| Davao | 62.6 | 36.6 | 446 | 16.3 | 2.1 | 515 | 37.8 | 18.1 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 48.1 | 25.3 | 439 | 9.3 | 0.7 | 460 | 28.2 | 12.7 | 900 |
| CAR | 65.9 | 29.5 | 1,150 | 25.8 | 2.0 | 198 | 44.3 | 14.9 | 370 |
| ARMM | 35.4 | 26.5 | 173 | 8.5 | 0.3 | 355 | 21.3 | 12.5 | 671 |
| Caraga | 69.8 | 30.9 | 316 | 23.5 | 1.6 | 255 | 47.1 | 16.4 | 520 |
| NCR | 58.2 | 39.1 | 265 | 44.9 | 15.8 | 1,357 | 51.0 | 26.6 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 58.0 | 38.2 | 2,398 | 33.5 | 9.7 | 2,831 | 44.7 | 22.8 | 5,228 |
| Rural | 55.8 | 34.4 | 6,962 | 17.5 | 2.6 | 6,982 | 36.6 | 18.5 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 61.8 | 46.2 | 1,730 | 19.2 | 5.4 | 922 | 47.0 | 32.0 | 2,651 |
| High school undergraduate | 51.6 | 32.4 | 3,530 | 19.5 | 4.8 | 3,503 | 35.6 | 18.6 | 7,032 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 61.5 | 38.3 | 2,410 | 25.2 | 5.5 | 3,052 | 41.2 | 20.0 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 53.2 | 26.7 | 1,688 | 23.0 | 3.0 | 2,336 | 35.7 | 13.0 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 54.7 | 34.9 | 1,886 | 13.3 | 2.1 | 1,954 | 33.6 | 18.2 | 3,840 |
| Second | 57.2 | 34.3 | 1,913 | 18.9 | 2.4 | 2,022 | 37.5 | 17.9 | 3,935 |
| Middle | 56.2 | 36.6 | 2,091 | 23.2 | 4.8 | 2,082 | 39.8 | 20.7 | 4,173 |
| Fourth | 57.6 | 37.4 | 1,942 | 26.6 | 6.7 | 2,063 | 41.6 | 21.6 | 4,006 |
| Highest (Richest) | 55.8 | 33.2 | 1,527 | 29.1 | 7.7 | 1,693 | 41.8 | 19.8 | 3,219 |
| Total | 56.3 | 35.4 | 9,361 | 22.1 | 4.7 | 9,813 | 38.8 | 19.7 | 19,174 |

to 5.9 percent in 2002 and decreased to 4.7 percent in 2013 (Figure 6.1).

Sociodemographic, environmental, and personal factors are correlated with young people's tobacco use, as evident in the differentials in the exposure level across background variables. Those residing in NCR registered the highest level (51\%) of exposure to tobacco (\% who ever smoked), while the exposure is lowest in ARMM (21.3\%).

Generally, males and those in the older age groups are more likely to be currently smoking. The proportion of male current smokers is highest in Central Luzon (45.5\%), Western Visayas (40.1\%), and NCR (39.1\%). For the females, it is highest in NCR (15.8\%) and Central Luzon (6.6\%). Living in urban areas as compared to rural areas is associated with a higher prevalence of tobacco use. This is quite apparent among the females; about a third of those from the urban areas ever smoked, which is about twice the level in the rural areas. The same pattern is noted for current tobacco use, with the proportion currently smoking at 9.7 percent and 2.6 percent for urban and rural females, respectively. The urban-rural differential is not as stark for the males, where an almost comparable level of use is noted.

Figure 6.1 Percent of youth who are currently smoking cigarettes by sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


No definite education gradient for tobacco exposure is evident from the data, although a gender distinction is notable. Generally, those with the lowest educational attainment (no schooling and elementary) registered the highest proportion who ever smoked and are currently smoking, although the level does not necessarily decline monotonically as one goes up the education ladder. This pattern seems to be true with males and for the current smoking status of the females. A different pattern is observed for females in terms of the proportion who ever smoked, however, with higher education associated with higher proportion of ever use. At least 25.2 percent and 23 percent of high schooland college-educated females, respectively, reported to have ever smoked, which is higher than the level observed among those with a lower educational background (about 19\% for those with lower than high school education).

The SES differentials are also quite distinct between the males and the females. While a positive relationship generally exists between the proportions who ever smoked and the SES, the pattern is not as evident for current smoking. Data also show no substantial difference in cigarette exposure across the SES categories for the males, but a clear positive relationship is noted for the females. About 29 percent of females in the highest quintile have ever smoked as compared to 13.3 percent for their counterparts in the lowest quintile. The figures for the proportion currently smoking are 7.7 percent and 2.1 percent, respectively.

The timing of the onset of cigarette use is important to consider given the health consequences associated with early exposure, including the increased likelihood of addiction resulting from in prolonged use and exposure to nicotine. Among those who have ever smoked, they started at 15.9 years, on the average. More than a quarter (27\%) among those who have ever smoked started smoking before they turned 15 years old; this proportion increases dramatically to around nine in 10 by the time they turn 18 years old (Table 6.2). This implies that among the youth who have ever used tobacco, most of
them have tried it even before reaching the age of majority (i.e., 18 years).

Generally, the males smoke earlier than the females, starting at an average age of 15.7 (vs. 16.3 years among females). Males' earlier initiation is also evident from the findings showing that at least 28.8 percent among them had their first smoke by age 15 as compared to 22.7 percent for their female counterparts. Lower education is not only associated with higher prevalence of smoking but also with earlier age of initiation to tobacco use, with those attaining at least a high school diploma initiating smoking
a year later than their counterparts with lower education. No apparent age differential is noted in the initiation across the regions. Youth from SOCCSKSARGEN reported the lowest mean age of first tobacco use at 15.5 years on the average.

## Drinking

Another problem associated with the youth is alcohol consumption. Like smoking, drinking-especially binge drinking and persistent consumption of alcohol-can compromise one's health and pose safety risks,

Table 6.2 Percent of youth by age first started to smoke and mean age smoking initiation by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age started to smoke |  |  |  |  |  | Mean age started to smoke | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 15 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | above 18 |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 28.8 | 17.6 | 16.3 | 14.3 | 10.9 | 12.1 | 15.7 | 5,263 |
| Female | 22.7 | 15.4 | 16.9 | 12.7 | 13.8 | 18.5 | 16.3 | 2,166 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 24.0 | 18.9 | 15.1 | 17.3 | 11.1 | 13.7 | 16.0 | 371 |
| Cagayan Valley | 26.1 | 16.8 | 16.0 | 12.6 | 10.5 | 18.1 | 16.0 | 238 |
| Central Luzon | 27.0 | 15.0 | 17.3 | 13.2 | 14.0 | 13.6 | 16.0 | 788 |
| CALABARZON | 27.4 | 17.5 | 21.3 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 11.5 | 15.8 | 1,037 |
| MIMAROPA | 21.9 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 12.8 | 14.3 | 15.3 | 16.1 | 196 |
| Bicol | 20.6 | 17.4 | 15.8 | 16.9 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 16.2 | 431 |
| Western Visayas | 25.5 | 20.1 | 18.6 | 12.0 | 11.5 | 12.2 | 15.7 | 607 |
| Central Visayas | 29.8 | 15.2 | 16.3 | 12.6 | 11.9 | 14.2 | 15.7 | 514 |
| Eastern Visayas | 19.9 | 20.8 | 14.0 | 12.3 | 11.4 | 21.6 | 16.4 | 236 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 26.1 | 14.8 | 18.3 | 12.5 | 11.7 | 16.7 | 16.0 | 257 |
| Northern Mindanao | 29.7 | 15.7 | 14.1 | 16.9 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 15.7 | 313 |
| Davao | 25.9 | 17.9 | 14.3 | 15.4 | 11.8 | 14.6 | 15.9 | 363 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 35.0 | 16.9 | 13.8 | 9.4 | 10.2 | 14.6 | 15.5 | 254 |
| CAR | 29.4 | 10.4 | 16.6 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 20.2 | 15.9 | 163 |
| ARMM | 23.7 | 19.4 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 9.4 | 17.3 | 16.1 | 139 |
| Caraga | 28.7 | 16.4 | 14.3 | 12.7 | 14.3 | 13.5 | 15.6 | 244 |
| NCR | 29.8 | 16.6 | 13.9 | 16.8 | 10.2 | 12.8 | 15.7 | 1,277 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 29.1 | 16.5 | 14.4 | 15.3 | 11.4 | 13.2 | 15.8 | 2,336 |
| Rural | 26.1 | 17.2 | 17.4 | 13.2 | 11.9 | 14.3 | 15.9 | 5,091 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 31.2 | 20.0 | 15.5 | 12.0 | 9.3 | 12.1 | 15.6 | 1,242 |
| High school undergraduate | 36.0 | 21.1 | 15.8 | 11.3 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 15.2 | 2,503 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 18.6 | 13.9 | 18.0 | 15.8 | 15.0 | 18.6 | 16.5 | 2,247 |
| College or higher | 21.1 | 11.8 | 16.0 | 16.8 | 16.0 | 18.3 | 16.3 | 1,435 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 25.7 | 19.1 | 18.3 | 13.4 | 9.8 | 13.6 | 15.8 | 1,290 |
| Second | 26.9 | 16.0 | 17.2 | 13.8 | 11.7 | 14.5 | 15.9 | 1,473 |
| Middle | 25.8 | 17.5 | 16.8 | 13.2 | 12.9 | 13.8 | 15.9 | 1,656 |
| Fourth | 27.4 | 17.2 | 15.3 | 14.2 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 15.8 | 1,665 |
| Highest (Richest) | 29.5 | 15.1 | 14.9 | 15.0 | 11.8 | 13.7 | 15.9 | 1,344 |
| Total | 27.0 | 17.0 | 16.5 | 13.9 | 11.7 | 13.9 | 15.9 | 7,429 |

such as involvement in vehicular accidents. Excessive drinking is also associated with other consequences such as school problems and could negatively affect peer and family relationships.

More Filipino youth drink than smoke. In all, 68.2 percent have ever drunk alcohol while 36.7 percent are current drinkers. As with smoking, drinking is a male-dominated behavior; while 53.2 percent of males are current drinkers, the corresponding proportion for females is only 21 percent (Table 6.3). Regardless of sex, drinking is more prevalent in the older (46.5\%) than the younger (30.1\%)
cohort. Older males (20-24 age group) exhibited the highest prevalence who ever drunk at 89.2 percent, although their female counterparts are not far behind (71.2\%). By education, a positive relationship is apparent, with those having at leastahigh school diplomaregistering a markedly higher level of alcohol consumption relative to those with lower educational attainment. The college educated have the highest prevalence of current alcohol drinking behavior (62.9\% and 28.9\% for males and females, respectively). High school undergraduates reported the lowest level of current drinking, which could be attributed to

Table 6.3 Percent of males and females who ever drank and are currently drinking by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ever drank | Currently drinking |  | Ever drank | Currently drinking |  | Ever drank | Currently drinking |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 68.8 | 42.9 | 5,770 | 52.2 | 17.1 | 5,652 | 60.6 | 30.1 | 11,422 |
| 20-24 | 89.2 | 69.8 | 3,590 | 71.2 | 26.3 | 4,160 | 79.5 | 46.5 | 7,751 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ilocos | 79.1 | 54.3 | 473 | 65.5 | 17.5 | 468 | 72.3 | 36.0 | 942 |
| Cagayan Valley | 73.8 | 50.6 | 344 | 62.0 | 11.3 | 326 | 68.1 | 31.5 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 80.9 | 64.5 | 953 | 62.1 | 20.5 | 1,096 | 70.8 | 41.0 | 2,050 |
| CALABARZON | 81.5 | 54.4 | 1,243 | 67.3 | 24.1 | 1,305 | 74.2 | 38.9 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 75.3 | 49.1 | 283 | 58.8 | 12.5 | 279 | 67.1 | 31.0 | 562 |
| Bicol | 77.0 | 53.8 | 522 | 56.9 | 14.0 | 573 | 66.5 | 33.0 | 1,094 |
| Western Visayas | 69.2 | 52.5 | 764 | 53.5 | 14.3 | 722 | 61.6 | 33.9 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 80.2 | 60.5 | 742 | 61.8 | 23.6 | 674 | 71.4 | 43.0 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 72.8 | 48.2 | 427 | 69.7 | 36.7 | 403 | 71.3 | 42.7 | 830 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 64.1 | 38.1 | 373 | 44.7 | 9.3 | 356 | 54.6 | 24.0 | 730 |
| Northern Mindanao | 77.9 | 46.5 | 447 | 49.9 | 10.6 | 473 | 63.5 | 28.2 | 920 |
| Davao | 81.8 | 53.6 | 446 | 49.4 | 13.4 | 514 | 64.5 | 32.1 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 62.6 | 33.7 | 439 | 32.1 | 6.7 | 460 | 46.9 | 19.9 | 899 |
| CAR | 84.3 | 64.7 | 173 | 65.5 | 13.7 | 197 | 74.3 | 37.4 | 370 |
| ARMM | 10.8 | 3.5 | 316 | 5.4 | 0.8 | 353 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 671 |
| Caraga | 88.3 | 50.0 | 265 | 72.0 | 17.6 | 255 | 80.2 | 34.0 | 520 |
| NCR | 92.7 | 68.8 | 1,150 | 84.2 | 45.4 | 1,357 | 88.1 | 56.1 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 86.3 | 61.9 | 2,398 | 72.8 | 32.4 | 2,831 | 79.0 | 45.9 | 5,229 |
| Rural | 73.3 | 50.2 | 6,962 | 55.2 | 16.3 | 6,983 | 64.2 | 33.3 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 67.5 | 48.9 | 1,730 | 43.4 | 15.3 | 922 | 59.1 | 37.2 | 2,652 |
| High school undergraduate | 69.1 | 43.5 | 3,530 | 47.4 | 14.4 | 3,503 | 58.3 | 29.0 | 7,032 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 86.6 | 63.9 | 2,410 | 70.0 | 24.1 | 3,052 | 77.3 | 41.6 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 87.4 | 62.9 | 1,688 | 73.5 | 28.9 | 2,336 | 79.3 | 43.2 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 63.4 | 41.0 | 1,887 | 41.1 | 10.4 | 1,954 | 52.1 | 25.4 | 3,841 |
| Second | 73.8 | 48.3 | 1,913 | 53.0 | 15.7 | 2,022 | 63.1 | 31.5 | 3,935 |
| Middle | 77.2 | 56.4 | 2,091 | 63.4 | 20.0 | 2,082 | 70.3 | 38.2 | 4,173 |
| Fourth | 83.8 | 61.0 | 1,942 | 72.0 | 27.1 | 2,063 | 77.7 | 43.5 | 4,005 |
| Highest (Richest) | 86.4 | 60.3 | 1,527 | 72.8 | 33.2 | 1,692 | 79.2 | 46.1 | 3,220 |
| Total | 76.6 | 53.2 | 9,360 | 60.2 | 21.0 | 9,814 | 68.2 | 36.7 | 19,174 |

exposure. Those in the lower educational levels are more likely to be younger and are expected to have a lower exposure to drinking relative to their older counterparts.

An urban-rural differential is also evident, with 45.9 percent of urban youth currently drinking as compared to 33.3 percent for their rural counterparts. This pattern affirms the variation found across the regions, where the prevalence of current drinking is highest in NCR (56.1\%), Central Visayas (43\%), and Eastern Visayas (42.7\%) and almost non-existent in ARMM (2.1\%). The high current level of alcohol consumption observed in NCR is true for both gender, with almost half (45.4\%) of the females currently drinking as compared to 68.8 percent for their male counterparts.

Unlike smoking, a clear positive relationship between alcohol consumption and SES is evident. About a fourth (25.4\%) of those in the lowest quintile are currently drinking as compared to almost half (46.1\%) among those in the highest quintile. While the prevalence of current drinking is lower among the females relative to the males, the SES differential is sharper among the former, with about a third of those in the highest quintile (33.2\%) currently drinking, which is more than three times the proportion in the poorest quintile (10.4\%). The magnitude of the difference is less for the males, where the prevalence among the richest quintile ( $60.3 \%$ ) is about 1.5 times higher than that of the poorest quintile (41\%).

Young people smoke before they drink. Initiation to smoking happens at age 15.9 years on the average as compared to 16.3 years for drinking. About 19 percent had their first taste of alcoholic beverages before turning 15 as compared to 27 percent for smoking. However, the exposure rate to drinking increases more rapidly with age relative to smoking so that by the time they reach age 18 , the levels of exposure for smoking and drinking are generally comparable (about 85\% exposure rate for both before age 18). There is no perceptible difference in the timing of initiation to alcohol by place of
residence, educational attainment, SES, and region (Table 6.4).

Similar to smoking, there has also been a perceptible decline in drinking prevalence over the last decade, particularly for the males, where the proportion who are currently drinking dropped from 61.1 percent in 2002 to 53.2 percent in 2013. The same pattern is noted for the females, although to a much lesser degree than that of males, from 23.6 percent in 2002 to 21 percent in 2013 (Figure 6.2). This gender difference in the trend data suggests bigger recent improvements in male drinking behavior relative to the females, albeit males continue to outdo females in alcohol consumption.

The observed decline in drinking among the youth, particularly among the males, is a welcome development given the social, behavioral, and health problems associated with frequent and excessive alcohol consumption. Study findings show that a considerable number admitted to have gotten into trouble due to excessive drinking, particularly among older males (21\%). At least 27.4 percent of older males and 7.3 percent of older females have experienced passing out during a drinking session because of too much alcohol intake; this

Figure 6.2 Percent of youth who are currently drinking alcoholic beverages by sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013

reveals the extent of extreme drinking behavior experienced by some young people. What is also revealing is the general lack of awareness among parents or guardians and even spouses/partners about the adolescents' drinking behavior, particularly among females in their teens (15-19 years old). Only about a third of the youth aged 15-24 admitted that their parents are aware of their drinking behavior (Table 6.5). For teenage girls, the level is lowest at 14.4 percent, which is worrisome considering that some of them have reported that they had passed out due to excessive alcohol intake.

Drug use

The increasing prevalence of drug use among the Filipino youth, particularly the males as revealed in the 1994 and 2002 rounds of YAFS has precipitated greater interest in continuing to monitor this youth risk behavior. Notwithstanding the reported low level of drug use in the country, the severe and far-reaching consequences of drug use, particularly among the young users, is in itself a compelling reason to continue understanding this issue and thus help achieve lower illegal drug demand-if not

Table 6.4 Percent of youth by age first started to drink and mean age of drinking initiation by background characteristics
$\left.\begin{array}{llllllllll} \\ & \text { Background Characteristics } & & & \text { Age started to drink } & & \text { Mean age started } \\ \text { to drink }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { No. } \\ \text { of cases }\end{array}\right]$

Table 6.5 Other indicators of drinking behavior by sex and age

| Sex and age | Percent who have ever gotten into trouble in connection with drinking | Percent who have passed out in a drinking session because $R$ drank too much | Percent whose parent/guardian is aware of R's drinking | Percent whose spouse/live-in partner is aware of R's drinking | Percent whose parent/guardian (never married) or spouse/live-in partner (married) is aware of R's drinking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 14.0 | 18.4 | 49.4 | 68.7 | 49.3 |
| 15-19 | 9.9 | 12.8 | 38.7 | 63.1 | 38.6 |
| 20-24 | 20.6 | 27.4 | 66.7 | 69.8 | 66.5 |
| Female | 2.6 | 5.0 | 18.5 | 17.3 | 18.5 |
| 15-19 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 14.4 | 13.3 | 14.4 |
| 20-24 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 24.0 | 18.7 | 24.0 |
| Both sexes | 8.2 | 11.5 | 33.6 | 30.6 | 33.5 |
| 15-19 | 6.1 | 8.1 | 26.7 | 22.3 | 26.6 |
| 20-24 | 11.3 | 16.6 | 43.8 | 33.1 | 43.6 |
| Total | 8.2 | 11.5 | 33.6 | 30.6 | 33.5 |

altogether eliminate it-particularly among the young population sector.

Consistent with the trend in smoking and drinking, the prevalence of drug use among the youth has dropped over the past decade (Figure 6.3). This is particularly notable among the males, whose prevalence of current use of drugs declined from 4.7 percent in 2002 to 1.3 percent in 2013. The Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB) of the Philippines defines drugs as chemicals that affect a person in such a way as to bring about physiological, emotional, or behavioral change, while "dangerous drugs" are those that have a high tendency for abuse and dependency.

YAFS4 findings reveal drug use to be less common compared to smoking and drinking, with 4 percent admitting to having ever abused drugs. Drug use is male dominated, with an 8-to-1 male-to-female ratio among those who have ever used drugs (i.e., $7.1 \%$ and $0.9 \%$ among males and females, respectively) (Table 6.6). The proportion of currentuse is muchlower compared to that of ever use but with more marked male dominance ( $1.3 \%$ vs. $0.1 \%$ for males and females, respectively). Shabu (or methamphetamine) and marijuana are identified as the "most used" illicit drugs of the youth in the country regardless of sex (Figures 6.4a and 6.4b).

Differences in drug use by age and place of residence follow the same direction as smoking and drinking. Data also show a clear education and SES pattern for the males, with the highest level of drug use reported among those with the highest education and in the richest quintile. About 9 percent of males with college education or higher have ever used drugs as compared to 5.8 percent for those at the lowest end of the education ladder. The corresponding values for SES are 8.1 percent among males in the richest quintile and 5 percent for their poorest

Figure 6.3 Percent of youth who are currently using using drugs by sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013


Figure 6.4a Types of drugs ever tried by male youth

Figure 6.4b Types of drugs ever tried by female youth


Table 6.6 Percent of males and females who ever used drugs and currently using drugs by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ever used drugs | Currently using drugs |  | Ever used drugs | Currently using drugs |  | Ever used drugs | Currently using drugs |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 5,770 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 5,652 | 2.6 | 0.5 | 11,422 |
| 20-24 | 11.0 | 1.8 | 3,591 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 4,160 | 5.8 | 1.0 | 7,751 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 3.0 | 0.4 | 473 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 468 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 2.0 | 0.6 | 345 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 326 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 671 |
| Central Luzon | 2.0 | 0.3 | 953 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1,097 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 2,049 |
| CALABARZON | 6.7 | 1.8 | 1,244 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1,304 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 2,548 |
| MIMAROPA | 2.5 | 0.4 | 284 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 279 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 562 |
| Bicol | 4.8 | 0.2 | 521 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 573 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 1,095 |
| Western Visayas | 4.5 | 1.2 | 764 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 723 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 1,487 |
| Central Visayas | 11.2 | 3.4 | 741 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 674 | 6.4 | 1.8 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 2.6 | 0.2 | 427 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 402 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 829 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 7.8 | 0.8 | 373 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 355 | 4.0 | 0.4 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 15.7 | 4.3 | 447 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 473 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 921 |
| Davao | 18.2 | 2.7 | 446 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 515 | 9.2 | 1.3 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 7.3 | 1.4 | 439 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 461 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 900 |
| CAR | 4.0 | 0.0 | 173 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 198 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 371 |
| ARMM | 1.9 | 0.6 | 318 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 354 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 672 |
| Caraga | 13.2 | 3.0 | 266 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 254 | 7.1 | 1.5 | 519 |
| NCR | 10.2 | 0.6 | 1,150 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 1,357 | 6.0 | 0.8 | 2,508 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 9.6 | 1.3 | 2,397 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2,831 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 5,228 |
| Rural | 6.2 | 1.3 | 6,963 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 6,981 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 13,944 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 5.8 | 1.0 | 1,731 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 922 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 2,653 |
| High school undergraduate | 5.6 | 1.2 | 3,530 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 3,502 | 3.2 | 0.6 | 7,031 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 8.8 | 1.4 | 2,411 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 3,052 | 4.4 | 0.8 | 5,461 |
| College or higher | 9.0 | 1.7 | 1,687 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 2,336 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 5.0 | 0.9 | 1,887 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1,953 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 3,840 |
| Second | 6.4 | 1.1 | 1,914 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 2,022 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 3,936 |
| Middle | 7.1 | 1.5 | 2,091 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2,081 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 4,172 |
| Fourth | 8.9 | 1.1 | 1,941 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 2,063 | 4.9 | 0.7 | 4,005 |
| Highest (Richest) | 8.1 | 2.0 | 1,527 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1,692 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 3,220 |
| Total | 7.1 | 1.3 | 9,364 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 9,813 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 19,173 |

counterpart. Across regions, Davao registered the highest proportion of youth who have ever used and are currently using drugs at 9.2 percent and 1.3 percent, respectively.

Among the three problem behaviors assessed so far, initiation to drugs comes relatively later. The mean age at first drug use is 17.3 years on the average and is similar for males and females (Table 6.7). That illicit drug experimentation comes later than smoking and drinking is also evident in the timing of initiation among those exposed to drugs. Significantly, teen girls are more likely to be initiated to drugs
sooner than their male counterparts, with 10.7 percent among the former having their first exposure prior to age 15 as compared to 8.5 percent among the males. By age 18, however, more teen boys than girls have been exposed to drugs. The timing of exposure to drugs also reveals that unlike smoking and drinking, where the onset happens mostly prior to age 18, drug initiation happens later which seems to agree to the data of the Dangerous Drugs Board that drug abusers in the country are about 28 years, on average (n.d.).

Table 6.7 Percent of youth by age first started to use drugs and mean age of drug use initiation by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age started to use drugs |  |  |  |  |  | Mean age started to use drugs | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 15 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | above 18 |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 8.5 | 11.6 | 15.4 | 16.6 | 19.2 | 28.7 | 17.3 | 656 |
| Female | 10.7 | 19.0 | 9.5 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 35.7 | 17.4 | 84 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 6.7 | 13.3 | 40.0 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 16.6 | 15 |
| Cagayan Valley | 9.1 | 27.3 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 9.1 | 16.5 | 11 |
| Central Luzon | 15.8 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 10.5 | 15.8 | 26.3 | 16.9 | 19 |
| CALABARZON | 3.6 | 7.1 | 29.8 | 16.7 | 17.9 | 25.0 | 17.4 | 84 |
| MIMAROPA | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 11.1 | 55.6 | 18.7 | 9 |
| Bicol | 10.3 | 20.7 | 10.3 | 13.8 | 10.3 | 34.5 | 17.0 | 29 |
| Western Visayas | 7.9 | 23.7 | 10.5 | 7.9 | 13.2 | 36.8 | 17.5 | 38 |
| Central Visayas | 5.6 | 10.1 | 12.4 | 16.9 | 12.4 | 42.7 | 18.0 | 89 |
| Eastern Visayas | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 33.3 | 17.7 | 15 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 6.9 | 6.9 | 3.4 | 27.6 | 24.1 | 31.0 | 17.8 | 29 |
| Northern Mindanao | 5.3 | 12.0 | 16.0 | 17.3 | 18.7 | 30.7 | 17.6 | 75 |
| Davao | 15.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 12.5 | 18.2 | 21.6 | 16.8 | 88 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 8.3 | 11.1 | 8.3 | 16.7 | 30.6 | 25.0 | 17.3 | 36 |
| CAR | 12.5 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 17.2 | 8 |
| ARMM | 0.0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 17.4 | 6 |
| Caraga | 8.1 | 5.4 | 10.8 | 16.2 | 27.0 | 32.4 | 17.7 | 37 |
| NCR | 11.2 | 15.1 | 11.2 | 15.8 | 18.4 | 28.3 | 17.0 | 152 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 10.3 | 12.9 | 15.4 | 15.8 | 17.3 | 28.3 | 17.1 | 274 |
| Rural | 7.9 | 12.2 | 14.3 | 16.9 | 18.4 | 30.2 | 17.4 | 466 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 5.6 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 14.8 | 17.6 | 29.6 | 17.5 | 108 |
| High school undergraduate | 17.9 | 10.8 | 17.0 | 21.5 | 16.1 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 223 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 4.2 | 12.9 | 10.4 | 15.0 | 15.4 | 42.1 | 17.8 | 240 |
| College or higher | 5.3 | 11.2 | 17.2 | 13.6 | 23.7 | 29.0 | 17.5 | 169 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 9.1 | 11.1 | 15.2 | 24.2 | 18.2 | 22.2 | 17.3 | 99 |
| Second | 8.5 | 12.1 | 19.1 | 11.3 | 17.7 | 31.2 | 17.4 | 141 |
| Middle | 6.5 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 14.8 | 17.2 | 36.7 | 17.6 | 169 |
| Fourth | 12.2 | 12.2 | 12.8 | 16.8 | 14.8 | 31.1 | 17.1 | 196 |
| Highest (Richest) | 6.6 | 13.9 | 16.1 | 18.2 | 23.4 | 21.9 | 17.2 | 137 |
| Total | 8.7 | 12.4 | 14.8 | 16.6 | 18.0 | 29.5 | 17.3 | 740 |

## Physical violence

Interpersonal violence is defined as "the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against another person or against a group or community that results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation" (Dahlberg \& Krug, 2002, p.5). Involvement in physical violence can either be as a victim or as an offender.

Youth involvement in violence in the country was initially explored in the 2002 YAFS and pursued in the 2013 YAFS. However, only one question was phrased similarly in the two surveys, which allows for the tracking of change in youth involvement in violence over time. Specifically, the question asked was "Have you ever experienced being threatened by someone?" The rest of the questions used different time frames, which render them incomparable.

Results of the 2013 YAFS reveal that about a quarter of the youth (23.7\%) reported having ever been threatened by someone. This is slightly higher than the 20.8 percent level noted in 2002. The exposure to violence is true for both males and females (Table 6.8). Males, urban residents, those in the lower educational bracket, and those in the top two SES quintiles are more prone to the experience. On the other hand, respondents were also asked if they have been on the receiving end of physical violence and if they have been perpetrators of an act of physical violence against someone in the 12 months preceding the survey.

The level of youth experience of violence is generally high. The proportion who have ever experienced being hurt by someone in the past 12 months is 17.2 percent, which is lower than the proportion who reported hurting someone ( $22.5 \%$ ). More males and those in the 15-19 age bracket are prone to violence. While there is no clear monotonic education pattern, those in the lowest education brackets are more predisposed to being avictim of physical violence. In particular, high school undergraduates registered the highest proportion (21.3\%) who reported having been at the receiving end of violence. A clearer
positive pattern emerges for SES, with increasing brushes with violence noted as one goes up the SES ladder. For example, 14.1 percent among those belonging to the poorest quintile have ever been hurt by someone in the past year as compared to 20.5 percent among those in the richest quintile. The corresponding figures for those who admitted having perpetuated violence for the same period are 18.2 percent and 27 percent, respectively. This seems to suggest that poverty does not necessarily predispose the youth to violent behavior. Across the regions, those living in NCR reported the highest level of recent experience with violence, both as a victim (29.5\%) and as a perpetrator (34.5\%). Meanwhile, the proportions who experienced violence either as a victim (5.5\%) or a perpetrator (10.5\%) are lowest in ARMM.

In the study, we also asked the respondents if they carried a weapon with them in the last 12 months. Results show that the percentage is highest among the older males (11.2\%) and lowest among the younger females (2.1\%) (Table 6.9).

Circumstances surrounding the experience of violence vary across age and gender. Violence against the males in general has been perpetuated by their friends as well as classmates or schoolmates (for the younger cohort). Friends have also been the recipients of the young males' violent outbursts (Table 6.9). Unlike the males, the females' experience with violence is more likely to occur within the domestic front. In particular, teenage girls are more likely to have been hurt by their mother (3.9\%), father (3.2\%), or siblings (3.4\%) and are more likely to vent their physical aggression on their siblings (7.4\%). Intimate partner violence is more apparent among the older females, as indicated by their experience of violence involving someone with whom they have a close interpersonal relationship, such as a husband, partner, or boyfriend. Older females are more likely to report being physically hurt by their spouse, partner, or boyfriend, but at the same time, they also inflict physical violence on their intimate partners (Table 6.9).

Table 6.8 Percent who experienced violence by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Ever been threatened by someone | No. of cases | Ever experienced being hurt by someone in the past 12 months | No. of cases | Have hurt someone in the past 12 months | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 30.2 | 9,361 | 21.1 | 9,358 | 24.5 | 9,363 |
| Female | 17.4 | 9,809 | 13.6 | 9,792 | 20.6 | 9,808 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 23.5 | 11,421 | 20.0 | 11,407 | 23.8 | 11,419 |
| 20-24 | 23.8 | 7,751 | 13.2 | 7,745 | 20.6 | 7,752 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 18.9 | 942 | 16.7 | 942 | 22.7 | 941 |
| Cagayan Valley | 22.5 | 671 | 14.9 | 670 | 27.4 | 671 |
| Central Luzon | 13.6 | 2,049 | 16.4 | 2,049 | 23.6 | 2,050 |
| CALABARZON | 23.7 | 2,547 | 18.4 | 2,539 | 24.9 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 21.5 | 562 | 18.5 | 561 | 19.8 | 562 |
| Bicol | 19.6 | 1,095 | 20.0 | 1,095 | 16.5 | 1,094 |
| Western Visayas | 21.0 | 1,484 | 11.0 | 1,482 | 15.6 | 1,485 |
| Central Visayas | 28.3 | 1,415 | 14.7 | 1,415 | 18.7 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 26.5 | 829 | 13.3 | 826 | 13.5 | 827 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 20.0 | 729 | 11.0 | 729 | 20.6 | 729 |
| Northern Mindanao | 24.7 | 920 | 17.8 | 921 | 21.0 | 921 |
| Davao | 25.7 | 960 | 14.2 | 960 | 23.1 | 960 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 19.4 | 899 | 14.7 | 898 | 18.9 | 898 |
| CAR | 29.2 | 370 | 16.8 | 370 | 27.6 | 369 |
| ARMM | 11.7 | 674 | 5.5 | 674 | 10.5 | 674 |
| Caraga | 35.8 | 520 | 17.3 | 519 | 25.4 | 519 |
| NCR | 35.4 | 2,505 | 29.5 | 2,503 | 34.5 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 28.2 | 5,226 | 23.1 | 5,224 | 29.9 | 5,229 |
| Rural | 21.9 | 13,944 | 15.0 | 13,927 | 19.8 | 13,942 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 24.9 | 2,654 | 18.6 | 2,646 | 20.7 | 2,653 |
| High school undergraduate | 24.4 | 7,031 | 21.3 | 7,025 | 25.5 | 7,029 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 23.1 | 5,461 | 13.2 | 5,459 | 21.3 | 5,463 |
| College or higher | 22.2 | 4,023 | 14.8 | 4,019 | 20.2 | 4,023 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 22.2 | 3,841 | 14.1 | 3,829 | 18.2 | 3,838 |
| Second | 22.4 | 3,936 | 15.4 | 3,935 | 19.5 | 3,937 |
| Middle | 23.2 | 4,171 | 17.2 | 4,170 | 22.7 | 4,171 |
| Fourth | 25.7 | 4,005 | 19.6 | 4,003 | 25.8 | 4,005 |
| Highest (Richest) | 24.9 | 3,218 | 20.5 | 3,216 | 27.0 | 3,219 |
| Total | 23.7 | 19,172 | 17.2 | 19,153 | 22.5 | 19,171 |

Suicide

The 2014 World Health Organization Global Report cited suicide as the second leading cause of death globally among people 15 to 29 years of age (WHO, 2014). The significant toll that suicide takes on young lives notwithstanding, studies on the true state of suicide in certain settings like the Philippines remain scarce largely due to data
constraints (mostly cultural factors). Where suicide is consideredataboo,itislikelythat deaths resulting from suicide are not properly recorded, resulting in the underestimation of suicide rates. The few studies on suicide among Filipino youth, including those emanating from the previous YAFS series, reveal low incidence rates. What is alarming, however, is the increasing incidence of suicide, with females registering the highest

Table 6.9 Other indicators of the youth's experience of violence by sex and age

| Indicators of violence | Male |  | No. of males | Female |  | No. of females | Both sexes |  | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  | 15-19 | 20-24 |  |
| Person who hurt R in the last 12 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Friend | 7.3 | 4.2 | 9,351 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 9,788 | 5.0 | 2.2 | 19,141 |
| Classmate/schoolmate | 5.4 | 0.6 | 9,351 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 9,788 | 3.5 | 0.5 | 19,141 |
| Father | 1.8 | 1.0 | 9,351 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 9,788 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 19,141 |
| Spouse/partner (BF/GF) | 1.1 | 1.5 | 9,351 | 1.2 | 4.4 | 9,788 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 19,141 |
| Mother | 1.0 | 0.5 | 9,351 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 9,788 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 19,141 |
| Siblings | 1.3 | 0.9 | 9,351 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 9,788 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 19,141 |
| Person hurt by $\mathbf{R}$ in the last $\mathbf{1 2}$ months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Friend | 9.5 | 6.8 | 9,354 | 5.3 | 1.9 | 9,808 | 7.4 | 4.2 | 19,161 |
| Classmate/schoolmate | 8.2 | 2.6 | 9,354 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 9,808 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 19,161 |
| Father | 0.1 | 0.3 | 9,354 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 9,808 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 19,161 |
| Spouse/partner (BF/GF) | 0.1 | 0.8 | 9,354 | 3.7 | 8.1 | 9,808 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 19,161 |
| Mother | 0.1 | 0.0 | 9,354 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 9,808 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 19,161 |
| Siblings | 1.8 | 1.6 | 9,354 | 7.4 | 4.0 | 9,808 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 19,161 |
| Percent who carried a weapon in the last 12 months | 8.1 | 11.2 | 9,306 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 9,772 | 5.2 | 6.7 | 19,077 |

suicide rates among 15-24-year-olds (Redaniel, Lebanan-Dalida, \& Gunnell, 2011). The same study found no substantial differential in rates across all age groups among the males. Findings indicating that for every suicide there are many more people who attempt suicide (WHO, 2014) suggest the need for closer scrutiny not only of suicide attempts but also of suicide ideation as
a significant risk factor to the risk of suicide in general.

It is in this context that the YAFS studies since 2002 have inquired into the youth's experiences of suicide ideation and attempts as well as the circumstances surrounding these experiences. Results show that like smoking, drinking, and drug use, the proportion of youth who have ever thought of committing suicide

Figure 6.5a Percent of youth who have ever thought of committing suicide by sex: 2002 and 2013


Figure 6.5b Percent of youth who have ever tried to commit suicide among those who ever thought of committing suicide by sex: 2002 and 2013

declined in the last decade from 13.4 percent in 2002 to 8.7 percent in 2013 (Figure 6.5a). However, the proportion among those who thought of committing suicide who attempted suicide increased from 25 percent to 37 percent with the increasing pattern observed for both males and females (Figure 6.5b). It should be

Table 6.10 Percent who ever thought of and who have tried committing suicide by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent who ever thought of committing suicide | Percent who tried to commit suicide | No. of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |
| Male | 4.5 | 1.5 | 9,356 |
| Female | 12.6 | 4.8 | 9,807 |
| Age |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 7.3 | 2.5 | 11,412 |
| 20-24 | 10.7 | 4.3 | 7,749 |
| Region |  |  |  |
| llocos | 10.0 | 2.6 | 940 |
| Cagayan Valley | 5.2 | 1.8 | 670 |
| Central Luzon | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2,047 |
| CALABARZON | 8.3 | 2.4 | 2,547 |
| MIMAROPA | 7.1 | 2.0 | 561 |
| Bicol | 7.7 | 3.7 | 1,094 |
| Western Visayas | 8.4 | 4.0 | 1,483 |
| Central Visayas | 12.4 | 3.2 | 1,414 |
| Eastern Visayas | 8.1 | 3.0 | 828 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 9.5 | 3.2 | 728 |
| Northern Mindanao | 11.3 | 4.2 | 920 |
| Davao | 12.3 | 3.2 | 961 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 6.3 | 1.6 | 898 |
| CAR | 8.1 | 1.6 | 369 |
| ARMM | 6.2 | 1.8 | 675 |
| Caraga | 13.8 | 3.8 | 520 |
| NCR | 10.9 | 5.6 | 2,507 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |
| Urban | 9.5 | 4.5 | 5,224 |
| Rural | 8.3 | 2.7 | 13,937 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 7.9 | 3.1 | 2,653 |
| High school undergraduate | 8.1 | 3.0 | 7,026 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 9.0 | 3.2 | 5,461 |
| College or higher | 9.7 | 3.5 | 4,019 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 8.0 | 2.6 | 3,839 |
| Second | 9.1 | 3.1 | 3,936 |
| Middle | 8.5 | 2.9 | 4,170 |
| Fourth | 7.8 | 3.2 | 3,999 |
| Highest (Richest) | 10.2 | 4.4 | 3,217 |
| Total | 8.7 | 3.2 | 19,162 |

noted, however, that the level of reported suicide attempts is an underestimate as the study captures only non-fatal suicide attempts and excludes successful ones.

Results from the 2013 YAFS show that generally, more females than males entertained suicidal thoughts and attempted to end their lives. Around 12.6 percent of female youth aged 15-24 have ever thought of committing suicide as compared to 4.5 percent for their male counterparts (Figure 6.5a). The corresponding figures for suicide attempts are 4.8 percent and 1.5 percent, respectively (Table 6.10). Suicide ideation is also higher among the older youth, urban residents, those with higher education, and those in the highest income brackets. Suicide attempts are also higher among the older cohort, urban residents, and those residing in NCR. The reported level of suicide attempts does not vary much across education categories and is slightly elevated for those in the highest quintile.

Across regions, youth living in CARAGA (13.8\%), Central Visayas (12.4\%), and Davao (12.3\%) expressed the highest level of suicide ideation, while those in Central Luzon (3.1\%), Cagayan Valley (5.2\%), and ARMM (6.2\%) registered the lowest. For suicide attempts, the proportions are generally low in all regions. The highest prevalence is recorded in NCR at 5.6 percent. In most regions, the proportion who ever attempted suicide is below 3 percent.

A significant proportion (37\%) of those with suicidal thoughts eventually carried out their plans to end their lives. Among them, a few reported the use of violent means of suicide. Different methods were employed by the males and females, with wrist slashing and substance ingestion more common among females and hanging oneself more common among males. Family problems and relationships are the most frequently mentioned precipitating factors for youth's suicide attempts (Table 6.11).

The study findings indicate a strong relationship between adolescent suicide ideation and attempts and the presence of depression, low self-esteem, and alcohol abuse (Table 6.12). The CES-D depression scale and Rosenberg's

Table 6.11 Methods and reasons for committing suicide


Table 6.12 Percent who ever thought of and who have ever tried committing suicide by mean depression and self-esteem score and drinking behavior

|  | Mean depression | Mean self-esteem score | Percent of currently drinking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Suicide ideation |  |  |  |
| Yes | 9.6 | 17.5 | 36.9 |
| No | 7.7 | 18.6 | 36.7 |
| Total | 7.9 | 18.5 | 36.7 |
| Suicide attempt |  |  |  |
| Yes | 10.0 | 17.6 | 43.0 |
| No | 9.4 | 17.4 | 33.4 |
| Total | 9.6 | 17.5 | 36.9 |

self-esteem scale were used to measure the level of depression and self-esteem, respectively. Results indicate that those who ever considered and attempted to end their lives exhibited higher depression scores relative to those who did not. For example, those who have ever thought of committing suicide registered a mean depression score of 9.6 as compared to 7.7 among those who have not experienced such thoughts. In a similar vein, the mean self-esteem score of those who contemplated suicide is lower than those who did not. Youth who have tried to do something to end their lives are more likely to be current drinkers of alcoholic beverages compared to those who have not gone through the experience ( $43 \%$ vs. $33.4 \%$, respectively).

## Summary and conclusions

The foregoing discussion demonstrates that young Filipinos face a wide range of nonsexual risk behaviors. Alcohol consumption is
the most predominant among them, with about two in three having tried alcoholic beverages, although the prevalence of current drinkers is down to a third at the time of the survey. The youth are more likely to drink than to smoke, although they get initiated to tobacco sooner than to alcohol. There is considerable exposure to violence, both as a victim and as a perpetrator, with a higher incidence of intimate partner violence observed among the older female youth. Reports on suicide attempts and drug abuse may be much lower but are nevertheless significant considering their direct toll on the young persons' health and mortality condition. Findings indicating that over a third (37\%) among those who contemplated suicide eventually carried it out provide an idea of the extent of the mental health problem among Filipino youth. Suicide ideation and the subsequent actions to end one's life which are found to be closely interrelated with self-esteem, depression, and current alcohol consumption, suggest the dangerous
connections among these unhealthy youth behaviors.

The dangers posed by these risk behaviors lie not only in the prevalence of practice but also in the timing of initiation. With many starting to explore these risk behaviors in their early teens, addiction and consequently long-term potential use, as in the case of smoking, are more likely to occur. These, in turn, are expected to be associated with greater health risk in later life.

The good news, however, is that for most of these non-sexual risk behaviors, the experience is far from universal. Many have dropped out after their initial excursions into these risky experiences. Moreover, results indicate a consistent decline in the prevalence of smoking, drinking, drug use, and suicide ideation and attempts over the last decade. Only the experience of violence increased over the same period.

The differentials in exposure to nonsexual risks across sectors of the youth population provide a clear mapping of youth vulnerability. Generally, the males are more likely to smoke, drink, do drugs, and engage in violence, but more females have entertained suicidal thoughts and carried them out. Compared to the rural areas, urban areas are associated with a higher prevalence of all the non-sexual risk behaviors considered in the analysis. However, the effect of education is not as clear. For the males, better education is associated with higher levels of alcohol and drug consumption but a lower level of smoking. Males with the lowest education registered the highest preponderance of smoking. For the females, the opposite effects of higher education are also noted in that higher educational attainment is associated with greater exposure to smoking and drinking. No clear education pattern is noted for the perpetuation of violence, although a higher incidence of being at the receiving end of violence is noted among those with poorer education. Suicide ideation is also higher among the better educated. The males exhibit a positive relationship between SES and drinking, drug use, and suicide ideation. For the females, higher

SES is associated with higher levels of smoking, alcohol use, and suicide ideation. Those of higher SES are also more likely to experience violence, both as a perpetrator and as a victim.

In sum, it seems that higher education and SES are both associated with higher exposure to smoking, drinking, and suicide ideation for the females and the males, with increased levels of drinking, drug use, and suicide ideation. Does this imply that the higher level of some of these risk behaviors such as smoking and drinking found among highly educated young people and those in the higher SES can be a function of access? The education patterns are not clear suggesting the need for further analysis to tease out the true direction of the relationship in a multivariate model.

The findings also show that while data over the last decade suggest a drop in the prevalence of these risk behaviors, the remaining proportion of young people who are still currently hooked on these risky behaviors is substantially high.
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# Sexual Behavior 

Maria Paz N. Marquez

The first YAFS conducted in 1982 was conceptualized primarily to examine sexuality-related issues and their antecedents among Filipino female youth to design interventions that would address the rising trend in unplanned and teenage pregnancy. Since then, YAFS has been known as the pioneering large-scale study of Filipino youth sexuality. The most recent YAFS round provides a comprehensive source of information on the Filipino youth's knowledge, attitude, and behavior related to sexuality. One of the main features of the YAFS4 survey is the inclusion of questions on new forms of sexual activity that have emerged in recent years, such as having a "fuck buddy" (FUBU), phone sex, and recording sex videos. It should be noted that YAFS-as with most surveys that deal with sensitive issues such as sexual behavior-is prone to social desirability bias, which could lead to overreporting of sexual activity among males and under-reporting among females (Wellings et al., 2006). To minimize this limitation, the study devised several measures to ensure privacy during the interview process and confidentiality of the responses.

Sexual behavior covers a broad spectrum of activities including masturbation, kissing, petting, and having sex. The survey defined the term "having sex" as sexual intercourse or coitus that involves vaginal or anal penetration (Demographic Research and Development Foundation \& University of the Philippines Population Institute, 2012). This chapter
discusses the patterns and trends of three aspects of sexual behavior: initiation of sexual activity, premarital sex experience, and risky sexual behaviors. Since gender disparity in sexual behavior is well established, most of the analyses in this chapter will be separate for males and females. In addition, apart from the five background characteristics, marital status has also been included in this chapter as one of the differentiating factors of sexual behavior.

## Sexual experience

The majority of Filipino youth age 15-24 have not yet engaged in sexual intercourse. Table 7.1 shows that three in five youth have not initiated sexual activity ( $61.6 \%$ among males and $59.4 \%$ among females). Conversely, 2 in 5 youth have sexual experience. Among males, 38.5 percent have engaged in sex; 35.8 percent did so while they were still single. A minority of males' (2.6\%) first sexual intercourse occurred after marriage. Among females, 40.6 percent have sexual experience. Similar to males, most sexual initiations of females are premarital (28.7\%), but a substantial 11.9 percent reported marital first sex.

## Age at sexual initiation

Age at sexual initiation is considered a proxy measure of exposure to the risk of pregnancy among females and the risk of fatherhood among males. It is also an important
Table 7.1 Percent distribution of the sexual experience of youth 15-24 years old by sex and background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No sexual experience | With sexual experience |  |  | Total | No. of males | No sexual experience | With sexual experience |  |  | Total | No. of females |
|  |  | Premarital first sex | Marital first sex | Total |  |  |  | Premarital first sex | Marital first sex | Total |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 79.4 | 19.9 | 0.7 | 20.6 | 100.0 | 5,770 | 80.5 | 14.1 | 5.3 | 19.5 | 100.0 | 5,652 |
| 20-24 | 33.0 | 61.4 | 5.7 | 67.0 | 100.0 | 3,592 | 30.7 | 48.5 | 20.8 | 69.3 | 100.0 | 4,161 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 70.3 | 29.7 | 0.0 | 29.7 | 100.0 | 8,198 | 89.9 | 10.1 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 100.0 | 6,483 |
| Ever marrried | 0.0 | 78.8 | 21.2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1,166 | 0.0 | 65.0 | 35.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 3,331 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 61.1 | 35.9 | 3.0 | 38.9 | 100.0 | 473 | 64.0 | 26.4 | 9.6 | 36.0 | 100.0 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 67.2 | 29.1 | 3.8 | 32.8 | 100.0 | 344 | 55.0 | 25.4 | 19.6 | 45.0 | 100.0 | 327 |
| Central Luzon | 54.2 | 43.2 | 2.6 | 45.8 | 100.0 | 952 | 55.1 | 35.7 | 9.2 | 44.9 | 100.0 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 62.7 | 36.1 | 1.2 | 37.3 | 100.0 | 1,243 | 65.5 | 22.5 | 12.0 | 34.5 | 100.0 | 1,304 |
| MIMAROPA | 62.5 | 34.6 | 2.8 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 283 | 59.3 | 28.2 | 12.5 | 40.7 | 100.0 | 280 |
| Bicol | 67.9 | 29.2 | 2.9 | 32.1 | 100.0 | 521 | 62.8 | 21.6 | 15.5 | 37.2 | 100.0 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 67.1 | 31.7 | 1.2 | 32.9 | 100.0 | 764 | 60.5 | 31.9 | 7.6 | 39.5 | 100.0 | 722 |
| Central Visayas | 59.0 | 40.3 | 0.7 | 41.0 | 100.0 | 742 | 61.4 | 29.7 | 8.9 | 38.6 | 100.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 68.6 | 27.2 | 4.2 | 31.4 | 100.0 | 427 | 55.5 | 23.6 | 20.9 | 44.5 | 100.0 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 59.7 | 36.8 | 3.5 | 40.3 | 100.0 | 372 | 56.1 | 31.8 | 12.1 | 43.9 | 100.0 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 63.3 | 35.6 | 1.1 | 36.7 | 100.0 | 447 | 60.0 | 30.7 | 9.3 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 473 |
| Davao | 58.5 | 39.9 | 1.6 | 41.5 | 100.0 | 446 | 55.8 | 37.7 | 6.4 | 44.2 | 100.0 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 70.7 | 25.9 | 3.4 | 29.3 | 100.0 | 440 | 62.9 | 20.6 | 16.5 | 37.1 | 100.0 | 461 |
| CAR | 66.9 | 30.8 | 2.3 | 33.1 | 100.0 | 172 | 51.8 | 37.1 | 11.2 | 48.2 | 100.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 72.9 | 6.2 | 20.9 | 27.1 | 100.0 | 321 | 61.5 | 7.1 | 31.4 | 38.5 | 100.0 | 353 |
| Caraga | 61.9 | 35.8 | 2.3 | 38.1 | 100.0 | 265 | 58.3 | 31.5 | 10.2 | 41.7 | 100.0 | 254 |
| NCR | 50.8 | 48.6 | 0.6 | 49.2 | 100.0 | 1,151 | 56.4 | 34.7 | 8.9 | 43.6 | 100.0 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 52.5 | 46.3 | 1.2 | 47.5 | 100.0 | 2,398 | 58.8 | 33.1 | 8.1 | 41.2 | 100.0 | 2,831 |
| Rural | 64.7 | 32.2 | 3.1 | 35.3 | 100.0 | 6,966 | 59.6 | 26.9 | 13.4 | 40.4 | 100.0 | 6,983 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 63.0 | 31.1 | 5.9 | 37.0 | 100.0 | 1,731 | 43.5 | 30.9 | 25.5 | 56.5 | 100.0 | 921 |
| High school undergraduate High school graduate/ | 74.4 | 24.0 | 1.6 | 25.6 | 100.0 | 3,530 | 71.7 | 18.8 | 9.5 | 28.3 | 100.0 | 3,503 |
| Vocational | 48.6 | 48.7 | 2.7 | 51.4 | 100.0 | 2,412 | 44.5 | 39.5 | 15.9 | 55.5 | 100.0 | 3,052 |
| College or higher | 51.8 | 47.0 | 1.2 | 48.2 | 100.0 | 1,688 | 66.7 | 28.6 | 4.8 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 2,336 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 68.0 | 26.7 | 5.3 | 32.0 | 100.0 | 1,887 | 49.4 | 28.6 | 22.0 | 50.6 | 100.0 | 1,953 |
| Second | 68.9 | 28.5 | 2.5 | 31.1 | 100.0 | 1,916 | 59.3 | 27.8 | 12.8 | 40.7 | 100.0 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 59.9 | 37.7 | 2.5 | 40.1 | 100.0 | 2,090 | 58.7 | 29.3 | 12.0 | 41.3 | 100.0 | 2,082 |
| Fourth | 54.7 | 43.9 | 1.4 | 45.3 | 100.0 | 1,942 | 63.5 | 28.5 | 7.9 | 36.5 | 100.0 | 2,064 |
| Highest (Richest) | 55.4 | 43.4 | 1.2 | 44.6 | 100.0 | 1,527 | 66.8 | 29.4 | 3.8 | 33.2 | 100.0 | 1,692 |
| Total | 61.6 | 35.8 | 2.6 | 38.5 | 100.0 | 9,363 | 59.4 | 28.7 | 11.9 | 40.6 | 100.0 | 9,813 |

indicator of exposure to the transmission of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) including HIV. In the survey, age at sexual initiation was derived from responses to two questions asking for (1) the age at first premarital sex among youth with premarital sex experience and (2) the age at marriage or cohabitation among ever married youth with no premarital sex experience.

Table 7.2 presents the percentage distribution and median age at sexual initiation by background characteristics. Males reported a lower median age of 17.8 years compared with 18.2 years for females, signifying that males were generally initiated into sex at a younger age than females. As expected, the younger cohort of youth (15-19 years old) reported a lower median age at sexual initiation than the older cohort (20-24 years old) for both sexes. For males, the median age at first sex reported by those in the ages $15-19$ is 16.6 years, while the median age at first sex for those in the ages 20-24 is 18.7 years. The corresponding figures for females are 16.8 and 18.8 years, respectively.

Interestingly, a gender variation is evident in the differentials of the median age by marital status. On average, ever married males engaged in sex at a much later age than their never married counterparts (18.4 vs. 17.7 years), while for females, the reverse is true. Never married females reported a higher median age of 18.5 years compared with the ever married at 18.1 years.

Across regions, the youngest median age at sexual initiation for males was recorded in NCR (17.0 years) and Davao Region (17.4 years), while the oldest was in CAR (18.6 years) and ARMM (19.3 years). Females exhibited a different pattern, with the highest median ages found in Bicol (18.6 years) and Central Visayas (18.5 years) and the lowest in Davao Region (17.7 years). In most regions, the median age at first sex of males is lower than that of females. However, for Cagayan Valley, Eastern Visayas, SOCCSKSARGEN, CAR, ARMM, and Caraga, it is the females who engage in sex earlier than males on average. The age at sexual initiation of female youth in ARMM was, on
average, 1.4 years earlier than that of their male counterparts ( 17.9 years old vs. 19.3 years old).

On average, urban residents reported an earlier onset of intercourse than their rural counterparts for both sexes. There is no clear pattern in the median age at first sex by education among males, but among females, a monotonic increase is apparent, with the median age at sexual initiation two years later among those with college education (19.1 years) compared with youth who had no or elementary schooling (16.9 years). Increasing socioeconomic status is associated with a decreasing median age at first sex among males, but there is no distinct pattern among females.

Among the sexual behaviors tracked by the YAFS series is early sexual initiation, defined as beginning sexual activity before age 18. The proportion is computed from the youth age 1824 to avoid the censoring effect of the inclusion of youth who were not yet 18 years old. Also of particular interest is the proportion of youth age 15-24 who have had sexual intercourse before age 15. This is one of the core indicators used by the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS to measure the global progress made to halt the spread of HIV/AIDS (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, 2009a).

The results of the three YAFS rounds indicate an increasing proportion of youth who began sexual activity before age 18 , from 12.9 percent in 1994 to 24.3 percent in 2013 for both males and females (Figure 7.1). Among males, this proportion increased from 13.8 percent in 1994 to 25.1 percent in 2013; for females, the corresponding increase was from 12 percent to 23.5 percent. The "younging" trend in the onset of sexual intercourse is also evident in the declining median age at first sex. For males, the median age at sexual initiation decreased from 18.0 years in 1994 to 17.8 in 2013; for females, it decreased from 18.8 in 1994 to 18.2 in 2013 (data not shown).

Looking at the proportion of youth with early sexual activity across background characteristics reveals interesting findings (Table 7.2). By marital status, there is a wide disparity
age 18 by sex and background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Median age at first sex | No. of males 15-24 years old with sexual experience | Had sex before age 15 | No. of males 15-24 years old | Had sex before age 18 | No. of males 18-24 years old | Median age at first sex | No. of females 15-24 years old with sexual experience | Had sex before age 15 | No. of females 15-24 years old | Had sex before age 18 | No. of females 18-24 years old |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 16.6 | 1,159 | 3.2 | 5,740 | 25.4 | 2,197 | 16.8 | 1,030 | 2.1 | 5,583 | 26.9 | 1,953 |
| 20-24 | 18.7 | 2,316 | 3.7 | 3,504 | 24.9 | 3,504 | 18.8 | 2,625 | 1.8 | 3,906 | 21.8 | 3,907 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 17.7 | 2,404 | 2.8 | 8,170 | 21.2 | 4,646 | 18.5 | 646 | 0.3 | 6,475 | 6.1 | 3,085 |
| Ever marrried | 18.4 | 1,071 | 7.4 | 1,074 | 41.9 | 1,055 | 18.1 | 3,009 | 5.5 | 3,013 | 42.8 | 2,774 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 17.8 | 178 | 2.1 | 468 | 23.6 | 284 | 18.1 | 154 | 1.5 | 455 | 24.2 | 273 |
| Cagayan Valley | 18.4 | 107 | 1.8 | 337 | 15.6 | 205 | 18.0 | 131 | 2.3 | 311 | 25.9 | 197 |
| Central Luzon | 17.7 | 421 | 4.8 | 937 | 30.3 | 630 | 18.3 | 474 | 2.1 | 1,079 | 22.8 | 782 |
| CALABARZON | 17.8 | 443 | 4.4 | 1,222 | 26.5 | 740 | 18.3 | 422 | 1.5 | 1,277 | 22.9 | 726 |
| MIMAROPA | 18.2 | 104 | 2.8 | 282 | 22.8 | 167 | 18.3 | --- | 1.1 | 273 | 20.7 | 174 |
| Bicol | 17.8 | 162 | 2.1 | 516 | 21.3 | 310 | 18.6 | 195 | 1.3 | 555 | 19.5 | 339 |
| Western Visayas | 17.8 | 240 | 2.3 | 753 | 22.3 | 480 | 18.3 | 246 | 1.5 | 683 | 20.6 | 427 |
| Central Visayas | 18.2 | 301 | 2.8 | 738 | 21.4 | 471 | 18.5 | 240 | 1.4 | 653 | 17.9 | 368 |
| Eastern Visayas | 18.4 | 128 | 2.4 | 421 | 18.5 | 233 | 18.0 | 151 | 2.4 | 375 | 24.9 | 221 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 17.8 | 146 | 2.7 | 369 | 29.0 | 241 | 18.1 | 119 | 1.9 | 317 | 21.5 | 205 |
| Northern Mindanao | 17.8 | 162 | 1.8 | 445 | 25.9 | 247 | 18.3 | 175 | 1.3 | 458 | 20.4 | 260 |
| Davao | 17.4 | 176 | 4.3 | 437 | 30.4 | 270 | 17.7 | 214 | 2.4 | 501 | 30.1 | 322 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 18.1 | 122 | 2.8 | 433 | 16.7 | 227 | 18.0 | 146 | 2.1 | 436 | 26.2 | 229 |
| CAR | 18.6 | 54 | 2.4 | 170 | 16.5 | 109 | 18.5 | 90 | 1.6 | 192 | 19.1 | 136 |
| ARMM | 19.3 | 83 | 0.9 | 319 | 8.6 | 220 | 17.9 | 121 | 3.8 | 341 | 24.4 | 213 |
| Caraga | 17.9 | 100 | 1.9 | 264 | 26.1 | 161 | 17.8 | 97 | 3.3 | 246 | 30.6 | 134 |
| NCR | 17.0 | 548 | 6.2 | 1,134 | 36.2 | 705 | 17.8 | 575 | 2.9 | 1,340 | 27.0 | 854 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 17.4 | 1,104 | 5.7 | 2,364 | 34.3 | 1,488 | 18.0 | 1,112 | 2.5 | 2,777 | 25.1 | 1,758 |
| Rural | 18.0 | 2,371 | 2.6 | 6,881 | 21.8 | 4,213 | 18.2 | 2,543 | 1.8 | 6,713 | 22.7 | 4,102 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 17.9 | 607 | 3.4 | 1,699 | 23.0 | 998 | 16.9 | 455 | 7.9 | 859 | 48.4 | 506 |
| High school undergraduate High school graduate/ | 17.2 | 882 | 3.1 | 3,509 | 23.4 | 1,324 | 17.2 | 902 | 2.6 | 3,413 | 39.5 | 1,057 |
| Vocational | 18.1 | 1,193 | 3.3 | 2,367 | 25.6 | 1,998 | 18.5 | 1,569 | 0.9 | 2,931 | 21.7 | 2,464 |
| College or higher | 17.8 | 792 | 3.9 | 1,666 | 27.3 | 1,380 | 19.1 | 728 | 0.2 | 2,285 | 9.8 | 1,833 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 18.0 | 582 | 2.1 | 1,869 | 19.4 | 1,059 | 17.8 | 861 | 2.7 | 1,830 | 35.3 | 1,095 |
| Second | 18.0 | 574 | 1.9 | 1,895 | 20.4 | 1,137 | 18.3 | 750 | 2.4 | 1,952 | 21.7 | 1,137 |
| Middle | 18.0 | 801 | 2.7 | 2,054 | 23.2 | 1,309 | 18.3 | 791 | 2.1 | 2,014 | 22.0 | 1,255 |
| Fourth | 17.8 | 856 | 5.3 | 1,918 | 29.8 | 1,244 | 18.1 | 713 | 1.2 | 2,025 | 20.9 | 1,297 |
| Highest (Richest) | 17.3 | 662 | 5.1 | 1,508 | 33.3 | 952 | 18.3 | 539 | 1.5 | 1,669 | 18.1 | 1,076 |
| Total | 17.8 | 3,475 | 3.4 | 9,244 | 25.1 | 5,701 | 18.2 | 3,655 | 2.0 | 9,489 | 23.5 | 5,860 |

Figure 7.1 Percent of youth age 15-24 who had sex before age 18 by sex: 1994, 2002, 2013

in the proportion who initiated sex before age 18 between ever married and never married youth, suggesting that the sexual activity may have prompted the union. The 41.9 percent of ever married males with early sexual initiation is nearly double that of their never married counterparts. Among females, the proportion among the ever married (42.8\%) is seven times higher than that among the never married (6.1\%).

Worth noting is the proportion of youth in NCR with early sexual initiation, particularly for males, the highest among all regions. More than 3 in 10 (36.2\%) young men in NCR began sexual activity before they turned 18 , with 6.2 percent having sex at a very young age (below 15 years old). Females in NCR also recorded a high proportion of early sexual debut at 27 percent, but this is lower than Davao Region's 30.1 percent and Caraga's 30.6 percent. However, when sexual activity of females before age 15 is examined, ARMM and Caraga stand out with 3.8 and 3.3 percent, respectively.

For both sexes, early sexual activity is more pervasive among urban than rural residents. Also notable are the divergent gender patterns of early sexual activity by educational attainment and socioeconomic status. Among males, the proportion who had sex before age 18 is positively associated with both education and socioeconomic status, but an inverse association is evident for females. In other words, early sexual initiation is more prevalent among the more educated and wealthier males, but it is the
low-educated and poorer females who recorded greater prevalence of early sexual activity.

## Premarital sexual initiation

## Premarital sexual experience

The YAFS series has also been tracking the prevalence of premarital sexual activity, defined as sex before cohabitation or formal marriage, among Filipino youth. Premarital sex per se does not pose a higher risk for early and unintended pregnancy or increase the risk for STI transmission. The concern regarding premarital sex lies on its social unacceptability in the country, as reported in an earlier chapter.

Trend data reveal a substantial upward shift in the prevalence of premarital sex, from 17.9 percent in 1994 to 32.2 percent in 2013 (Figure 7.2). With the increasing prevalence of premarital sexual activity comes a narrowing of the gap in the level between men and women. In 1994, 26.2 percent of young men had premarital sexual experience, more than double the 10.2 percent prevalence among young women. Two decades later, 35.8 percent of males and 28.7 percent of females have engaged in premarital sex, a difference of only 7 percentage points. In fact, in 2013, the prevalence of premarital sexual activity is higher for females than males in CAR ( $37.1 \%$ vs. $30.8 \%$ ) and Western Visayas (31.9\% vs. 31.7\%), as shown in Table 7.1.

Figure 7.2 Percent of youth age 15-24 with premarital sex experience by sex: 1994, 2002, 2013


It is evident in Table 7.1 that the lion's share of the young people's sexual initiations are premarital in nature. Among youth with sexual experience, 93.1 percent of males and 70.7 percent of females had their first sex prior to marriage.

Table 7.1 also presents the proportion of youth with premarital sex experience for males and females across background characteristics. The proportion of youth with premarital sex experience is much higher among the older than the younger cohort ( $61.4 \%$ vs. $19.9 \%$ for males and $48.5 \%$ vs. $14.1 \%$ for females). As expected, ever married youth reported a higher prevalence of premarital sex than never married youth. Nearly 8 in 10 ( $78.8 \%$ ) ever married males have engaged in premarital sex, while the corresponding proportion among the never married males is only 29.7 percent. Among females, the gap is even wider at 65 percent among the ever married against 10.1 percent among the never married.

Males from NCR (48.6\%) and Central Luzon (43.2\%) and females from Davao Region ( $37.7 \%$ ) and CAR (37.1\%) reported the highest levels of premarital sexual activity. ARMM, where early marriage is common, reported the lowest at 6.2 percent for males and 7.1 percent for females. Regardless of sex, premarital sex is more common in urban than rural areas. By education, the level of premarital sex is highest among high school graduates (43.6\%) and lowest among high school undergraduates (21.4\%), a pattern that is evident for both males and females. However,
the proportion with premarital sex experience is positively associated with socioeconomic status for males but not for females.

## Wantedness of first premarital sex

Respondents with premarital sex experience were asked to describe the wantedness of their first premarital sex by choosing from four scenarios: The first intercourse/contact was (1) something they wanted to happen at that time, (2) something they did not want to happen but went along with, (3) something they did not plan to happen but happened anyway, and (4) something that happened against their will. The results indicate that Filipino youth's sexual initiation is typically unplanned. Table 7.3 shows that less than half ( $46.6 \%$ ) of the youth wanted their first sex to happen at the time it did. One in five (21\%) youth said they did not want it to happen but went along with it, while 29.8 percent said they did not plan it but it happened anyway. The remaining 2.5 percent admitted that their first sex happened against their will (coercive sex).

Coercive sex is more common among females than males ( $3.8 \%$ vs. $1.5 \%$, respectively). It is also more prevalent among younger youth, Bicol and MIMAROPA residents, and the least educated compared with their counterparts.

## Protection during first premarital sex

What makes premarital sex risky is not only the age at which it first transpired but also if the sexual act is not protected from the risk of conception or STIs. Table 7.3 shows the proportion of young people who used any form of protection and the proportion who used a
condom during their premarital sexual initiation. Special attention is accorded to the condom because among all methods, it has the distinction of providing dual protection against unintended pregnancy and STIs. The condom is the method of choice for Filipino youth's sexual initiation, as it accounts for 58.3 percent of protected sexual activities.

Table 7.3 Percent distribution of wantedness of first premarital sex and percent who used protection during first premarital sex among youth 15-24 years old with premarital sex experience by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Youth whose first premarital sex was something the youth: |  |  |  |  | Youth with premarital sex experience who: |  | No. of youth who ever had premarital sex |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wanted to happen at that time | Did not want to happen but went along with | Did not plan but happened anyway | Happened against will | Total | Used any form of protection during first premarital sex | Used condom during first premarital sex |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 53.4 | 16.0 | 29.1 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 26.6 | 15.7 | 3,217 |
| Female | 38.0 | 27.5 | 30.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 16.2 | 9.2 | 2,498 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 46.1 | 22.1 | 28.7 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 21.0 | 12.0 | 1,845 |
| 20-24 | 46.9 | 20.5 | 30.4 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 22.6 | 13.3 | 3,869 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 47.6 | 18.9 | 31.2 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 27.3 | 17.7 | 3,036 |
| Ever marrried | 45.6 | 23.5 | 28.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 16.1 | 7.4 | 2,678 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 42.0 | 19.3 | 36.9 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 33.6 | 18.5 | 274 |
| Cagayan Valley | 54.9 | 22.8 | 19.8 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 13.7 | 9.3 | 162 |
| Central Luzon | 46.8 | 24.0 | 28.9 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 17.9 | 15.2 | 772 |
| CALABARZON | 51.5 | 14.5 | 32.6 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 30.9 | 17.8 | 688 |
| MIMAROPA | 38.1 | 26.8 | 30.4 | 4.8 | 100.0 | 22.8 | 10.2 | 168 |
| Bicol | 44.0 | 18.7 | 32.1 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 15.7 | 15.0 | 252 |
| Western Visayas | 53.3 | 22.2 | 20.6 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 12.4 | 10.2 | 418 |
| Central Visayas | 41.0 | 25.6 | 30.0 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 29.8 | 10.9 | 480 |
| Eastern Visayas | 49.4 | 22.7 | 25.0 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 15.9 | 10.2 | 176 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 44.7 | 20.2 | 33.7 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 6.2 | 208 |
| Northern Mindanao | 47.4 | 21.3 | 28.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 9.8 | 5.2 | 287 |
| Davao | 49.7 | 15.2 | 32.5 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 19.8 | 9.2 | 348 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 54.0 | 21.6 | 22.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 176 |
| CAR | 40.7 | 25.4 | 29.7 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 22.2 | 13.6 | 118 |
| ARMM | 61.3 | 12.9 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 9.7 | 6.5 | 31 |
| Caraga | 60.0 | 15.8 | 20.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 14.5 | 5.5 | 165 |
| NCR | 40.6 | 22.5 | 33.9 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 31.5 | 16.3 | 995 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 44.0 | 21.7 | 31.6 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 26.1 | 15.0 | 1,955 |
| Rural | 48.0 | 20.6 | 28.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 11.8 | 3,759 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 59.8 | 17.4 | 19.1 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 11.7 | 5.0 | 726 |
| High school undergraduate | 48.0 | 22.1 | 27.2 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 10.2 | 1,382 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 44.7 | 20.5 | 32.2 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 20.4 | 11.1 | 2,219 |
| College or higher | 41.5 | 22.6 | 34.2 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 22.3 | 1,387 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 50.3 | 21.6 | 24.6 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 12.0 | 5.1 | 915 |
| Second | 46.9 | 23.4 | 26.9 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 14.5 | 8.7 | 1,018 |
| Middle | 49.4 | 18.3 | 28.7 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 21.6 | 9.3 | 1,281 |
| Fourth | 41.8 | 20.9 | 35.4 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 27.6 | 15.8 | 1,376 |
| Highest (Richest) | 46.4 | 21.6 | 31.2 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 30.9 | 23.5 | 1,124 |
| Total | 46.6 | 21.0 | 29.8 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 22.1 | 12.9 | 5,714 |

Figure 7.3 Percent who used any form of protection during first premarital sex by sex: 1994, 2002, 2013


Most of the first premarital sexual encounters of Filipino youth were unprotected. Among youth with premarital sex experience, 12.9 percent used a condom during their sexual initiation while 9.2 percent used other methods, notably withdrawal. The rest (77.9\%) were unprotected. The low level of protected sex is not surprising given the generally spontaneous nature of the sexual initiation, as described earlier.

The proportion who reported using a condom during first sex is higher for males ( $15.7 \%$ ) than females ( $9.2 \%$ ), which is expected because the condom is a male-dependent method. Condom use is also higher among the older cohort of youth, the never married, and urban residents compared with their respective counterparts. Condom use at sexual initiation is more widespread among young people in Ilocos (18.5\%), CALABARZON (17.8\%), and NCR (16.3\%) and least pervasive in Northern Mindanao (5.2\%) and Caraga (5.5\%). Condom use during first sex rises with corresponding increases in the levels of educational attainment and socioeconomic status. For instance, only 1 in 20 of the least educated or the poorest youth used a condom. In contrast, more than one in five among the college educated or those belonging to the richest quintile reported condom use. The wide disparity across education categories suggests that lack of knowledge about the condom or its sources may have hindered condom use. On the other hand, the large difference in condom use between the poorest and the richest segments of the youth
population implies that more financially welloff youth are able to afford condoms and other contraceptive methods more than their poorer counterparts.

The trend data in Figure 7.3 show that the prevalence of protected sexual initiation among males has remained stable over the past 20 years, while a seesaw pattern is apparent among females. From 1994 to 2013, nearly a quarter of males age 15-24 used any form of protection during their first premarital sex. In contrast, from 8.5 percent in 1994, the proportion of females who used protection during their sexual debut climbed to 15.8 percent in 2002 but went down to 14.1 percent in 2013. The good news is the rising level of condom use during the sexual initiation of both male and female youth. Among males, the 8.9 percent level of condom use in 1994 steadily rose until 2003, when it surpassed the level of use of other methods combined ( $14.6 \%$ vs. $9.7 \%$, respectively). Among females, the rather low 1.4 percent level of condom use increased to 6.6 percent in 2002 but dipped slightly to 6.3 percent in 2013.

When asked for the main reason why the youth or their partner did not use any form of protection the first time they had premarital sex, the leading reason given was they did not expect to engage in sex at thattime. This was reported by 50.5 percent of male youth and 44.6 percent of female youth (Figure 7.4). A substantial 10.4 percent of males and 14 percent of females also admitted a lack of knowledge about contraceptives as the

Figure 7.4 Percent distribution of the main reason for non-use of protection during first premarital sex by sex

reason for their unprotected sexual initiation. In addition, 14.2 percent of males but only 3.2 percent of females felt that the sexual act would not be fun if they used contraceptives. Objection by their sexual partner was the main reason given by a sizable 12.1 percent of females and 6.6 percent of males. Nearly 9 percent of females said they wanted to get pregnant. The corresponding proportion for males who wanted to get their partners pregnant is much lower at 1 percent. A variety of other reasons were mentioned, each rarely exceeding 1 percent, but when combined constitute about one tenth of all responses. These include belief that contraceptives are wrong or dangerous to use, deficient knowledge on where to get contraceptives, firm belief that pregnancy will not happen, inability to use contraceptives because they were drunk at that time or were raped, or simply personal choice.

## Reason for first premarital sex

Meston and Buss (2007) identified a multitude of reasons why people engage in sexual intercourse. They noted significant gender differences that are also evident in the YAFS4 data. As shown in Figure 7.5, there is a considerable gender disparity in the main reason why Filipino youth engaged in sex for the first time. For a great majority ( $71.9 \%$ ) of females, expression of love is the primary motivating factor for their first sexual activity. In contrast, only 30.6 percent of males gave the same reason, and a nearly equal proportion
(27.9\%) admitted that release of sexual tension or arousal compelled them to have sex for the first time. The latter reason was reported by only 5.8 percent of females. In addition, for 21.4 percent of males and 6.7 percent of females, the desire to experience something new or curiosity about sex was the driving force behind their sexual initiation. Furthermore, a notable 9.5 percent of males and 6 percent of females were under the influence of drugs and alcohol when they first engaged in sexual intercourse, suggesting that their first sexual experience was nonconsensual in nature. Another 8.3 percent of males and 5.9 percent of females said they gave in to their partner's desire to have sex. Peer pressure was also one of the reasons mentioned by the youth, but it figured in only less than 1 percent of the young people's sexual debut. Other reasons cited for initiating sex include the desire to get themselves or their partner pregnant, to make up after a fight or misunderstanding, to escape from family problems, to prove virginity, and as a form of rebellion.

## Risky sexual behaviors

The survey elicited information on a number of other sexual activities, which if unprotected could pose a higher risk for unplanned pregnancy and contracting STIs including HIV. These are commercial sex (paying for sex and being paid in exchange for sex), casual sex, having a FUBU, coercive sex, sex with

Figure 7.5 Percent distribution of the main reason for engaging in first premarital sex by sex

multiple partners, extramarital sex, and sex between males. Commercial sex, for instance, is an important public health concern because clients of sex workers are considered important bridging groups in the transmission of STIs and HIV to wider sexual networks (Wellings et al., 2006). The proportions of youth who engaged in these risky sexual activities are presented in Table 7.4.

## Commercial sex

Commercial sex or transactional sex is defined in the study as sexual acts involving payment either in cash or in kind. The survey questions asked whether the respondent is a seeker (the respondent paid for sex) or a provider (the respondent has been paid for sex). Aside from cash, payments come in many forms, from expensive material things such as cellphones and other electronic gadgets, jewelry, clothes, perfume, and tuition fee payment to as little as cellphone load, slippers, and teddy bears. Intangibles such as assistance in doing homework are also exchanged for sexual favors.

Commercial sex activities among the young people are rather low: 1.4 percent have ever paid for sex, while 1.5 percent have been paid in exchange for sexual favors. About 3 percent of males reported having paid for or received payment for sex, while the comparable figure for females is considerably lower at less than 1 percent. Since commercial sex is illegal in
the country, there is reason to believe that the reported data may be under-reported.

Commercial sex is more common among older youth (20-24 years old) and urban residents. Both types of commercial sex activities are most common in NCR and Davao Region and least prevalent in Cagayan Valley and ARMM. There is no clear pattern in the prevalence of these sexual activities by marital status and education. A positive association is apparent, however, between socioeconomic status and the proportion who paid for sex, signifying a higher capacity to pay for such favors among the youth belonging to the highest quintile compared with their poorer counterparts.

## Casual sex and sex with a FUBU

In recent years, casual sexual relationships or sexual hook-ups, as they are called in popular media, are increasingly becoming a normative experience among adolescents and young adults, particularly among university students in Western countries (Fielder, Walsh, Carey, \& Carey, 2013; Garcia, Reiber, Massey, \& Merriweather, 2012; Wentland \& Reissing, 2014).

In the 2013 YAFS, casual sex refers to sexual activities outside the context of a romantic relationship, with no payment involved, and which happened only once or twice (e.g., onenight stand). Sexual partners in this type of sexual activity include strangers, acquaintances, neighbors, board mates, dorm mates, and friends.
Table 7.4 Percent of youth 15-24 years old who have engaged in risky sexual activities by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Youth who have: |  |  |  |  |  | No. of youth | Ever-married youth who have engaged in extramarital sex | No. of evermarried youth | Percentage of males who have sex with males (MSM) | No. of males |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ever paid for sex | Received payment for sex | Casual sex experience | A "fuck buddy" (FUBU) | Coercive sex experience | Sex with multiple partners |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 2.7 | 2.7 | 9.4 | 6.6 | 3.2 | 25.0 | 9,364 | 10.1 | 1,164 | 5.1 | 9,364 |
| Female | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 9,813 | 0.6 | 3,325 | --- | - |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 7.8 | 11,424 | 1.4 | 1,051 | 3.4 | 5,771 |
| 20-24 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 8.5 | 6.1 | 7.4 | 25.6 | 7,755 | 3.6 | 3,436 | 7.7 | 3,594 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 1.4 | 1.4 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 13.1 | 14,683 | --- | --- | 4.9 | 8,200 |
| Ever marrried | 1.4 | 1.5 | 4.7 | 3.5 | 13.2 | 21.3 | 4,496 | 3.1 | 4,489 | 6.3 | 1,166 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 0.6 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 2.9 | 5.0 | 14.8 | 941 | 3.1 | 194 | 5.1 | 473 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 8.6 | 671 | 0.0 | 176 | 1.2 | 344 |
| Central Luzon | 2.1 | 1.6 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 15.8 | 2,050 | 1.2 | 573 | 5.0 | 953 |
| CALABARZON | 1.2 | 1.3 | 6.8 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 16.2 | 2,546 | 2.8 | 528 | 6.4 | 1,243 |
| MIMAROPA | 1.8 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 5.5 | 14.4 | 563 | 2.7 | 146 | 7.1 | 283 |
| Bicol | 0.6 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 6.6 | 10.8 | 1,095 | 2.1 | 233 | 3.3 | 521 |
| Western Visayas | 1.2 | 0.9 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 12.3 | 1,486 | 1.1 | 277 | 4.2 | 764 |
| Central Visayas | 1.2 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 3.2 | 5.4 | 15.7 | 1,415 | 2.1 | 291 | 4.2 | 741 |
| Eastern Visayas | 1.1 | 0.6 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 12.4 | 829 | 0.5 | 216 | 3.5 | 426 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 1.4 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 14.7 | 729 | 1.6 | 193 | 5.4 | 373 |
| Northern Mindanao | 1.4 | 2.6 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 14.8 | 921 | 3.1 | 196 | 7.8 | 448 |
| Davao | 2.4 | 2.4 | 6.4 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 18.9 | 960 | 2.6 | 230 | 7.0 | 446 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 0.3 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 4.2 | 7.7 | 901 | 1.1 | 188 | 2.3 | 440 |
| CAR | 1.1 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 10.8 | 370 | 1.0 | 102 | 1.7 | 173 |
| ARMM | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 676 | 0.0 | 207 | 0.6 | 321 |
| Caraga | 1.0 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 6.0 | 15.6 | 520 | 1.8 | 110 | 4.5 | 266 |
| NCR | 2.4 | 2.8 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 4.8 | 24.1 | 2,507 | 11.3 | 626 | 7.9 | 1,150 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 2.0 | 2.5 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 4.6 | 21.3 | 5,228 | 6.8 | 1,216 | 7.0 | 2,398 |
| Rural | 1.1 | 1.1 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 4.3 | 12.6 | 13,949 | 1.7 | 3,272 | 4.4 | 6,967 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 1.8 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 5.2 | 15.2 | 2,653 | 1.9 | 776 | 4.9 | 1,731 |
| High school undergraduate High school graduate/ | 0.8 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 10.0 | 7,033 | 4.5 | 1,219 | 3.7 | 3,532 |
| Vocational | 1.9 | 1.7 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 6.4 | 18.6 | 5,465 | 2.3 | 1,816 | 6.5 | 2,412 |
| Vocational College or higher | 1.3 | 1.3 | 6.6 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 18.6 | 4,023 | 3.8 | 678 | 5.9 | 1,687 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 0.9 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 4.7 | 10.2 | 3,843 | 1.4 | 1,202 | 3.4 | 1,888 |
| Second | 1.0 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 4.4 | 11.5 | 3,938 | 1.0 | 911 | 5.0 | 1,917 |
| Middle | 1.6 | 1.5 | 5.0 | 3.1 | 5.1 | 16.0 | 4,172 | 3.3 | 978 | 5.3 | 2,091 |
| Fourth | 1.7 | 1.2 | 6.6 | 5.7 | 4.1 | 18.3 | 4,005 | 4.6 | 861 | 4.9 | 1,942 |
| Highest (Richest) | 1.7 | 2.2 | 7.8 | 6.0 | 3.6 | 19.6 | 3,219 | 7.3 | 534 | 7.0 | 1,527 |
| Total | 1.4 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 15.0 | 19,177 | 3.1 | 4,489 | 5.1 | 9,364 | Notes: --- Not applicable

The proportion who have engaged in casual sex is 9.4 percent among males and only 0.7 percent for females.

As mentioned earlier, a new type of sexual relationship was documented for the first time in the 2013 YAFS: nonromantic regular sexual relationships where two people who are not in a romantic relationship regularly engage in sexual intercourse. In the language of the youth, this is called "FUBU" or "FB" (short for "friends with benefits"). ${ }^{1}$ Sex with a FUBU may pose a higher vulnerability to STIs because it does not include an expectation of exclusivity in the sexual relationship. Hence, this type of arrangement carries a higher likelihood of having multiple partners for either partner. This sexual activity was reported by 3.6 percent of Filipino youth: 6.6 percent of males but only 0.7 percent of females.

For both casual sex and sex with a FUBU, the patterns across background characteristics are similar. The older youth, the urban residents, the more educated, and the economically well off exhibit a higher proportion of both casual sex and FUBU sex. Among regions, these sexual activities are most prevalent in NCR, where 8 percent have experienced casual sex and 9 percent have a FUBU.

## Coercive sex

In addition to nonconsensual sex during premarital sexual initiation (Table 7.3), the survey also asked the respondents if they have ever been forced into having sexual intercourse at any time in their lives. The results presented in Table 7.4 reveal that 4.4 percent of the youth have experienced coercive sex. This risky sexual behavior has the distinction of being the only one in which females outnumber the males (5.5\% vs. $3.2 \%$, respectively). However, like the other risky sexual behaviors, the older youth, the ever married, and the urban residents recorded a higher prevalence compared with their counterparts. In terms of geographic variation, the proportion
with coercive sex is highest in Bicol (6.6\%) and Caraga (6\%) and lowest in Central Luzon (2.1\%). There is no distinct pattern in the level of coercive sex experience across educational attainment and socioeconomic status gradients.

## Sex with multiple partners

The proportion of youth who have engaged in sex with multiple partners measures the lifetime number of sexual partners. It is derived from responses to several questions asking for the number of sexual partners for each type of risky sexual behavior and whether the respondents have engaged in sex with someone other than their first partner. It should be noted that the data do not capture whether the sexual partnerships are concurrent (overlapping in time) or serial (one partner at a time). The former allows for a more rapid spread of STIs than the latter.

Table 7.4 shows that sexual monogamy remains the dominant pattern among Filipino youth, with only 15 percent reporting having more than one sexual partner. Multiple partnership is five times more prevalent among males than females ( $25 \%$ vs. $5.5 \%$, respectively), lending support to the widely held belief that men are naturally polygamous. This finding comes as no surprise within the context of Philippine society, where the double standard of morality in sexual aspects privileges men (Medina, 2015). Having numerous "sexual conquests" among men is proof of their masculinity and enhances their reputation (Meston \& Buss, 2007), whereas females with large numbers of sexual partners are often viewed in a negative light and labeled as "flirts" or "loose women."

Huge disparities are also apparent in other background characteristics. Older youth, who have had presumably more opportunity to engage in sex with a greater number of partners compared with their more junior counterparts, exhibit a higher preponderance of multiple partnership. A quarter of the youth in the ages 15-24 and only

[^19]7.8 percent of those in the ages 15-19 reported multiple sexual partners. By marital status, one fifth (21.3\%) of the ever married youth have engaged in sex with more than one partner, while the corresponding proportion for the never married is lower at 13.1 percent. It should be noted that for ever married youth, the sexual partners include those that they have interacted with prior to the marriage or cohabitation.

The prevalence of multiple partnership is highest in NCR (24.1\%) and lowest in ARMM (3\%). This pattern is also evident in the urban-rural divide, wherein 21.3 percent of urban residents as against 12.6 percent of rural residents reported having sex with more than one partner. Higher proportions of multiple sexual partnership are also found among better-educated youth than those with lower educational attainment. By socioeconomic status, the proportion of multiple partnership monotonically increases from 10.2 percent among the poorest to 19.6 percent among the richest group of youth.

## Extramarital sex

One form of concurrent multiple partnership is extramarital sex, defined as engaging in sexual intercourse with someone other than one's spouse or live-in partner while still married or cohabiting. In extramarital sex, the risk of acquiring STI and HIV infections is greater, as it extends to a wider sexual network consisting of the unfaithful spouses and their marital and extramarital partners. Medina (2015) noted that extramarital sex is more strongly condemned in the country than premarital sex because it does not only disrupt an ongoing marriage but also affects the married individuals, their children, and other family members.

This risky sexual behavior was reported by 3.1 percent of all youth, with the prevalence among males 10 times higher compared with females ( $10.1 \%$ vs. $0.6 \%$, respectively). As a subset of sex with multiple partners, the differentials of extramarital sex experience across the youth's background characteristics mimic those of the former.

The differentials by specific marital status categories are not shown in Table 7.4, but the pattern validates the instability of cohabitation. Young people in a living-in arrangement are more susceptible to extramarital sex, as 4.2 percent admitted having extramarital sex experience. In contrast, only 0.9 percent of formally married youth have a concurrent sexual partner apart from their spouses. The youth who have been separated from their spouses or live-in partners reported the highest proportion of extramarital sex experience at 6.4 percent, which suggests that the extramarital affair may have been the cause of the separation.

## Males who have sex with males

One of the sexual behaviors tracked by YAFS that is specific to males is same-sex activity or "men who have sex with men" (MSM). According to the UNAIDS Action Framework (Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, 2009b), the term refers to males who have sex with other males, regardless of whether they have sex with women or have a personal or social identity associated with that behavior, such as being "gay" or "bisexual." It is of value to track this behavior because it poses a heightened risk for STIs, especially HIV, if unprotected. MSM is one of the sectors of the population with a rapidly growing incidence of HIV infection in the Philippines since 2008 (Philippine National AIDS Council, 2014). Consequently, young, sexually active men who have sex with men are now considered the core transmitters of the HIV epidemic in the country (Ross et al., 2013).

Table 7.4 shows that 5.1 percent of males have engaged in sex with a fellow male. This practice is most prevalent in NCR (7.9\%) and Northern Mindanao (7.8\%) and least common in ARMM (0.6\%) and Cagayan Valley (1.2\%). Similar to other types of risky sexual activities, more of the 20-24-year-olds and urban males have engaged in sex with another male than their respective counterparts. MSM is more common among ever married males (6.3\%) than never married males (4.9\%), while there is no discernible pattern in

Figure 7.6 Percent of youth 15-24 years old who have engaged in risky sexual activities by sex: 2002 and 2013

this practice across males' educational attainment or socioeconomic status categories.

## Change in risky sexual behavior over time

Comparable data on selected risky sexual behavior for 2002 and 2013 are depicted in Figure 7.6. Data from the past two survey years reveal a decline in the levels of commercial sex activities among males but an increase in multiple sex and extramarital sex. In 2013, 2.7 percent of males reported having paid for sex, about half of the level found in 2002. The proportion of males who received payment for sex, meanwhile, recorded a slight decline from 3.9 to 2.7 percent. For females, the prevalence of commercial sex is too low for a meaningful analysis.

An upsurge in the proportion with multiple sex partners is observed for both men and women. Males recorded a considerable increase, from 17.4 percent in 2002 to 25 percent in 2013. A more modest increase is evident for females, from 2 to 5.5 percent in the same period. For extramarital sex, the proportions changed slightly between

2002 and 2013 but in opposite directions for men and women.

## Unprotected sex during risky sexual activities

Although the prevalence of the risky sexual activities described earlier may be on the low side, it is still a cause for concern because most young people engage in these activities without protection against the risk of unintended pregnancy and contracting STIs. For example, among males who have ever paid for sex, only 28.6 percent reported using a condom every time they paid for sex in the past 12 months before the survey (Figure 7.7). Among male youth who were paid in exchange for sexual favors, only 11 percent reported consistent condom use in the past 12 months prior to the survey. Those who engaged in casual sex reported higher levels of protected sex. Of those with casual sex experience, 53.8 percent used a condom the last time they had casual sex. The same level is recorded among males with FUBU sex. Extramarital sex activities are likewise mostly unprotected. Three in 10 males used a

Figure 7.7 Percent of males 15-24 years old who used a condom during risky sexual activities

condom the last time they engaged in sex with their extramarital partner.

## Summary and conclusions

The 2013 YAFS provides a rich source of information on various facets of the sexual behavior of Filipino youth. The results indicate a heightened, bolder, and wider range of sexual behavior among the young. Trend data reveal that Filipino youth are increasingly becoming sexually active at an early age. Coupled with the delay in entry into marital union, it comes as no surprise that a growing proportion of youth are engaging in sex prior to marriage. What compounds the rising level of premarital sex is the low and unchanging level of first sexual encounters that are protected from unintended conception and STIs.

Sexual risk taking among the youth is becoming more pervasive, but contrary to general perceptions, the increase over time is quite modest. Recent years have witnessed the emergence of new forms of sexual interactions outside of committed relationships, such as sex with a FUBU. Sex with multiple partners registered the highest prevalence at 15 percent, while commercial sex, casual sex, sex with a FUBU, coercive sex, extramarital sex, and MSM all recorded singledigit levels. Although the proportions may be on the low side, when translated to absolute terms, this amounts to millions of young Filipinos who are potentially at risk of adverse consequences, especially in the context of low prevalence of the use of protection.

The established gender variation of sexual behavior is substantiated by the findings. Males are more sexually adventurous, as evidenced by the higher proportions who engage in risky sexual activities compared with females. It is only in coercive sex that females outnumber males. While some risky sexual behavior remains the domain of men, the narrowing gap in early sexual initiation and premarital sex points to increasing feminization of these sexual behaviors. This does not bode well, as the costs of such sexual activities are higher for females, particularly concerning pregnancy risks.

The findings also highlight distinct regional differences suggesting the possible influence of modernization and easy access to new technologies. The regional variation paints a picture of two extreme regions. Young people in NCR consistently reported the highest prevalence of risky sexual behavior among all regions, while the youth of ARMM repeatedly reported the lowest. A similar scenario is evident for premarital sex, with young people from ARMM exhibiting the lowest preponderance, largely due to the high prevalence of early marriage.

The differentials by other background characteristics reveal expected findings. That various sexual activities manifest at higher levels among the older cohort of youth is not surprising, as youth in the 20-24 age bracket have had longer exposure to these activities than those in the 15-19 age group. Urban-rural differentials are consistent with the regional findings. Generally, education and socioeconomic status show a
positive association with risky sexual behavior, with the prevalence higher among the more educated and better-off youth. The same direction of association, however, is evident in the use of protection, particularly condoms, suggesting that risks are minimized.

The findings altogether demonstrate the extent of the young people's vulnerability to unintended pregnancy and STI transmission. They underscore the need for sexual and reproductive health interventions for this important segment of the population.
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# Fertility and Fertility Preferences 

Josefina N. Natividad<br>Maria Paz N. Marquez

The first survey in the YAFS series conducted in 1982 was designed as a fertility study on young women aged 15-24. Only in the second YAFS conducted in 1994 was the topic of sexuality included and the sample expanded to include male youth. Beginning in 1994, the YAFS results came to be associated more with sexuality than fertility. In this report on the 2013 YAFS, we reintroduce a focus on fertility in this age group, especially in light of the findings that fertility in the early childbearing years has been on the rise.

In describing the fertility of the youth, it is important to keep in mind that young adulthood covers two distinct age groups when it comes to childbearing. Generally, in the teen years, which include the ages $15-19$, childbearing is considered too early and fraught with risk, both to mother and child (Natividad, 2013). Meanwhile, ages 20-24 mark the beginning of childbearing for most women. At these ages, childbearing is considered more biologically sound as well as culturally more acceptable in contrast to the teen years. Thus, there is typically a sharp increase in childbearing from late teenhood to the early 20s. To illustrate, results of the 2013 National Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) show that the age-specific fertility rate (ASFR) of women aged 15-19 is 57 births per thousand women. In comparison, the ASFR among 20-24-year-old women was 148 births per thousand women (Philippine Statistics Authority \& ICF International, 2014). Therefore, in reading about youth fertility, which spans the
ages $15-24$, one must be aware of this important distinction.

The YAFS4 provides a rich source of data on youth fertility based on the pregnancy history of all women regardless of marital status. The pregnancy history collected detailed information on pregnancy intention; the child's sex, age, date of birth, date of pregnancy termination, and survival status; and prenatal, delivery, postnatal, and breastfeeding practices for each pregnancy and birth of the women. The main measure we use to describe youth fertility is the proportion of women who have begun childbearing. This refers to women who have had a birth plus women who were pregnant with their first child at the time of the survey. Through this measure, we can better describe the timing of childbearing because a woman (or more specifically, her experience of the first birth) is counted only once unlike the ASFR where a woman can contribute more than one birth (Singh, 1998).

## Pregnancy and motherhood among young adults

Table 8.1 presents information on women 15-24 years old who have begun childbearing by background characteristics. Nearly one third of these young women have commenced childbearing, of which 29.4 percent have had a live birth and 3 percent are pregnant with their first child. As mentioned earlier, the early 20s mark the onset of most Filipino women's reproductive life; this is substantiated by the survey results.

The majority (57.8\%) of the 20-24-year olds have begun childbearing, while the corresponding figure for their more junior counterparts is only 13.7 percent. Since a marital union provides a steady sexual partner, higher exposure to the risk of pregnancy is expected among women who are married or in a consensual union. The data lend support to this, as high proportions

Table 8.1 Percent of females who have had a live birth, pregnant with first child and have begun childbearing by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Have had a live birth | Are pregnant with first child |  | No. of Females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 11.0 | 2.6 | 13.7 | 5,653 |
| 20-24 | 54.4 | 3.4 | 57.8 | 4,160 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 4.0 | 0.6 | 4.7 | 6,483 |
| Living-in | 75.9 | 9.8 | 85.6 | 1,912 |
| Formally married | 83.8 | 5.0 | 88.8 | 1,246 |
| Separated/Widowed | 76.3 | 1.1 | 76.9 | 173 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 25.2 | 3.0 | 28.0 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 33.1 | 4.3 | 37.4 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 32.2 | 3.9 | 36.1 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 24.6 | 2.2 | 26.7 | 1,305 |
| MIMAROPA | 30.5 | 3.2 | 33.7 | 279 |
| Bicol | 27.2 | 2.1 | 29.4 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 28.5 | 4.7 | 33.3 | 723 |
| Central Visayas | 27.6 | 2.2 | 29.7 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 33.0 | 2.5 | 35.3 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 35.2 | 2.5 | 37.7 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 32.3 | 3.4 | 35.7 | 474 |
| Davao | 34.6 | 2.9 | 37.5 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 27.6 | 3.3 | 31.0 | 461 |
| CAR | 37.6 | 3.1 | 40.4 | 198 |
| ARMM | 29.4 | 1.7 | 31.1 | 354 |
| Caraga | 30.6 | 3.1 | 33.9 | 254 |
| NCR | 28.2 | 2.7 | 31.0 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 28.7 | 2.6 | 31.3 | 2,831 |
| Rural | 29.7 | 3.1 | 32.8 | 6,982 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 43.0 | 3.8 | 46.7 | 922 |
| High school undergraduate | 21.1 | 2.1 | 23.2 | 3,503 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 41.6 | 3.9 | 45.5 | 3,053 |
| College or higher | 20.7 | 2.7 | 23.4 | 2,336 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 39.5 | 3.3 | 42.8 | 1,953 |
| Second | 31.8 | 2.9 | 34.7 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 29.5 | 3.3 | 32.8 | 2,081 |
| Fourth | 25.7 | 2.9 | 28.6 | 2,064 |
| Highest (Richest) | 19.4 | 2.4 | 21.8 | 1,693 |
| Total | 29.4 | 3.0 | 32.4 | 9,813 |

(85.6\% among women in a living-in arrangement and $88.8 \%$ among formally married women) have started childbearing compared with only 4.7 percent among never married women.

By place of residence, there is very little difference in the proportion who have begun childbearing between urban (31.3\%) and rural (32.8\%) women. However, across regions, the proportion ranges from a low of 26.7 percent in CALABARZON to a high of 40.4 percent in CAR. There is no clear pattern in the proportion who have begun childbearing across education categories, but socioeconomic status, a variable that the literature consistently shows to exert a significant influence on fertility behavior, displays an inverse association. From 42.8 percent among the poorest group of women, the proportion who have begun childbearing is down to half (21.8\%) among women in the richest quintile.

In addition to the proportion of women who have begun childbearing, another important indicator of youth fertility is the proportion who have ever been pregnant. It must be noted that the latter measure will always result in a higher level compared with the former, since it includes women whose pregnancy did not result in a live birth. The results in Table 8.2 show that 33.5 percent of women 15-24 years old have ever been pregnant, about one percentage point higher than the proportion who have begun childbearing. This difference implies that at least 1 percent of women have experienced a pregnancy that ended either in a spontaneous or induced abortion or in a non-live birth. As expected, the patterns in the proportion of women who have ever been pregnant across the different background characteristics mirror that of the proportion who have begun childbearing.

Of particular interest in Table 8.2 is the proportion of women who have had three or more pregnancies. In the absence of contraceptive practice, we would expect these young women to eventually end up with a large family size, as they are still at the starting point of their childbearing period yet have already had three or more pregnancies. Overall, 2.7 percent
of women 15-24 years old have had at least three pregnancies. This percentage is highest in ARMM and Eastern Visayas, both high-fertility regions, where 7.1 percent and 5.2 percent of women, respectively, have already had three or more pregnancies. Among formally married
women, a sizeable 11.4 percent have already been pregnant at least three times.

Table 8.2 also presents the proportion of women who were pregnant at the time of the interview ("currently pregnant"), which measures not only fertility but also fecundity or

Table 8.2 Percent distribution of females by number of pregnancies and percent who have been pregnant and currently pregnant by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | No. of pregnancies ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  | Have ever been pregnant | Are currently pregnant | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 or more | Total |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 85.6 | 12.0 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 14.4 | 3.5 | 5,653 |
| 20-24 | 40.6 | 34.4 | 18.8 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 59.4 | 8.2 | 4,161 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 95.2 | 4.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 6,483 |
| Living-in | 11.3 | 57.9 | 24.8 | 5.9 | 100.0 | 88.7 | 16.8 | 1,912 |
| Formally married | 9.0 | 49.8 | 29.7 | 11.4 | 100.0 | 91.0 | 13.6 | 1,245 |
| Separated/Widowed | 15.0 | 57.2 | 23.1 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 85.0 | 2.9 | 173 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 70.4 | 21.3 | 7.5 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 29.6 | 4.3 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 61.3 | 25.5 | 11.0 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 38.7 | 8.3 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 62.6 | 23.3 | 11.9 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 37.3 | 6.3 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 72.4 | 16.6 | 7.9 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 27.6 | 5.9 | 1,304 |
| MIMAROPA | 63.9 | 24.6 | 7.9 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 35.7 | 5.7 | 280 |
| Bicol | 69.3 | 17.9 | 9.4 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 30.5 | 4.0 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 65.9 | 23.4 | 8.3 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 34.2 | 7.1 | 722 |
| Central Visayas | 68.5 | 22.3 | 8.2 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 31.5 | 5.5 | 674 |
| Eastern Visayas | 63.3 | 21.3 | 10.2 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 36.8 | 6.5 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 61.7 | 23.1 | 11.3 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 38.6 | 5.3 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 63.5 | 24.7 | 11.0 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 36.6 | 4.4 | 474 |
| Davao | 61.9 | 25.6 | 9.9 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 38.1 | 6.4 | 515 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 68.7 | 21.5 | 7.6 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 31.3 | 4.3 | 460 |
| CAR | 58.8 | 28.1 | 10.1 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 41.1 | 4.6 | 199 |
| ARMM | 68.6 | 13.0 | 11.3 | 7.1 | 100.0 | 31.4 | 7.4 | 354 |
| Caraga | 64.7 | 22.7 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 35.0 | 5.9 | 255 |
| NCR | 67.7 | 21.1 | 8.1 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 32.3 | 3.6 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 67.5 | 21.6 | 8.2 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 32.5 | 4.4 | 2,831 |
| Rural | 66.1 | 21.4 | 9.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 33.9 | 5.9 | 6,983 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 51.1 | 24.9 | 16.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 | 48.8 | 9.3 | 921 |
| High school undergraduate | 75.8 | 13.9 | 7.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 24.2 | 3.8 | 3,503 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 53.1 | 31.8 | 11.9 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 46.9 | 7.6 | 3,053 |
| College or higher | 76.2 | 17.9 | 5.1 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 23.8 | 3.6 | 2,336 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 55.7 | 23.7 | 15.3 | 5.3 | 100.0 | 44.2 | 7.8 | 1,954 |
| Second | 64.2 | 22.7 | 11.1 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 35.8 | 5.7 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 66.2 | 22.5 | 8.1 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 33.8 | 6.9 | 2,082 |
| Fourth | 70.6 | 21.2 | 6.4 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 29.3 | 3.7 | 2,063 |
| Highest (Richest) | 77.1 | 16.7 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 22.9 | 3.0 | 1,692 |
| Total | 66.5 | 21.5 | 9.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 33.5 | 5.5 | 9,813 |

[^20]the capacity to bear children. This is an important fertility measure because when translated to absolute terms, it provides an indication of the demand for maternal and infant health services and facilities at a given time, particularly since early pregnancy is associated with increased health risk for both mother and child.

Overall, 5.5 percent of women 15-24 years old are currently pregnant. This proportion ranges from a low of 3.6 percent in NCR to a high of 8.3 percent in Cagayan Valley. This proportion likewise varies considerably according to women's other background characteristics. There are more than twice as many pregnant women among the 20-24-year-old women compared with women in the younger ages (8.2\% vs. $3.5 \%$, respectively). While a negligible 0.7 percent of never married women were pregnant at the time of the interview, the corresponding figures are 16.8 percent and 13.6 percent among living-in women and formally married women, respectively. Disaggregation by educational attainment and socioeconomic status also shows a wide disparity between the lowest and highest categories, but there is no clear general pattern.

## Age at first birth

Age at first birth is an important fertility indicator because it signals the start of a woman's reproductive career. Postponing the first birth typically shortens the duration of the childbearing period, which can contribute to the decline of the total fertility rate. Table 8.3 presents the percent distribution of women's age at first birth categorized into three: below 18 years, $18-19$ years, and $20-24$ years. The table also shows the median age at first birth, which represents the age by which half of the women have experienced giving birth.

Among females aged 15-24 who have given birth, the median age at first birth is 19.3 years, a full year older than the median age at sexual initiation (median age of 18.2 years at first sex) as reported in the preceding chapter. More than a quarter (26.3\%) had their first birth before they turned 18, 37.3 percent between the ages of 18
and 19 and 36.4 percent after their teens (ages 20-24). Among 15-19-year-old women who have given birth, three in five bore a child before they turned 18, while the corresponding proportion among the 20-24 year olds is much lower at 17 percent. For the latter group, a high 46.5 percent had their first birth in their 20s.

Differentials by marital status exhibited a somewhat surprising finding. The formerly married (separated/widowed) reported the earliest commencement of childbearing, with 32.3 percent having given birth before age 18 and a median age at first birth of 18.9 years. In comparison, the median age at first birth among the formally married is higher by about half a year (19.5 years).

Among all regions, ARMM and Caraga have the lowest median age at first birth (18.9 years) while Bicol and CAR have the highest (19.7 years), followed by MIMAROPA (19.6 years). Delayed childbearing among Bicol and CAR youth is also manifested in the low proportions who gave birth before age 18 ( $19 \%$ and $15.1 \%$, respectively). In contrast, a third of NCR and ARMM female youth bore a child before they turned 18.

Urban-rural differentials show a slightly higher median age at first birth among rural women (19.3 years) relative to urban women (19.2 years). The median age at first birth monotonically increases with increasing educational attainment, from 17.9 years among women who did not reach high school to 20.1 years among those who have reached college. There is no clear variation in the age at first birth by socioeconomic status. However, women belonging to the lowest quintile recorded the earliest median age at first birth of 18.8 years. Also worth noting is that one in three of young women in the lowest quintile gave birth before age 18, much higher than the proportions for their economically better-off counterparts.

## Teenage fertility

In this section, we present the fertility experience of the 15-19-year-old women. As
noted earlier in this chapter, childbearing in the teen years is known to be associated with higher risks both to mother and child compared to childbearing in the 20s. A high teenage fertility rate is thus considered a cause for concern and calls for public health intervention.

Among women aged 15-19 at the time of the survey, the YAFS4 results show that 14.4 percent have ever been pregnant. Over the 20 -year period covered by the YAFS, this percentage rose dramatically only in the last 10 years, doubling from 6.9 percent in 2002 to its

Table 8.3 Percent distribution of females who have given birth by age at first birth and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age at first birth |  |  |  |  | No. of females who have ever given birth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 18 | 18-19 | 20-24 | Total | Median |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 60.2 | 39.8 | --- | 100.0 | 17.7 | 613 |
| 20-24 | 17.0 | 36.6 | 46.5 | 100.0 | 19.8 | 2,227 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 25.3 | 37.2 | 37.5 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 261 |
| Living-in | 20.8 | 35.6 | 43.6 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 1,033 |
| Formally married | 30.0 | 38.6 | 31.4 | 100.0 | 19.5 | 1,414 |
| Separated/Widowed | 32.3 | 35.4 | 32.3 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 130 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 23.9 | 38.5 | 37.6 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 117 |
| Cagayan Valley | 27.5 | 32.4 | 40.2 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 102 |
| Central Luzon | 22.8 | 35.7 | 41.5 | 100.0 | 19.5 | 342 |
| CALABARZON | 24.6 | 38.2 | 37.2 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 317 |
| MIMAROPA | 18.5 | 35.8 | 45.7 | 100.0 | 19.6 | 81 |
| Bicol | 19.0 | 39.9 | 41.2 | 100.0 | 19.7 | 153 |
| Western Visayas | 29.5 | 29.5 | 41.1 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 207 |
| Central Visayas | 23.9 | 37.5 | 38.6 | 100.0 | 19.4 | 184 |
| Eastern Visayas | 28.0 | 34.1 | 37.9 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 132 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 26.6 | 40.3 | 33.1 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 124 |
| Northern Mindanao | 19.7 | 45.4 | 34.9 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 152 |
| Davao | 32.6 | 31.5 | 36.0 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 178 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 26.8 | 38.6 | 34.6 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 127 |
| CAR | 15.1 | 41.1 | 43.8 | 100.0 | 19.7 | 73 |
| ARMM | 33.3 | 30.5 | 36.2 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 105 |
| Caraga | 27.4 | 38.4 | 34.2 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 73 |
| NCR | 34.2 | 42.2 | 23.5 | 100.0 | 19.0 | 374 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 27.5 | 40.8 | 31.8 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 800 |
| Rural | 25.8 | 35.9 | 38.3 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 2,040 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 49.9 | 29.7 | 20.5 | 100.0 | 17.9 | 391 |
| High school undergraduate | 39.0 | 38.3 | 22.7 | 100.0 | 18.5 | 731 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 17.9 | 39.1 | 42.9 | 100.0 | 19.6 | 1,237 |
| College or higher | 9.6 | 36.8 | 53.6 | 100.0 | 20.1 | 481 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 33.7 | 38.0 | 28.3 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 763 |
| Second | 23.2 | 39.7 | 37.0 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 624 |
| Middle | 22.9 | 32.6 | 44.5 | 100.0 | 19.6 | 607 |
| Fourth | 24.3 | 41.0 | 34.7 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 522 |
| Highest (Richest) | 24.4 | 33.3 | 42.3 | 100.0 | 19.5 | 324 |
| Total | 26.3 | 37.3 | 36.4 | 100.0 | 19.3 | 2,840 |

[^21]14.4 percent level in 2013 (Figure 8.1). ${ }^{1}$ Between 1994 and 2002, the percentage of women who have ever been pregnant hardly changed (7.1 percent in 1994 vs. 6.9 percent in 2002).

In Figure 8.2 we show the prevalence of early childbearing, i.e., the percentage of women aged 15-19 at the time of the survey who had begun childbearing. Comparing 2002 and 2013 results indicates that the prevalence of early childbearing more than doubled in the 10 -year period from 6.3 percent in 2002 to 13.6 percent in 2013. The latter is broken down to 11 percent who were already mothers and 2.6 percent who were pregnant with their first child when they were interviewed.

Table 8.4 and Table 8.5 show the fertility profile of 15-19 year olds across background characteristics. Again, two measures of fertility are shown: the proportion who have begun childbearing and the proportion who have ever
been pregnant. The difference between these two measures is an indicator of pregnancy loss. Broken down into single years, results in Table 8.4 show that the prevalence of early childbearing begins at a low level of 1.7 percent at age 15 , rising dramatically by ages 17,18 and 19 . Among 19-year olds, 35.1 percent had already begun childbearing. Comparing across the woman's marital status, 2.2 percent of $15-19$-year-old women who were never married at the time of the survey have begun childbearing. The percentage increases considerably to 78 percent among teens in a consensual union or livingin arrangement and to 81.8 percent among the formally married. Even at this young age, a number of teens reported their marital status to be separated/widowed. Of this group, 53.5 percent have begun childbearing.

The two regions highest on the list in the two teenage fertility indicators are Cagayan

Figure 8.1 Percent of females age 15-19 who have ever been pregnant: 1994, 2002, 2013


[^22]Table 8.4 Percent of females age 15-19 who have had a live birth, pregnant with first child, and who have begun childbearing by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Have had a live birth | Are pregnant with first child | Have begun childbearing | No. of females age 15-19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 1,261 |
| 16 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 1,173 |
| 17 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 10.4 | 1,222 |
| 18 | 18.9 | 4.0 | 23.0 | 1,049 |
| 19 | 29.9 | 5.4 | 35.1 | 948 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 1.6 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 4,789 |
| Living-in | 61.9 | 16.3 | 78.0 | 651 |
| Formally married | 70.8 | 10.7 | 81.8 | 171 |
| Separated/Widowed | 48.8 | 4.7 | 53.5 | 43 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 10.6 | 2.5 | 12.7 | 284 |
| Cagayan Valley | 14.9 | 3.2 | 18.1 | 187 |
| Central Luzon | 11.4 | 3.7 | 15.1 | 544 |
| CALABARZON | 7.1 | 1.0 | 8.1 | 785 |
| MIMAROPA | 10.3 | 1.9 | 12.3 | 155 |
| Bicol | 7.3 | 1.2 | 8.8 | 328 |
| Western Visayas | 10.9 | 4.3 | 15.1 | 403 |
| Central Visayas | 11.2 | 1.9 | 13.1 | 427 |
| Eastern Visayas | 9.7 | 2.1 | 11.8 | 238 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 13.5 | 2.7 | 16.3 | 185 |
| Northern Mindanao | 10.9 | 2.5 | 13.1 | 284 |
| Davao | 13.6 | 3.1 | 16.7 | 288 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 10.3 | 3.3 | 13.7 | 301 |
| CAR | 15.5 | 2.1 | 18.4 | 98 |
| ARMM | 10.8 | 1.0 | 11.8 | 195 |
| Caraga | 13.1 | 3.8 | 17.4 | 161 |
| NCR | 13.9 | 3.8 | 17.7 | 793 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 12.0 | 3.0 | 14.9 | 1,623 |
| Rural | 10.7 | 2.5 | 13.2 | 4,031 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 22.9 | 3.3 | 26.1 | 525 |
| High school undergraduate | 7.9 | 1.9 | 9.8 | 2,818 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 18.9 | 4.4 | 23.3 | 1,221 |
| College or higher | 4.6 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 1,089 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 15.8 | 2.7 | 18.5 | 1,114 |
| Second | 11.6 | 2.6 | 14.1 | 1,203 |
| Middle | 10.3 | 3.3 | 13.6 | 1,199 |
| Fourth | 9.5 | 2.3 | 11.9 | 1,187 |
| Highest (Richest) | 7.6 | 2.3 | 9.9 | 951 |
| Total | 11.0 | 2.7 | 13.7 | 5,654 |

Valley and CAR. Cagayan has the highest percentage of teens who have ever been pregnant (19.1\%; Table 8.5) while CAR has the highest proportion who have begun childbearing at age 15-19 (18.4\%; Table 8.4). Considering that CAR also has the highest median age at first birth and the lowest proportion of women whose first birth occurred below age 18 among all regions, these imply that while CAR has the highest proportion of women who have begun childbearing at ages $15-19$, the teenage births are actually concentrated in the late teen years (i.e., ages 18 and 19). By either measure, teen fertility is lowest in Bicol and CALABARZON, both at less than 10 percent of teenage women.

More women residing in urban areas have begun childbearing compared with rural residents. By education, women with elementarylevel schooling have the highest prevalence of early childbearing (26.1\%), followed by high school graduates (23.3\%). Those with collegelevel education have the lowest at 7 percent. High school undergraduates have a relatively low level of teen childbearing mainly because this group is composed mostly of those who are still in high school. The pattern by socioeconomic status indicates a clear gradient, with those belonging to the poorest quintile having the highest proportions who have either gotten pregnant (19.7\%) or begun childbearing (18.5\%), and those belonging to the highest quintile having the lowest ( $10.3 \%$ and $9.9 \%$ respectively). In between, the proportion steadily decreases with an increase in socioeconomic status.

Comparing the difference between the proportion who have had a pregnancy (Table 8.5) and the proportion who have begun childbearing (Table 8.4) across background characteristics, the difference is lowest among 15 -year-olds compared with other ages. Those who are separated have the highest difference (9.3 percentage points), while there is no difference among the never married. Those who belong to the lowest education level and the poorest quintile have the biggest difference between the proportions who have ever been pregnant and have begun childbearing; otherwise, there

Table 8.5 Percent distribution of females age 15-19 years by number of pregnancies and percent who have been pregnant and currently pregnant by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | No. of pregnancies ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Have ever been pregnant | Are currently pregnant | No. of females age 15-19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 or more | Total |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 98.2 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 1,260 |
| 16 | 95.5 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 4.5 | 1.4 | 1,176 |
| 17 | 88.5 | 9.6 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 11.5 | 3.2 | 1,218 |
| 18 | 75.7 | 20.4 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 24.3 | 6.0 | 1,050 |
| 19 | 63.8 | 29.0 | 7.3 | 100.0 | 36.2 | 7.5 | 949 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 97.8 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 4,788 |
| Living-in | 17.5 | 66.8 | 15.7 | 100.0 | 82.5 | 21.7 | 651 |
| Formally married | 15.2 | 69.6 | 15.2 | 100.0 | 84.8 | 16.0 | 171 |
| Separated/Widowed | 37.2 | 44.2 | 18.6 | 100.0 | 62.8 | 7.0 | 43 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 87.0 | 11.6 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 2.5 | 284 |
| Cagayan Valley | 80.9 | 13.3 | 5.9 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 5.3 | 188 |
| Central Luzon | 84.0 | 11.9 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 16.0 | 5.3 | 544 |
| CALABARZON | 91.2 | 7.5 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 8.8 | 2.0 | 785 |
| MIMAROPA | 85.2 | 12.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 14.8 | 3.2 | 155 |
| Bicol | 90.5 | 7.6 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 9.5 | 2.1 | 327 |
| Western Visayas | 83.7 | 12.6 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 16.3 | 5.8 | 404 |
| Central Visayas | 85.4 | 14.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 14.6 | 2.1 | 426 |
| Eastern Visayas | 87.4 | 9.7 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 12.6 | 3.0 | 238 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 83.2 | 14.1 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 16.8 | 3.3 | 185 |
| Northern Mindanao | 85.9 | 13.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 14.1 | 2.5 | 283 |
| Davao | 83.0 | 14.6 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 17.0 | 4.5 | 288 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 86.3 | 12.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 13.7 | 3.3 | 300 |
| CAR | 81.6 | 16.3 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 18.4 | 3.1 | 98 |
| ARMM | 88.1 | 7.2 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 11.9 | 2.1 | 194 |
| Caraga | 82.0 | 14.9 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 18.0 | 5.6 | 161 |
| NCR | 82.0 | 15.1 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 18.0 | 3.8 | 793 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 84.6 | 12.8 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 15.4 | 3.5 | 1,623 |
| Rural | 86.0 | 11.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 14.0 | 3.5 | 4,030 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 71.6 | 20.0 | 8.4 | 100.0 | 28.4 | 6.2 | 525 |
| High school undergraduate | 89.6 | 8.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 10.4 | 2.3 | 2,817 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 75.8 | 21.2 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 24.2 | 5.8 | 1,221 |
| College or higher | 92.9 | 6.9 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 7.1 | 2.5 | 1,089 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 80.3 | 16.4 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 19.7 | 4.1 | 1,113 |
| Second | 85.0 | 11.6 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 15.0 | 3.7 | 1,203 |
| Middle | 85.5 | 11.9 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 14.5 | 4.6 | 1,198 |
| Fourth | 88.0 | 10.5 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 12.0 | 2.4 | 1,187 |
| Highest (Richest) | 89.7 | 9.1 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 10.3 | 2.4 | 952 |
| Total | 85.6 | 12.0 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 14.4 | 3.5 | 5,653 |

Note: a Including current pregnancy
is no consistent pattern by education and socioeconomic status.

While it is risky enough to have begun childbearing in the teen years, having more than one pregnancy at this young age subjects the young woman to repeated risks. In Table 8.5 we show the results on the experience of repeat pregnancies during the teen years, based on data from the 15-19 year old respondents. Overall, 2.4 percent of women 15-19 years old have been pregnant more than once. By background characteristics, the proportion who have experienced more than one pregnancy is highest among the 19-year old women (7.3\%), separated/ widowed (18.6\%), women from Cagayan Valley (5.9\%), urban residents (2.6\%), women with no schooling or those who have reached only the elementary level (8.4\%) and women belonging to the second quintile (3.4\%).

## Male teen fertility

In the study of fertility in general and teen fertility in particular, an often-overlooked topic is the issue of early fatherhood. In this report, we present the experience of teen males with regard to early childbearing in the form of the proportion of 15-19-year-old males who reported that they have gotten someone pregnant. Unlike teenage childbearing, this measure is prone to bias, as men may not always know whether they have gotten someone pregnant, especially if they are not in a marital union as males in this age group are most likely to be.

In all, 2.4 percent of males aged 15-19 reported that they have gotten someone pregnant (Table 8.6). The proportion is higher among urban (3.7\%) than rural (2\%) residents. Across marital status, teen males in consensual unions and the formally married have very high proportions who have gotten someone pregnant.

This measure also varies widely across regions, from a low of 0.9 percent in Cagayan Valley and Zamboanga Peninsula to a high of 4.7 percent in NCR and Caraga. By education status, there is no difference between those with high and low education. Neither is there a pattern
by socioeconomic status, although the highest proportion who have gotten someone pregnant is recorded among young males with the highest socioeconomic status, at 3.3 percent.

Overall, the wide disparity between the proportion of teen males who reported having gotten someone pregnant and the proportion of teen girls who have ever been pregnant likely comes from two major factors: (1) reporting error by males due to lack of knowledge of whether they have fathered a child and (2) teenage women getting pregnant by non-teen partners.

## Fertility preferences

All youth, regardless of marital or fertility status, were asked the question "How many children do you want to have?" The response to this question is likely a result of both personal preference and the influence of prevalent fertility norms. In general, males want more children (mean of 2.8) than do females (mean of 2.3; Table 8.7). There is no difference between the 15-19 and 20-24-year-old males; among females, the $15-19$-year-olds on the average want a slightly lower number (mean of 2.3) than the 20-24-year-olds (mean of 2.4).

The pattern of difference in the preferred number of children across background characteristics is similar for men and women. Rural residents prefer slightly more children than urban residents. Those with the lowest educational attainment have the highest mean preferred number of children, but all those with higher than elementary education tend to have almost the same mean preferred number of children. The same is true for socioeconomic status. Those who belong to the poorest quintile also express a higher preferred number of children than all the rest, but those who belong to the second up to the fifth (richest) quintiles tend to express a similarly lower preference, with no apparent difference among the remaining four quintiles.

Across regions, youth in ARMM registered the highest preferred number of children as well

Table 8.6 Percent of males who have gotten someone pregnant by age group and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Males age 15-19 years |  | Males age 20-24 years |  | Males age 15-24 years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Have gotten someone pregnant | No. of males | Have gotten someone pregnant | No. of males | Have gotten someone pregnant | No. of males |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 0.7 | 5,582 | 4.3 | 2,617 | 1.8 | 8,200 |
| Living-in | 58.0 | 150 | 74.8 | 592 | 71.4 | 742 |
| Formally married | 34.4 | 32 | 78.1 | 360 | 74.5 | 392 |
| Separated/Widowed | (33.3) | 6 | (64.0) | 25 | 58.1 | 31 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 1.3 | 303 | 24.1 | 170 | 9.5 | 473 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.9 | 221 | 20.5 | 122 | 8.1 | 345 |
| Central Luzon | 3.0 | 564 | 20.3 | 389 | 10.1 | 953 |
| CALABARZON | 1.3 | 773 | 18.3 | 469 | 7.7 | 1,243 |
| MIMAROPA | 2.3 | 175 | 25.9 | 108 | 11.3 | 283 |
| Bicol | 2.1 | 332 | 21.2 | 189 | 9.0 | 521 |
| Western Visayas | 2.8 | 495 | 19.7 | 269 | 8.8 | 764 |
| Central Visayas | 2.4 | 449 | 18.5 | 292 | 8.9 | 742 |
| Eastern Visayas | 1.5 | 271 | 24.5 | 155 | 9.9 | 426 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 0.9 | 228 | 29.0 | 145 | 12.0 | 374 |
| Northern Mindanao | 2.0 | 299 | 24.3 | 148 | 9.4 | 447 |
| Davao | 2.7 | 259 | 27.3 | 187 | 13.0 | 446 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 1.0 | 298 | 28.2 | 142 | 9.8 | 440 |
| CAR | 2.1 | 95 | 17.9 | 78 | 9.3 | 172 |
| ARMM | 1.7 | 177 | 37.5 | 144 | 17.8 | 321 |
| Caraga | 4.7 | 171 | 23.4 | 94 | 10.9 | 265 |
| NCR | 4.7 | 657 | 30.2 | 493 | 15.7 | 1,150 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 3.7 | 1,423 | 25.9 | 975 | 12.8 | 2,398 |
| Rural | 2.0 | 4,348 | 22.9 | 2,619 | 9.8 | 6,967 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 2.6 | 1,049 | 28.2 | 682 | 12.7 | 1,731 |
| High school undergraduate | 1.7 | 2,835 | 32.6 | 696 | 7.8 | 3,531 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 3.7 | 1,085 | 24.1 | 1,326 | 15.0 | 2,413 |
| College or higher | 2.8 | 799 | 12.8 | 890 | 8.0 | 1,687 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 2.1 | 1,231 | 32.9 | 657 | 12.9 | 1,889 |
| Second | 1.8 | 1,236 | 23.3 | 681 | 9.4 | 1,916 |
| Middle | 2.2 | 1,282 | 22.2 | 810 | 9.9 | 2,091 |
| Fourth | 2.9 | 1,111 | 23.1 | 830 | 11.5 | 1,941 |
| Highest (Richest) | 3.3 | 911 | 17.2 | 616 | 8.9 | 1,527 |
| Total | 2.4 | 5,771 | 23.7 | 3,594 | 10.6 | 9,365 |

Notes: Figures in parentheses are based on less than 30 cases.
Totals may not add up due to rounding
as the highest difference between the sexes. Male youth in ARMM want an average of 4.6 children, whereas female youth want only 3.5 . ARMM is an outlier in this regard, as none of the regions come close to this desired number of children. Among males, the next highest number of preferred children is 3.0 , which was registered
among male youth from Eastern Visayas. For female youth, the second highest preferred number of children is 2.5 , among female youth from CAR and Central Mindanao. On the other hand, the lowest preferred number of children is found among male youth in Ilocos, at 2.5. Among female youth, six regions registered the lowest

| Background Characteristics | Preferred number of children among males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males | Preferred number of children among females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total | Mean |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total | Mean |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 0.7 | 5.8 | 38.3 | 39.4 | 8.4 | 6.0 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 5,761 | 0.6 | 10.7 | 59.0 | 24.3 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 5,614 |
| 20-24 | 0.4 | 5.4 | 40.1 | 37.7 | 8.6 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 3,589 | 1.0 | 11.3 | 51.4 | 27.1 | 6.6 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 4,146 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 0.6 | 5.5 | 38.0 | 39.2 | 8.7 | 5.9 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 8,189 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 57.2 | 24.8 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 6,433 |
| Living-in | 0.1 | 7.4 | 51.5 | 34.5 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 742 | 0.1 | 13.0 | 58.1 | 24.7 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 1,912 |
| Formally married | 0.0 | 4.9 | 34.9 | 37.9 | 11.0 | 7.4 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 3.1 | 391 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 45.0 | 31.5 | 9.0 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 1,242 |
| Separated/Widowed | 0.0 | 0.0 | 39.3 | 35.7 | 17.9 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 3.0 | 28 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 56.1 | 17.9 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.1 | 173 |
| Number of living children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0.7 | 5.6 | 38.4 | 39.0 | 8.5 | 5.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 8,304 | 1.1 | 9.5 | 57.9 | 24.9 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 6,567 |
| 1 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 45.7 | 34.7 | 6.7 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 654 | 0.1 | 20.5 | 53.9 | 21.7 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.1 | 1,845 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 46.1 | 39.0 | 8.7 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 242 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 58.4 | 26.6 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 632 |
| 3 or more | 0.0 | 2.0 | 13.7 | 41.2 | 21.6 | 19.6 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 3.5 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 66.7 | 13.7 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 100.0 | 3.3 | 183 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 1.5 | 7.0 | 46.7 | 35.3 | 6.6 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 472 | 1.1 | 9.0 | 61.2 | 25.1 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.6 | 6.1 | 43.6 | 36.9 | 7.6 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 344 | 0.9 | 12.0 | 52.9 | 24.9 | 8.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 0.8 | 6.2 | 40.2 | 43.1 | 6.6 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 953 | 1.0 | 10.7 | 56.5 | 27.3 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 0.0 | 6.6 | 38.8 | 42.7 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 1,241 | 0.2 | 11.8 | 59.0 | 24.6 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 1,295 |
| MIMAROPA | 0.0 | 3.5 | 33.3 | 46.5 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 283 | 0.4 | 12.5 | 57.0 | 27.2 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 279 |
| Bicol | 0.2 | 4.4 | 34.8 | 43.3 | 9.4 | 7.1 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 520 | 1.7 | 11.5 | 51.1 | 28.8 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 0.8 | 3.9 | 41.7 | 40.9 | 8.0 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 762 | 1.1 | 13.9 | 57.4 | 23.1 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 0.9 | 7.2 | 42.0 | 35.1 | 9.9 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 740 | 0.3 | 14.7 | 55.3 | 22.7 | 5.8 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 0.7 | 5.2 | 30.6 | 41.9 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 3.0 | 425 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 55.3 | 29.0 | 4.5 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 400 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 0.0 | 6.2 | 38.9 | 36.7 | 9.7 | 7.0 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 373 | 0.6 | 11.3 | 58.1 | 25.5 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 0.2 | 4.3 | 40.5 | 39.6 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 447 | 0.2 | 12.2 | 53.6 | 25.3 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 473 |
| Davao | 0.2 | 6.7 | 43.1 | 34.6 | 8.3 | 5.6 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 445 | 1.2 | 8.9 | 59.1 | 25.0 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 505 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 0.5 | 5.5 | 34.8 | 37.5 | 10.3 | 9.6 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 439 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 49.7 | 29.1 | 6.8 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 457 |
| CAR | 1.7 | 4.7 | 34.9 | 37.8 | 12.8 | 6.4 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 172 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 50.5 | 30.6 | 9.2 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 198 |
| ARMM | 0.0 | 0.6 | 11.3 | 20.4 | 24.1 | 25.7 | 17.9 | 100.0 | 4.6 | 319 | 0.3 | 5.5 | 22.3 | 28.6 | 18.2 | 14.7 | 10.4 | 100.0 | 3.5 | 347 |
| Caraga | 0.8 | 5.3 | 35.8 | 42.6 | 7.5 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 265 | 0.8 | 10.6 | 52.2 | 28.6 | 4.7 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 255 |
| NCR | 1.0 | 6.4 | 44.4 | 35.4 | 8.3 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 1,151 | 1.2 | 9.9 | 63.4 | 22.0 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 1,347 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.8 | 6.4 | 43.1 | 36.9 | 8.1 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2.6 | 2,399 | 1.0 | 10.6 | 59.9 | 23.4 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 2,814 |
| Rural | 0.5 | 5.4 | 37.5 | 39.4 | 8.6 | 6.3 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 6,954 | 0.6 | 11.0 | 54.1 | 26.4 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 6,946 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 0.2 | 7.5 | 35.5 | 34.0 | 10.1 | 9.9 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 1,725 | 1.0 | 13.8 | 46.6 | 24.2 | 8.4 | 3.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 912 |
| High school undergraduate | 0.6 | 5.8 | 39.5 | 38.4 | 8.2 | 6.2 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 3,528 | 0.5 | 11.2 | 58.2 | 23.9 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 3,483 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 0.5 | 5.0 | 38.0 | 42.9 | 7.6 | 3.6 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 2,412 | 0.7 | 11.9 | 55.8 | 25.7 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 3,039 |
| College or higher | 1.0 | 4.3 | 42.6 | 38.3 | 8.6 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 1,686 | 1.1 | 8.1 | 55.8 | 28.1 | 4.9 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 2,327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 0.4 | 5.3 | 35.3 | 36.5 | 9.4 | 10.1 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 3.0 | 1,879 | 0.4 | 10.1 | 50.5 | 26.9 | 7.6 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 1,944 |
| Second | 0.6 | 6.0 | 37.9 | 38.2 | 9.1 | 6.5 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 1,914 | 0.5 | 11.1 | 56.2 | 24.7 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 2,004 |
| Middle | 0.5 | 5.0 | 40.5 | 39.7 | 8.0 | 4.3 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 2,091 | 0.7 | 12.1 | 56.8 | 25.0 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 2,070 |
| Fourth | 0.6 | 5.4 | 41.6 | 39.0 | 7.9 | 4.2 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 1,940 | 1.0 | 10.8 | 59.2 | 25.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 2,060 |
| Highest (Richest) | 1.0 | 6.9 | 39.3 | 40.4 | 7.9 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 1,526 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 56.2 | 26.2 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 1,682 |
| Total | 0.6 | 5.6 | 39.0 | 38.7 | 8.5 | 5.7 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 9,350 | 0.8 | 10.9 | 56.2 | 25.5 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 9,760 |

preferred number of children, all at 2.2. These are Ilocos, CALABARZON, MIMAROPA, NCR, Central Visayas, and Western Visayas.

Table 8.7 also presents the percent distribution of the responses by the individual number of children the respondents said they want to have, putting into sharper focus the difference between the sexes as well as among the regions, differences which are averaged out when looking only at the mean. For example, more than half of all female youth (56.2\%) want two children only; the comparative proportion for males is lower at 39 percent. Moreover, 67.9 percent of females want two or fewer children; for males, the comparative figure is much lower at 45.2 percent. A small percentage wants no children at all $(0.6 \%$ among males and $0.8 \%$ among females). Preference for high fertility defined as wanting four or more children is low with 16.1 percent of male youth and 7.1 percent of female youth wanting four or more children. The low proportion expressing preference for 4 or more children is reflected across all the regions with the notable exception of ARMM where 67.7 percent of males and 43.4 percent of females said they wanted four or more children.

## Trend in preferred number of children

Results from the NDHS on the ideal family size as expressed by women in the reproductive age shows that over the past 20 years (NDHS 1993, 1998, 2003, 2008, and 2013), the ideal family size has been consistently declining alongside the total fertility rate. Moreover, younger females (15-19) have likewise consistently registered a lower ideal family size than older females (20-24)-the same pattern observed in the YAFS results.

The YAFS series provides comparative data for men that cannot be found in the NDHS. Figure 8.3 shows the trend in the mean preferred number of children over the same 20 -year period among Filipino youth by sex. It shows a consistent pattern of difference between the sexes, with males wanting more children. In 1994, male youth wanted on the average 3.3 children, while
female youth reported wanting 2.8 children. By 2013, the preferred number of children declined to 2.8 for males and 2.3 for females. While the preferred number of children has consistently declined, the difference between the sexes has been constant at 0.5 children.

## Unintended pregnancies

The preceding chapter on sexual behavior documented a low and inconsistent use of contraceptive methods during young people's various sexual activities, which may result in unplanned pregnancies. Unintended pregnancies are an important concern since such pregnancies are associated with a host of adverse consequences not only for the mother but for her child as well.

To assess the prevalence of unintended pregnancies among the youth, the intention or planning status at the time of conception of each pregnancy was asked. Specifically, the women were asked "At the time you became pregnant, did you want to become pregnant then, did you want to wait until later, or did you not want to become pregnant at all?" Responses of "wanted to become pregnant then" are considered intended pregnancies, pregnancies that were wanted at a later time are classified as mistimed pregnancies, and responses of not wanting to become pregnant at all are deemed unwanted pregnancies. The latter two combined constitute unintended pregnancies. It should be noted that althoughthis measure of unintended pregnancies is widely used, it is likely to underestimate unintended pregnancies because it is subject to recall error and post-factum rationalization bias (Bankole \& Westoff, 1998; Santelli et al., 2003). To minimize recall bias of pregnancy intention, the analysis was restricted to births in the five years prior to the survey.

Table 8.8 presents the distribution of births to women in the five years preceding the survey according to their intention status and selected characteristics at the time of birth. Overall, 37.4 percent of births to women aged 1524 are unintended, 22.1 percent are mistimed,

Figure 8.3 Mean preferred number of children by sex: 1994, 2002 and 2013

and 15.3 percent were not wanted at all at the time of conception.

There is no distinct pattern in the proportion of unintended pregnancies by birth order. Unintended pregnancies, however, are highest among first-order births; 2 in 5 first births are unintended. Meanwhile, the proportion of unintended pregnancies is inversely related with the age of the mother at the time of birth. Such pregnancies are most prevalent among the youngest cohort of women. Data show that nearly half (46.7\%) of births to women below 18 years old are unintended, with about one unwanted birth for every five births. In contrast, only one third of births to women 20-24 years old are unintended.

By marital status of the mother at the time of birth, unmarried women (single or separated/widowed) posted higher proportions of unintended pregnancies compared with their counterparts. Among births to never married mothers, three in five were unintended, with one in three an unwanted birth. Among births to separated or widowed women, half were unintended. In contrast, the corresponding proportions among women in a living-in arrangement and formal marriage are much lower at 37.5 percent and 24.6 percent, respectively.

## Abortion attempt

To avoid unintended births, some women resort to abortion. In the Philippines, abortion is legally restricted, and women who
undergo this procedure are highly stigmatized. Despite this, it is estimated that a substantial 610,000 pregnancies among Filipino women end in abortion annually (Hussain \& Finer, 2013). Unfortunately, most of these abortions are performed under clandestine and unsafe conditions that put women's lives and health in jeopardy.

To determine whether the young women have done anything to prematurely end a pregnancy, the following question was posed for each pregnancy, including the current one: "Did you or with the help of someone else do something to end the pregnancy early?" An affirmative response to this query is considered an attempt at induced abortion. The results indicate that more than one in 10 (11.6\%) of ever-pregnant females have done something to terminate any of their pregnancies early (Table 8.9). There is no notable difference in this proportion between the two age cohorts of women. Likewise, a comparison between age groups across socioeconomic characteristics reveals generally similar patterns.

Predictably, the never married women consistently reported the highest proportion while the formally married reported the lowest proportionwhohave made anattemptat premature termination of a pregnancy. Among never married women 15-24 years old, 20.1 percent reported having done something to end the pregnancy early, while only 8.2 percent of their formally married counterparts reported such a practice. This comes as no surprise, since pregnancy outside the context of a marital union is still largely viewed as socially
unacceptable in Philippine society, although that view seems to be changing.

A comparison across regions shows that more than a quarter (26.3\%) of women from Zamboanga Peninsula have tried to terminate a pregnancy. This is overwhelmingly higher than the figures recorded by regions with the next highest proportions, namely Western Visayas (18.8\%) and NCR (17.4\%). At the other end of the spectrum, Central Luzon (4.2\%) and ARMM (4.9\%) registered the lowest incidence of attempted pregnancy termination. Also worth noting is the high incidence of abortion attempts among the $15-19$-year-olds in Western Visayas, where 23.3 percent have tried to end any of their pregnancies early.

The proportion of women with abortion attempt experience is higher in urban areas than in rural areas ( $14.9 \%$ vs. $10.4 \%$ ) and increases with educational attainment, from 9.3 percent among the least educated women to 13.7 percent among the college-educated women. There is no distinct pattern across socioeconomic status categories, but women belonging to the poorest quintile reported the lowest proportion at 10.3 percent.

## Summary and conclusions

The youth of today are the parents of the next generation. Analysis of fertility behavior at the earliest onset of childbearing provides important information for possible interventions to improve fertility outcomes for the teenage youth who have already begun childbearing and to prevent too early childbearing for those who have not. One of the most significant findings from the YAFS4 is the evidence of a doubling of the proportion of women aged 15-19 at the survey date who have begun childbearing (who have either borne a live birth or were pregnant at the time of the survey) in the last 10 years. To the extent that early childbearing is associated with increased risk to both mother and child, this unprecedented rise implies a higher need for maternal health services for very young women who have already begun childbearing. Further analysis of the YAFS4 results is needed to unravel the antecedents of this sharp rise in teen fertility.

Another significant finding is the high level of unintended pregnancies, either because these are mistimed or not wanted at all at the time of conception. This, along with the finding in the previous chapter of low contraceptive

Table 8. 8 Percent distribution of births to females age 15-24 in the five years preceding the survey by the intention status of birth, birth order and mother's characteristics at the time of the birth

| Background Characteristics | Intention status of birth |  |  | Total | Unintendedbirths | Number of births |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intended | Mistimed | Unwanted |  |  |  |
| Birth order |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 59.4 | 22.4 | 18.2 | 100.0 | 40.6 | 2,566 |
| 2 | 71.0 | 21.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 | 29.0 | 880 |
| 3 or more | 66.4 | 21.1 | 12.5 | 100.0 | 33.6 | 232 |
| Mother's age at birth |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Below 18 | 53.3 | 26.9 | 19.9 | 100.0 | 46.7 | 615 |
| 18-19 | 62.1 | 20.8 | 17.1 | 100.0 | 37.9 | 1,209 |
| 20-24 | 66.0 | 21.5 | 12.5 | 100.0 | 34.0 | 1,854 |
| Mother's marital status at birth ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 40.2 | 25.3 | 34.4 | 100.0 | 59.8 | 569 |
| Living-in | 62.5 | 23.3 | 14.2 | 100.0 | 37.5 | 1,905 |
| Formally married | 75.4 | 17.8 | 6.8 | 100.0 | 24.6 | 1,100 |
| Separated/Widowed | 49.5 | 30.1 | 20.4 | 100.0 | 50.5 | 93 |
| Total | 62.6 | 22.1 | 15.3 | 100.0 | 37.4 | 3,678 |

Note: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Excludes 11 cases with missing information
use among the sexually active, indicates a high level of unmet need for contraception among the youth. This finding corroborates persistent findings from the NDHS surveys that show the women in the youngest childbearing ages having very high levels of unmet need. Addressing unmet need is made even more imperative by
the finding that more than 1 in 10 ever pregnant women have tried to terminate pregnancy early.

Other significant findings are the persistent gap in the preferred number of children between the sexes, with men wanting more children compared with women. The fertility-related behaviors and attitudes of

Table 8.9 Percent of ever-pregnant females who did something to end pregnancy early by age group and background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Females age 15-19 years |  | Females age 20-24 years |  | Females age 15-24 years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Did something to end pregnancy early | No. of females who have ever been pregnant | Did something to end pregnancy early | No. of females who have ever been pregnant | Did something to end pregnancy early | No. of females who have ever been pregnant |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 16.5 | 103 | 22.1 | 195 | 20.1 | 298 |
| Living-in | 10.7 | 525 | 12.7 | 1,133 | 12.1 | 1,658 |
| Formally married | 11.9 | 134 | 7.6 | 952 | 8.2 | 1,087 |
| Separated/Widowed | (11.5) | 26 | 15.9 | 113 | 15.1 | 139 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 8.1 | 37 | 7.9 | 101 | 7.9 | 139 |
| Cagayan Valley | 6.5 | 31 | 8.1 | 86 | 7.7 | 117 |
| Central Luzon | 5.7 | 87 | 3.8 | 316 | 4.2 | 403 |
| CALABARZON | 13.0 | 69 | 11.4 | 281 | 11.7 | 351 |
| MIMAROPA | (8.7) | 23 | 13.0 | 77 | 11.1 | 99 |
| Bicol | 16.7 | 30 | 11.3 | 141 | 12.3 | 171 |
| Western Visayas | 23.3 | 60 | 17.2 | 163 | 18.8 | 223 |
| Central Visayas | 11.3 | 62 | 5.4 | 147 | 7.2 | 209 |
| Eastern Visayas | (13.8) | 29 | 10.3 | 117 | 11.0 | 146 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | (20.7) | 29 | 28.2 | 103 | 26.3 | 133 |
| Northern Mindanao | 7.7 | 39 | 10.1 | 129 | 9.5 | 168 |
| Davao | 15.6 | 45 | 8.4 | 143 | 10.1 | 188 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 19.4 | 36 | 14.4 | 97 | 15.8 | 133 |
| CAR | (11.1) | 18 | 7.1 | 56 | 8.2 | 73 |
| ARMM | (9.1) | 22 | 3.7 | 82 | 4.9 | 103 |
| Caraga | 6.7 | 30 | 11.7 | 60 | 10.1 | 89 |
| NCR | 10.5 | 143 | 20.7 | 295 | 17.4 | 438 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 11.8 | 245 | 16.0 | 663 | 14.9 | 908 |
| Rural | 11.6 | 543 | 9.9 | 1,730 | 10.4 | 2,274 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 9.2 | 141 | 9.3 | 279 | 9.3 | 421 |
| High school undergraduate | 13.6 | 286 | 10.7 | 542 | 11.7 | 828 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 10.8 | 288 | 11.7 | 1,103 | 11.5 | 1,390 |
| College or higher | 12.3 | 73 | 13.9 | 469 | 13.7 | 542 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 10.4 | 211 | 10.1 | 622 | 10.3 | 834 |
| Second | 14.6 | 171 | 9.8 | 521 | 11.0 | 693 |
| Middle | 10.5 | 171 | 13.1 | 518 | 12.5 | 689 |
| Fourth | 8.6 | 139 | 14.8 | 453 | 13.3 | 592 |
| Highest (Richest) | 14.7 | 95 | 10.4 | 279 | 11.7 | 375 |
| Total | 11.7 | 788 | 11.6 | 2,394 | 11.6 | 3,182 |

young males is a little-explored topic for further analysis and for intervention programs to reduce the risk of teen pregnancy. Again, the issue of the gender gap in male and female fertility-related beliefs, attitudes, and behavior is one area that needs to be further explored.
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# Reproductive Health 

Maria Paz N. Marquez Arnisson Andre C. Ortega

According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2006), reproductive health (RH) refers to the total well-being in all aspects of reproduction (i.e., physical, emotional, behavioral, and social). This term gained greater prominence after the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development that saw a historic shift in paradigm from family planning to the broader concept of RH. RH is part of the UN Millennium Development Goals, with a specific target of achieving universal access to RH by 2015. But greater emphasis is given to addressing RH concerns of the youth, since they face specific health-related issues such as early sexual initiation and early and risky pregnancies. In the Philippines, the passage of the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act of 2012, more commonly known as the RH Law, underscores the importance of providing universal access to RH. One of the key features of the RH Law is the provision of ageand development-appropriate RH education to adolescents.

RH encompasses a broad range of issues. The Department of Health has adopted 10 core service elements of RH since 1996 to effectively provide the necessary care and services (Commission on Population, 2003). Under the RH Law, these elements have been expanded to 12: (1) family planning information and services; (2) maternal, infant, and child health and nutrition, including breastfeeding; (3) proscription of abortion and management of abortion complications; (4) adolescent and youth RH guidance and counseling; (5) prevention,
treatment, and management of reproductive tract infections, HIV and AIDS, and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs); (6) elimination of violence against women and children and other forms of sexual and gender-based violence; (7) education and counseling on sexuality and RH; (8) treatment of breast and reproductive tract cancers and other gynecological conditions and disorders; (9) male responsibility and involvement and men's RH; (10) prevention, treatment, and management of infertility and sexual dysfunction; (11) RH education for the adolescents; and (12) mental health aspect of RH care.

Earlier chapters covered contraception and abortion. This chapter examines the Filipino youth's milestones in pubertal development, experience of RH problems, and awareness and knowledge of STIs, including HIV/AIDS.

## Pubertal development

Puberty is the phase of development when boys and girls begin their physical transition to adulthood. It is the stage when the body transitions to sexual maturity and full reproductive ability. At this stage, young people experience physical changes, which can pose challenges for them as they assume the corresponding roles and responsibilities that such changes entail. This section focuses on young people's knowledge of these physical changes and the physiological milestones they experience as they traverse this transition.

## Knowledge of physical changes at puberty

The YAFS4 survey asked male respondents to enumerate the physical changes they know that boys go through during the transition from childhood to adolescence. Similarly, female respondents were asked to mention spontaneously the changes that girls experience during this developmental stage. The data revealed universal knowledge of physical changes among Filipino youth. Less than 1 percent of males and females were unable to cite any physical change that happens to young people during puberty.

Table 9.1 presents the percentage of males and females who mentioned the physical changes specific to their sex. For males, the most cited physical change is body growth (79.7\%), followed by growth of hair in underarms and pubic area (57.1\%) and change in voice (55.2\%). At the other end of the spectrum, the least cited are penile discharge (5.4\%) and enlargement of the scrotum ( $7.3 \%$ ). For females, the most frequently reported physical changes are the onset of menstrual period (75.7\%) and development of breasts (72.9\%). Very few females (5.6\%) are aware of vaginal discharge as a physical change that girls experience at puberty.

As expected, older youth (20-24 years old) are more knowledgeable of these physical changes. Among males, this pattern is most pronounced in change of voice ( $53.8 \%$ for $15-19$-year-olds vs. $57.3 \%$ for $20-24$-year-olds) and enlargement of scrotum ( $6.4 \%$ vs. $8.8 \%$ ). Among females, this age differential is most notable in development of breasts ( $70.8 \%$ vs. $75.7 \%$ ) and onset of menstrual period ( $74.7 \%$ vs. 77.2\%). While there are no evident urban-rural and socioeconomic status differentials, a clear education pattern is apparent, with a generally increasing level of knowledge with increasing educational attainment.

Comparing responses across regions, the patterns of responses are generally similar for both males and females. However, some deviations can be observed. Among ARMM youth, a significantly lower proportion of youth
cited body growth ( $46.5 \%$ for males and $36 \%$ for females) and growth of hair in the underarms and pubic area ( $25.6 \%$ for males and $19.4 \%$ for females). Meanwhile, a substantially higher proportion of Central Luzon female youth mentioned body growth (72.7\%), development of breasts ( $91.3 \%$ ), and onset of menstrual period (89.2\%) compared with other regions.

## Circumcision

Male circumcision is a traditional practice in Filipino culture. Male teenagers undergo the ritual before entering their adult years (Lee, 2006). More than a cultural rite of passage, male circumcision is now recognized as an efficacious intervention for the prevention of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), the virus that causes the acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS; WHO \& UNAIDS, 2007).

The YAFS4 data show that this practice remains highly prevalent, as nearly all (98.6\%) Filipino males aged 15-24 reported that they are circumcised (Table 9.2). Circumcision is a universal practice in all regions in the country except for ARMM, where 16.7 percent reported that they are not circumcised.

The mean age at circumcision is 11.0 years. Only around 0.1 percent (data not shown) had undergone circumcision at birth, a practice that is more widespread in Western countries. The lowest mean age of 9.3 years is recorded in Central Visayas, Northern Mindanao, and Davao Region, while ARMM has the highest mean age at circumcision of 12.9 years. There are no substantial differences in the mean age at circumcision by age, place of residence, education, and socioeconomic status.

Apart from age at circumcision, it is also important to examine the person who performed the circumcision, as those without medical training may practice unhygienic procedures or perform the circumcision in an unsanitary environment that can lead to infections. Table 9.2 shows the proportion of circumcised males whose circumcision procedure was done by a medical professional, which includes doctors,

| Background Characteristics | Percent of males who mentioned: |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males | Percent of females who mentioned: |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Body growth | Growth of hair in underarms and pubic area | Penile discharge | Skin becoming oily and development of pimples | Change in voice | Enlargement of Adam's apple | Enlargement of scrotum |  | Body growth | Growth of hair in underarms and pubic area | Vaginal discharge | Skin becoming oily and dev't of pimples | Development of breasts | Onset of menstrual period |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 79.7 | 56.5 | 5.2 | 24.1 | 53.8 | 28.5 | 6.4 | 5,743 | 55.6 | 35.9 | 5.2 | 26.5 | 70.8 | 74.7 | 5,641 |
| 20-24 | 79.7 | 58.0 | 5.7 | 24.4 | 57.3 | 30.2 | 8.8 | 3,580 | 56.1 | 36.6 | 6.2 | 26.4 | 75.7 | 77.2 | 4,145 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 91.5 | 59.4 | 2.1 | 16.1 | 65.2 | 21.2 | 1.3 | 472 | 49.9 | 50.7 | 1.9 | 26.9 | 70.4 | 77.8 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 85.7 | 77.8 | 6.1 | 30.0 | 67.6 | 36.7 | 7.3 | 343 | 49.7 | 42.0 | 9.6 | 32.4 | 73.1 | 88.9 | 324 |
| Central Luzon | 84.9 | 77.3 | 14.5 | 45.9 | 74.4 | 51.4 | 26.6 | 953 | 72.7 | 48.6 | 6.9 | 26.4 | 91.3 | 89.2 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 79.6 | 50.7 | 0.2 | 15.8 | 33.6 | 25.9 | 1.6 | 1,228 | 53.8 | 23.7 | 1.2 | 18.7 | 68.9 | 75.1 | 1,295 |
| MIMAROPA | 87.3 | 47.0 | 2.1 | 23.4 | 55.7 | 30.0 | 2.5 | 283 | 67.0 | 29.7 | 2.9 | 27.6 | 59.7 | 86.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 85.2 | 57.2 | 1.3 | 14.2 | 53.0 | 22.9 | 1.2 | 520 | 60.4 | 37.3 | 2.1 | 22.2 | 75.5 | 79.8 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 82.8 | 62.3 | 4.9 | 17.5 | 45.9 | 32.1 | 15.6 | 760 | 57.3 | 33.5 | 8.0 | 26.0 | 75.0 | 82.7 | 723 |
| Central Visayas | 65.9 | 55.9 | 3.1 | 14.8 | 59.9 | 18.7 | 4.0 | 742 | 53.9 | 30.6 | 2.5 | 29.4 | 70.5 | 56.8 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 86.6 | 55.4 | 7.0 | 22.8 | 61.5 | 27.1 | 6.3 | 425 | 59.0 | 39.7 | 2.5 | 23.3 | 66.4 | 86.6 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 76.1 | 55.3 | 4.6 | 21.5 | 59.1 | 30.4 | 2.2 | 368 | 50.0 | 38.1 | 4.8 | 35.1 | 71.2 | 65.7 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 74.3 | 61.7 | 20.1 | 46.1 | 73.2 | 40.3 | 22.4 | 447 | 35.3 | 26.8 | 4.7 | 36.6 | 78.3 | 73.2 | 473 |
| Davao | 77.8 | 62.1 | 4.5 | 29.6 | 54.8 | 21.8 | 1.8 | 446 | 64.9 | 47.2 | 19.6 | 36.7 | 77.9 | 76.1 | 515 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 80.4 | 51.8 | 8.7 | 28.1 | 53.4 | 29.9 | 2.7 | 438 | 49.5 | 36.7 | 11.1 | 33.7 | 70.5 | 71.8 | 457 |
| CAR | 83.2 | 52.3 | 4.0 | 9.3 | 52.3 | 22.1 | 2.3 | 173 | 57.9 | 50.0 | 15.3 | 29.6 | 82.1 | 66.8 | 196 |
| ARMM | 46.5 | 25.6 | 5.4 | 36.2 | 68.0 | 38.1 | 3.2 | 316 | 36.0 | 19.4 | 6.3 | 25.4 | 57.1 | 72.0 | 350 |
| Caraga | 70.9 | 43.8 | 6.4 | 27.2 | 61.9 | 24.9 | 4.6 | 265 | 41.5 | 31.0 | 15.9 | 43.3 | 54.8 | 58.9 | 253 |
| NCR | 83.1 | 51.4 | 2.1 | 19.2 | 44.0 | 20.7 | 3.0 | 1,145 | 57.5 | 37.4 | 2.3 | 17.7 | 74.9 | 70.4 | 1,354 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 81.4 | 57.2 | 4.1 | 23.6 | 51.1 | 27.9 | 7.0 | 2,389 | 58.6 | 40.8 | 5.3 | 24.5 | 74.8 | 73.7 | 2,827 |
| Rural | 79.1 | 57.0 | 5.8 | 24.4 | 56.6 | 29.6 | 7.4 | 6,934 | 54.7 | 34.3 | 5.8 | 27.2 | 72.1 | 76.6 | 6,959 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 76.3 | 49.3 | 4.2 | 23.0 | 48.7 | 24.0 | 4.8 | 1,718 | 44.7 | 27.3 | 5.9 | 20.3 | 63.5 | 72.8 | 921 |
| High school undergraduate | 78.5 | 56.4 | 5.4 | 24.0 | 54.6 | 27.7 | 6.5 | 3,514 | 54.7 | 32.2 | 5.0 | 26.3 | 68.4 | 74.9 | 3,491 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 80.6 | 56.6 | 5.4 | 25.0 | 57.4 | 34.2 | 9.2 | 2,408 | 55.7 | 35.2 | 5.0 | 28.1 | 74.2 | 75.5 | 3,040 |
| College or higher | 84.2 | 67.0 | 6.5 | 24.4 | 59.8 | 30.2 | 8.7 | 1,681 | 62.1 | 46.8 | 7.3 | 26.9 | 81.7 | 78.4 | 2,334 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 76.7 | 54.6 | 6.7 | 26.6 | 55.3 | 28.1 | 7.8 | 1,878 | 49.0 | 28.7 | 6.4 | 28.7 | 64.8 | 73.7 | 1,945 |
| Second | 78.6 | 52.6 | 4.4 | 22.4 | 55.0 | 28.1 | 6.3 | 1,909 | 54.2 | 33.2 | 5.3 | 28.9 | 71.9 | 75.0 | 2,017 |
| Middle | 80.4 | 58.3 | 5.3 | 21.8 | 53.2 | 30.0 | 5.9 | 2,087 | 58.6 | 36.2 | 5.2 | 24.9 | 71.6 | 73.9 | 2,078 |
| Fourth | 79.7 | 58.3 | 5.1 | 27.4 | 57.3 | 28.9 | 7.6 | 1,930 | 55.8 | 41.3 | 5.2 | 25.4 | 76.6 | 77.7 | 2,061 |
| Highest (Richest) | 83.7 | 62.3 | 5.5 | 22.6 | 55.5 | 31.0 | 9.6 | 1,519 | 62.2 | 42.0 | 6.2 | 24.0 | 80.5 | 78.9 | 1,686 |
| Total | 79.7 | 57.1 | 5.4 | 24.2 | 55.2 | 29.1 | 7.3 | 9,323 | 55.8 | 36.2 | 5.6 | 26.4 | 72.9 | 75.7 | 9,785 |

nurses, midwives, and barangay health workers. The data show that two in three males were circumcised by a health professional. More than half (51.4\%) of circumcisions were performed by a physician.

Circumcisions performed by health professionals are more prevalent among younger youth, urban residents, more educated youth, and more affluent youth. A high prevalence of circumcision by health professionals is also observed in NCR, Central Luzon, and Ilocos, where more than four in five males were circumcised by medical personnel. A cause for concern, however, is the low prevalence in CALABARZON, Western Visayas, and ARMM,
where about half of the males were circumcised by non-health professionals.

## Menarche

Menarche refers to the onset of menstruation and marks the start of puberty in females. It also signals the beginning of females' capacity for reproduction. Almost all females aged 15-24 (99.7\%) said they had already experienced menarche (Table 9.3). Only 0.3 percent have not started menstruating yet, all of whom belong to the 15-19 age group.

The mean age at menarche is 13.0 years, with a range of 7 to 22 years (Table 9.3). More than 1 in 10 women experienced menstruation

Table 9.2 Percent distribution of males by age at circumcision, mean age at circumcision, and percentage circumcised by medical professional by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age at circumcision (in years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of males | Circumcised by medical personnela ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | No. of males who have been circumcised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Below 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 and over | Not circumcised | Total | Mean |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 26.6 | 15.6 | 12.3 | 19.8 | 23.8 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 10.9 | 5,760 | 71.2 | 5,607 |
| 20-24 | 25.8 | 14.7 | 11.1 | 20.2 | 27.7 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 11.2 | 3,582 | 61.6 | 3,547 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 20.5 | 15.8 | 15.6 | 19.8 | 27.2 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 11.2 | 474 | 84.3 | 460 |
| Cagayan Valley | 14.5 | 17.7 | 12.5 | 22.3 | 31.9 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 11.7 | 345 | 69.5 | 334 |
| Central Luzon | 22.2 | 19.2 | 14.2 | 27.0 | 22.8 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 952 | 86.5 | 934 |
| CALABARZON | 11.3 | 11.1 | 14.3 | 29.5 | 31.3 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 11.9 | 1,242 | 51.8 | 1,205 |
| MIMAROPA | 11.7 | 12.1 | 13.1 | 27.3 | 34.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 11.9 | 282 | 30.2 | 278 |
| Bicol | 15.5 | 14.0 | 10.0 | 24.8 | 35.1 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 11.7 | 521 | 30.1 | 515 |
| Western Visayas | 9.7 | 10.4 | 9.1 | 20.5 | 48.9 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 12.4 | 761 | 52.7 | 748 |
| Central Visayas | 58.0 | 15.5 | 6.7 | 10.8 | 8.9 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 9.3 | 742 | 75.8 | 741 |
| Eastern Visayas | 40.5 | 19.0 | 6.8 | 16.6 | 16.2 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 10.1 | 427 | 59.2 | 422 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 48.8 | 16.4 | 9.1 | 13.4 | 11.5 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 9.8 | 373 | 60.1 | 368 |
| Northern Mindanao | 56.5 | 15.0 | 7.2 | 11.4 | 9.6 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 9.3 | 446 | 79.8 | 446 |
| Davao | 55.0 | 17.3 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 10.8 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 9.3 | 444 | 77.7 | 444 |
| soccsksargen | 11.7 | 17.1 | 20.0 | 26.3 | 24.7 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 10.4 | 436 | 73.8 | 428 |
| CAR | 21.8 | 12.1 | 9.8 | 27.3 | 32.8 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 11.5 | 174 | 63.1 | 168 |
| ARMM | 9.0 | 8.7 | 5.4 | 12.5 | 47.8 | 16.7 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 312 | 52.9 | 261 |
| Caraga | 52.8 | 15.8 | 7.5 | 11.3 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 9.6 | 265 | 63.1 | 100 |
| NCR | 11.7 | 17.1 | 20.0 | 26.3 | 24.7 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 11.5 | 1,149 | 89.2 | 1,143 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 21.8 | 17.9 | 15.7 | 22.3 | 22.0 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 17.0 | 2,394 | 84.0 | 2,379 |
| Rural | 27.8 | 14.4 | 10.5 | 19.1 | 26.4 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 6,949 | 61.7 | 6,775 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 23.6 | 14.7 | 6.6 | 17.1 | 35.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 11.4 | 1,724 | 50.6 | 1,671 |
| High school undergraduate | 27.0 | 14.8 | 11.9 | 20.3 | 24.1 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 10.9 | 3,523 | 68.3 | 3,431 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 27.0 | 15.8 | 13.6 | 18.6 | 24.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 2,410 | 68.0 | 2,381 |
| College or higher | 26.4 | 16.3 | 14.6 | 23.8 | 18.6 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 10.8 | 1,686 | 82.0 | 1,669 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 29.6 | 13.7 | 7.5 | 15.6 | 30.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 1,880 | 49.9 | 1,810 |
| Second | 27.9 | 13.3 | 9.1 | 21.2 | 26.9 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 1,911 | 57.6 | 1,869 |
| Middle | 24.7 | 14.6 | 11.7 | 21.2 | 27.0 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 11.1 | 2,088 | 68.5 | 2,060 |
| Fourth | 24.7 | 17.5 | 14.6 | 19.6 | 23.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 1,941 | 77.6 | 1,917 |
| Highest (Richest) | 24.2 | 17.8 | 17.4 | 22.3 | 17.2 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 10.8 | 1,523 | 86.6 | 1,498 |
| Total | 26.3 | 15.3 | 11.8 | 19.9 | 25.3 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 9,342 | 67.5 | 9,159 |

Note: : Includes doctors, nurses, midwives, and barangay health workers (BHWs)
before age 12, 26.1 percent at age $12,25.7$ percent at age $13,19.6$ percent at age 14 , and 15.2 percent at age 15 and older.

Across the regions, the youngest mean age at menarche is reported in NCR at 12.7 years, while the oldest, reported in ARMM, is 13.6 years. Nearly half (48.1\%) of the women in NCR and two in five women in Ilocos, Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon, CALABARZON, Western Visayas, and Central Visayas had their first menstrual period before they turned 13 years old. Menstruation occurs later among rural females than their urban counterparts, with a mean age at menarche of 13.1 and 12.8 years, respectively.

By educational attainment, the mean age at menarche consistently decreases as education
increases, although the range is not very wide (from 12.8 years among the college educated to 13.3 years among those with no schooling/ elementary education). The same pattern is apparent for socioeconomic status. The mean age at menarche is lowest among women belonging to the highest quintile (12.7 years) and highest among women from the lowest quintile (13.2 years). These patterns are not unexpected since higher educational attainment and socioeconomic status are associated with better nutrition and health practices which in turn are determinants of earlier onset of menarche (Osteria, 1983; Rah, et al., 2009).

Table 9.3 Percent distribution of females by age at menarche, and mean age at menarche by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Age at menarche (in years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 and below | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 and over | Not menstruating yet | Total |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.4 | 9.5 | 26.8 | 27.3 | 20.2 | 12.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 5,637 |
| 20-24 | 4.0 | 9.4 | 25.2 | 23.5 | 18.7 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 4,157 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 3.2 | 10.5 | 27.6 | 30.1 | 16.2 | 12.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 3.4 | 8.6 | 30.3 | 21.1 | 23.5 | 12.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 327 |
| Central Luzon | 4.8 | 12.1 | 26.3 | 27.0 | 15.1 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 2.3 | 11.5 | 26.3 | 24.4 | 20.2 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 1,295 |
| MIMAROPA | 1.8 | 8.6 | 25.5 | 23.7 | 25.9 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 574 |
| Bicol | 3.5 | 4.5 | 22.5 | 27.9 | 22.8 | 18.3 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 13.3 | 724 |
| Western Visayas | 4.7 | 9.4 | 27.9 | 25.8 | 19.5 | 12.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 673 |
| Central Visayas | 4.0 | 10.4 | 26.4 | 24.8 | 20.2 | 13.4 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 403 |
| Eastern Visayas | 0.7 | 7.2 | 24.8 | 25.3 | 21.8 | 19.4 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 13.3 | 355 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 2.0 | 7.9 | 23.1 | 26.5 | 22.5 | 17.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.2 | 473 |
| Northern Mindanao | 1.1 | 8.7 | 22.0 | 26.8 | 23.5 | 16.9 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 13.2 | 515 |
| Davao | 2.9 | 9.3 | 27.6 | 25.0 | 21.6 | 13.4 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 461 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 3.3 | 6.9 | 28.2 | 31.7 | 18.2 | 11.3 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 1,354 |
| CAR | 3.0 | 8.1 | 22.8 | 29.4 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 197 |
| ARMM | 2.6 | 3.7 | 12.9 | 25.1 | 28.9 | 25.1 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 13.6 | 350 |
| Caraga | 2.7 | 7.1 | 27.1 | 24.3 | 19.6 | 18.4 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 255 |
| NCR | 7.0 | 11.5 | 29.5 | 22.9 | 14.4 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.7 | 278 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 5.7 | 11.1 | 28.8 | 24.7 | 16.1 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.8 | 2,825 |
| Rural | 2.8 | 8.8 | 25.0 | 26.1 | 20.9 | 15.9 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 6,969 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 2.9 | 4.9 | 19.1 | 28.2 | 26.5 | 17.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 13.3 | 918 |
| High school undergraduate | 3.1 | 8.8 | 26.7 | 27.9 | 20.3 | 12.6 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 3,501 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 2.7 | 9.7 | 27.5 | 23.6 | 17.7 | 18.6 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 3,046 |
| College or higher | 6.0 | 11.9 | 26.0 | 24.1 | 18.1 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.8 | 2,329 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 1.7 | 5.8 | 24.2 | 27.1 | 22.8 | 17.5 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 13.2 | 1,950 |
| Second | 2.4 | 9.3 | 22.7 | 25.5 | 22.6 | 17.1 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 3.4 | 7.5 | 28.3 | 25.2 | 19.9 | 15.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 2,080 |
| Fourth | 3.8 | 12.4 | 28.0 | 24.4 | 17.0 | 14.3 | 0.1 | 100.0 | 12.9 | 2,057 |
| Highest (Richest) | 7.7 | 12.5 | 27.4 | 26.4 | 14.9 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 12.7 | 1,685 |
| Total | 3.7 | 9.5 | 26.1 | 25.7 | 19.6 | 15.2 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 9,794 |

## Trends in pubertal development

Figure 9.1 shows the trends from 1994 to 2013 of the two indicators of pubertal development discussed earlier. The mean age at circumcision remained stable at 11.0 years during the 20 -year period. The mean age at menarche, however, followed a slight downward trend from 13.3 years in 1994 to 13.0 years in 2013.

## RH problems

Young people cannot reach their full potential if they are saddled with illnesses that can exact a toll on their everyday lives. Diseases related to their RH, in particular, can affect their reproductive lives, particularly their ability to bear children and to engage in healthy sexual relationships. The YAFS4 survey asked the young people if they have experienced symptoms related to RH problems. Symptoms such as abnormal genital discharge, genital warts, and swollen testicles are seen as possible indications of more serious diseases that require medical attention, such as STIs.

Tables 9.4 and 9.5 show the proportions of males and females who reported ever experiencing a given symptom. Among these symptoms are abnormal genital discharge, blood in urine, genital warts, itching in the genital area, and painful urination. Except for painful urination, which more females (28.5\%) than males (19.9\%) reported, the experience of symptoms of RH problems is about the same for men and women, and all symptoms have a
relatively low level of prevalence. In addition to these symptoms common to males and females, the study also inquired about gender-specific symptoms such as erectile dysfunction for males and dysmenorrhea for females.

The most common RH complaints of males are painful urination (19.9\%), genital itching (11.1\%), and infection from circumcision (9\%). There is no distinct pattern of difference in post-circumcision infection by age and other background characteristics, but there is a wide variability across regions. The proportion of males who experienced post-circumcision infection is lowest at 0.1 percent in Central Luzon, followed by Bicol (2.1\%) and MIMAROPA (2.9\%). At the other extreme, the proportion is highest in SOCCSKSARGEN (42.9\%), followed by Zamboanga Peninsula (26.4\%) and Northern Mindanao (23.9\%).

Among females, menstruation-related complaints are the most prevalent RH problems. Nearly half (47.6\%) of females reported painful menstruation, while 31.6 percent have experienced irregular menstrual period. Sexrelated problems are also quite common, more so among females than males. Low sex drive and painful sexual intercourse were reported by one in five females. Among males, young as they are, nearly 4 percent have also experienced impotence or erectile dysfunction.

In all, 36.5 percent of males and 73 percent of females have experienced any RH problem. The high level of RH problems among females can be attributed to the high prevalence of dysmenorrhea.

Figure 9.1 Trends in mean age at circumcision and age at menarche: 1994, 2002, and 2013

Table 9.4 Percent of males who experienced reproductive health (RH) problems and percentage who consulted a health professional for any RH problem by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Abnormal penile discharge | Blood in urine | Genital warts | Itching in the genital area | Painful urination | Reddish and swollen testicles | Infection from circumcision ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Low libido/ drive drive | Impotence/ Erectile dysfunction | Any RH problem | No. of males | Consulted a medical professional for any RH problem experienced | No. of males who experienced any RH problem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 11.9 | 19.8 | 3.0 | 9.2 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 36.7 | 5,766 | 24.0 | 2,082 |
| 20-24 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 9.8 | 20.1 | 3.0 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 4.1 | 36.2 | 3,591 | 33.1 | 1,285 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 3.5 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 11.1 | 19.3 | 3.1 | 9.1 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 35.6 | 8,191 | 26.6 | 2,865 |
| Ever married | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 11.2 | 24.1 | 2.5 | 8.8 | 14.1 | 5.4 | 42.9 | 1,166 | 32.2 | 503 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ilocos | 1.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 17.8 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 28.0 | 472 | 27.8 | 133 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.3 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 7.3 | 16.2 | 0.9 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 24.2 | 345 | 24.1 | 87 |
| Central Luzon | 0.4 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 9.6 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 10.8 | 952 | 38.1 | 113 |
| CALABARZON | 10.8 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 23.3 | 29.5 | 9.8 | 6.4 | 12.7 | 9.2 | 52.7 | 1,243 | 32.1 | 629 |
| MIMAROPA | 2.1 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 11.3 | 20.5 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 29.9 | 283 | 24.7 | 89 |
| Bicol | 1.9 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 20.0 | 27.6 | 3.7 | 2.1 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 43.3 | 520 | 21.9 | 219 |
| Western Visayas | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 10.3 | 0.7 | 5.7 | 4.6 | 2.2 | 24.1 | 764 | 33.3 | 159 |
| Central Visayas | 3.1 | 4.2 | 1.3 | 5.5 | 12.8 | 2.2 | 4.3 | 6.3 | 3.5 | 26.4 | 741 | 32.3 | 195 |
| Eastern Visayas | 2.1 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 8.5 | 13.8 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 26.4 | 427 | 28.8 | 111 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 1.3 | 3.0 | 8.4 | 6.7 | 27.2 | 1.6 | 26.4 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 52.0 | 372 | 21.1 | 194 |
| Northern Mindanao | 5.6 | 3.6 | 6.7 | 10.7 | 28.9 | 1.8 | 23.9 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 53.6 | 447 | 25.3 | 237 |
| Davao | 3.4 | 2.2 | 4.5 | 8.1 | 22.9 | 2.0 | 13.0 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 44.2 | 446 | 26.0 | 192 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 2.1 | 1.8 | 4.3 | 8.2 | 19.3 | 2.0 | 42.9 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 53.3 | 439 | 15.6 | 225 |
| CAR | 2.3 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 11.0 | 33.5 | 0.6 | 12.6 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 43.9 | 173 | 18.7 | 75 |
| ARMM | 2.5 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 6.3 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 24.8 | 317 | 14.1 | 85 |
| Caraga | 7.2 | 3.0 | 5.7 | 12.1 | 21.1 | 1.1 | 10.3 | 7.9 | 3.8 | 39.9 | 265 | 22.4 | 107 |
| NCR | 3.0 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 18.1 | 21.9 | 4.9 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 4.9 | 44.6 | 1,150 | 32.1 | 514 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 2.8 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 12.6 | 19.1 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 3.9 | 38.2 | 2,398 | 31.4 | 917 |
| Rural | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 10.6 | 20.2 | 2.8 | 9.4 | 5.4 | 3.7 | 35.9 | 6,958 | 26.0 | 2,450 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 9.3 | 20.0 | 4.0 | 8.7 | 4.9 | 4.3 | 35.9 | 1,730 | 31.2 | 628 |
| High school undergraduate | 3.7 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 12.6 | 20.8 | 2.4 | 10.0 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 38.9 | 3,528 | 22.3 | 1,356 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 3.4 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 10.7 | 20.2 | 2.9 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 3.9 | 35.2 | 2,412 | 31.6 | 836 |
| College or higher | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 10.3 | 17.4 | 3.5 | 9.1 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 34.1 | 1,687 | 29.6 | 547 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 9.6 | 20.2 | 2.8 | 12.5 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 37.6 | 1,884 | 24.4 | 712 |
| Second | 3.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 10.1 | 21.2 | 2.8 | 9.5 | 6.2 | 4.6 | 38.5 | 1,916 | 24.9 | 719 |
| Middle | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 11.8 | 19.5 | 3.8 | 7.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 | 34.7 | 2,089 | 27.2 | 727 |
| Fourth | 2.4 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 10.6 | 20.0 | 2.2 | 6.6 | 7.2 | 3.6 | 36.1 | 1,941 | 30.7 | 688 |
| Highest (Richest) | 5.1 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 13.7 | 18.4 | 3.5 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 3.7 | 35.7 | 1,526 | 31.2 | 522 |
| Total | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 11.1 | 19.9 | 3.0 | 9.0 | 6.4 | 3.7 | 36.5 | 9,356 | 27.4 | 3,367 |

[^23]Table 9.5 Percent of females who experienced reproductive health (RH) problems and percentage who consulted a health professional for any RH problem by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of females who experienced the following RH problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of females | Consulted a medical professional for any RH problem experienced | No. of females who experienced any RH problem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Abnormal vaginal discharge | Blood in urine | Genital warts | Itching in the genita area | Painful urination | Dysmenorrhea ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Irregular menṣtrual period ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Breast mass | Low libido/ sex drive | Painful sexual intercourse ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Any RH problem |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 2.1 | 10.0 | 27.3 | 46.5 | 30.3 | 2.8 | 18.2 | 25.1 | 70.4 | 5,646 | 27.7 | 3,909 |
| 20-24 | 6.2 | 5.1 | 2.5 | 14.0 | 30.2 | 49.0 | 33.3 | 4.6 | 20.6 | 21.1 | 76.4 | 4,159 | 42.3 | 3,120 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 11.0 | 25.1 | 51.1 | 31.6 | 3.3 | 22.7 | 30.3 | 71.6 | 6,478 | 27.3 | 4,561 |
| Ever married | 6.6 | 6.3 | 2.2 | 13.1 | 35.1 | 40.6 | 31.5 | 4.1 | 19.4 | 20.7 | 75.6 | 3,328 | 47.0 | 2,468 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 2.4 | 5.4 | 1.7 | 11.2 | 30.7 | 49.9 | 25.8 | 2.6 | 19.3 | 24.1 | 71.9 | 467 | 34.1 | 317 |
| Cagayan Valley | 1.2 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 10.2 | 31.4 | 49.4 | 27.4 | 2.5 | 21.9 | 29.3 | 72.0 | 325 | 33.3 | 228 |
| Central Luzon | 1.2 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 5.5 | 21.8 | 28.9 | 24.7 | 3.7 | 11.3 | 8.5 | 54.6 | 1,097 | 49.7 | 573 |
| CALABARZON | 3.9 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 17.0 | 30.2 | 50.0 | 37.3 | 3.3 | 17.3 | 27.5 | 79.1 | 1,303 | 35.7 | 1,026 |
| MIMAROPA | 3.6 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 11.1 | 29.7 | 38.6 | 36.4 | 1.8 | 17.5 | 24.6 | 70.9 | 279 | 36.0 | 197 |
| Bicol | 2.4 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 10.6 | 31.9 | 47.5 | 36.1 | 2.8 | 31.6 | 31.8 | 77.5 | 573 | 35.8 | 438 |
| Western Visayas | 6.5 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 11.5 | 25.9 | 50.8 | 40.3 | 2.1 | 27.3 | 23.1 | 76.7 | 723 | 39.2 | 541 |
| Central Visayas | 5.3 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 8.6 | 32.2 | 61.6 | 40.6 | 2.7 | 33.3 | 27.2 | 84.9 | 674 | 25.3 | 566 |
| Eastern Visayas | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 12.2 | 26.3 | 34.0 | 27.0 | 3.5 | 16.8 | 17.9 | 67.6 | 403 | 34.3 | 271 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 4.2 | 5.6 | 2.5 | 11.3 | 25.9 | 47.6 | 25.4 | 5.9 | 7.7 | 18.1 | 63.8 | 355 | 24.7 | 223 |
| Northern Mindanao | 7.6 | 5.9 | 3.2 | 11.0 | 23.5 | 47.8 | 26.8 | 4.7 | 19.0 | 14.7 | 72.1 | 474 | 26.3 | 338 |
| Davao | 5.7 | 4.9 | 1.0 | 9.9 | 22.4 | 54.6 | 22.0 | 4.5 | 8.9 | 13.8 | 65.9 | 514 | 27.0 | 333 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.8 | 6.9 | 32.2 | 42.7 | 13.3 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 11.8 | 62.7 | 461 | 25.6 | 277 |
| CAR | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 13.2 | 43.7 | 55.3 | 26.4 | 1.5 | 22.3 | 35.1 | 80.0 | 197 | 46.4 | 153 |
| ARMM | 5.7 | 2.6 | 5.7 | 15.1 | 33.6 | 61.5 | 18.9 | 4.6 | 7.5 | 11.9 | 76.6 | 350 | 13.7 | 262 |
| Caraga | 5.1 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 9.8 | 32.3 | 48.8 | 28.0 | 3.1 | 23.6 | 30.2 | 76.0 | 254 | 28.8 | 191 |
| NCR | 7.2 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 16.1 | 28.9 | 50.3 | 41.6 | 3.5 | 29.6 | 30.5 | 80.9 | 1,357 | 38.8 | 1,093 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 5.9 | 5.5 | 2.1 | 14.2 | 28.3 | 50.4 | 36.2 | 3.8 | 22.8 | 25.0 | 76.2 | 2,829 | 37.4 | 2,124 |
| Rural | 4.1 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 10.7 | 28.6 | 46.4 | 29.7 | 3.5 | 18.7 | 21.1 | 71.6 | 6,976 | 32.8 | 4,906 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 4.8 | 5.5 | 2.2 | 8.7 | 30.8 | 35.9 | 26.5 | 2.0 | 13.9 | 22.2 | 64.4 | 921 | 30.9 | 579 |
| High school undergraduate | 4.4 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 10.0 | 27.2 | 41.0 | 30.9 | 2.2 | 18.3 | 20.4 | 68.1 | 3,498 | 29.8 | 2,359 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 4.6 | 4.7 | 1.8 | 12.0 | 28.6 | 47.1 | 31.6 | 4.4 | 20.9 | 21.3 | 74.6 | 3,052 | 38.2 | 2,225 |
| College or higher | 5.0 | 4.7 | 2.7 | 15.0 | 29.6 | 62.5 | 34.5 | 5.1 | 23.9 | 26.6 | 81.6 | 2,333 | 35.9 | 1,865 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 4.0 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 8.9 | 29.7 | 41.4 | 27.3 | 3.7 | 17.7 | 21.6 | 68.3 | 1,954 | 27.7 | 1,316 |
| Second | 4.4 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 9.8 | 29.4 | 46.1 | 31.5 | 2.8 | 19.6 | 20.5 | 71.0 | 2,018 | 31.4 | 1,409 |
| Middle | 4.9 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 13.0 | 27.2 | 47.2 | 31.3 | 3.8 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 74.3 | 2,080 | 34.3 | 1,520 |
| Fourth | 4.7 | 4.5 | 2.0 | 11.9 | 29.4 | 49.3 | 32.1 | 3.4 | 20.1 | 25.0 | 75.4 | 2,062 | 37.3 | 1,537 |
| Highest (Richest) | 5.2 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 15.2 | 26.8 | 54.7 | 36.1 | 4.3 | 23.6 | 25.5 | 75.9 | 1,691 | 40.5 | 1,248 |
| Total | 4.6 | 4.5 | 2.3 | 11.7 | 28.5 | 47.6 | 31.6 | 3.6 | 19.9 | 22.2 | 73.0 | 9,805 | 34.2 | 7,029 |

Survey respondents who experienced a specific RH problem were asked if they consulted a doctor or a health professional for their problem. Of those who experienced any symptom of RH problems, more females ( $34.2 \%$ ) consulted a medical professional than did males (27.4\%). The older youth ( $20-24$ years old), the ever married, urban residents, and richer youth tend to engage the assistance of medical personnel more than their counterparts do. For both males and females, Central Luzon and ARMM posted the highest and the lowest proportions, respectively, of youth who sought medical attention for their RH problem. Interestingly, while health utilization among females from CAR is among the highest, the reverse is true for their male counterparts, suggesting the need to further encourage health-seeking behavior among male youth in CAR.

## STIs and HIV/AIDS

Addressing STIs is a major step in ensuring the RH of the youth. STIs are infections that are transmitted through sexual contact. According to the WHO (2015), there are more than 30 bacteria, viruses, and parasites that can be spread through person-to-person sexual contact. The most common diseases that these bacteria cause are chlamydia, gonorrhea, hepatitis, syphilis, human papilloma virus, and HIV.

Among the STIs, HIV/AIDS is one of the most serious public health concerns. HIV can be transmitted not only through sexual intercourse but also through mother-to-child transmission, blood transfusion, and intravenous drug use. HIV, however, cannot be transmitted through casual contact (e.g., kissing, shaking hands, or sharing food, clothing, or toilet seats), nor can it be spread by mosquitoes.

Unlike most parts of the world, the Philippines is one of the few countries with an accelerating increase of new HIV cases (UNAIDS, 2014). Once described as having a "low and slow" prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS, the number of HIV cases in the country is now rising at a "fast and furious" rate. In recent years, the Department
of Health has noted an alarming increase in the number of Filipinos infected with HIV. From 1984 to June 2015, there have been 26,456 diagnosed HIV/AIDS cases in the country, of which 22,032 or 83 percent were reported in the past five years (Department of Health, 2015). Young people aged 15-24 are considered a vulnerable sector for HIV/AIDS, as they account for more than a quarter of Filipinos living with HIV. This vulnerable population is predominantly male, with male-to-male sexual contact as the primary mode of transmission.

## Awareness of STIs and HIV/AIDS

To assess the Filipino youth's awareness of STIs and HIV/AIDS, the survey asked whether the respondents know about infections or diseases that are associated with sex or with having sex (STIs). Regardless of their response to this question, the respondents were also asked if they have heard of an illness called AIDS.

Results reveal a generally high level of awareness of AIDS among Filipino youth (83.3\%), with no notable variation by sex (Table 9.6). Interestingly, awareness of the more general STIs is considerably lower, with less than half (47.4\%) reporting knowing of STIs. Differentials in the awareness of STIs and AIDS are similar, with higher awareness found among the older cohort of youth, the urban residents, those with higher educational attainment, and those with higher socioeconomic status. Geographic differences also exhibit similar patterns, with NCR, Davao Region, and Central Luzon youth ranked the highest in terms of awareness of STIs and AIDS. The least aware of these diseases are the youth from ARMM, where only 43.8 percent have heard of AIDS and 15.8 percent are aware of STIs.

Respondents who have heard of AIDS were further asked if they think AIDS is curable. Additionally, they were asked a direct question: "What are the chances that a person like you will get AIDS?" Young Filipinos' knowledge of HIV/ AIDS is still shrouded in misinformation, as only 4 in 10 believe that AIDS is curable, with more males and older youth subscribing to this belief.

Table 9.6 Percent of youth who are aware and know STIs and HIV/AIDS by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Know STIs | Have heard of AIDS | No. of youth | Think that AIDS is curable | Think that there is no chance of them getting HIV | No. of youth who have heard of AIDS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 50.5 | 81.9 | 9,362 | 43.1 | 72.4 | 7,644 |
| Female | 44.5 | 84.7 | 9,807 | 36.6 | 80.3 | 8,240 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 43.3 | 79.8 | 11,414 | 38.5 | 76.4 | 9,061 |
| 20-24 | 53.5 | 88.5 | 7,753 | 41.3 | 76.7 | 6,825 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 47.9 | 82.7 | 14,672 | 39.1 | 76.0 | 12,082 |
| Ever married | 45.9 | 85.3 | 4,495 | 41.8 | 78.2 | 3,805 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 49.2 | 81.8 | 942 | 42.7 | 83.4 | 770 |
| Cagayan Valley | 41.2 | 76.6 | 671 | 44.8 | 79.5 | 502 |
| Central Luzon | 60.9 | 89.6 | 2,049 | 38.5 | 89.7 | 1,832 |
| CALABARZON | 44.1 | 86.7 | 2,545 | 42.7 | 74.6 | 2,199 |
| MIMAROPA | 49.6 | 85.9 | 562 | 47.8 | 85.7 | 482 |
| Bicol | 45.0 | 80.6 | 1,093 | 48.5 | 85.8 | 880 |
| Western Visayas | 43.5 | 79.4 | 1,487 | 35.6 | 71.5 | 1,161 |
| Central Visayas | 46.9 | 83.3 | 1,415 | 36.9 | 61.9 | 1,175 |
| Eastern Visayas | 36.6 | 73.0 | 829 | 40.6 | 76.9 | 597 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 30.4 | 80.1 | 728 | 39.8 | 71.8 | 581 |
| Northern Mindanao | 30.9 | 79.1 | 920 | 36.5 | 58.1 | 726 |
| Davao | 52.4 | 90.8 | 960 | 26.6 | 75.8 | 863 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 34.1 | 76.5 | 899 | 33.1 | 60.7 | 679 |
| CAR | 51.5 | 86.2 | 370 | 34.2 | 83.7 | 319 |
| ARMM | 15.8 | 43.8 | 672 | 35.8 | 70.7 | 290 |
| Caraga | 40.8 | 87.5 | 520 | 44.4 | 65.1 | 455 |
| NCR | 70.5 | 94.8 | 2,508 | 42.3 | 83.0 | 2,376 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 63.0 | 92.0 | 5,227 | 38.9 | 80.8 | 4,787 |
| Rural | 41.5 | 80.1 | 13,941 | 40.1 | 74.6 | 11,098 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 26.9 | 58.4 | 2,651 | 44.8 | 72.2 | 1,537 |
| High school undergraduate | 40.4 | 79.9 | 7,028 | 38.2 | 76.2 | 5,582 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 51.7 | 90.5 | 5,465 | 43.6 | 77.5 | 4,925 |
| College or higher | 67.4 | 95.9 | 4,023 | 34.9 | 77.3 | 3,844 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 28.1 | 68.8 | 3,838 | 38.0 | 71.8 | 2,627 |
| Second | 40.3 | 79.3 | 3,935 | 42.7 | 75.1 | 3,094 |
| Middle | 47.5 | 85.7 | 4,172 | 42.1 | 77.6 | 3,558 |
| Fourth | 58.9 | 90.9 | 4,003 | 38.4 | 78.5 | 3,629 |
| Highest (Richest) | 64.6 | 92.9 | 3,220 | 36.9 | 78.5 | 2,977 |
| Total | 47.4 | 83.3 | 19,167 | 39.7 | 76.5 | 15,887 |

In addition, about 8 in 10 think that there is no chance of them getting AIDS in the future, a manifestation of a general feeling of invincibility among the youth. While no age differential was found, there is a clear gender disparity, with more females (80.3\%) than males (72.4\%) thinking there is no chance of them getting infected with HIV.

Trends in the awareness and knowledge of HIV/ AIDS

One of the most worrisome findings in YAFS4 is the evidence of a decline in the awareness of HIV/AIDS (Figure 9.2). In 1994, 95 percent of the youth expressed awareness of HIV and AIDS. This remained largely the same in 2002. However, in 2013, the level dropped to only 83.3 percent. The decrease is steeper among males (from 94.5\% in 1994 to $81.9 \%$ in 2013) than among females (from 95\% in 1994 to 84.7\% in 2013). This declining trend is corroborated by the results of the series of National Demographic and Health Surveys, which documented a similar drop in the awareness of AIDS not only among the 15-24 age group but also among all women of reproductive age (15-49 years; National Statistics Office \& ORC Macro, 2004; Philippine Statistics Authority \& ICF International, 2014). If the declining level of HIV/AIDS awareness among our young people is a driving force behind the dramatic upsurge in HIV cases in the country, then this drop in awareness warrants a more indepth investigation.

## Knowledge of HIV/AIDS

One of the key indicators of the HIV/ AIDS response to Millennium Development Goal 6 (to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases) is the proportion of the population aged 15-24 with comprehensive knowledge of HIV. Comprehensive knowledge of HIV is defined as correctly identifying the two major ways of preventing the sexual transmission of HIV (i.e., using condoms and limiting sex to one faithful, uninfected partner), rejecting the two most common local misconceptions about HIV transmission, and knowing that a healthylooking person can be HIV positive (UNAIDS, 2009). In the YAFS4 survey, respondents were asked whether they agreed with each of the following five knowledge statements on HIV prevention and local misconceptions:

1. The risk of HIV transmission can be reduced by having sex with only one uninfected partner who has no other sexual partners.
2. A person can reduce the risk of getting infected with HIV by using a condom every time they have sex.
3. A healthy-looking person can have HIV.
4. A person can get HIV from mosquito bites.
5. A person can get HIV by sharing food with someone who is infected.
The last two statements were reverse coded to reflect the correct information. A person who agrees with all five statements is

Figure 9.2 Percent of youth who have heard of HIV/AIDS by sex: 1994, 2002, 2013

deemed to have comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS.

Table 9.7 shows the proportion with correct knowledge for each of the five statements and the proportion with comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS. Overall, only 16.8 percent of Filipino youth have comprehensive knowledge of HIV/ AIDS, a level far below the 95 percent target set at the 2001 United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV and AIDS (United Nations, 2001). The proportion with comprehensive knowledge is higher among males, the older cohort, the urban residents, the higher educated, and those of higher socioeconomic status. Across the regions, the highest proportions with comprehensive knowledge are the youth from CAR (24\%), NCR (22\%), and Central Luzon (20.9\%), while the regions with the lowest levels are ARMM (6.1\%) and Northern Mindanao (9.1\%).

A comparison of results across the five statements indicates that the proportion with correct knowledge is lowest for the statement "A person cannot get HIV by sharing food with someone who is infected" (41.8\%). On the other hand, the highest proportion at 68.2 percent was posted for the statement that the risk of HIV can be reduced by maintaining a monogamous sexual relationship. Also worth noting is that two in three Filipino youth correctly answered that mosquito bites cannot transmit HIV.

## Summary and conclusions

This chapter discussed several aspects of youth RH, such as milestones in pubertal development, experience of RH problems, and the awareness and knowledge of STIs including HIV/ AIDS. In terms of pubertal development, trends in mean age at circumcision, mean age at first nocturnal emission, and mean age at menarche have largely remained the same over the past two decades. When it comes to RH problems, there is a gender disparity in both experience and consultation with medical professionals. Compared with their male counterparts, a higher percentage of females have experienced
any RH problem (73\%) and have consulted a medical professional (34.2\%). But the most worrisome finding in YAFS4 is the decline in the level of awareness of HIV/AIDS among the youth, with a more significant decline among males than females. This issue is further exacerbated by a very low level of comprehensive knowledge, pegged at 16.8 percent. This level is dismally lower than the 95 percent target set by the United Nations (2001).

Given these findings, much is needed to address various reproductive concerns of the Filipino youth, from access to medical professionals to information and dissemination about sexual health. While the recently passed RH Law promises to improve adolescent RH and provide RH education for the youth, more concrete and strategic steps are needed to address youth access to information and RH services. Perhaps the most pressing issue that needs immediate programmatic response is increasing the youth's awareness and knowledge of HIV/AIDS. Given the existing societal stigma surrounding HIV/AIDS, a critical intervention is needed in various sectors. Among the youth, education has an important role in reaching comprehensive knowledge. Since the proportion of those with comprehensive knowledge is lower among females, the younger cohort, rural residents, the lower educated, and those of lower socioeconomic status, educational programs and information campaigns might be needed to reach these sectors of the youth population.

Table 9.7 Percent of youth who correctly reject local misconceptions about HIV/AIDS and percent with comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS by background characteristics

| Background Characteristics | Percent of youth who say that: |  |  |  |  | With comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | No. of youth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The risk of HIV transmission can be reduced by having sex with only one uninfected partner who has no other sexual partners | A person can reduce the risk of getting infected with HIV by using a condom everytime they have sex | A healthylooking person can have HIV | A person cannot get HIV from mosquito bites | A person cannot get HIV by sharing food with someone who is infected |  |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 68.3 | 62.8 | 60.1 | 61.8 | 40.0 | 17.7 | 9,315 |
| Female | 68.1 | 55.3 | 59.4 | 68.3 | 43.4 | 16.0 | 9,745 |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 63.6 | 53.7 | 55.5 | 61.9 | 39.4 | 14.5 | 11,352 |
| 20-24 | 75.0 | 66.7 | 66.0 | 69.9 | 45.3 | 20.2 | 7,709 |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never marrried | 67.0 | 58.0 | 59.3 | 64.5 | 41.6 | 16.7 | 14,586 |
| Ever married | 72.1 | 62.1 | 61.3 | 67.3 | 42.1 | 17.3 | 4,474 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 64.2 | 53.5 | 56.3 | 64.8 | 45.8 | 18.3 | 935 |
| Cagayan Valley | 63.4 | 54.5 | 51.8 | 54.1 | 36.5 | 12.0 | 661 |
| Central Luzon | 81.9 | 71.6 | 67.1 | 72.8 | 42.9 | 20.9 | 2,040 |
| CALABARZON | 70.1 | 61.0 | 69.3 | 66.0 | 40.6 | 18.2 | 2,538 |
| MIMAROPA | 72.8 | 58.1 | 49.4 | 66.5 | 39.6 | 12.7 | 561 |
| Bicol | 67.7 | 58.4 | 43.6 | 66.2 | 38.9 | 13.7 | 1,092 |
| Western Visayas | 59.2 | 53.0 | 61.4 | 60.7 | 44.1 | 17.1 | 1,470 |
| Central Visayas | 64.0 | 55.2 | 60.5 | 71.1 | 42.6 | 16.6 | 1,415 |
| Eastern Visayas | 59.3 | 52.3 | 56.5 | 51.6 | 33.6 | 12.9 | 827 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 67.6 | 63.9 | 59.3 | 52.7 | 39.2 | 14.8 | 724 |
| Northern Mindanao | 53.4 | 43.1 | 48.0 | 59.7 | 41.9 | 9.1 | 917 |
| Davao | 69.5 | 60.0 | 65.4 | 65.7 | 49.8 | 16.5 | 945 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 60.7 | 51.8 | 57.9 | 52.5 | 40.8 | 18.5 | 878 |
| CAR | 67.5 | 63.2 | 62.7 | 69.4 | 50.8 | 24.0 | 367 |
| ARMM | 34.6 | 26.2 | 27.4 | 28.4 | 21.9 | 6.1 | 674 |
| Caraga | 69.0 | 56.8 | 60.1 | 66.3 | 39.9 | 13.1 | 519 |
| NCR | 84.1 | 73.2 | 67.7 | 82.5 | 46.8 | 22.0 | 2,494 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 79.4 | 69.7 | 67.9 | 75.6 | 45.9 | 21.1 | 5,194 |
| Rural | 64.0 | 54.9 | 56.7 | 61.2 | 40.2 | 15.2 | 13,866 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 46.7 | 40.3 | 38.1 | 41.4 | 26.8 | 8.4 | 2,636 |
| High school undergraduate | 62.2 | 53.3 | 54.0 | 61.0 | 37.9 | 12.7 | 6,982 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 75.5 | 65.5 | 65.2 | 72.1 | 46.2 | 19.6 | 5,431 |
| College or higher | 82.9 | 72.3 | 76.7 | 78.4 | 52.4 | 25.7 | 4,006 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 53.2 | 45.2 | 46.4 | 49.7 | 33.7 | 11.1 | 3,818 |
| Second | 62.0 | 51.7 | 54.9 | 59.4 | 40.0 | 13.9 | 3,908 |
| Middle | 70.1 | 61.3 | 62.4 | 67.0 | 41.6 | 17.0 | 4,152 |
| Fourth | 76.5 | 67.3 | 65.7 | 73.9 | 45.3 | 19.0 | 3,983 |
| Highest (Richest) | 80.8 | 70.8 | 70.8 | 77.1 | 49.2 | 24.4 | 3,199 |
| Total | 68.2 | 59.0 | 59.8 | 65.1 | 41.8 | 16.8 | 19,060 |

Note: a Comprehensive knowledge means knowing that consistent use of condoms during sexual intercourse and having just one HIV-negative and faithful partner can reduce the chances of getting HIV, knowing that a healthy-looking person can have HIV, and rejecting the two most common local misconceptions about AIDS can reduce the chances of getting Hiv, knowing that a healthy-looking person can have Hiv, and rejecting the two mos mis mion and prevention, i.e., knowing that a person cannot get HIV from mosquito bites and a person cannot get HIV by sharing food with someone who is not transmiss
infected.
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# Knowledge and Sources of Information about Sex and Reproduction 

Maria Midea M. Kabamalan

The YAFS surveys gather information that can provide possible explanatory factors for the variations in sexual and non-sexual risk behaviors of the youth. In relation to the sexual behaviors and their outcomes, YAFS4 asked about the youth's level of knowledge about sex and reproduction and their self-perceived adequacy of knowledge about sex. It also asked about their sources of information on sex and their preferences as to whom to consult if they have questions at home and in school regarding sex.

## Perceived adequacy of knowledge about sex

To get a sense of their perceived adequacy of knowledge about sex, the respondents were asked a direct question: "Do you think you have enough knowledge aboutsex?" Only 27.4 percent of Filipino youth think they have enough knowledge about sex, with a higher proportion among males (30.9\%) than females (24.1\%) and among the older ( $41.9 \%$ and $33.2 \%$ for males and females, respectively) than the younger youth ( $24 \%$ and $17.4 \%$ for males and females, respectively; Table 10.1).

By region, NCR has the highest percentage of youth who think they have enough knowledge about sex ( $51.7 \%$ among males and $36.1 \%$ among females), while ARMM has the lowest (15.5\% among males and $12.7 \%$ among females). In most of the regions, more males than females think they have enough knowledge about sex. In particular, the proportion of males in NCR,

Central Visayas, Ilocos, and Bicol who think they have enough knowledge about sex is at least 14 percentage points higher than that of their female counterparts. In contrast, more females than males in Caraga, Cagayan Valley, and Eastern Visayas think they have enough knowledge about sex, with a difference of at least five percentage points. Not surprisingly, more youth from urban areas reported having enough knowledge about sex compared with those from rural areas.

In terms of educational background, results show an education gradient, with an increasing proportion who think they have adequate knowledge about sex as the education level rises. However, the percentage among the college educated who think they have adequate knowledge is not high (only $41.3 \%$ for males and $31.5 \%$ for females), indicating a general selfperception of inadequate knowledge among the youth regardless of education level. A similar gradient is found with regard to socioeconomic status (SES), with the proportion who think they have adequate knowledge increasing as SES improves. This pattern is more pronounced among males than females.

Comparing the percentage of youth who think they have enough knowledge about sex in the three YAFS surveys (1994, 2002, and 2013), Figure 9.1 shows that this percentage has not improved over the past 20 years, with the 2013 level the same as that in 1994. In all three rounds, more males thought they had enough knowledge about sex compared with the females.

Table 10.1 Percent distribution of youth who said they have enough knowledge about sex by background characteristics and by sex

| Background Characteristics | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent who said they have enough knowledge about sex | Number | Percent who said they have enough knowledge about sex | Number |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 24.0 | 5,748 | 17.4 | 5,630 |
| 20-24 | 41.9 | 3,582 | 33.2 | 4,142 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 29.7 | 471 | 15.6 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 24.0 | 339 | 29.4 | 321 |
| Central Luzon | 24.4 | 951 | 25.7 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 35.7 | 1,243 | 24.9 | 1,301 |
| MIMAROPA | 28.5 | 281 | 30.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 29.8 | 519 | 15.9 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 39.0 | 760 | 31.0 | 711 |
| Central Visayas | 34.4 | 739 | 19.1 | 671 |
| Eastern Visayas | 20.1 | 426 | 25.1 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 26.9 | 371 | 17.8 | 354 |
| Northern Mindanao | 19.4 | 446 | 18.6 | 471 |
| Davao | 23.1 | 445 | 16.3 | 513 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 18.8 | 436 | 19.0 | 457 |
| CAR | 32.2 | 171 | 21.7 | 197 |
| ARMM | 15.5 | 318 | 12.7 | 348 |
| Caraga | 17.4 | 265 | 23.8 | 255 |
| NCR | 51.7 | 1,150 | 36.1 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 40.7 | 2,395 | 31.5 | 2,822 |
| Rural | 27.5 | 6,935 | 21.1 | 6,950 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 23.5 | 1,719 | 16.1 | 916 |
| High school undergraduate | 26.6 | 3,522 | 16.7 | 3,482 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 35.2 | 2,406 | 29.3 | 3,041 |
| College or higher | 41.3 | 1,684 | 31.5 | 2,332 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 21.8 | 1,875 | 20.3 | 1,946 |
| Second | 24.0 | 1,909 | 19.4 | 2,004 |
| Middle | 31.3 | 2,086 | 22.5 | 2,077 |
| Fourth | 37.9 | 1,936 | 25.9 | 2,055 |
| Highest (Richest) | 41.3 | 1,522 | 33.9 | 1,690 |
| Total | 30.9 | 9,330 | 24.1 | 9,772 |

Figure 10.1 Trend in percentage of youth who said they have enough knowledge about sex: 1994, 2002 and 2013


## Knowledge about reproduction

To test for actual knowledge, the respondents were asked several questions. One set of questions, adapted from the National Demographic and Health Survey, tested their knowledge of the timing of conception. Respondents were also asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following series of statements about reproduction:

1. A girl can get pregnant before she experiences her first menstruation.
2. A woman can get pregnant from one unprotected sexual intercourse.
3. A girl can get pregnant if she engages in sexual intercourse any time during her menstrual cycle.
4. A woman cannot get pregnant if her partner did not ejaculate during sexual intercourse.
Results in Tables 10.2 and 10.3 show an overall poor level of knowledge about human reproduction among both males and females. Only 12 percent of males and 18.1 percent of females correctly identified the time during the menstrual cycle when a woman is most likely to conceive if she has sexual relations. Of the four statements above, only the second statement was correctly answered by a sizable majority (73.1\% of males and $78.3 \%$ of females). The percentages who gave a correct answer to the three remaining statements ( 1,3 , and 4 ) are all below 36 percent.

Comparing by age group, place of residence, education, and SES among males, the results in Table 10.2 indicate that, in general, a
slightly higher percentage of older youth, those residing in urban areas, the more educated, and those who come from richer households gave correct answers to the questions/statements on human reproduction. The ranking of the regions according to the percentage who gave the correct answers varies depending on the knowledge item considered. None of the regions consistently ranked lowest or highest for all or most of the knowledge items.

For females, the older youth and the more educated generally have a higher percentage of correct answers (Table 10.3). Unlike the male pattern, urban residents do not always outperform rural residents in the percentage of correct answers among females. The differential by SES does not follow a distinct pattern; those who belong to the higher SES groups do not necessarily know better. In contrast to the patterns found among males by region,

Table 10.2 Percent distribution of males by knowledge of when pregnancy is likely to occur by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent who correctly identified the time when a woman is most likely to get pregnant if she has sexual relations. | Percent who correctly answered that that a girl can get pregnant before she experiences her first menstruation. | Percent who correctly answered that a woman can get pregnant from one unprotected sexual intercourse. | Percent who correctly answered that a woman can get pregnant even if her partner did not ejaculate during sexual intercourse. | Number of cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 11.6 | 26.9 | 69.9 | 35.3 | 5,730 |
| 20-24 | 12.8 | 31.8 | 78.1 | 36.1 | 3,567 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 12.1 | 22.5 | 57.3 | 32.8 | 471 |
| Cagayan Valley | 5.2 | 30.8 | 61.6 | 39.8 | 338 |
| Central Luzon | 13.6 | 45.2 | 78.7 | 30.9 | 945 |
| CALABARZON | 12.6 | 34.7 | 80.4 | 46.3 | 1,240 |
| MIMAROPA | 9.9 | 27.5 | 72.8 | 30.8 | 282 |
| Bicol | 16.3 | 31.7 | 64.4 | 27.5 | 515 |
| Western Visayas | 11.0 | 21.7 | 69.1 | 33.4 | 746 |
| Central Visayas | 19.1 | 17.4 | 66.7 | 41.9 | 740 |
| Eastern Visayas | 14.5 | 20.0 | 65.6 | 12.9 | 425 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 10.1 | 19.6 | 80.1 | 29.9 | 371 |
| Northern Mindanao | 12.8 | 24.7 | 75.7 | 37.5 | 447 |
| Davao | 8.7 | 28.3 | 77.0 | 38.2 | 444 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 8.5 | 20.9 | 73.0 | 47.9 | 436 |
| CAR | 7.3 | 22.8 | 63.4 | 36.8 | 170 |
| ARMM | 5.7 | 30.0 | 54.8 | 33.8 | 318 |
| Caraga | 7.8 | 27.0 | 73.2 | 44.6 | 265 |
| NCR | 12.3 | 33.9 | 85.7 | 32.3 | 1,144 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 14.2 | 33.6 | 80.7 | 35.4 | 2,385 |
| Rural | 11.3 | 27.2 | 70.5 | 35.7 | 6,913 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 9.5 | 25.6 | 63.4 | 34.0 | 1,713 |
| High school undergraduate | 12.1 | 27.8 | 70.1 | 35.2 | 3,516 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 12.0 | 29.3 | 77.3 | 37.0 | 2,386 |
| College or higher | 14.6 | 33.6 | 83.3 | 36.3 | 1,683 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 10.1 | 25.2 | 65.7 | 33.9 | 1,880 |
| Second | 11.1 | 25.4 | 68.3 | 37.0 | 1,911 |
| Middle | 12.9 | 28.2 | 72.4 | 37.5 | 2,089 |
| Fourth | 12.1 | 31.7 | 79.5 | 33.4 | 1,938 |
| Highest (Richest) | 14.5 | 34.7 | 80.8 | 36.3 | 1,525 |
| Total | 12.0 | 28.8 | 73.1 | 35.6 | 9,297 |

two regions-Central Luzon and CAR-are consistently in the top six, while Eastern Visayas is at the bottom of the list in three statements.

Altogether, these results show that Filipino youth are generally not knowledgeable about human reproduction. What is most surprising is that the percentage who gave correct answers to four of the five knowledge items is extremely low among the college educated. For instance, only 14.6 percent of college-educated males and
21.9 percent of college-educated females could correctly identify the time during the menstrual cycle when a woman is most likely to get pregnant if she has sexual relations.

## Sources of information about puberty

Given these levels of knowledge, one could ask, "What could be the youth's sources of information in matters pertaining to sexuality?"

Table 10.3 Percent distribution of females by knowledge of when pregnancy is likely to occur by background characteristics
$\left.\begin{array}{lllll} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Percent who correctly } \\ \text { identified the time } \\ \text { when a woman is most } \\ \text { Bikely to get pregnant } \\ \text { if she has sexual } \\ \text { relations. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Percent who agrees } \\ \text { that a girl can get } \\ \text { pregnant before she } \\ \text { experiences her first } \\ \text { menstruation. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Percent who agrees } \\ \text { that a woman can get } \\ \text { pregnant from one } \\ \text { unprotected sexual } \\ \text { intercourse. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Percent who agrees } \\ \text { that a woman can } \\ \text { get pregnant if her } \\ \text { partner did not } \\ \text { ejaculate during } \\ \text { sexual intercourse. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Number of cases }\end{array}\right]$

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Father | Mother | Brother/ Sister | Other relatives | Friends | Others | Total | No. of Males | None | Father | Mother | "Brother/ Sister" | Other relatives | Friends | Others | Total | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 27.3 | 17.5 | 23.7 | 4.1 | 4.8 | 17.2 | 5.6 | 100.0 | 5,727 | 7.1 | 1.5 | 70.5 | 6.6 | 8.2 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 5,615 |
| 20-24 | 30.2 | 17.5 | 20.0 | 4.9 | 4.4 | 18.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 | 3,568 | 9.2 | 1.4 | 72.4 | 4.7 | 7.4 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 4,145 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 50.3 | 12.5 | 9.1 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 13.4 | 10.0 | 100.0 | 471 | 7.9 | 1.5 | 68.8 | 6.6 | 9.0 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 29.4 | 23.7 | 24.0 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 12.2 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 337 | 9.6 | 1.9 | 73.6 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 322 |
| Central Luzon | 27.4 | 32.8 | 13.2 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 14.2 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 951 | 4.9 | 1.7 | 81.0 | 3.6 | 6.4 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 24.9 | 14.3 | 21.1 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 22.4 | 9.0 | 100.0 | 1,239 | 10.3 | 0.7 | 67.6 | 9.0 | 6.0 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 1,304 |
| MIMAROPA | 19.0 | 25.0 | 27.1 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 15.5 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 284 | 5.8 | 1.8 | 78.0 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 277 |
| Bicol | 17.4 | 16.1 | 31.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 21.1 | 4.8 | 100.0 | 522 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 72.8 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 570 |
| Western Visayas | 28.3 | 16.7 | 29.9 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 12.0 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 756 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 71.3 | 4.3 | 7.7 | 4.9 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 27.4 | 12.8 | 27.0 | 3.8 | 9.2 | 17.4 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 742 | 5.2 | 1.9 | 74.6 | 5.8 | 8.6 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 672 |
| Eastern Visayas | 30.8 | 13.6 | 23.8 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 17.9 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 425 | 15.5 | 1.5 | 60.5 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 5.8 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 400 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 48.5 | 14.9 | 12.5 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 369 | 14.7 | 0.6 | 67.7 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 22.6 | 11.0 | 37.0 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 18.8 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 446 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 76.1 | 4.9 | 7.4 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 472 |
| Davao | 29.5 | 8.6 | 34.2 | 3.4 | 8.8 | 14.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 444 | 13.6 | 1.4 | 68.9 | 4.2 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 501 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 31.9 | 16.2 | 18.1 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 16.2 | 10.2 | 100.0 | 432 | 8.2 | 1.8 | 75.2 | 3.8 | 8.2 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 452 |
| CAR | 44.4 | 15.2 | 8.2 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 15.8 | 9.4 | 100.0 | 171 | 6.1 | 1.5 | 70.4 | 9.7 | 6.6 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 196 |
| ARMM | 63.2 | 15.5 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 11.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 310 | 24.0 | 1.4 | 57.7 | 6.3 | 8.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 350 |
| Caraga | 19.0 | 16.0 | 30.8 | 2.7 | 6.5 | 20.9 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 263 | 5.1 | 1.6 | 74.0 | 6.7 | 7.1 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 254 |
| NCR | 15.0 | 20.6 | 20.7 | 8.7 | 4.9 | 24.3 | 5.8 | 100.0 | 1,136 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 69.4 | 5.4 | 11.4 | 4.7 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 1,348 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 21.4 | 19.3 | 21.5 | 6.6 | 4.3 | 20.7 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 2,376 | 4.9 | 1.7 | 71.9 | 5.6 | 8.8 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 2,811 |
| Rural | 30.8 | 16.8 | 22.6 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 16.4 | 5.1 | 100.0 | 6,921 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 71.1 | 5.9 | 7.4 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 6,949 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 37.1 | 18.1 | 21.2 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 13.3 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 1,713 | 18.7 | 1.3 | 62.0 | 4.9 | 9.0 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 919 |
| High school undergraduate | 28.6 | 16.6 | 22.9 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 17.5 | 5.8 | 100.0 | 3,515 | 7.6 | 1.7 | 69.5 | 6.8 | 8.3 | 3.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 3,480 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 25.4 | 18.1 | 20.9 | 4.8 | 6.2 | 18.7 | 6.0 | 100.0 | 2,397 | 7.8 | 1.4 | 72.7 | 5.9 | 7.6 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 3,040 |
| College or higher | 23.4 | 17.9 | 24.0 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 20.2 | 7.0 | 100.0 | 1,668 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 75.9 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 2,320 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 33.9 | 17.1 | 23.3 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 14.7 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 1,865 | 12.1 | 1.3 | 69.9 | 5.2 | 6.9 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 1,948 |
| Second | 37.5 | 16.0 | 22.5 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 17.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 1,904 | 9.7 | 1.2 | 71.3 | 5.8 | 7.1 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 2,009 |
| Middle | 27.1 | 16.3 | 22.6 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 19.6 | 5.4 | 100.0 | 2,082 | 7.0 | 1.3 | 72.9 | 5.9 | 8.0 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 2,066 |
| Fourth | 25.2 | 20.4 | 20.8 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 17.2 | 5.9 | 100.0 | 1,935 | 6.1 | 2.1 | 70.5 | 5.9 | 8.1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 2,055 |
| Highest (Richest) | 23.6 | 17.7 | 22.2 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 18.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 | 1,506 | 4.9 | 1.2 | 71.9 | 6.4 | 9.3 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 1,682 |
| Total | 28.4 | 17.5 | 22.3 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 17.5 | 5.3 | 100.0 | 9,295 | 8.0 | 1.5 | 71.3 | 5.8 | 7.8 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 9,760 |

There are several questions in YAFS4 designed to elicit information on the sources of information, including both persons and materials.

One question asked about the main person/s most helpful to the respondents in what they know about puberty. Table 10.4 shows that among males, 22.3 percent reported this person to be their mother, 17.5 percent cited their father, and another 17.5 percent mentioned their friends. However, almost 3 out of every 10 males said there is no particular person most helpful to them in what they know about puberty. Among females, about 7 in 10 reported this person to be their mother. Only 8 percent said that no particular person has been helpful to them.

Among male youth, the mother is more commonly mentioned by the younger youth, the college educated, and the rural residents. By region, mothers are mentioned by at least 25 percent of youth in MIMAROPA, Bicol, Western and Central Visayas, Northern Mindanao, Caraga, and Davao Region. Among female youth, the mother is more often mentioned by older youth and those with higher education. At least 75 percent of female youth in Central Luzon, MIMAROPA, CentralVisayas, Northern Mindanao, and SOCCSKSARGEN reported their mother as their source of information about puberty.

Differences in the characteristics of those who reported having no one who was most helpful to them in what they know about puberty

Figure 10.2a Percent distribution of male youth's top five persons most helpful to them on what they know about puberty: 2002 and 2013


Figure 10.2b Percent distribution of female youth's top five persons most helpful to them on what they know about puberty: Females 2002 and 2013

are also important to highlight if programs are to be designed for these youth. More of the older youth, the rural residents, and those with lower educational attainment among both males and females belong to this category. Across regions, male youth in ARMM, Ilocos, and Zamboanga Peninsula and female youth in ARMM, Eastern Visayas, and Zamboanga Peninsula have the highest proportion who said no one was helpful to them in what they know about puberty.

Compared with data from 2002 and focusing on the five most commonly mentioned persons, Figures 10.2 a and 10.2 b show that for both males and females, fewer youth in 2013 reported their parents, teachers, friends, and other relatives as the most helpful persons to them in what they know about puberty. The proportion who reported that no one was helpful to them rose alarmingly over the past decade.

Respondents were also asked what their most important sources of information about puberty were (see Table 10.5). What is most striking about the results presented in Table 10.5 is that 45.7 percent of males and 43.4 percent of females reported no sources of information about puberty in the form of materials. Of those who did mention material sources of information, books and television are the most common answers, with more females mmentioning books and more males mentioning television. By age, slightly more of the older youth reported having no material
sources compared with the younger youth. More of the older males mentioned television while more of the younger males mentioned books.

Across the regions, 78.1 percent of the males and 79.7 percent of the females in ARMM reported no material sources of information about puberty, the highest among the regions. Male youth in Central Luzon and Bicol and female youth from CAR and NCR have the lowest percentage (though still high at close to 30\%) who reported no source. Among males, books are most frequently mentioned by residents of Western Visayas (22.5\%) and Bicol (20.6\%), while television is most commonly mentioned in Cagayan Valley, Central Luzon, and Bicol (higher than 30\%). Among females, books are most popular among residents of Cagayan Valley and Bicol (both at 36.9\%) and Western Visayas (36.1\%), and television is most popular among those in Central Luzon (18.5\%), Caraga (17.5\%), and NCR (17.3\%). In CAR, 18.9 percent of males and 21 percent of females relied on school charts/ films; this source was also popular among Caraga males (19.8\%) and Zamboanga Peninsula females (20.4\%). Not surprisingly, males and females in NCR reported the highest percentages who relied on the Internet for information about puberty.

In terms of urban-rural differences, more youth in rural than urban areas reported no material source of information about puberty. Technology-based sources such as television and

Figure 10.3a. Percent distribution of male youth's top five material sources of information on puberty: 2002 and 2013


| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Books | Television | School charts/ <br> films | Internet | Magazines | Others | Total | No. of Males | None | Books | Television | $\begin{aligned} & \text { School } \\ & \text { charts/ } \\ & \text { films } \end{aligned}$ | Internet | Magazines | Others | Total | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 44.9 | 16.2 | 20.0 | 7.5 | 5.6 | 1.5 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 5,691 | 42.7 | 24.3 | 11.9 | 11.0 | 5.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 5,566 |
| 20-24 | 46.9 | 11.0 | 22.7 | 7.5 | 4.7 | 2.3 | 4.9 | 100.0 | 3,540 | 44.4 | 23.3 | 13.3 | 10.9 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 4,100 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 67.5 | 13.2 | 8.9 | 1.7 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 471 | 54.1 | 23.4 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 40.6 | 11.9 | 31.3 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 6.9 | 100.0 | 335 | 41.9 | 36.9 | 10.0 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 320 |
| Central Luzon | 28.8 | 13.5 | 32.5 | 10.3 | 6.9 | 2.1 | 5.9 | 100.0 | 933 | 38.0 | 15.6 | 18.5 | 18.4 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 1,090 |
| calabarzon | 43.5 | 16.1 | 25.8 | 6.7 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 1,232 | 48.4 | 23.1 | 10.3 | 10.8 | 4.1 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 1,301 |
| mimaropa | 36.9 | 19.9 | 25.2 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 282 | 35.4 | 31.4 | 15.5 | 9.7 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 277 |
| Bicol | 29.8 | 20.6 | 34.4 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 520 | 35.7 | 36.9 | 14.8 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 569 |
| Western Visayas | 42.8 | 22.5 | 17.4 | 8.2 | 1.1 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 746 | 42.3 | 36.1 | 10.3 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 679 |
| Central Visayas | 57.7 | 16.4 | 6.8 | 3.3 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 737 | 44.2 | 27.7 | 8.7 | 6.9 | 6.0 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 667 |
| Eastern Visayas | 44.2 | 14.0 | 26.6 | 6.4 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 421 | 41.1 | 28.5 | 14.1 | 9.6 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 5.0 | 100.0 | 397 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 58.5 | 13.3 | 11.7 | 10.8 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 369 | 30.6 | 28.6 | 10.5 | 20.4 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 353 |
| Northem Mindanao | 48.5 | 12.4 | 14.4 | 16.0 | 3.2 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 100.0 | 443 | 55.2 | 17.8 | 11.4 | 10.1 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 466 |
| Davao | 56.2 | 6.4 | 21.2 | 4.6 | 5.7 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 100.0 | 438 | 61.8 | 12.0 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 498 |
| soccsksargen | 56.6 | 15.0 | 15.5 | 7.6 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 433 | 49.7 | 23.9 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 439 |
| car | 47.9 | 13.6 | 5.3 | 18.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 8.3 | 100.0 | 169 | 25.6 | 34.9 | 7.7 | 21.0 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 5.1 | 100.0 | 195 |
| ARMM | 78.1 | 5.2 | 10.0 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 310 | 79.7 | 13.7 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 350 |
| Caraga | 39.9 | 10.3 | 21.7 | 19.8 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 100.0 | 263 | 39.4 | 22.3 | 17.5 | 12.0 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 251 |
| NCR | 36.9 | 9.8 | 23.9 | 8.4 | 15.7 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 1,130 | 29.8 | 18.6 | 17.3 | 16.4 | 14.4 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 1,351 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 38.4 | 12.8 | 23.2 | 8.5 | 11.1 | 1.9 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 2,354 | 34.5 | 20.4 | 15.7 | 14.9 | 9.5 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2,788 |
| Rural | 48.1 | 14.7 | 20.3 | 7.1 | 3.3 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 6,877 | 47.0 | 25.3 | 11.2 | 9.3 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 6,878 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 62.3 | 8.3 | 19.3 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 100.0 | 1,716 | 66.2 | 11.7 | 12.1 | 4.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 911 |
| High school undergraduate | 46.0 | 15.7 | 20.1 | 8.5 | 4.7 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 3,497 | 46.9 | 22.9 | 11.4 | 10.5 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 3,464 |
| High school graduat/Vocational | 41.9 | 13.1 | 24.1 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 5.4 | 100.0 | 2,369 | 43.7 | 23.1 | 14.0 | 11.5 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 3,001 |
| College or higher | 32.8 | 18.8 | 20.5 | 10.1 | 10.8 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 1,650 | 28.8 | 31.1 | 12.2 | 13.6 | 8.6 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 2,291 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 56.6 | 14.0 | 14.7 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 5.2 | 100.0 | 1,865 | 58.8 | 19.4 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 1,926 |
| Second | 48.3 | 12.8 | 21.9 | 6.0 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 6.0 | 100.0 | 1,889 | 47.4 | 24.3 | 12.5 | 9.0 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 1,987 |
| Middle | 42.8 | 14.7 | 23.2 | 9.1 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 2,068 | 41.6 | 26.6 | 13.2 | 10.6 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 2,044 |
| Fourth | 41.7 | 14.4 | 22.4 | 7.9 | 8.3 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 1,923 | 35.8 | 25.6 | 13.6 | 12.6 | 7.2 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 2,039 |
| Highest (Richest) | 37.7 | 15.4 | 23.1 | 7.7 | 10.6 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 1,488 | 32.4 | 23.3 | 15.6 | 13.9 | 9.7 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 1,668 |
| Total | 45.7 | 14.2 | 21.0 | 7.5 | 5.3 | 1.8 | 4.5 | 100.0 | 9,231 | 43.4 | 23.9 | 12.5 | 10.9 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 9,666 |

the Internet are reported by more youth in urban than rural areas. The patterns by education follow expectations that a higher percentage of less educated youth would report no sources compared with those with higher education; this is true for both males and females. Patterns by SES also indicate that higher percentages of youth from poorer families than youth from richer households reported having no sources of information.

A comparison of 2013 YAFS results with those from 2002 shows a shift in material sources (see Figures 10.3a and 10.3b). Mention of traditional media forms such as books and magazines, school charts or films, and television as sources of information declined from 2002 to 2013, while the percentage who cited the Internet as a material source of information increased sharply between the two periods.

## Sources of information about sex

The youth were also asked to mention all their material sources of information about sex. As shown in Table 10.6, the most commonly mentioned among male youth are television (22.3\%), the Internet (18.3\%), and books (12.5\%). The same sources were frequently mentioned by females but with a slightly different ranking: books (22.7\%), television (18.5\%), and the Internet (14.3\%). In 2013, more than 4 in 10 youth ( $40.4 \%$ of males and $42.8 \%$ of females) mentioned no material sources of information on sex.

By age, more of the older males (24.7\%) and females (20.3\%) than their younger counterparts ( $20.8 \%$ for males and $17.2 \%$ for females) mentioned television, while more of the younger youth mentioned books, partly because most $15-19$-year-olds are still in school. The Internet was reported by a higher percentage of younger females and older males. Similar to the patterns found earlier for sources of information about puberty, fewer youth from rural areas than urban areas reported the Internet as their source of information about sex. This is also validated by the higher percentages of youth from the more urbanized regions (NCR, CALABARZON, and Central Visayas) reporting the Internet as a source. Likewise, patterns found by education and SES reflect the association of access to the Internet for information about sex with higher education and higher SES.

The regions of NCR and ARMM again reveal a stark contrast with regard to sources of information about sex. In ARMM, 74.8 percent of males and 79.6 percent of females reported having no material sources of information on sex; in NCR, the corresponding percentages are 20 percent for males and 23.3 percent for females.

Trend data indicate that mention of the Internet as a source of information on sex has become more frequent over time, while mention of magazines declined from 1994 to 2013 (Figures 10.4a and 10.4b). There is no clear trend on the use of television, books, and school charts or films. A cause for concern is the steady

Figure 10.4a. Percent distribution of male youth's top five material sources of information about sex: 1994, 2002, and 2013

Table 10.6 Percent distribution of youth's (material) sources of information about sex by background characteristics and by sex

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Books | Television | School charts/ films | Internet | Magazines | Radio | Movies | Others | No. of Males | None | Books | Television | School charts/ films | Internet | Magazines | Radio | Movies | Others | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 41.0 | 13.2 | 20.8 | 5.2 | 17.7 | 5.5 | 2.7 | 6.0 | 10.2 | 5,744 | 42.9 | 23.7 | 17.2 | 6.7 | 14.9 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 7.5 | 5,622 |
| 20-24 | 39.6 | 11.3 | 24.7 | 3.2 | 19.3 | 6.8 | 3.2 | 6.6 | 11.8 | 3,587 | 42.8 | 21.4 | 20.3 | 4.5 | 13.5 | 8.2 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 10.5 | 4,143 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ilocos | 63.4 | 10.7 | 13.1 | 1.1 | 15.3 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 5.7 | 471 | 49.4 | 22.8 | 10.4 | 4.8 | 11.6 | 6.7 | . 6 | . 7 | 4.7 | 467 |
| Cagayan Valley | 38.9 | 12.8 | 31.5 | 2.9 | 7.4 | 10.9 | 2.3 | 17.2 | 9.1 | 342 | 43.4 | 32.4 | 16.5 | 1.6 | 8.5 | 6.7 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 9.5 | 323 |
| Central Luzon | 21.3 | 10.6 | 39.2 | 6.7 | 15.4 | 7.0 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 10.8 | 949 | 40.9 | 22.8 | 23.1 | 5.8 | 12.4 | 6.6 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 9.8 | 1,095 |
| CALABARZON | 35.7 | 13.0 | 21.0 | 2.5 | 23.8 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 11.6 | 11.7 | 1,237 | 46.3 | 19.2 | 12.9 | 5.3 | 13.9 | 8.7 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 8.3 | 1,294 |
| MIMAROPA | 33.5 | 14.8 | 28.7 | 3.4 | 14.2 | 10.7 | 1.8 | 8.9 | 13.0 | 282 | 35.5 | 25.8 | 21.0 | 4.5 | 9.7 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 10.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 24.7 | 17.8 | 40.3 | 1.7 | 14.3 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 9.7 | 11.7 | 516 | 34.9 | 30.7 | 30.8 | 3.2 | 11.2 | 8.7 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 9.3 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 46.8 | 14.7 | 19.6 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 8.5 | 5.3 | 3.0 | 11.2 | 761 | 45.3 | 29.7 | 16.7 | 2.9 | 8.4 | 10.2 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 8.6 | 716 |
| Central Visayas | 51.7 | 17.4 | 6.2 | 1.2 | 16.5 | 7.1 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 9.8 | 741 | 43.3 | 23.4 | 13.1 | 3.3 | 17.1 | 7.8 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 11.3 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 39.8 | 13.7 | 31.7 | 2.7 | 14.7 | 7.3 | 3.5 | 13.3 | 9.7 | 427 | 41.1 | 20.3 | 23.9 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 7.3 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 12.4 | 401 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 53.7 | 13.2 | 17.4 | 8.0 | 9.6 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 5.5 | 371 | 34.6 | 32.7 | 17.9 | 12.2 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 14.3 | 354 |
| Northern Mindanao | 48.9 | 6.9 | 22.2 | 11.8 | 11.6 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 447 | 56.7 | 11.8 | 15.0 | 2.9 | 9.0 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 7.4 | 470 |
| Davao | 54.1 | 5.5 | 21.3 | 2.6 | 19.2 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 10.0 | 10.9 | 444 | 62.8 | 15.8 | 13.9 | 6.5 | 9.2 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 7.4 | 510 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 58.0 | 13.7 | 16.2 | 6.1 | 7.4 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 6.3 | 440 | 53.5 | 22.8 | 15.0 | 9.2 | 5.2 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 7.8 | 456 |
| CAR | 49.5 | 14.2 | 13.1 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 7.0 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 11.3 | 172 | 25.5 | 32.7 | 17.8 | 15.6 | 12.5 | 10.4 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 23.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 74.8 | 6.8 | 10.5 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 5.6 | 315 | 79.6 | 10.0 | 5.2 | 1.2 | 4.3 | 1.2 | . 0 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 347 |
| Caraga | 39.0 | 8.3 | 26.0 | 12.3 | 12.0 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 8.8 | 265 | 35.8 | 27.4 | 23.6 | 4.6 | 8.2 | 6.3 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 9.3 | 255 |
| NCR | 20.0 | 12.6 | 18.0 | 4.3 | 49.2 | 6.7 | 2.9 | 5.2 | 18.6 | 1,150 | 23.3 | 20.8 | 26.6 | 8.6 | 37.0 | 6.9 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 6.2 | 1,356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 26.7 | 12.2 | 21.5 | 5.3 | 37.0 | 6.2 | 2.6 | 5.6 | 14.9 | 2,392 | 31.7 | 23.2 | 22.8 | 7.0 | 27.0 | 7.3 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 8.9 | 2,819 |
| Rural | 45.2 | 12.6 | 22.6 | 4.1 | 11.9 | 5.9 | 3.0 | 6.5 | 9.4 | 6,940 | 47.4 | 22.5 | 16.8 | 5.3 | 9.2 | 6.8 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 6,946 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 59.4 | 6.8 | 19.2 | 1.3 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 8.3 | 1,723 | 65.8 | 9.8 | 15.8 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 8.4 | 912 |
| High school undergraduate | 42.2 | 12.4 | 22.0 | 5.6 | 15.1 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 5.6 | 10.5 | 3,522 | 48.5 | 20.8 | 15.5 | 6.5 | 9.7 | 4.7 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 7.4 | 3,486 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 34.7 | 11.4 | 26.0 | 4.1 | 19.2 | 7.4 | 4.3 | 7.4 | 14.1 | 2,399 | 41.9 | 21.5 | 21.6 | 4.0 | 12.0 | 6.8 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 11.0 | 3,039 |
| College or higher | 25.7 | 19.9 | 20.9 | 5.7 | 38.3 | 9.3 | 2.0 | 7.2 | 9.3 | 1,687 | 26.5 | 32.2 | 20.1 | 8.7 | 28.8 | 12.4 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 8.0 | 2,327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 57.4 | 9.4 | 16.9 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 7.6 | 1,865 | 58.2 | 17.2 | 12.6 | 3.9 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 8.5 | 1,926 |
| Second | 45.8 | 11.8 | 24.9 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 7.2 | 11.2 | 1,889 | 47.2 | 23.0 | 18.8 | 4.9 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 10.4 | 1,987 |
| Middle | 38.0 | 14.0 | 23.9 | 4.4 | 17.3 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 10.9 | 2,068 | 44.4 | 21.6 | 19.1 | 6.2 | 11.5 | 5.6 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 8.9 | 2,044 |
| Fourth | 31.2 | 12.8 | 24.6 | 4.4 | 26.3 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 6.6 | 13.2 | 1,923 | 33.7 | 24.8 | 22.6 | 6.6 | 22.2 | 7.7 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 8.7 | 2,039 |
| Highest (Richest) | 27.8 | 14.8 | 20.8 | 5.0 | 39.1 | 7.9 | 1.8 | 6.6 | 10.9 | 1,488 | 29.3 | 27.3 | 19.3 | 7.5 | 27.5 | 10.9 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 6.9 | 1,668 |
| Total | 40.4 | 12.5 | 22.3 | 4.4 | 18.3 | 6.0 | 2.9 | 6.2 | 10.8 | 9,332 | 42.8 | 22.7 | 18.5 | 5.8 | 14.3 | 6.9 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 8.8 | 9,765 |

increase from 1994 to 2013 in the percentage of youth who said they had no material sources of information on sex.

## Persons to consult for questions on sex

When asked about the persons the youth would most likely consult for questions about sex, half of the males reported they would consult their friends, 15.2 percent said they would consult their father, and 11.1 percent said they would consult their mother (Table 10.7). Among females, 43.1 percent said they would consult their mother, and 25.9 percent said they would consult their friends. More of the 15-19-year-olds would consult their father or mother compared with the older youth. Almost a fourth (23.7\%) of the males and a fifth (19.6\%) of the females reported they would consult no one for questions about sex.

By region, the majority of male youth from CALABARZON (64.2\%) and NCR (59.3\%) reported they would consult their friends. In Central Luzon, 24.3 percent of the male youth said they would consult their father, while in Bicol, 20.6 percent of the male youth said they would consult their mother. Around 11 percent each from MIMAROPA, Northern Mindanao, and NCR said they would also consult health professionals. Among female youth, one eighth each from MIMAROPA and CALABARZON reported they would consult their father, 58.3 percent from Central Luzon said they would consult their mother, and 36.7 percent and 35.3

Figure 10.5a. Percent distribution of male youth's top five persons to consult for questions about sex: 2002 and 2013


| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | None | Father | Mother Br | rother | Sister | Other relatives | Spouse/ <br> Partner/ BF/GF | Friends | Doctor/ Nurse/ Midwife | Others | No. of Males | None | Father | Mother B | Brother | Sister | Other relatives | Spouse/ <br> Partner/ BF/GF | Friends | Doctor/ Nurse/ Midwife | Others | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 23.1 | 17.0 | 12.6 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 49.5 | 6.9 | 4.5 | 5,761 | 19.2 | 8.3 | 48.4 | 1.2 | 9.0 | 7.2 | 3.4 | 25.7 | 7.7 | 5.0 | 5,627 |
| 20-24 | 24.5 | 12.2 | 8.6 | 5.4 | 0.8 | 3.6 | 5.1 | 50.9 | 9.5 | 2.7 | 3,593 | 20.1 | 3.7 | 35.9 | . 5 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 14.3 | 26.0 | 15.1 | 2.4 | 4,151 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 46.2 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 2.6 | 43.3 | 4.9 | 1.1 | 472 | 22.3 | 5.0 | 36.4 | 1.5 | 8.3 | 6.5 | 10.4 | 27.8 | 7.3 | 3.0 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 35.4 | 19.2 | 8.8 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 6.7 | 3.0 | 42.3 | 4.6 | 2.5 | 344 | 25.2 | 6.2 | 41.6 | . 8 | 4.1 | 6.2 | 8.9 | 22.2 | 10.2 | 3.4 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 19.5 | 24.3 | 9.4 | 5.3 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 2.6 | 47.2 | 9.1 | 2.2 | 953 | 17.8 | 3.4 | 58.3 | . 7 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 9.5 | 18.2 | 10.7 | 3.1 | 1,096 |
| CALABARZON | 14.4 | 13.3 | 8.8 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 64.2 | 4.1 | 6.4 | 1,239 | 20.8 | 12.4 | 46.2 | 1.2 | 8.0 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 20.2 | 9.5 | 3.8 | 1,288 |
| MIMAROPA | 21.4 | 18.7 | 15.1 | 4.8 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 45.3 | 11.8 | 4.0 | 283 | 11.5 | 12.0 | 54.9 | 2.2 | 9.8 | 6.2 | 6.9 | 19.0 | 12.9 | 4.9 | 279 |
| Bicol | 14.0 | 17.8 | 20.6 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 48.6 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 520 | 11.9 | 9.1 | 53.0 | . 5 | 14.8 | 8.1 | 4.7 | 35.3 | 9.9 | 5.3 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 32.2 | 11.6 | 14.1 | 7.7 | 0.9 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 36.3 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 764 | 23.3 | 2.9 | 41.4 | . 7 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 25.7 | 5.6 | 2.5 | 716 |
| Central Visayas | 17.2 | 13.1 | 12.0 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 5.3 | 4.5 | 56.5 | 9.9 | 2.0 | 741 | 11.7 | 6.2 | 40.9 | . 0 | 5.6 | 6.5 | 10.5 | 31.9 | 13.7 | 4.1 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 23.9 | 15.4 | 13.2 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 54.4 | 8.8 | 3.7 | 427 | 23.9 | 5.7 | 28.7 | 1.5 | 7.9 | 6.7 | 11.5 | 28.2 | 11.3 | 3.9 | 401 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 33.2 | 9.4 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 51.1 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 372 | 25.3 | 4.3 | 41.1 | 1.0 | 8.7 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 23.0 | 11.9 | 4.5 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 17.4 | 12.4 | 16.0 | 5.4 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 45.8 | 10.8 | 1.9 | 447 | 23.5 | 4.4 | 37.0 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 20.2 | 14.6 | 4.0 | 473 |
| Davao | 30.9 | 8.7 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 1.7 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 54.7 | 8.6 | 4.6 | 445 | 29.5 | 5.0 | 31.5 | . 3 | 11.3 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 31.7 | 11.5 | 6.1 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 27.9 | 18.4 | 12.7 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 38.6 | 8.1 | 9.5 | 440 | 27.0 | 3.5 | 40.3 | 1.3 | 6.8 | 2.9 | 8.3 | 18.5 | 15.9 | 4.8 | 460 |
| CAR | 29.7 | 11.5 | 3.8 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 47.1 | 8.8 | 3.4 | 172 | 12.0 | 4.1 | 38.2 | . 2 | 12.3 | 6.0 | 10.8 | 32.2 | 20.3 | 4.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 58.5 | 12.4 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 23.5 | 9.5 | 2.2 | 320 | 53.2 | . 8 | 24.8 | . 4 | 10.0 | 1.2 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 347 |
| Caraga | 19.8 | 11.5 | 14.3 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 49.4 | 6.1 | 3.6 | 265 | 14.8 | 6.3 | 36.0 | 1.2 | 8.8 | 5.0 | 7.9 | 31.3 | 11.6 | 2.2 | 255 |
| NCR | 13.0 | 20.9 | 14.0 | 6.6 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 59.3 | 11.6 | 4.1 | 1,151 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 44.8 | 1.0 | 9.4 | 11.1 | 9.1 | 36.7 | 11.4 | 4.2 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 16.9 | 18.7 | 12.7 | 6.3 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 53.8 | 10.1 | 4.4 | 2,396 | 13.1 | 6.7 | 45.1 | 1.1 | 8.9 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 31.5 | 10.9 | 4.5 | 2,822 |
| Rural | 26.0 | 14.0 | 10.5 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 3.1 | 48.8 | 7.2 | 3.6 | 6,957 | 22.3 | 6.2 | 42.2 | . 8 | 8.2 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 23.6 | 10.8 | 3.6 | 6,956 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 32.6 | 14.2 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 40.9 | 5.4 | 1.1 | 1,726 | 32.3 | 2.2 | 34.2 | . 7 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 11.7 | 18.4 | 7.1 | 1.8 | 909 |
| High school undergraduate | 24.9 | 15.0 | 11.6 | 5.4 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 49.5 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 3,529 | 22.4 | 8.3 | 45.5 | . 9 | 8.4 | 6.0 | 5.7 | 20.6 | 8.3 | 4.2 | 3,492 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 19.5 | 16.5 | 10.9 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 54.0 | 9.2 | 3.3 | 2,411 | 17.6 | 5.4 | 41.9 | . 7 | 8.8 | 6.7 | 11.1 | 26.6 | 12.3 | 2.4 | 3,043 |
| College or higher | 17.9 | 14.8 | 11.4 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 55.0 | 12.6 | 6.3 | 1,687 | 13.2 | 6.2 | 44.5 | 1.3 | 8.8 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 35.7 | 14.4 | 6.2 | 2,334 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 30.6 | 13.5 | 10.2 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 43.4 | 6.4 | 2.6 | 1,884 | 30.2 | 3.7 | 36.5 | . 4 | 5.6 | 4.4 | 9.7 | 19.6 | 9.6 | 2.1 | 1,949 |
| Second | 25.8 | 15.0 | 13.0 | 4.6 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 48.1 | 7.4 | 3.3 | 1,913 | 21.2 | 6.7 | 43.0 | . 7 | 7.9 | 5.8 | 8.6 | 22.7 | 10.9 | 3.1 | 2,009 |
| Middle | 22.5 | 13.6 | 10.1 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 52.0 | 7.1 | 4.8 | 2,090 | 17.7 | 7.3 | 44.9 | . 8 | 9.2 | 5.4 | 8.1 | 25.1 | 11.0 | 5.0 | 2,075 |
| Fourth | 20.0 | 16.0 | 10.8 | 6.2 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 54.3 | 9.2 | 3.8 | 1,941 | 14.0 | 7.1 | 46.6 | 1.6 | 9.1 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 30.6 | 11.7 | 4.8 | 2,057 |
| Highest (Richest) | 18.7 | 18.5 | 11.4 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 52.6 | 9.9 | 4.5 | 1,526 | 14.7 | 6.9 | 44.3 | 1.3 | 10.4 | 7.6 | 5.6 | 32.1 | 10.9 | 4.5 | 1,689 |
| Total | 23.7 | 15.2 | 11.1 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 50.0 | 7.9 | 3.8 | 9,354 | 19.6 | 6.3 | 43.1 | . 9 | 8.4 | 6.3 | 8.0 | 25.9 | 10.9 | 3.9 | 9,778 |

Osias of the Commission on Population requested for the addition of one question on the youth's preferred sources of information on sex and reproduction. The question was as follows: "Ifyou had a choice, would you like to learn about sex and reproduction from ...?" A list of possible persons was given, to which the respondent could answer yes or no. From a programmatic standpoint, this will be useful information so that programs will be better targeted.

Table 10.8 shows that the youth most commonly preferred to learn about sex and reproduction from friends of the same sex ( $64.7 \%$ for males and 54.5\% for females). Half of the females and 33.8 percent of the males would like to learn from medical professionals. Parents still play a role, especially for females, half of whom said they would like to learn from their mother. For males, 29 percent would like to learn from their father, and 18.5 percent would like to learn from their mother. Again, there is a segment of youth who, given the choice, would still not want to learn about sex and reproduction from any person, consistently giving an answer of "no" to all the persons mentioned. They constitute about 20 percent of the youth, more of them from the rural areas, those with lower education, and those belonging to the poorer households.

By region, at least 70 percent of males from CALABARZON, Central Luzon, SOCCSKSARGEN, and NCR prefer to learn from their male friends. At least 55 percent of females from NCR, CAR, and Central Luzon prefer to learn from their mother. It is notable that 24 percent of the male youth from ARMM would like to learn about sex
and reproduction from their imam or religious leaders. Among the regions, ARMM youth have the highest percentage who prefer none of the given choices as sources of information on sex and reproduction (36.2\% for males and 49.3\% for females).

## Discussion of sex at home

It is often argued in the Philippine context that knowledge and values about sex should begin to be inculcated in the home for the youth to get proper guidance from their parents. Data in Table 10.9 show that despite such pronouncements, only 10 percent reported that sex was ever discussed at home while they were growing up; the proportion was higher among older youth, urban residents, the more educated, and those from richer households. Across the regions, the highest proportion who discussed sex at home while growing up is in the NCR (20\% among males and $16 \%$ among females), while the lowest is in ARMM (3.1\% among males and 6.3\% among females).

Trend data in Figure 10.6 show that the proportion of youth who ever discussed sex at home while growing up has declined in the last 10 years, with the percentage for males and females converging at 10 percent in 2013.

## Persons to help with sex-related problems in school

The youth who were still in school at the time of the survey were asked if there was

Figure 10.6 Percent of youth who ever discussed sex at home by sex: 1994, 2002 \& 2013



|  | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Background characteristics | Father Mother Brother |  |  | Sister | Friends of same sex | Friends of opposite sex | School teachers | Imam/ Religious leaders | Medical professionals | None | No. of Males | Father | Mother Brother |  | Sister | Friends of same sex | Friends of opposite sex | School teachers | Imam/ Religious leaders | Medical professionals | None | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 28.5 | 18.2 | 19.8 | 6.6 | 63.2 | 20.0 | 17.9 | 7.8 | 31.1 | 23.1 | 5,741 | 14.0 | 50.1 | 8.5 | 32.4 | 51.7 | 12.6 | 30.6 | 16.2 | 47.8 | 25.5 | 5,629 |
| 20-24 | 30.0 | 19.0 | 24.8 | 8.7 | 67.0 | 26.4 | 20.8 | 9.7 | 38.2 | 21.4 | 3,584 | 12.4 | 49.5 | 8.2 | 36.0 | 58.3 | 15.1 | 28.6 | 15.6 | 55.6 | 20.4 | 4,144 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 10.8 | 5.7 | 10.3 | 1.8 | 50.7 | 11.9 | 6.1 | 1.3 | 17.3 | 42.4 | 471 | 7.7 | 39.6 | 6.3 | 22.4 | 46.5 | 9.6 | 18.0 | 8.2 | 42.2 | 29.4 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 22.4 | 9.0 | 15.6 | 2.1 | 55.0 | 10.3 | 13.1 | 6.8 | 16.7 | 31.7 | 344 | 14.3 | 44.7 | 6.8 | 21.2 | 41.6 | 8.7 | 20.5 | 10.0 | 37.1 | 34.3 | 324 |
| Central Luzon | 41.3 | 17.3 | 25.2 | 6.0 | 71.9 | 13.2 | 18.5 | 3.1 | 26.0 | 14.4 | 953 | 11.6 | 68.2 | 6.0 | 38.6 | 54.3 | 7.4 | 28.6 | 13.2 | 50.4 | 14.2 | 1,097 |
| CALABARZON | 24.8 | 14.2 | 17.2 | 5.9 | 74.7 | 28.1 | 20.1 | 7.7 | 27.9 | 17.8 | 1,222 | 17.0 | 53.5 | 9.5 | 39.4 | 54.2 | 13.3 | 36.8 | 18.7 | 63.1 | 22.6 | 1,297 |
| MIMAROPA | 37.3 | 25.7 | 29.3 | 12.4 | 54.2 | 22.6 | 21.2 | 13.0 | 41.9 | 30.7 | 283 | 19.7 | 54.1 | 15.0 | 38.9 | 48.8 | 14.6 | 33.4 | 21.0 | 55.0 | 27.1 | 279 |
| Bicol | 36.6 | 27.0 | 31.6 | 8.9 | 68.6 | 24.0 | 24.4 | 11.9 | 54.9 | 14.0 | 519 | 19.4 | 53.0 | 14.2 | 42.5 | 63.9 | 16.6 | 36.0 | 21.5 | 56.9 | 17.3 | 571 |
| Western Visayas | 29.2 | 22.6 | 22.8 | 7.6 | 61.5 | 15.7 | 13.9 | 5.8 | 28.5 | 23.0 | 761 | 10.4 | 45.4 | 8.1 | 30.8 | 53.7 | 13.9 | 26.3 | 8.9 | 43.7 | 27.6 | 717 |
| Central Visayas | 26.0 | 20.2 | 20.7 | 9.9 | 63.1 | 23.1 | 11.5 | 5.5 | 36.5 | 19.7 | 736 | 14.4 | 51.8 | 6.7 | 30.6 | 51.8 | 13.3 | 28.6 | 14.0 | 56.3 | 24.8 | 671 |
| Eastern Visayas | 20.8 | 14.3 | 18.1 | 7.0 | 59.7 | 26.7 | 13.3 | 5.6 | 29.5 | 28.2 | 427 | 12.8 | 38.9 | 6.7 | 30.1 | 59.7 | 11.2 | 23.1 | 10.9 | 43.8 | 24.5 | 401 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 21.5 | 9.2 | 17.9 | 3.9 | 66.4 | 17.0 | 14.9 | 6.1 | 30.6 | 21.5 | 372 | 8.1 | 34.9 | 4.8 | 27.1 | 39.8 | 9.8 | 24.0 | 5.9 | 42.0 | 41.5 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 30.3 | 23.4 | 18.8 | 9.9 | 53.4 | 23.9 | 18.2 | 7.2 | 33.6 | 28.3 | 447 | 13.6 | 41.9 | 9.2 | 24.1 | 36.4 | 9.9 | 23.5 | 15.5 | 36.2 | 34.7 | 472 |
| Davao | 20.1 | 14.7 | 20.2 | 9.0 | 65.4 | 27.9 | 21.0 | 11.1 | 44.1 | 24.8 | 445 | 9.2 | 45.1 | 4.9 | 31.5 | 60.0 | 14.4 | 24.7 | 14.3 | 44.8 | 22.6 | 510 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 36.1 | 26.1 | 23.1 | 7.5 | 70.5 | 26.0 | 25.7 | 11.6 | 35.3 | 18.3 | 440 | 9.2 | 45.2 | 6.8 | 24.0 | 36.5 | 7.9 | 13.3 | 8.5 | 34.9 | 32.6 | 459 |
| CAR | 20.1 | 12.8 | 23.3 | 5.7 | 66.2 | 19.2 | 19.5 | 9.5 | 36.3 | 22.5 | 171 | 9.1 | 56.7 | 7.7 | 45.2 | 68.2 | 14.6 | 30.2 | 15.8 | 58.0 | 14.2 | 196 |
| ARMM | 20.3 | 3.8 | 20.2 | 1.2 | 38.3 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 24.0 | 24.6 | 36.2 | 321 | 1.0 | 28.5 | 1.2 | 25.2 | 24.3 | 2.4 | 7.1 | 1.3 | 21.7 | 49.3 | 347 |
| Caraga | 24.4 | 22.0 | 25.4 | 13.6 | 67.8 | 32.9 | 16.6 | 11.3 | 26.7 | 23.4 | 264 | 11.9 | 40.6 | 5.2 | 32.2 | 57.5 | 11.1 | 23.1 | 11.9 | 40.6 | 22.3 | 254 |
| NCR | 40.0 | 28.3 | 27.0 | 10.6 | 70.0 | 34.9 | 35.6 | 13.6 | 51.0 | 18.7 | 1,149 | 18.4 | 55.0 | 12.9 | 42.0 | 77.7 | 28.1 | 49.5 | 32.9 | 70.8 | 8.6 | 1,356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 36.6 | 24.3 | 25.9 | 9.6 | 69.4 | 30.4 | 29.9 | 12.2 | 44.8 | 18.6 | 2,392 | 15.6 | 53.5 | 9.8 | 36.6 | 66.3 | 20.4 | 40.5 | 24.7 | 61.1 | 15.1 | 2,821 |
| Rural | 26.4 | 16.5 | 20.3 | 6.7 | 63.0 | 19.7 | 15.3 | 7.3 | 30.1 | 23.7 | 6,932 | 12.4 | 48.4 | 7.8 | 32.9 | 49.8 | 10.9 | 25.4 | 12.4 | 47.1 | 26.7 | 6,952 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 24.8 | 14.9 | 22.9 | 6.6 | 57.4 | 14.4 | 8.6 | 6.0 | 20.0 | 31.8 | 1,725 | 7.6 | 37.0 | 5.7 | 25.4 | 36.0 | 6.0 | 13.4 | 5.9 | 28.1 | 39.9 | 916 |
| High school undergraduate | 27.4 | 18.4 | 20.4 | 6.8 | 60.8 | 19.5 | 16.9 | 7.0 | 30.2 | 25.0 | 3,517 | 13.2 | 46.5 | 8.5 | 31.6 | 47.3 | 11.6 | 26.2 | 13.8 | 43.7 | 29.1 | 3,487 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 29.3 | 17.7 | 23.7 | 8.3 | 70.7 | 24.2 | 19.6 | 8.2 | 35.7 | 18.0 | 2,398 | 13.5 | 53.2 | 9.1 | 37.8 | 57.5 | 13.2 | 29.3 | 15.1 | 56.0 | 19.4 | 3,041 |
| College or higher | 36.6 | 23.7 | 20.8 | 8.2 | 71.7 | 34.4 | 33.2 | 14.9 | 52.9 | 13.9 | 1,684 | 15.5 | 55.6 | 8.2 | 35.6 | 68.6 | 20.3 | 42.2 | 24.3 | 65.0 | 13.5 | 2,328 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 23.5 | 15.3 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 57.8 | 14.1 | 10.9 | 6.8 | 24.7 | 28.3 | 1,889 | 8.3 | 41.2 | 5.9 | 26.6 | 40.2 | 7.1 | 17.0 | 7.5 | 36.3 | 35.7 | 1,954 |
| Second | 27.6 | 18.5 | 21.5 | 8.3 | 63.8 | 21.3 | 14.7 | 7.6 | 29.1 | 23.3 | 1,916 | 12.1 | 48.6 | 7.5 | 32.1 | 49.2 | 9.3 | 22.9 | 11.5 | 44.0 | 26.9 | 2,022 |
| Middle | 27.1 | 16.0 | 20.4 | 6.6 | 63.1 | 18.6 | 17.0 | 6.7 | 33.3 | 24.6 | 2,091 | 13.0 | 50.1 | 7.3 | 35.4 | 54.4 | 13.0 | 30.2 | 16.4 | 53.6 | 21.5 | 2,081 |
| Fourth | 32.2 | 21.6 | 25.9 | 8.1 | 69.5 | 27.8 | 25.9 | 9.9 | 39.2 | 18.5 | 1,942 | 15.8 | 52.2 | 10.5 | 35.1 | 61.8 | 17.5 | 37.3 | 20.7 | 59.0 | 18.9 | 2,061 |
| Highest (Richest) | 36.5 | 22.1 | 23.3 | 8.3 | 70.3 | 32.6 | 28.3 | 12.7 | 45.0 | 16.0 | 1,527 | 17.9 | 58.2 | 11.0 | 41.3 | 68.7 | 22.5 | 43.0 | 24.8 | 64.1 | 12.7 | 1,692 |
| Total | 29.0 | 18.5 | 21.7 | 7.4 | 64.7 | 22.5 | 19.0 | 8.5 | 33.8 | 22.4 | 9,365 | 13.3 | 49.9 | 8.4 | 33.9 | 54.5 | 13.7 | 29.8 | 16.0 | 51.1 | 23.4 | 9,809 |

anybody in their school who could help them with a sex-related problem in case they were confronted with one. Half of them answered in the affirmative (44.1\% among males and 58.8\% among females; Table 10.10). Asked to identify who these persons are, 75.4 percent of the males and 72.5 percent of the females reported that the person would be a classmate/friend (Table 9.10). Other persons mentioned were teachers (57.4\%

Table 10.9 Percent of youth who ever discussed 'sex' at home by background characteristics and by sex

| Background Characteristics | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent of youth who ever discussed 'sex' at home | Number | Percent of youth who ever discussed 'sex' at home | Number |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 8.7 | 5,745 | 9.0 | 5617 |
| 20-24 | 10.9 | 3,584 | 11.2 | 4143 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 4.7 | 470 | 6.9 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 5.8 | 342 | 9.5 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 8.6 | 952 | 9.5 | 1,094 |
| CALABARZON | 12.9 | 1,237 | 10.0 | 1,298 |
| MIMAROPA | 13.8 | 283 | 11.5 | 279 |
| Bicol | 9.8 | 520 | 10.5 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 7.5 | 748 | 8.2 | 709 |
| Central Visayas | 7.2 | 741 | 10.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 6.6 | 427 | 8.5 | 390 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 7.5 | 371 | 5.9 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 5.1 | 447 | 8.5 | 472 |
| Davao | 4.0 | 445 | 6.6 | 513 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 8.2 | 438 | 5.5 | 458 |
| CAR | 5.8 | 171 | 16.2 | 197 |
| ARMM | 3.1 | 320 | 6.3 | 348 |
| Caraga | 9.4 | 265 | 12.2 | 255 |
| NCR | 20.0 | 1,151 | 16.0 | 1,357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 16.5 | 2,395 | 13.5 | 2,823 |
| Rural | 7.1 | 6,933 | 8.5 | 6,936 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 6.2 | 1,719 | 7.6 | 912 |
| High school undergraduate | 8.0 | 3,515 | 7.5 | 3,483 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 10.2 | 2,411 | 9.5 | 3,031 |
| College or higher | 15.2 | 1,685 | 15.1 | 2,332 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 5.7 | 1,879 | 7.6 | 1,940 |
| Second | 7.6 | 1,903 | 6.0 | 2,009 |
| Middle | 7.5 | 2,088 | 10.0 | 2,067 |
| Fourth | 11.5 | 1,938 | 12.1 | 2,054 |
| Highest (Richest) | 17.0 | 1,522 | 14.5 | 1,692 |
| Total | 9.6 | 9,329 | 9.9 | 9,760 |

among males and 70.4\% among females) and guidance counselors (36.3\% for males and 43.2\% for females). One third reported that the person would be the school doctor or nurse (33.3\% for males and $35.5 \%$ for females).

Since only half of those still in school reported that they have someone in school who can help them with problems about sex, it should therefore be emphasized that the other half reported that no one in their school can help them with a sex-related problem should they ever face one (Table 10.11). Also worth noting is that this percentage is higher among the 15-19-year-olds, the rural residents, those with lower educational attainment, and the poorer youth. Special mention should also be made of ARMM, since the majority ( $93.1 \%$ of males and $83.6 \%$ of females) are in this category.

Figure 10.7 shows the trend from 1994 to 2013 in the percentage who reported that there is someone in school who can help them with a sex-related problem. In general, the percentage has been on a steady decline, from 67 percent in 1994 to 52 percent in 2013.

Figure 10.7 Percentage of youth in school who said there is somebody in school who can help with a sex-related problem: 1994, 2002 \& 2013
 1994

Table 10.10 Percent distribution of youth in school by persons in school who can help them for problems about sex by background characteristics and by sex

| Background characteristics | Male |  |  |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Classmate/ Friend | Teacher/ Professor/ Adviser | Guidance Counselor | School Doctor/ Nurse | Others | No. of Males | Classmate/ Friend | Teacher/ Professor/ Adviser | Guidance Counselor | School Doctor/ Nurse | Others | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 76.3 | 58.1 | 36.5 | 33.8 | 5.1 | 1,267 | 73.4 | 70.5 | 42.9 | 35.3 | 8.3 | 1,866 |
| 20-24 | 70.1 | 53.5 | 34.7 | 30.7 | 3.9 | 216 | 64.1 | 69.8 | 46.4 | 37.9 | 1.4 | 216 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 80.7 | 62.5 | 34.6 | 35.4 | 7.4 | 49 | 73.5 | 65.6 | 34.1 | 36.6 | 7.3 | 115 |
| Cagayan Valley | 81.2 | 68.7 | 55.4 | 54.7 | 5.8 | 37 | 61.8 | 40.6 | 15.5 | 7.9 | . 0 | 54 |
| Central Luzon | 65.8 | 34.1 | 26.9 | 24.3 | 1.0 | 110 | 67.0 | 75.3 | 42.4 | 32.8 | . 0 | 155 |
| CALABARZON | 87.8 | 68.6 | 57.1 | 55.0 | 18.3 | 156 | 80.6 | 81.5 | 62.7 | 50.2 | 31.1 | 341 |
| MIMAROPA | 91.4 | 82.2 | 73.1 | 67.3 | 7.7 | 57 | 82.3 | 82.8 | 61.7 | 56.7 | 9.4 | 75 |
| Bicol | 75.4 | 53.2 | 28.0 | 26.2 | . 9 | 126 | 77.2 | 66.2 | 18.6 | 17.4 | 1.9 | 144 |
| Western Visayas | 63.7 | 71.1 | 61.6 | 45.1 | 16.5 | 105 | 72.0 | 83.7 | 55.7 | 44.5 | 13.5 | 115 |
| Central Visayas | 63.2 | 40.4 | 12.6 | 3.0 | . 0 | 101 | 63.8 | 53.4 | 11.1 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 183 |
| Eastern Visayas | 56.5 | 36.3 | 9.1 | 6.3 | 1.4 | 65 | 60.5 | 59.4 | 12.2 | 11.6 | . 5 | 83 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 88.2 | 59.0 | 46.3 | 45.2 | 3.5 | 60 | 64.2 | 80.7 | 52.3 | 49.6 | 1.6 | 54 |
| Northern Mindanao | 59.7 | 52.9 | 29.8 | 16.1 | 1.6 | 82 | 47.8 | 47.6 | 41.4 | 15.7 | . 0 | 101 |
| Davao | 82.9 | 63.3 | 41.0 | 48.1 | 2.0 | 59 | 71.9 | 66.9 | 46.3 | 41.0 | 3.3 | 68 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 68.1 | 61.0 | 27.9 | 28.9 | 1.4 | 89 | 85.6 | 82.3 | 78.1 | 65.3 | 8.7 | 69 |
| CAR | 85.5 | 63.3 | 43.8 | 50.4 | . 4 | 33 | 81.5 | 72.4 | 63.3 | 58.2 | 2.7 | 53 |
| ARMM | 89.0 | 55.6 | 55.6 | 66.6 | 13.9 | 5 | 77.6 | 60.6 | 41.9 | 44.0 | 8.0 | 17 |
| Caraga | 55.0 | 67.1 | 28.1 | 27.0 | 4.8 | 39 | 62.7 | 62.7 | 25.3 | 18.4 | 1.1 | 50 |
| NCR | 83.3 | 57.3 | 29.7 | 30.1 | 1.8 | 311 | 76.6 | 74.0 | 48.6 | 42.8 | . 9 | 407 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 80.0 | 57.5 | 34.3 | 33.8 | 3.3 | 512 | 74.3 | 73.4 | 48.9 | 41.4 | 5.1 | 734 |
| Rural | 72.9 | 57.4 | 37.3 | 33.1 | 5.8 | 971 | 71.4 | 68.8 | 40.2 | 32.4 | 8.9 | 1,348 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 75.7 | 55.9 | 25.9 | 27.0 | 2.3 | 62 | 58.0 | 68.7 | 19.7 | 19.0 | 2.0 | 39 |
| High school | 74.0 | 59.5 | 32.9 | 32.0 | 5.0 | 850 | 71.6 | 70.3 | 40.0 | 32.7 | 8.8 | 1,180 |
| College or higher level | 77.1 | 53.0 | 42.9 | 35.2 | 5.1 | 493 | 74.6 | 70.1 | 50.1 | 40.8 | 6.3 | 793 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 69.8 | 58.5 | 36.8 | 33.9 | 4.1 | 187 | 70.4 | 62.1 | 37.3 | 29.3 | 7.5 | 260 |
| Second | 68.0 | 59.9 | 36.3 | 30.6 | 3.2 | 244 | 73.0 | 63.1 | 38.3 | 28.9 | 7.0 | 379 |
| Middle | 80.8 | 58.4 | 33.0 | 30.9 | 4.2 | 282 | 75.9 | 70.6 | 40.5 | 34.6 | 6.2 | 432 |
| Fourth | 77.5 | 52.1 | 32.2 | 29.5 | 6.5 | 396 | 72.5 | 78.1 | 47.9 | 40.2 | 8.5 | 512 |
| Highest (Richest) | 76.6 | 60.2 | 42.8 | 40.7 | 5.3 | 374 | 70.1 | 72.3 | 47.7 | 39.8 | 8.2 | 499 |
| Total | 75.4 | 57.4 | 36.3 | 33.3 | 4.9 | 1,483 | 72.5 | 70.4 | 43.2 | 35.5 | 7.6 | 2,083 |

## Summary and conclusions

As admitted by the youth themselves, only a small percentage have enough knowledge about sex. Actual knowledge about sex is very poor overall, as measured by the extremely low percentages who correctly identified the time during the menstrual cycle when a woman is most likely to conceive if she has sexual relations. Sadly, having higher education does not necessarily translate to being knowledgeable

Table 10.11 Percent distribution of youth in school who reported there is no one in school who can help with matters related to sex, by sex

| Background Characteristics | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | No. of Males | Percent | No. of Females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 56.2 | 2,896 | 41.1 | 3,171 |
| 20-24 | 53.9 | 467 | 41.4 | 371 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 71.0 | 167 | 41.4 | 196 |
| Cagayan Valley | 69.3 | 120 | 54.7 | 118 |
| Central Luzon | 48.3 | 213 | 31.9 | 228 |
| CALABARZON | 63.2 | 424 | 32.5 | 504 |
| MIMAROPA | 47.5 | 109 | 31.5 | 109 |
| Bicol | 37.7 | 203 | 36.6 | 227 |
| Western Visayas | 62.8 | 282 | 53.6 | 250 |
| Central Visayas | 62.1 | 266 | 35.9 | 286 |
| Eastern Visayas | 58.5 | 156 | 38.8 | 135 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 55.1 | 134 | 59.2 | 132 |
| Northern Mindanao | 51.9 | 170 | 46.3 | 187 |
| Davao | 62.9 | 159 | 61.5 | 177 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 58.5 | 214 | 63.8 | 190 |
| CAR | 40.9 | 56 | 18.9 | 65 |
| ARMM | 93.1 | 69 | 83.6 | 107 |
| Caraga | 61.5 | 100 | 52.0 | 105 |
| NCR | 40.2 | 521 | 22.5 | 525 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 47.9 | 984 | 32.1 | 1,081 |
| Rural | 59.2 | 2,379 | 45.2 | 2,461 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 68.1 | 194 | 64.1 | 110 |
| High school | 58.4 | 2,229 | 44.7 | 2,261 |
| College or higher | 47.5 | 940 | 32.1 | 1,171 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 64.6 | 529 | 55.4 | 583 |
| Second | 58.6 | 589 | 44.4 | 684 |
| Middle | 61.7 | 736 | 40.4 | 725 |
| Fourth | 48.1 | 763 | 36.8 | 810 |
| Highest (Richest) | 49.9 | 746 | 32.5 | 740 |
| Total | 55.9 | 3,363 | 41.2 | 3,542 |

about human reproduction. This brings to the fore the importance of learning about the youth's sources of information about human reproduction.

The sources of information of the youth in 2013 are mainly their parents (usually fathers for males and mothers for females), their friends (of the same sex), and some professionals in their current environment, namely teachers (among those still in school) and medical professionals. For material sources, the Internet has become a popular source, whereas print materials (e.g., books and magazines), presumably because they can also be read from the Internet, have become less popular sources. The trend in terms of television as a source of information is unclear but remains important.

What is alarming, however, is the high percentage of youth who reported having no material sources of information about human reproduction, especially among the males, the older youth, the rural residents, the poorer youth, and those with lower educational attainment. Patterns by region are difficult to summarize, but what is clear is that NCR and ARMM represent the two contrasting poles.

The increasing absence of material sources is accompanied by increasing reports of having no one to consult for information on puberty, sex, and reproduction. The high percentage of youth who reported having no one at school to help them with sex-related problems and the very low percentage who reported having discussed sex at home (which has also declined since 1994) should serve as an eye-opener for policy makers and program managers. If the youth's preferred sources are their friends, with whom they share the same characteristics, then the kind of information the youth will get should be a cause for concern.

# Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation 

Christian Joy P. Cruz

Adolescence is a time for exploration and discovery. During this time, individuals develop a sense of identity and autonomy. Adolescence is also a time when young people learn how to have relationships and build the relationship patterns that they will often carry into adulthood. Developing a stable sense of oneself and one's role in society is a key feature of healthy adolescent development. A strong sense of self prepares an individual for intimacy in young adulthood. This chapter will discuss two facets of identity that influence one's sexuality: gender identity and sexual orientation. It will also cover the youth's exposure to sexual minorities and the problems they face in relation to their gender and sexuality.

Gender identity refers to a person's internal sense of being male, female, or something else, whereas gender expression refers to the way a person communicates gender identity to others through behavior, clothing, hairstyle, voice, or body characteristics. Sex is different from gender. Sex is the biological status of being male or female assigned at birth and based primarily on physical attributes, while gender refers to the socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given culture considers appropriate for boys and men or girls and women (American Psychological Association, 2011). Related to gender identity is the term cisgender, which refers to a person whose gender identity conforms to his or her sex assignment at birth. While the vast majority of people are cisgender, there are people who consider themselves transgender; this is an
umbrella term for persons whose gender identity, gender expression, or behavior does not conform to those typically associated with the sex they were assigned at birth (American Psychological Association, 2011).

On the other hand, sexual orientation refers to each person's capacity for profound emotional, affectional, and sexual attraction to, and intimate and sexual relations with, individuals of a different gender, the same gender, or more than one gender ("Yogyakarta Principles," 2007). Sexual orientation is believed to range along a continuum, but it is generally discussed in terms of attraction to the opposite sex (heterosexual), attraction to the same sex (homosexual/gay among males and lesbian among females), and attraction to both sexes (bisexual).

Conceptually, sexual orientation has three major dimensions: (a) sexual identity - how one identifies one's sexual orientation (heterosexual/ straight, gay, lesbian, or bisexual); (b) sexual attraction - the sex or gender of individuals to whom one feels attracted; and (c) sexual behavior - the sex of sex partners (i.e., individuals of the same sex, opposite sex, or both sexes; Gagnon \& Simon, 1973; Sexual Minority Assessment Research Team [SMART], 2009).

All young people, including sexual minorities, face certain developmental challenges such as developing social skills, thinking about career choices, and fitting into a peer group. Like most heterosexual youth, most lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youths are healthy individuals who have significant attachments to
and make contributions to their families, peers, schools, and religious institutions. However, these young sexual minorities must also cope with the prejudice, discrimination, and violence against them in society and, in some cases, in their own families, schools, and communities. Such marginalization negatively affects their health in general and their mental health in particular.

## Gender identity

Information on gender identity from YAFS4 is based on the question "If you could choose your sex, what would you want it to be? Male or female?" The response categories are "same sex," "opposite sex," and "it does not matter." Results of the YAFS4 show that the overwhelming majority of respondents would prefer their current sex, while a minority (6.2\%) signified their desire to be the opposite sex (see Table 11.1). This crossgender desire is more apparent among females (9.7\%) than males (2.5\%).

No notable difference in cross-gender desires across age groups was observed, implying that age does not have a differentiating effect on cross-gender desires. However, disparities can be observed across the regions. ARMM has the highest proportion of males who want to be females (4.7\%), while Bicol and Zamboanga Peninsula have the lowest $(0.4 \%$ and $0.5 \%$, respectively). NCR has the highest proportion of young females who want to be males (17.5\%), whereas ARMM has the lowest (1.7\%).

In terms of place of residence, more young males from the urban areas compared with their rural counterparts ( $3.9 \%$ vs. $2.1 \%$ ) want to be the opposite sex. The same observation holds for females but with a wider difference between the proportion from urban and rural areas who have cross-gender desires ( $13.9 \%$ vs. $8 \%$ ).

Results show an increasing level of cross-gender desires as the level of education increases, regardless of the respondent's sex. Among those with a college education, 3.6 percent of males and 12.3 percent of females want to be the opposite sex, compared with 1.9
percent of males and 6.8 percent of females with the lowest educational attainment. In terms of socioeconomic status, there is an increasing proportion of females who want to be males as one goes up the socioeconomic ladder (5.9\% from the lowest socioeconomic status vs. 12.5\% from the highest socioeconomic status).

The same question was also asked in the YAFS2 and YAFS3, thus permitting a comparison of results from the three rounds, each conducted about 10 years apart. Figure 11.1 shows that the proportion of young people who want to be the opposite sex declined between 1994 and 2013, from 11.3 to 6.2 percent. The difference in cross-gender desires between males and females is negligible at less than 1 percent, but both exhibited a declining pattern, from 11.5 percent to 6.0 percent among males and from 10.9 percent to 6.6 percent among females during the same period. Similarly, there is a declining proportion with cross-gender desires among both the younger and older youth. The decline is steeper among the 20-24-year-olds, where the proportion expressing cross-gender desires is also higher to begin with.

Wanting to be the same or opposite sex does not always connote a sexual dimension, as males or females may be attracted to other aspects of gender identity, such as power or influence for the male gender identity. There is a need to evaluate the reasons for these crossgender desires to determine if they are within the bounds of the transgender identity. Moreover, to verify the sexual dimension of the responses to the gender identity question, they should be cross validated with answers to related questions on sexual orientation and sexual attraction-an analysis that is beyond the scope of this chapter.

## Sexual orientation

## Sexual identity

The direct question "How would you best describe yourself?" was used to gauge the identity dimension of sexual orientation. The response categories are straight/heterosexual,

Table 11.1 Same gender and cross gender desires of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males who want to be (when they could choose their sex): |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females who want to be (when they could choose their sex): |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | same sex | opposite sex | ```it does not matter what sex``` |  |  | same sex | opposite sex | ```it does not matter what sex``` |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 94.4 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 100 | 5744 | 89.9 | 9.6 | 0.5 | 100 | 5625 |
| 20-24 | 94.7 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 100 | 3576 | 89.6 | 9.9 | 0.5 | 100 | 4139 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 96.8 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 100 | 472 | 91.6 | 8.1 | 0.2 | 100 | 467 |
| Cagayan Valley | 98.8 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 100 | 345 | 92.3 | 7.1 | 0.6 | 100 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 95.6 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 100 | 942 | 92.8 | 6.9 | 0.3 | 100 | 1090 |
| CALABARZON | 88.2 | 1.4 | 10.5 | 100 | 1241 | 88.6 | 10.4 | 1.0 | 100 | 1296 |
| MIMAROPA | 98.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 100 | 281 | 88.5 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 100 | 279 |
| Bicol | 99.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100 | 520 | 92.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 95.4 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 100 | 754 | 89.5 | 10.2 | 0.3 | 100 | 713 |
| Central Visayas | 96.6 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 100 | 742 | 87.8 | 11.8 | 0.4 | 100 | 672 |
| Eastern Visayas | 92.4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 100 | 423 | 90.8 | 8.4 | 0.7 | 100 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 98.1 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 100 | 372 | 92.9 | 6.3 | 0.9 | 100 | 351 |
| Northern Mindanao | 97.5 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 100 | 448 | 92.6 | 7.0 | 0.4 | 100 | 474 |
| Davao | 90.8 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 100 | 446 | 87.1 | 11.9 | 1.0 | 100 | 512 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 95.9 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 100 | 436 | 94.7 | 4.8 | 0.4 | 100 | 454 |
| CAR | 96.5 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 100 | 172 | 92.9 | 6.6 | 0.5 | 100 | 197 |
| ARMM | 95.3 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 100 | 319 | 96.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100 | 344 |
| Caraga | 97.4 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 100 | 265 | 92.2 | 7.5 | 0.4 | 100 | 255 |
| NCR | 91.6 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 100 | 1144 | 82.5 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 100 | 1356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 92.5 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 100 | 2387 | 85.7 | 13.9 | 0.4 | 100 | 2826 |
| Rural | 95.3 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 100 | 6934 | 91.4 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 100 | 6938 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 96.6 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 100 | 1725 | 92.6 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 100 | 915 |
| High school undergraduate | 94.3 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 100 | 3513 | 90.8 | 8.7 | 0.5 | 100 | 3484 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 94.9 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 100 | 2402 | 89.8 | 9.8 | 0.5 | 100 | 3035 |
| College or higher | 92.3 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 100 | 1681 | 87.2 | 12.3 | 0.4 | 100 | 2327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 95.4 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 100 | 1878 | 93.4 | 5.9 | 0.7 | 100 | 1940 |
| Second | 94.0 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 100 | 1908 | 90.3 | 9.3 | 0.3 | 100 | 2006 |
| Middle | 95.5 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 100 | 2083 | 90.6 | 9.1 | 0.3 | 100 | 2070 |
| Fourth | 94.7 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 100 | 1936 | 87.4 | 12.2 | 0.4 | 100 | 2056 |
| Highest (Richest) | 92.6 | 2.6 | 4.7 | 100 | 1517 | 86.9 | 12.5 | 0.7 | 100 | 1692 |
| Total | 94.5 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 100 | 9320 | 89.8 | 9.7 | 0.5 | 100 | 9764 |

lesbian, gay, and bisexual. The results in Table 10.2 indicate that an overwhelming majority of males (95.8\%) and females (96.6\%) describe themselves as heterosexual. Only 2.4 percent of males identify as gay and 1.9 percent of males identify as bisexual, regardless of age group. For females, the proportion of 20-24-year-olds who self-describe as lesbian is 2.5 percent, which is higher than that of their 15-19-yearold counterparts at 1.3 percent. In contrast, a
slightly higher proportion of the 15-19-year-old females (2\%) identify as bisexual compared with the 20-24-year-olds (1.1\%).

The region with the highest proportion of males who consider themselves gay ( $4.2 \%$ ) and bisexual (4.2\%) is NCR. The regions with the next highest proportion of males who self-identify as gay are Central Luzon (3.7\%) and Eastern Visayas (3.5\%). The region with the second highest proportion who self-identify as bisexual

Figure 11.1 Trends in cross gender desires by sex and age group: 1994, 2002 and 2013

is Davao (3.2\%). At the other end of the spectrum is ARMM, where none of the male youth consider themselves gay.

For females, the region with the highest proportion who self-identify as lesbian is Eastern Visayas (2.7\%), followed by Western Visayas and NCR (both at 2.4\%). The highest proportion who self-reported as bisexual was found in Central Visayas (2.7\%) and Western Visayas (2.6\%). ARMM youth registered the lowest proportion of males and females who identify as nonheterosexual (i.e., gay, lesbian, or bisexual).

In terms of place of residence, slightly more males ( $3.6 \%$ vs. $1.9 \%$ ) and females ( $2.2 \%$ vs. $1.6 \%$ ) from the urban areas compared with their rural counterparts self-identify as gays and lesbians, respectively. Bisexual identity among males ( $3.2 \%$ for urban vs. 1.4\% for rural) and females ( $2.2 \%$ for urban vs. 1.4\% for rural) also exhibited a slight difference across place of residence.

Education-wise, results show that among males, the level of gay and bisexual identities increases with the level of education. Specifically, 3.6 percent and 3.7 percent of males with a college education identify as gay and bisexual, respectively, compared with the 1.1 percent who identify as gay and 0.4 percent who identify as bisexual among the males with the lowest educational attainment. The same pattern is observed among males across socioeconomic status; an increasing proportion of males identify as gay and bisexual as socioeconomic
status increases. About 3 percent of males from the highest socioeconomic status identify as either gay or bisexual compared with about 1 percent from the lowest socioeconomic status.

The pattern among males of an increasing proportion expressing homosexual and bisexual identities across education and socioeconomic status was not observed among females. While the lowest socioeconomic status has the lowest proportion of females who self-identify as lesbian ( $1.3 \%$ ) and bisexual ( $0.8 \%$ ), the highest proportion of females with lesbian (2.4\%) and bisexual (2.3\%) identities are found in the fourth socioeconomic quintile, not the richest quintile.

The direct question on sexual identity also provided for an 'Others' category for respondents who do not fit in any of the three categories provided, namely straight/heterosexual, lesbian, gay, and bisexual. The respondents who chose this category were asked to specify what best describe themselves, and two respondents reported that they have an identity crisis.

## Sexual attraction

Attraction is a vital dimension of sexual orientation, especially in the study of young people and others who are not yet sexually active (Saewyc et al., 2004). Some have claimed that attraction is the essence of sexual orientation; hence, it is an important dimension in research on psychological and developmental aspects, such as those focused on suicide ideation and

| Background Characteristics | Percent of males who identify as: |  |  |  |  | Percent of females who identify as: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Heterosexual | Gay | Bisexual | Total | No. of males | Heterosexual | Lesbian | Bisexual | Total | No. of females |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 95.9 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 5761 | 96.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 5645 |
| 20-24 | 95.6 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 3591 | 96.4 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 4152 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 95.6 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 473 | 96.8 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 468 |
| Cagayan Valley | 97.7 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 345 | 96.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 93.9 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 953 | 95.4 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 1094 |
| CALABARZON | 95.8 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 1243 | 97.8 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 1301 |
| MIMAROPA | 98.2 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 282 | 96.8 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 280 |
| Bicol | 97.7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 521 | 96.7 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 96.8 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 760 | 95.0 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 96.6 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 742 | 96.6 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 674 |
| Eastern Visayas | 94.6 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 426 | 96.0 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 98.4 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 370 | 97.7 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 354 |
| Northern Mindanao | 97.1 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 447 | 95.6 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 473 |
| Davao | 94.1 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 444 | 96.7 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 97.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 439 | 98.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 459 |
| CAR | 97.1 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 171 | 98.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 99.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 321 | 99.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 351 |
| Caraga | 97.0 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 265 | 96.9 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 255 |
| NCR | 91.7 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 1150 | 95.4 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 1357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 93.2 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 2397 | 95.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 2825 |
| Rural | 96.7 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 6954 | 97.0 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 6971 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 98.5 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 1726 | 96.6 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 919 |
| High school undergraduate | 96.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 3528 | 96.3 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 3498 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 94.6 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 2412 | 96.7 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 3046 |
| College or higher | 92.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 1686 | 96.9 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 2334 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 98.0 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 1881 | 97.8 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 1953 |
| Second | 95.7 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 1915 | 97.2 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2018 |
| Middle | 96.8 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 2090 | 96.6 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2077 |
| Fourth | 94.2 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 1941 | 95.3 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 2059 |
| Highest (Richest) | 93.6 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 1527 | 96.0 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 1689 |
| Total | 95.8 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 9352 | 96.6 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 9796 |

attempts (Cochran \& Mays, 2000; Russell \& Joyner, 2001).

To capture the attraction component of sexual orientation, the respondents were asked two questions: one on feelings of attraction and another on their preferred sexual partner. The first question on feelings of attraction to males and/or females is as follows:

Which describes your feelings of attraction? Are you...

Only attracted to males?
Mostly attracted to males?
Equally attracted to males and
females?
Mostly attracted to females?
Only attracted to females?
The categories were read out to the respondents. To help them describe their feelings of attraction, a flashcard containing the question and categories was shown.

Results show that while the majority of youth describe their feelings of attraction as exclusively toward the opposite sex, this proportion was higher among females (79\%) compared with males (68.8\%; see Table 11.3). Interestingly, a sizable proportion reported being attracted mostly but not exclusively to the opposite sex, with a much higher proportion among the male ( $25.6 \%$ ) than the female ( $8.6 \%$ ) youth. Meanwhile, a higher proportion of female youth (10.5\%) compared with male youth (2.6\%) expressed being equally attracted to males and females. Two percent of males are attracted only to males, while less than 1 percent of females are attracted only to females.

In terms of age, a slightly higher proportion of the $20-24$-year-old males ( $2.6 \%$ ) compared with the 15-19-year-olds (1.6\%) expressed being attracted only to males. The same age pattern was observed among females, but the levels are lower at 0.7 percent among the $15-19$-year-old females and 1.1 percent among the 20-24-yearolds. More among the 15-19-year-olds of both sexes expressed being equally attracted to males and females.

Looking at the differentials by region of residence, Central Luzon has the highest proportion of males who are attracted only to males (4\%), while MIMAROPA and Bicol have the lowest (both at $0.4 \%$ ). NCR has the highest proportion of males who are attracted equally to both sexes (7\%), while ARMM has the lowest (0.3\%). Surprisingly, ARMM has the highest proportion of women who reported being attracted equally to males and females (21.7\%), while Northern Mindanao has the lowest (4.9\%). Ilocos has the highest proportion of females who reported being attracted only to females (2.2\%). In CAR and CALABARZON, none of the female respondents reported being attracted only to females.

A consistent pattern of responses by educational attainment was observed for both males and females in the proportion who reported being exclusively attracted to the opposite sex: The proportion exclusively attracted to the opposite sex tends to decrease as educational attainment increases. While an education gradient is also observed for the response "equally attracted to males and females" for the male youth, this is in the opposite direction: The bisexual attraction tends to increase as education increases. Likewise, an increasing proportion of male youth equally attracted to males and females is noted as socioeconomic status improves.

The second question on sexual attraction is "Who are your preferred sexual partners?" The response categories are exclusively males, exclusively females, and either male or female. Table 11.4 presents the preferred sexual partners of the male and female respondents. It indicates that a great majority of youth prefers someone from the opposite sex; 92.7 percent of males and 96.8 percent of females prefer a partner who is exclusively of the opposite sex. The difference between males and females is more pronounced in that more males either exclusively prefer a sexual partner of the same sex (3.3\% for males vs. $1.8 \%$ for females) or want either a male or female partner ( $4 \%$ for males vs. $1.5 \%$ for females).
Table 11.3 Feelings of attraction of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males who are attracted: |  |  |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females who are attracted: |  |  |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Only to males | Mostly to males | Equally <br> to males and females | Mostly to females | Only to females |  |  | Only to males | Mostly to males | Equally to males and females | Mostly to females | Only to females |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 25.8 | 68.5 | 100.0 | 5705 | 78.7 | 8.6 | 11.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 5604 |
| 20-24 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 25.4 | 69.2 | 100.0 | 3556 | 79.4 | 8.7 | 9.5 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 4142 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 1.3 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 10.6 | 83.4 | 100.0 | 470 | 79.7 | 7.8 | 9.5 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 464 |
| Cagayan Valley | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 36.3 | 60.1 | 100.0 | 336 | 82.7 | 6.2 | 8.3 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 324 |
| Central Luzon | 4.0 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 44.6 | 47.9 | 100.0 | 936 | 84.6 | 7.3 | 5.7 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 1089 |
| CALABARZON | 1.5 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 21.7 | 74.4 | 100.0 | 1235 | 75.7 | 10.8 | 12.3 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1302 |
| MIMAROPA | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 36.1 | 61.4 | 100.0 | 277 | 81.3 | 5.8 | 10.8 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 278 |
| Bicol | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 21.5 | 75.6 | 100.0 | 520 | 78.1 | 9.3 | 10.8 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 572 |
| Western Visayas | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 16.4 | 79.1 | 100.0 | 761 | 82.7 | 4.6 | 10.4 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 2.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 34.7 | 60.8 | 100.0 | 737 | 78.5 | 15.3 | 5.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 2.9 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 15.2 | 77.9 | 100.0 | 420 | 77.2 | 8.1 | 11.6 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 395 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 14.9 | 82.1 | 100.0 | 369 | 72.6 | 13.4 | 12.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 350 |
| Northern Mindanao | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 40.6 | 55.8 | 100.0 | 446 | 81.6 | 10.2 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 472 |
| Davao | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.5 | 11.7 | 79.7 | 100.0 | 443 | 84.6 | 4.7 | 9.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 507 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 30.4 | 64.6 | 100.0 | 418 | 90.0 | 3.3 | 6.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 452 |
| CAR | 2.4 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 20.1 | 75.7 | 100.0 | 169 | 78.8 | 6.6 | 12.1 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 198 |
| ARMM | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 51.9 | 45.6 | 100.0 | 316 | 72.3 | 4.9 | 21.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 350 |
| Caraga | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 44.2 | 50.2 | 100.0 | 265 | 76.8 | 12.6 | 8.3 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 | 254 |
| NCR | 2.8 | 1.4 | 7.0 | 11.4 | 77.4 | 100.0 | 1144 | 72.7 | 9.7 | 16.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 1345 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 3.1 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 19.8 | 71.2 | 100.0 | 2383 | 75.8 | 10.1 | 12.4 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2804 |
| Rural | 1.6 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 27.7 | 67.9 | 100.0 | 6879 | 80.3 | 8.1 | 9.7 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 6942 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 1.7 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 25.8 | 70.3 | 100.0 | 1692 | 82.8 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 906 |
| High school undergraduate | 1.1 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 25.8 | 70.1 | 100.0 | 3490 | 80.6 | 7.0 | 10.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 3469 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 3.3 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 26.6 | 66.6 | 100.0 | 2398 | 78.8 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 3039 |
| College or higher | 2.1 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 23.8 | 67.4 | 100.0 | 1681 | 75.4 | 9.8 | 13.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 2328 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 27.9 | 69.0 | 100.0 | 1854 | 82.7 | 7.1 | 8.5 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 1935 |
| Second | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 25.8 | 68.7 | 100.0 | 1888 | 79.7 | 8.4 | 9.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 2016 |
| Middle | 1.9 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 27.3 | 67.9 | 100.0 | 2078 | 81.3 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 2064 |
| Fourth | 2.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 22.5 | 70.9 | 100.0 | 1922 | 74.9 | 10.4 | 12.3 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 2052 |
| Highest (Richest) | 2.6 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 24.2 | 67.1 | 100.0 | 1519 | 76.2 | 9.9 | 12.3 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 1679 |
| Total | 2.0 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 25.6 | 68.8 | 100.0 | 9262 | 79.0 | 8.6 | 10.5 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 9746 |

Young males from the highly urbanized areas of NCR and its neighbors CALABARZON and Central Luzon have the highest proportion who prefer same-sex sexual partners or want either male or female partners. The same pattern is observed among females in Ilocos, NCR, and Western Visayas.

When grouped according to their place of residence, more males and females from urban areas than rural areas express preference for same-sex sexual partners. There is a contrasting result across education between males and females: While males who have at least a high school education have the highest proportion of same-sex sexual partner preference, the highest proportion among females was reported among those with an elementary or lower education. Across wealth quintiles, males belonging to the richest quintile and females belonging to the fourth quintile registered the highest proportion who prefers sexual partners from the same sex or either sex.

## Sexual behavior

The behavioral dimension of sexual orientation is imperative for studies on sexual and other health topics (Pathela, Blank, Sell, \& Schillinger, 2006). In YAFS4, sexual behavior was gauged through two questions: The first is a proxy for sexual behavior with the opposite sex, and the second is a proxy for sexual behavior with the same sex. The two questions are gender specific. For males, the questions were "Did you ever have a girlfriend?" and "Sometimes, boys also have a romantic relationship with another boy. Did you ever have a boyfriend?" For females, the questions were "Did you ever have a boyfriend?" and "Sometimes, girls also have a romantic relationship with another girl. Did you ever have a girlfriend?"

The other indicator of the behavioral dimension of sexual orientation was derived from several questions that directly asked the respondents for the sex of the person or persons with whom they have engaged in sexual activities (e.g., first sexual experience, extramarital sex,
regular non-romanticsex, casual sex, commercial sex, and coerced sex).

Results in Table 11.5 show that close to a quarter of young males and females have never had any romantic relationship. About 7 in 10 ( $71.7 \%$ of males and $72.2 \%$ of females) have had romantic relationships only with someone of the opposite sex. A low proportion ( $1.5 \%$ each for males and females) have had a romantic relationship only with someone of the same sex. More females (4.3\%) than males (2.8\%) reported having had romantic relationships with both sexes.

As expected, more of the 15-19-year-olds have not yet experienced a romantic relationship compared with the $20-24$-year-olds. Among males, slightly more among the older males have had a romantic relationship only with another male ( $1.9 \%$ vs. $1.3 \%$ among the younger youth) and with both sexes $(4.1 \%$ for those aged $20-$ 24 vs. $2 \%$ for those aged 15-19). A similar age pattern is observed among females, with 2.2 percent of those aged $20-24$ and 1.0 percent of those aged 15-19 having had a romantic relationship only with someone of the same sex. However, more among the 15-19-yearolds (4.6\%) reported having had relationships with persons of both sexes compared with the 20-24-year-olds (3.9\%).

Comparing by region, the youth in ARMM have the highest proportion who have never had a romantic relationship (55.5\% of males and $56.2 \%$ of females). The prevalence of romantic relationships with someone of the same sex or persons of both sexes is practically nil in ARMM. In contrast, in NCR, only about 16 percent of either males or females have never had a romantic relationship-the lowest among all regions. The proportion of male and female youth who have ever had a homosexual romantic relationship in NCR was the highest of all the regions. For bisexual relationships, the region with the highest reported prevalence is Northern Mindanao for males (7.2\%) and NCR and Davao for females (both at 6.8\%).

Across the type of residence, more males and females from urban areas have had

Table 11.4 Preferred sexual partners of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males whose preferred sexual partner is: |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females whose preferred sexual partner is: |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exclusively males | Exclusively females | Either male or female |  |  | Exclusively males | Exclusively females | Either male or female |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 3.3 | 92.6 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 5754 | 97.0 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 5625 |
| 20-24 | 3.5 | 92.8 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 3591 | 96.4 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 4136 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 3.8 | 92.1 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 469 | 96.4 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 467 |
| Cagayan Valley | 2.6 | 94.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 345 | 96.3 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 5.5 | 90.1 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 951 | 95.9 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 1094 |
| CALABARZON | 2.8 | 90.7 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 1243 | 97.3 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 1302 |
| MIMAROPA | 2.5 | 94.7 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 281 | 97.1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 1.2 | 95.7 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 517 | 97.9 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 3.3 | 95.3 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 762 | 94.8 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 706 |
| Central Visayas | 2.0 | 96.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 741 | 97.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 3.7 | 92.3 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 427 | 95.4 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 395 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 1.4 | 96.8 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 370 | 97.4 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 351 |
| Northern Mindanao | 3.4 | 94.4 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 447 | 96.0 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 100.0 | 472 |
| Davao | 3.8 | 91.5 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 446 | 96.1 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 511 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 3.7 | 92.2 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 437 | 98.5 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 456 |
| CAR | 3.5 | 93.0 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 171 | 98.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 1.6 | 96.0 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 321 | 99.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 346 |
| Caraga | 3.4 | 94.0 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 265 | 98.4 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 254 |
| NCR | 4.9 | 88.7 | 6.4 | 100.0 | 1150 | 96.2 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 1357 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 4.6 | 90.6 | 4.8 | 100.0 | 2394 | 96.2 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 2823 |
| Rural | 2.9 | 93.4 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 6952 | 97.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 6938 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 2.0 | 95.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 1728 | 96.7 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 915 |
| High school undergraduate | 2.6 | 93.6 | 3.9 | 100.0 | 3520 | 96.7 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 3488 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 4.9 | 90.5 | 4.6 | 100.0 | 2410 | 96.9 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 3030 |
| College or higher | 4.1 | 91.4 | 4.5 | 100.0 | 1686 | 96.7 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 2327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 2.1 | 95.2 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 1879 | 98.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 1943 |
| Second | 3.7 | 92.3 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 1913 | 97.3 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 2000 |
| Middle | 3.4 | 92.4 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 2085 | 97.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 2069 |
| Fourth | 3.2 | 92.5 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 1940 | 95.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 2057 |
| Highest (Richest) | 4.5 | 90.9 | 4.7 | 100.0 | 1526 | 96.6 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 1690 |
| Total | 3.3 | 92.7 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 9345 | 96.8 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 9761 |

romantic relationships with persons of the same sex and of both sexes. On the other hand, when grouped according to their highest educational attainment, the proportion of males who have had a romantic relationship with another male rises as educational attainment increases. Among females, those with the lowest education posted the highest proportion who have had a romantic relationship with another female, while the high school undergraduates have the highest proportion who have had romantic relationships
with both sexes. In terms of socioeconomic status, males belonging to the richest quintile have the highest proportion who have had homosexual and bisexual romantic relationships; among females, the highest proportion is registered for the fourth socioeconomic quintile.

Table 11.6 presents the percentage of males and females who have ever had sexual contact with males, females, and both sexes. In all, 63.5 percent of males and 59.5 percent of females have never had sex; 33.6 percent of
Table 11.5 Romantic relationships of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males whose romantic relationships are with: |  |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females whose romantic relationships are with: |  |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | only females | $\begin{gathered} \text { only } \\ \text { males } \end{gathered}$ | both sexes | neither sexes (never had any romantic relationship) |  |  | only males | $\begin{gathered} \text { only } \\ \text { females } \end{gathered}$ | both sexes | neither sexes (never had any romantic relationship) |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 64.5 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 32.2 | 100.0 | 5768 | 61.3 | 1.0 | 4.6 | 33.1 | 100.0 | 5640 |
| 20-24 | 83.4 | 1.9 | 4.1 | 10.6 | 100.0 | 3591 | 87.0 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 6.9 | 100.0 | 4160 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 73.2 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 22.1 | 100.0 | 470 | 74.0 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 21.5 | 100.0 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 76.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 21.5 | 100.0 | 344 | 76.4 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 17.2 | 100.0 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 75.0 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 19.6 | 100.0 | 953 | 78.8 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 15.4 | 100.0 | 1096 |
| CALABARZON | 76.2 | 1.8 | 3.8 | 18.2 | 100.0 | 1244 | 74.8 | 0.8 | 4.8 | 19.6 | 100.0 | 1304 |
| MIMAROPA | 77.0 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 21.3 | 100.0 | 282 | 69.9 | 1.1 | 6.5 | 22.6 | 100.0 | 279 |
| Bicol | 70.7 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 26.8 | 100.0 | 522 | 68.5 | 1.4 | 4.9 | 25.2 | 100.0 | 571 |
| Western Visayas | 68.2 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 29.3 | 100.0 | 765 | 72.3 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 23.0 | 100.0 | 718 |
| Central Visayas | 74.7 | 0.9 | 3.8 | 20.6 | 100.0 | 742 | 76.1 | 0.7 | 4.8 | 18.4 | 100.0 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 62.0 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 35.2 | 100.0 | 426 | 71.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 24.1 | 100.0 | 403 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 74.5 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 22.5 | 100.0 | 373 | 72.4 | 0.8 | 4.2 | 22.5 | 100.0 | 355 |
| Northern Mindanao | 64.2 | 1.6 | 7.2 | 27.1 | 100.0 | 447 | 68.8 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 25.9 | 100.0 | 474 |
| Davao | 73.9 | 1.6 | 4.7 | 19.8 | 100.0 | 444 | 72.2 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 19.2 | 100.0 | 515 |
| SOCcsksargen | 67.9 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 31.0 | 100.0 | 439 | 63.1 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 33.8 | 100.0 | 458 |
| CAR | 63.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 35.7 | 100.0 | 171 | 76.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 21.2 | 100.0 | 198 |
| ARMM | 43.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 55.5 | 100.0 | 321 | 42.9 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 56.2 | 100.0 | 354 |
| Caraga | 69.8 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 26.4 | 100.0 | 265 | 69.4 | 0.8 | 4.7 | 25.1 | 100.0 | 255 |
| NCR | 77.5 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 15.7 | 100.0 | 1150 | 74.5 | 2.6 | 6.8 | 16.1 | 100.0 | 1358 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 76.1 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 17.6 | 100.0 | 2396 | 73.6 | 1.9 | 5.6 | 18.8 | 100.0 | 2829 |
| Rural | 70.2 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 26.1 | 100.0 | 6963 | 71.6 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 23.2 | 100.0 | 6970 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 61.4 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 35.1 | 100.0 | 1730 | 66.8 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 27.1 | 100.0 | 920 |
| High school undergraduate | 67.0 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 29.7 | 100.0 | 3528 | 60.6 | 1.1 | 4.9 | 33.4 | 100.0 | 3497 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 80.4 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 13.8 | 100.0 | 2411 | 83.7 | 1.7 | 4.6 | 10.0 | 100.0 | 3047 |
| College or higher | 80.0 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 14.8 | 100.0 | 1686 | 76.7 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 18.4 | 100.0 | 2334 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 61.4 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 35.4 | 100.0 | 1887 | 68.2 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 28.0 | 100.0 | 1951 |
| Second | 68.0 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 27.8 | 100.0 | 1915 | 70.3 | 1.0 | 4.5 | 24.1 | 100.0 | 2020 |
| Middle | 73.8 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 22.2 | 100.0 | 2090 | 74.0 | 1.2 | 4.5 | 20.3 | 100.0 | 2078 |
| Fourth | 79.6 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 15.9 | 100.0 | 1942 | 74.0 | 2.7 | 5.4 | 17.9 | 100.0 | 2062 |
| Highest (Richest) | 76.3 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 17.4 | 100.0 | 1526 | 74.6 | 1.6 | 4.3 | 19.5 | 100.0 | 1688 |
| Total | 71.7 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 23.9 | 100.0 | 9358 | 72.2 | 1.5 | 4.3 | 22.0 | 100.0 | 9801 |

males and 39.4 percent of females have had sexual relations with someone of the opposite sex. Below one percent of either males or females said they have ever had a sexual relationship with someone of the same sex. More males (2\%) than females ( $0.7 \%$ ) have sexual experience with both male and female partners.

When grouped by age, a higher proportion of the older youth reported having had sex with a person of the opposite sex and with persons of both sexes. Across region of residence, Northern Mindanao has the highest proportion of young males who reported having sexual experience with another male (2.9\%), while NCR has the highest proportion of young males who reported having sexual experience with partners from both sexes (4.1\%). Among females, youth from Cagayan Valley have the highest proportion who had sex with another female (1.2\%), while Caraga youth have the highest proportion that reported having bisexual sex experience (1.2\%). Still, across all regions, the proportion that have had sex with the same sex or with both sexes is generally low.

Similar to the other dimensions of sexual orientation, more male and female urban residents reported having homosexual and bisexual sex experience. A positive relationship between education and homosexual sex experience among males was also observed; the proportion of males who have had sex with another male increases as educational attainment rises. There is no observed pattern among females across education, but those with the lowest education posted the highest proportion who have had sex with another female and with persons of both sexes. Likewise, in terms of socioeconomic status, there is no consistent pattern.

## Non-heteronormative personal contacts

Another important aspect of studying sexual orientation is the exposure to sexual minorities. As established in several studies, knowing someone who is gay or lesbian fosters more accepting attitudes toward many of the issues surrounding gay and lesbian relations
(Herek, 1984; Morales, 2009). In the YAFS4, the respondents were asked if they have family members and friends who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual. In general, a higher proportion of youth reported having close friends rather than family members who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual. Of the three types of sexual minorities, the most commonly mentioned is gay (i.e., homosexual men).

More female youth reported having family members and close friends they know to be gay, lesbian, or bisexual. A comparison by age groups shows that more of the older youth of both sexes reported knowing a family member who belongs to the sexual minority (Table 11.7a). The same pattern was observed in the proportion who reported knowing a close friend who is gay, lesbian, or bisexual (Table 11.7b).

The regions with the highest proportion of male youth who reported having family members who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual are Central Luzon, NCR, Eastern Visayas, and Zamboanga Peninsula. Among females, the corresponding regions are NCR, Western Visayas, Central Visayas, and Cagayan Valley. The lowest proportions were reported in ARMM, Central Visayas, and CAR for males and in Ilocos, Central Visayas, and ARMM for females.

More urban residents than rural residents know members of the sexual minority among their family members and close friends. In terms of educational attainment, the proportion with a family member and close friend in the sexual minority is highest among those with a college education; the proportion decreases consistently as educational attainment decreases. The same positive relationship is observed for socioeconomic status, with the highest proportion among youth in the richest quintile and the lowest among youth in the poorest quintile.

## Problems experienced

Respondents who have cross-gender desires and those who identified as nonheterosexual (gay, lesbian, or bisexual) were
asked if they have encountered problems because of their gender and sexuality, namely confusion regarding gender, discrimination, rejection by family and friends, verbal abuse, physical assault, and sexual abuse. The list of possible problems was read out to the respondent.

Results in Table 11.8 show that among youth who expressed cross-gender desires or who self-identified as homosexual or bisexual, more males experienced problems related to their gender and sexuality compared with females. Gender confusion, discrimination, and verbal abuse were the more commonly reported problems, more so among males than females.

A higher proportion of males was sexually abused and was rejected by family. Some of the respondents were rejected by friends and experienced physical assault, but there is no significant difference in the proportion of males and females who encountered these two problems.

## Summary and conclusions

This chapter discussed gender identity and sexual orientation, which are two important facets of youth sexuality. It also provided information on the youth's exposure to gays,

Table 11.6 Sexual behavior of males and females by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males who ever had sexual contact with: |  |  |  | Total | No. of males | Percent of females who ever had sexual contact with: |  |  |  | Total | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Males | Females | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Both } \\ & \text { sexes } \end{aligned}$ | Never had sex |  |  | Males | Females | Both sexes | Never had sex |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 0.7 | 17.5 | 1.2 | 80.5 | 100.0 | 5770 | 18.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 80.5 | 100.0 | 5654 |
| 20-24 | 1.2 | 59.4 | 3.2 | 36.2 | 100.0 | 3593 | 67.4 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 30.8 | 100.0 | 4161 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 0.8 | 35.8 | 1.5 | 61.9 | 100.0 | 472 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 64.0 | 100.0 | 469 |
| Cagayan Valley | 0.3 | 30.4 | 0.9 | 68.4 | 100.0 | 345 | 42.6 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 55.2 | 100.0 | 326 |
| Central Luzon | 1.3 | 39.9 | 2.2 | 56.7 | 100.0 | 953 | 43.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 55.2 | 100.0 | 1097 |
| CALABARZON | 0.6 | 32.0 | 2.7 | 64.7 | 100.0 | 1243 | 33.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 65.5 | 100.0 | 1304 |
| MIMAROPA | 0.7 | 32.5 | 1.4 | 65.4 | 100.0 | 283 | 40.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 59.3 | 100.0 | 280 |
| Bicol | 0.4 | 29.1 | 1.3 | 69.2 | 100.0 | 522 | 36.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 62.8 | 100.0 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 0.5 | 27.2 | 1.4 | 70.8 | 100.0 | 765 | 38.3 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 60.3 | 100.0 | 723 |
| Central Visayas | 1.2 | 38.3 | 1.2 | 59.2 | 100.0 | 741 | 38.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 61.2 | 100.0 | 675 |
| Eastern Visayas | 0.9 | 27.9 | 0.7 | 70.4 | 100.0 | 426 | 43.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 55.5 | 100.0 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 0.5 | 35.9 | 1.1 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 373 | 43.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 56.2 | 100.0 | 356 |
| Northern Mindanao | 2.9 | 29.8 | 3.1 | 64.1 | 100.0 | 446 | 39.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 60.1 | 100.0 | 474 |
| Davao | 0.7 | 36.8 | 2.2 | 60.3 | 100.0 | 446 | 42.9 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 55.9 | 100.0 | 515 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 0.2 | 28.0 | 0.9 | 70.9 | 100.0 | 440 | 36.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 63.0 | 100.0 | 460 |
| CAR | 0.0 | 30.1 | 1.2 | 68.8 | 100.0 | 173 | 47.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 51.5 | 100.0 | 198 |
| ARMM | 0.0 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 73.8 | 100.0 | 320 | 38.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.6 | 100.0 | 354 |
| Caraga | 1.5 | 34.3 | 1.1 | 63.0 | 100.0 | 265 | 40.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 58.4 | 100.0 | 255 |
| NCR | 1.6 | 39.7 | 4.1 | 54.7 | 100.0 | 1150 | 41.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 56.5 | 100.0 | 1356 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 1.2 | 39.8 | 3.3 | 55.8 | 100.0 | 2398 | 39.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 58.9 | 100.0 | 2831 |
| Rural | 0.8 | 31.4 | 1.5 | 66.2 | 100.0 | 4613 | 39.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 59.7 | 100.0 | 6982 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 0.6 | 32.8 | 1.9 | 64.6 | 100.0 | 1733 | 54.8 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 43.4 | 100.0 | 922 |
| High school undergraduate | 0.6 | 22.3 | 1.6 | 75.6 | 100.0 | 3531 | 27.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 71.8 | 100.0 | 3503 |
| High school graduate Vocational | 1.3 | 45.2 | 2.6 | 51.0 | 100.0 | 2412 | 53.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 44.6 | 100.0 | 3053 |
| College or higher | 1.4 | 41.4 | 2.1 | 55.1 | 100.0 | 1689 | 32.3 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 66.8 | 100.0 | 2335 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 0.7 | 28.4 | 1.6 | 69.3 | 100.0 | 1889 | 49.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 49.6 | 100.0 | 1955 |
| Second | 0.9 | 27.3 | 1.5 | 70.3 | 100.0 | 1917 | 39.6 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 59.4 | 100.0 | 2022 |
| Middle | 0.7 | 34.7 | 2.2 | 62.5 | 100.0 | 2092 | 40.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 58.8 | 100.0 | 2081 |
| Fourth | 1.2 | 40.7 | 1.8 | 56.3 | 100.0 | 1941 | 35.1 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 63.5 | 100.0 | 2063 |
| Highest (Richest) | 1.1 | 37.3 | 3.0 | 58.6 | 100.0 | 1527 | 32.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 66.9 | 100.0 | 1693 |
| Total | 0.9 | 33.6 | 2.0 | 63.5 | 100.0 | 9364 | 39.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 59.5 | 100.0 | 9813 |

lesbians, bisexual men, and bisexual women, as well as the problems faced by the youth who have cross-gender desires and those who identify as members of the sexual minority. In terms of gender identity, trends in cross-gender desires exhibited a declining pattern over the past two decades. While there was no gender disparity in cross-gender desires in the last three YAFS rounds, a significant but narrowing difference across age groups was observed. A higher proportion of the youth who are urban residents, more educated, and belong to a higher socioeconomic status have cross-gender desires. Further analysis on the reasons for these
cross-gender desires is needed to determine if these young people fall under the transgender category.

The identity, attraction, and behavioral dimensions of sexual orientation were explored in this chapter. Youth who belong to the older age group, are urban residents, and reside in the highly urbanized regions of the country, namely NCR and Central Luzon, consistently have the highest proportion who belong to the sexual minority across the identity, attraction, and behavior indicators. ARMM youth consistently have the lowest levels across these three dimensions. The proportion of youth who belong

Table 11.7a Percent of males and females with family members who are gays, lesbians, bisexual man and bisexual woman by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males with family members who are: |  |  |  | No. of males | Percent of females with family members who are: |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gay | Lesbian | Bisexual man | Bisexual woman |  | Gay | Lesbian | Bisexual man | Bisexual woman |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 12.0 | 5.8 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 5750 | 17.7 | 11.6 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 5612 |
| 20-24 | 11.8 | 8.2 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 3579 | 22.3 | 14.2 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 4139 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 7.9 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 470 | 9.9 | 4.5 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 466 |
| Cagayan Valley | 11.6 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 344 | 28.3 | 19.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 19.4 | 10.2 | 3.7 | 0.7 | 950 | 30.2 | 21.4 | 4.9 | 2.0 | 1091 |
| CALABARZON | 10.4 | 7.3 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 1242 | 17.7 | 10.8 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1298 |
| MIMAROPA | 10.2 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 283 | 12.5 | 9.3 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 279 |
| Bicol | 9.1 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 519 | 14.0 | 7.3 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 573 |
| Western Visayas | 13.6 | 6.5 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 756 | 31.3 | 15.8 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 691 |
| Central Visayas | 6.1 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 741 | 7.6 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 14.4 | 7.6 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 423 | 18.4 | 11.5 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 402 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 16.0 | 6.5 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 369 | 22.4 | 9.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 353 |
| Northern Mindanao | 12.5 | 4.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 447 | 16.7 | 8.9 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 472 |
| Davao | 14.1 | 6.6 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 440 | 15.0 | 9.7 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 11.7 | 5.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 437 | 11.4 | 6.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 458 |
| CAR | 4.1 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 172 | 15.2 | 9.1 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 197 |
| ARMM | 3.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 319 | 10.5 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 351 |
| Caraga | 13.2 | 3.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 265 | 13.4 | 9.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 254 |
| NCR | 13.4 | 13.6 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1150 | 27.8 | 23.4 | 8.3 | 4.7 | 1355 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 14.4 | 10.4 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 2388 | 24.2 | 18.4 | 5.8 | 3.5 | 2821 |
| Rural | 11.0 | 5.5 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 6940 | 17.8 | 10.4 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 6932 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 8.5 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1725 | 16.7 | 10.1 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 918 |
| High school undergraduate | 12.4 | 7.0 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 3519 | 17.5 | 10.7 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 3481 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 11.8 | 7.4 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 2403 | 21.4 | 14.2 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 3035 |
| College or higher | 14.3 | 7.3 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 1682 | 21.8 | 14.8 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2317 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 9.0 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1878 | 14.1 | 7.9 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1946 |
| Second | 11.3 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1910 | 17.9 | 10.0 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 2007 |
| Middle | 11.1 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 2081 | 20.6 | 13.5 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 2068 |
| Fourth | 13.0 | 10.0 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 1935 | 20.8 | 17.1 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 2050 |
| Highest (Richest) | 15.9 | 9.7 | 3.1 | 0.6 | 1523 | 25.6 | 15.0 | 4.7 | 2.3 | 1682 |
| Total | 11.9 | 6.7 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 9329 | 19.7 | 12.7 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 9752 |

to the sexual minority in terms of identity, attraction, and behavior increases as education and socioeconomic status increase.

It must be noted that sexual identity is not always congruent with sexual attraction or behavior (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, \& Michaels, 1994; Saewyc et al., 2004). For example, it is possible that people reporting only samesex attraction and/or behavior will self-identify as heterosexual or bisexual. The incongruence between these three dimensions might be attributed to factors such as stigma, laws, cultural values, partner selection opportunities, and even economic reasons (SMART, 2009).

In YAFS4, only 10 percent of the youth found it sometimes/always acceptable for two males or two females to have a romantic relationship. The fact that romantic relationships between two males and between two females are still generally unacceptable among the Filipino youth may be related to their low level of exposure to gays, lesbians, bisexual men, and bisexual women. Several studies have found that persons with negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians are less likely to have had personal contact with them (Herek, 1984).

The sexual minority among the youth in the country is confronted with problems

Table 11.7b Percent of males and females with close friends who are gays, lesbians, bisexual man and bisexual woman by background characteristics

| Background characteristics | Percent of males with close friends who are: |  |  |  | No. of males | Percent of females with close friends who are: |  |  |  | No. of females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gay | Lesbian | Bisexual man | Bisexual woman |  | Gay | Lesbian | Bisexual man | Bisexual woman |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 39.2 | 25.2 | 9.2 | 4.0 | 5715 | 59.9 | 38.8 | 9.3 | 6.7 | 5635 |
| 20-24 | 44.6 | 30.8 | 12.2 | 6.2 | 3578 | 56.7 | 39.0 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 4139 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| llocos | 29.8 | 20.0 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 471 | 53.8 | 29.5 | 7.7 | 5.2 | 465 |
| Cagayan Valley | 21.2 | 9.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 345 | 53.2 | 36.3 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 325 |
| Central Luzon | 56.4 | 34.0 | 25.5 | 6.9 | 943 | 60.8 | 40.8 | 8.2 | 4.9 | 1093 |
| CALABARZON | 45.5 | 27.2 | 13.3 | 8.4 | 1221 | 61.2 | 36.4 | 8.4 | 6.8 | 1300 |
| MIMAROPA | 32.5 | 24.4 | 7.8 | 4.2 | 283 | 51.4 | 31.2 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 279 |
| Bicol | 44.2 | 21.9 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 520 | 50.2 | 34.2 | 7.7 | 6.1 | 574 |
| Western Visayas | 31.8 | 20.7 | 5.4 | 3.3 | 760 | 56.0 | 39.6 | 6.3 | 3.8 | 712 |
| Central Visayas | 29.1 | 17.9 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 741 | 58.2 | 37.6 | 5.1 | 3.4 | 673 |
| Eastern Visayas | 37.0 | 27.7 | 13.0 | 4.0 | 424 | 57.4 | 40.4 | 15.2 | 8.0 | 401 |
| Zamboanga Peninsula | 42.1 | 22.6 | 6.5 | 2.7 | 368 | 54.4 | 29.6 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 356 |
| Northern Mindanao | 41.6 | 30.9 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 447 | 55.2 | 38.2 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 474 |
| Davao | 61.5 | 44.2 | 18.6 | 8.2 | 441 | 66.3 | 43.6 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 514 |
| SOCCSKSARGEN | 34.3 | 26.3 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 438 | 45.5 | 25.9 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 459 |
| CAR | 25.7 | 12.2 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 172 | 42.3 | 25.5 | 6.2 | 3.6 | 196 |
| ARMM | 6.0 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 320 | 29.3 | 16.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 351 |
| Caraga | 35.6 | 25.3 | 6.8 | 4.9 | 265 | 60.2 | 33.5 | 6.3 | 4.7 | 255 |
| NCR | 59.4 | 48.5 | 20.1 | 11.4 | 1137 | 77.2 | 61.1 | 26.4 | 18.9 | 1349 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 56.5 | 42.9 | 20.6 | 9.9 | 2379 | 70.1 | 51.0 | 17.0 | 12.6 | 2819 |
| Rural | 36.0 | 22.0 | 6.8 | 3.1 | 6914 | 53.9 | 34.0 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 6955 |
| Educational attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No schooling/Elementary | 27.5 | 18.8 | 5.7 | 2.5 | 1722 | 36.5 | 23.6 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 919 |
| High school undergraduate | 36.8 | 23.7 | 8.3 | 3.4 | 3493 | 54.7 | 35.5 | 7.4 | 5.1 | 3487 |
| High school graduate/Vocational | 46.3 | 29.9 | 11.6 | 4.9 | 2402 | 59.2 | 43.5 | 10.2 | 7.5 | 3040 |
| College or higher | 57.4 | 40.3 | 17.6 | 10.1 | 1676 | 72.1 | 44.0 | 13.2 | 9.0 | 2327 |
| Socioeconomic status (Wealth quintile) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest (Poorest) | 29.2 | 17.8 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 1879 | 40.8 | 26.8 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 1949 |
| Second | 33.6 | 21.3 | 6 | 2.1 | 1904 | 53.2 | 33.3 | 4.4 | 3.2 | 2012 |
| Middle | 42.1 | 26.8 | 8.9 | 3.7 | 2078 | 59.5 | 40.7 | 10.3 | 6.4 | 2075 |
| Fourth | 47.6 | 35.1 | 16.1 | 8.1 | 1927 | 67.7 | 48.3 | 13.6 | 9.8 | 2050 |
| Highest (Richest) | 56.7 | 38 | 19.1 | 10 | 1505 | 73.1 | 45.8 | 15.1 | 11.8 | 1687 |
| Total | 41.3 | 27.4 | 10.4 | 4.8 | 9293 | 58.5 | 38.9 | 9.1 | 6.4 | 9773 |

Table 11.8 Problems experienced by males and females because of their gender and sexuality

| Problems | Male | Female |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Confusion regarding gender | 51.2 | 39.4 |
| Discrimination | 45.5 | 14.6 |
| Rejection by family | 11.0 | 7.5 |
| Rejection by friends | 4.8 | 7.7 |
| Verbal abuse | 34.8 | 12.6 |
| Physical assault | 6.5 | 5.7 |
| Sexual abuse | 5.5 | 1.3 |
| Did not experience any problem | 11.5 | 35.0 |
| No. of youth who are non-heterosexual or who have cross-gender desires | 418 | 855 |

surrounding their gender and sexual orientation. They experience confusion regarding their gender, are discriminated against, and experience verbal abuse. Apart from being rejected by their family and friends, some of these sexual minorities also reported experiencing physical assault and sexual abuse. While facing developmental challenges, these young people have also had to cope with this marginalization, which negatively affects their general well being.
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# Summary of Findings, Policy and Program Directions 

Josefina N. Natividad

The results of the 2013 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Survey present a current picture of the conditions of today's cohort of young adults in the traditional topic areas tracked by the YAFS series: sexual and non-sexual risk behaviors, as well as in some newly introduced topics like diet and lifestyle and an expanded section on gender identity, among others. Using the background factors of age, sex, highest educational attainment, urbanrural residence, socioeconomic status measured as wealth quintiles and region of residence, the overall results show that these background characteristics remain influential factors in explaining variability in the prevalence of risk behaviors as well as the other outcome measures discussed in the various chapters.

Compared with the results of YAFS surveys on earlier cohorts of Filipino youth we can draw, in broad strokes some of the notable areas of change in the conditions of today's young adults compared with the 1994 and 2002 cohorts. Among the most striking is the change in marriage patterns, notably a dramatic increase in the percentage of young people in a consensual union, commonly called living in, over the last decade with corresponding decline in the proportion who are formally married. In fact, over the last three YAFS rounds covering 20 years, there is evidence of a continuous decline in the proportion never married among the youth, accompanied by a similar decline in the proportion who are formally married, while the proportion who are living in has risen steadily, quite dramatically so in the last decade.

The shifting marriage pattern echoes, albeit weakly, the trend in other parts of the world, notably in western societies, of the decreasing proportions of couples in formal union and increase in consensual arrangements.

We also documented an increase in the prevalence of premarital sexual activity, with an evident narrowing of the gender gap such that the percentage of males and females who have engaged in premarital sex have now become almost equal, compared to 1994 and 2002 when the percentage was markedly higher among males. Despite the higher prevalence of premarital sexual activity however, the use of contraception among the youth remained very low and almost unchanged from the 1994 level. The net effect is a dramatic rise in teen pregnancy, more than doubling in the past 10 years, from 6 percent to 13 percent of 15-19 year old women who have begun childbearing in 2002 and 2013, respectively.

Unprotected premarital sex is considered in the YAFS surveys as risky because of the heightened likelihood of ending up with an unwanted pregnancy or of contracting a sexually transmitted infection. Generally, we found that most of the risky sexual activities are unprotected. Other forms of risky sex have been documented in this latest YAFS round, including a type of sexual relationship with a regular partner that is nonromantic in nature. In general there is evidence of increase in the prevalence of having multiple sexual partners but a decrease in commercial sex activity. Still, on the whole despite evidence of increase ,
the levels of the prevalence of risky sexual behaviors remain relatively low (all way below 50 percent) compared to the levels reported in developed countries although, under the local mores that prescribe no premarital sex at all, such levels may still be considered high.

Despite these documented changes in the behaviors of youth that suggest an increasing break from traditionally strict codes of sexual conduct, their attitudes and beliefs nonetheless reflect relatively high levels of adherence to such conservative beliefs as the importance of virginity before marriage for a woman and low levels of approval of premarital sexual activity also for a woman. A possible drift toward less conservative views is evident in the increasing proportions of youth who expressed the belief that a woman who gets pregnant out of wedlock should keep the baby without marrying the child's father. This is a significant shift from the attitudes and practices of earlier generations when an out-of-wedlock pregnancy had to be legitimized by formal marriage, regardless of the circumstances that led to the pregnancy. Such evidence of acceptance seen in the 2013 YAFS data is probably related to the rise of consensual unions among today's youth. In general, these results indicate that actual behaviors of the youth are changing faster than the norms of the larger society.

Moreover, while the prevalence of premarital sexual activity and other risky sexual behaviors are increasing, the level of knowledge about reproductive health in general, about conception in particular have remained poor as many of the youth are unable to correctly answer the survey questions designed to gauge level of knowledge about conception, even among those with college education. Even more alarming is the finding that the proportion of youth who are aware of STIs in general and of HIV in particular declined between 2002 and 2013. Moreover the proportion of youth who have comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS is only 17 percent. The picture is even more dire when one considers
the fact that between 2002 and 2013 the HIV infection rate in the Philippines has ballooned to epidemic proportions, fueled mainly by the risk behavior of men having sex with other men.

Overall, the youth appear to have limited access to credible material sources of information on puberty or on reproductive health. Asked to identify their most important material source of information on puberty, 46 percent said none. However, of those who mentioned a material source of information, the 2013 results showed a significant increase in the mention of the internet alongside television and books.

While there is evidence of increase in sexual risk behaviors, the trend in the nonsexual risk behaviors of smoking, drinking and drug use indicate a positive shift toward decreasing prevalence of these risk behaviors, more pronounced for smoking than for drinking. The decrease in the prevalence of smoking and drinking cannot be attributed to the passage of the law in 2013 increasing "sin" taxes for tobacco and liquor because the data collection phase of YAFS preceded the implementation of the law. More likely, the youth have become more conscious of the risks attributed to smoking and drinking such that fewer in this cohort took up these behaviors compared to their 1994 and 2002 counterparts. Furthermore, the prevalence of ever use of drugs documented in earlier survey rounds to be at a low level, has gone even lower in 2013.

But there are other forms of non-sexual risks that the youth are exposed to such as the experience of physical violence, both as victim and aggressor and the little researched risk behavior of suicide, proxied in the survey by suicidal ideation and suicide attempt.

Another significant development that the 2013 YAFS results has documented is the changing patterns of use of mass media by the youth. While television remains the most commonly subscribed media form, the use of the internet has supplanted other forms, particularly printed materials. Fewer youth
in 2013 read any form of printed material compared with earlier cohorts, be they books, comics, magazines or newspapers. The 2013 YAFS also documents the phenomenal increase in the pervasiveness of the use of the internet, from a mere 2 percent in 2002 to 59 percent of current users in 2013.

In the field of communications technologies in general, the 2013 YAFS has documented the remarkable increase in the prevalence of ownership of a cellular phone and its pervasive use in many aspects of the young people's lives. The personal cell phone has become a tool to widen one's social circles through virtual friends. It has also become a way to meet other young people for hook ups. Together, the cell phone and the internet has transformed the lives of today's youth to the point where most of their leisure activities are now technology-driven, but sadly, also more sedentary.

Amidst all these developments in telecommunications which are reshaping the lives of today's young people, there remains a significant variability in access to these technologies, evident in the Report when the youth are subdivided by education, socioeconomic status, urban-rural residence and by the region where they reside. Differentials in access remain, showing that those who have lower education, belong to the lower wealth quintiles, rural residents and residing in regions that are less developed are disadvantaged by having fewer of them able to use the internet or own a cell phone.

## Policy and program implications

From the beginning of the YAFS surveys in 1982, the enduring impetus for conducting these studies on the Filipino youth has been the need to provide the evidence base for programs and policies aimed at this sector. A recognition of the fast pace of change because of modernization, technological innovations, changing values, lifestyles and influences, the
fluidity of youth itself calls for a constant and regular updating of our knowledge about the youth so that policies and programs remain attuned to the realities on the ground. Not really by design, the YAFS surveys have been carried out every ten years, on average. Many planners in government and in the development community now recognize that a 10 -year interval between YAFS rounds is too long and some incipient developments that can have profound consequences at a later time may be missed if the data is updated only every 10 years. Thus, the first policy implication is the call for a regular YAFS survey, with a shorter interval, ideally 5 years.

There are many specific findings either already outlined in this Report or that can be generated from further mining of the 2013 YAFS data that can guide specific programs for the youth, over a very wide range of program intervention areas. Some of these specific recommendations for program planners can be found in the summary and conclusions section of each chapter beginning with chapter 2.

Some examples of the policy and program implications of the 2013 YAFS findings are:

1. The persistence of poor levels of knowledge about reproductive health, the lack of sources or even the interest to consult sources call for specific programs of action to raise the knowledge level of today's youth regarding matters related to sexuality and reproductive health, especially since many are already engaged in risky sexual behaviors. The historic passage of the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Act of 2012 (RA 10354) presents the golden opportunity to come up with a comprehensive sexuality education at the basic education level that will help overturn this current situation. The YAFS results provide the concrete evidence of the dire consequences of a general lack of a working knowledge on reproductive health among a sector already engaged in risky sexual behaviors, consequences
like the high teen pregnancy rates and an unacceptably high HIV infection rate. The YAFS results can likewise help identify the appropriate strategies for reaching out to this sector. For one, the use of reading materials for information dissemination may be less effective because of the low level of consumption of traditional print media. Information dissemination for the youth may be more effective if delivered via the internet or the cell phone.
2. While risk behaviors are the main focus of the YAFS surveys, there are other areas of intervention to enhance overall youth welfare and development that need attention, such as the promotion of healthy diets and lifestyles. Already, there is evidence of a decline in smoking and drinking among the youth, a positive development that needs reinforcing. The next area to address is the promotion of healthy nutrition and a healthy lifestyle, to prevent at this early stage in the life of the youth the later onset of lifestyle diseases brought about by poor diets and lack of physical activity.

In conclusion, as with previous rounds of the Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality studies, the 2013 YAFS results will continue to be mined further to help shed light on other aspects that may need an empirical evidence to guide programs for young people. The breadth and depth of information that the data can yield is barely scratched in this Report. We expect that the data will be mined further as new questions and new proposals for youth programs are planned, until it is felt that too much time has passed and it is time again to conduct a new YAFS survey.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ UN Secretary-General's Report to the General Assembly, A/40/256, 1985.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Except for YAFS1, funding for the YAFS series was coursed through the DRDF, which was founded in 1983.

[^2]:    Block A Individual Characteristics
    Block B Family Characteristics and Relationships
    Block C Self-Esteem and Values
    Block D School, Work, and Community
    Block E Media Exposure
    Block F Friends and Peers
    Block G Health and Lifestyle

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ The scale ranges from 0-30. Scores between 15 and 25 are within normal range; scores below 15 suggest low self-esteem (https://www.wwnorton.com/college/psych/psychsci/media/rosenberg.htm)

[^4]:    ${ }^{2}$ It is defined as the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m} 2)$.

[^5]:    ${ }^{3}$ WHO Expert Consultation (2004). Appropriate body mass index for Asian populations and its implications for policy and intervention strategies. The Lancet, 363(9403), 157.
    ${ }^{4}$ Above-normal BMI consists of the overweight plus the obese.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ This question was not asked of men in 1994.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ It should be noted that the YAFS survey does not make any distinction between "fuck buddy" and "friends with benefits," although many studies on casual sex (e.g., Wentland \& Reissing, 2014) have defined "fuck buddies" as having a relationship primarily for sexual interaction while "friends with benefits" interact in both social and sexual situations.

[^8]:    Note: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Including current pregnancy

[^9]:    Notes: --- Not applicable

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ We use the proportion who have ever been pregnant to compare the trend in fertility over the 20-year period because the 1994 YAFS questionnaire did not contain a pregnancy history; thus, the percentage who had begun childbearing cannot be computed from the 1994 data.
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