

**Working Children in Drugs in the Philippines:
A participatory action research
for child/family and community empowerment**

By

**Emma Porio, PhD and Christine S. Crisol
Ateneo de Manila University**

In collaboration with

Jerry Apolonio
Leonardo Estacio, Jr., PhD
Evelyn Galang
Amalia Lorelia
Andrea Bolhayon
Fernando Rico

**Submitted to
The International Labour Organization**

October 2004

| Table of Contents | |
|--|------|
| Section | Page |
| Table of Contents | 1 |
| List of Acronyms | 2 |
| Part I. Project Background | 3 |
| I.1. The Project Context and Justification | 3 |
| Part II. Project Design and Implementation | 4 |
| II.1. Target Groups/Beneficiaries and Partners | 4 |
| II.2. Research Partners and Collaborating NGOs/POs and Government Agencies | 6 |
| Figure 1. Matrix of Partner Organizations and Collaborating Agencies | 6 |
| II.3. The Participatory Action-Oriented Research (PAOR) | 7 |
| Figure 2. The Participatory Action-oriented Research Design. | 9 |
| Part III. 1. Changing Drug Contexts and Policy Framework | 10 |
| A. Social and Historical Contexts of Drug Use in the Philippines | 10 |
| B. Production, Transport and Distribution of Dangerous Drugs | 11 |
| C. Legal Framework and Policy Responses to Children in Drugs | 13 |
| Part III. 2. Profile of Children and Parents in the Project Sites | 17 |
| A. Research Site: Tatalon | 17 |
| B. Research Site: Pasay | 24 |
| C. Research Site: Paco-Pandacan | 30 |
| Summary: Profiles of Children and their Families and Shifts in Patterns of Drug-Related Issues | 37 |
| Part III. 3. Outcomes of Project Inputs and Activities | 39 |
| A. Project Intervention Strategies, Approaches, Outputs | 39 |
| Table 1. Project Strategies, Activities, and Outputs of KKPC in Tatalon, Quezon City | 39 |
| Table 2. Project Strategies, Activities, and Accomplishments of Addictus-Philippines | 40 |
| Table 3. Project Strategies/Activities of FCED in Paco-Pandacan, Manila | 40 |
| B. Reduction of Risks to Drugs | 41 |
| Part IV. Good Practices | 43 |
| Part V. Lessons Learned | 45 |
| Part VI. Project Challenges | 46 |
| Part VII. Implications/Recommendations | 46 |
| Part VIII. Postscript: The National Conference on Children in Drugs | 47 |
| Table 4. Conference Participants. | 47 |
| List of Appendices | 49 |
| Annex A. Map of Greater Metro Manila | 50 |
| Annex B. Map of Showing the Research Sites and the Urban Poor Areas in Metro Manila | 51 |
| Annex C. Social and Historical Contexts of Drug Use in the Philippines | 52 |
| Annex D. List of Sources | 73 |
| Annex E. Institutional Framework of Working Children in Drugs in the Philippines | 74 |
| Annex F. Protocol Forms and Research Instruments for PAOR | 75 |
| Annex G. Interview Schedules | 82 |
| Annex H. Sample of Community Social Risk Maps | 101 |
| Annex I. Sample of Community Profile | 102 |
| Annex J. Sample of Monitoring and Assessment Form | 103 |
| Table 5. Selected Findings: Youth in Drugs, 2000 | 104 |
| Table 6. Selected Findings on Working Children/Youth in Drugs, 2003 | 106 |
| Table 7. Selected Findings on Working Children/Youth in Drugs, 2004 | 108 |
| Table 8. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004 | 110 |

List of Acronyms

| | |
|-----------|---|
| ADMU - | Ateneo de Manila University |
| BADAC - | Barangay Anti-Drug Abuse Council |
| BBBRC - | Bahay ng Bagong Buhay Rehabilitation Center |
| BCPC - | Barangay Council for the Protection of Children |
| CBO - | Community-based Organization |
| COPA - | Council on Philippine Affairs |
| CUREDD - | Center for the Ultimate Rehabilitation of Drug Dependents |
| CWC - | Council for the Welfare of Children |
| DARC - | Drug Abuse Rehabilitation Center |
| DARE - | Drug Abuse Resistance Education |
| DECS - | Department of Education, Culture, and Sports |
| DDB - | Dangerous Drugs Board |
| DILG - | Department of Interior and Local Government |
| DOLE - | Department of Labor and Employment |
| DRDF - | Demographic Research and Development Foundation, Inc. |
| DSWD - | Department for Social Welfare and Development |
| EARIST - | Eulogio Amang Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology |
| ECOP - | Employers Confederation of the Philippines |
| ERDA - | Educational Research and Development Assistance |
| FCED - | Families and Children for Empowerment and Development |
| FGD - | focused group discussion |
| GHB - | Gamma hydroxyamphetamine, a central nervous system depressant |
| GO - | government organization |
| GNP - | gross national product |
| KII - | key informant interview |
| KKPC - | Kapatiran Komunidad People's Coalition |
| IEC - | information and education campaign |
| ILO - | International Labour Organization |
| IPEC - | International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour |
| LGU - | local government unit |
| NBI - | National Bureau of Investigation |
| NCSD - | National Council for Social Development |
| NDECC - | National Drug Enforcement Coordinating Council |
| NDLEPCC - | National Law Enforcement and Prevention Coordinating Center |
| NGO - | Non-government Organization |
| NYC - | National Youth Commission |
| PAOCC - | Presidential Anti-Organized Crime Commission |
| PAOCTF - | Presidential Anti-organized Crime Task Force |
| PAOR - | participatory action-oriented research |
| PAR-UA - | participatory action research in urban areas |
| PD - | Presidential Decree |
| PDEA - | Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency |
| PECS - | precursors and essential chemicals |
| POPCOM - | Population Commission |
| PNP - | Philippine National Police |
| PTCA - | Parent, Teachers and Community Assemblies |
| AIDSOTF - | Anti-Illegal Drugs Special Operations Task Force |
| RA - | Republic Act |
| SPPR - | State of the Philippines Population Report |
| UGAT - | Ugnayan at Tulong para sa Maralitang Pamilya Foundation, Inc. |
| UNDCP - | United Nations Drug Control Program |
| UNICEF - | United Nations Children's Fund |
| UNIFEM - | United Nations Development fund for Women |
| UNODC - | United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime |
| UPPI - | University of the Philippines Population Institute |
| USAID - | United States Agency for International Development |
| YAFS - | Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study |

Part I. Project Background

I.1 The Project Context and Justification

In the late 1990s, a significant number of children have been engaged in illicit drug use, sale, and trafficking in urban areas in the Philippines. ILO Convention 182 considers the use of children in illegal activities such as in the use of children in the production, sales, and trafficking of drugs, as one of the worst forms of child labour. Children engaged in the drug trade suffer from dangers and risks beyond the physical, psychological and mental disorders prevalent among drug-addicted children. Children in the drug trade/trafficking (CDT) are exposed to the world of illegal activities and criminality. They are involved in situations of tensions and conflicts and quite vulnerable to harassment and exploitation by both drug dealers and the police.

Involvement of children and youth in drugs

In the first quarter of 2000, the ILO-IPEC in Manila commissioned a rapid assessment of working children engaged in the production, sale and trafficking of drugs. The research, covering several urban poor communities in Metro Manila and Cebu City, revealed that a significant proportion of children and youth were engaged in illicit drug(s) trading, trafficking and abuse. Of particular interest is the high level of abuse and trafficking or "pushing" of metamphetamine chloride (locally known as *shabu*) among young children. This is a radical shift from the early 1990s when children were mainly into sniffing rugby, glue or other kinds of inhalants. The rapid assessment also showed that these children come from impoverished households with high level of abuse/violence.

Children involved in drug sales and trafficking are difficult to trace and identify because of the illegal and hidden nature of the trade and the social and political sensitivity of the phenomenon. Because of the associated risks/dangers and potential difficulties, it is necessary to use a cautious, process-based approach to gain an understanding of this emerging issue. Moreover, because of recent emergence of this phenomenon, not much is known about: (1) the profile of the working children engaged in substance abuse, sale, and trafficking; (2) the pattern of recruitment into the drug network and the strategies/techniques employed in getting the children hooked into drugs/drug network; and (3) how these children could be "weaned" or dislodged from the drug network and become part of the mainstream institution of work, education, and social networks in the community.

Structure of the Report

Part I of the report contains the project context and justification. This part describes the situation of children/youth in drug trafficking (CDT) and their links to children in the worst forms of child labor (WFCL). Part II describes the research design and the pilot intervention models in the communities. It also describes the target groups, partners and agencies involved in the project as well as the program approach and strategy. This section also elaborates on the research issues and methods utilized in this project. Part III

consists of the two major parts. Chapter III.A discusses the changing drug contexts and policy framework in the Philippines while chapter III.B describes the profile of communities, children/parent beneficiaries, and the project outcomes and results. Part IV highlights some effective community-based models in the three cities, namely, Paco-Pandacan in Manila, Barangay 91 in Pasay City and Tatalon in Quezon City. Part V enumerates the lessons learned from implementing the participatory action-oriented research project while Part VI discusses the challenges encountered in the implementation of the project. Finally, Part VII concludes the report with a set of recommendations for subsequent interventions for children/youth engaged in drug sale, production and trafficking of drugs.

Appendix A outlines the social and historical contexts of drug use in the Philippines. This part contains the following sections: (1) Dangerous Drug Use: A Background; Production; (2) Transport and Distribution of Dangerous Drugs; (3) Legal Framework and Policy Responses to Children in Drugs; (4) Selected Data on Children in Need of Special Protection; (5) The Politico-Institutional Framework of Drug Use in the Philippines; and (6) Issues and Tensions.

Part II. Project Design and Implementation

To respond to the problem of children in drugs, the ILO-IPEC initiated a participatory action-oriented research (PAOR) project in the Philippines in June 2002. The project was focused on pilot-testing community-based models of intervention for children/youth in drugs in selected communities in Metro Manila.

Three areas served as pilot sites for this action research project, namely, Paco-Pandacan in Manila, Tatalon in Quezon City and Barangay 91 in Pasay City. The Urban and Community Studies Program of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the Ateneo de Manila University served as the research organization in partnership with NGOs (Child Hope-Asia and Addictus-Philippines) and CBOs (Kapatiran-Komunidad People's Coalition and Barangay 91 Local Development Council) in implementing this project. The NGOs/CBOs conducted the direct interventions and activities with the children's groups and community-based organizations as well as provided research support to the research organization conducting/coordinating the research activities.

II. 1. Target groups/beneficiaries and partners

The beneficiaries of the project were: (1) children and youth population (7-17 years of age) at risk to engaging in drug-related activities reached through community awareness-raising and youth mobilization activities. Through these activities, parents/guardians of the target children, barangay (lowest political unit) officials, other community leaders and members of other civil society groups were also reached.

Direct beneficiaries. The project aimed to prevent and remove children/youth, who were at risk and/or were already involved in the use, sales and distribution of drugs in three

urban poor communities in Metro Manila. The participatory action research was implemented in collaboration with partner NGOs/CBO who provided direct interventions/services through family/child counseling and support, community awareness and training, youth mobilization and referral services.

The direct beneficiaries were 260 children and youth engaged in the use and trafficking/pushing of dangerous drugs like *shabu*, rugby, and marijuana in three selected research sites. For details, please see appended proposals of each partner.

Indirect beneficiaries. Aside from the staff of the research organization, the indirect recipients of project resources were the officers and staff of the partner organizations (Child Hope-Asia, Philippines and its sister NGO, Families and Children for Empowerment; Addictus-Philippines, Kapatiran-Komunidad People's Coalition, and the Dangerous Drug Board). These research partners are anti-drug use organizations and/or child-focused and child labor concerned organizations.

In the area handled by KKPC, services to direct recipients have resulted in the following: 25 children and their parents are now members of a cooperative; a second series of training has been conducted for all 24 community workers and community leaders; the KKPC youth federation consisting of 14 youth organizations was launched last November 2003; cultural performances of 30 children; and, seed capital was provided to 25 children and their families.

In the area of Addictus, services to direct recipients have resulted in the following: 24 leaders and 9 prevention workers were trained; 40 children were trained in talent enhancement and confidence-building; 50 children/youth are attending tutorials as part of the "back to school" program; and, 12 youth, 12 parents -- 24 core group members were trained on leadership training in order to prepare them for community organizing.

In the areas handled by FCED, services to direct recipients have resulted in the following: counseling sessions were given to all 60 beneficiaries from the 4 target sites; regular meetings and counseling sessions with 45 direct beneficiaries were conducted; 57 youths partook in outdoor activities; 30 participated in art workshops; 20 children were given values formation seminar; 10 children partook in community activities such as cleanliness programs; 20 availed of the livelihood skills training on soap making; 25 beneficiaries enrolled in vocational courses through ERDA and EARIST; and, 40 youth trained and 20 were selected to become trainers and eventually conducted advocacy sessions.

Total number of indirect beneficiaries. About one thousand and five hundred (1,500) parents, children, youth, community leaders and residents reached by information and education campaigns (IEC), advocacy sessions/training and support services.

II.2. Research Partners and Collaborating NGOs/POs and Government Agencies

Research Partners and Implementing Agencies. The project was executed by ILO-IPEC Manila in collaboration with the Ateneo de Manila University (an academic research institution) and several NGOs/CBOs. The main research partners of the research organization (Urban and Community Studies Program, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de Manila University) were:

- Child-Hope Philippines (NGO based in the Paco and Pandacan districts of Manila) and its sister NGO, the Families and Communities for Empowerment and Development or FCED) represented by Ms. Teresita Silva;
- Kapatiran-Komunidad People's Coalition (KKPC) a CBO based in Tatalon, Quezon City) represented by Evelyn Galang;
- Addictus-Philippines (NGO) in partnership with the Barangay 91 (Pasay City) Barangay Development Council represented by Leonardo Estacio, Jr. and Fernando Rico.

Collaborating Agencies. The project collaborated with the Barangay for the Council for the Protection of Children (BCPC), the Children's Laboratory Theatre and Department of Social Welfare and Development.

Figure 1. Matrix of Partner Organizations and Collaborating Agencies.

| | KKPC | FCED | ADDICTUS |
|---------|---|--|---|
| NGOs | ADDICTUS-Philippines Philippine Council on Drugs and Substance Abuse National Youth Federation USAID UNIFEM UNDCP Misereor 12 other NGOs | Childhope Asia UNICEF UNDCP USAID | Center for Family and Services, Inc. UNDCP UGAT-Philippines |
| GOs | Dangerous Drugs Board Quezon City Drug Council | Department of Education Technical Education and Science Development Authority (TESDA) Philippine National Police Dangerous Drugs Board Department of Social Welfare and Development Barangay Council for the Protection of Children | Pasay City Network for the Protection of Children Department of Social Welfare and Development City Council of Pasay 4 Barangay Councils |
| POs | Kapatiran Kaunlaran Foundation, Inc. 24 Local Organizations | Community Organizations | 4 Homewoner's Association Independent Movement of Pasav |
| Academe | Ateneo de Manila University ERDA Technical School | ERDA Technical School Ateneo de Manila University Eulogio Amang Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology (EARIST) | De La Salle University Ateneo de Manila University of the Philippines |

II.3. The Participatory Action-Oriented Research (PAOR)

The purpose of the action-oriented research was to generate reliable, appropriate, and timely data base to support the formulation and implementation of a strategic set of interventions to build the capabilities of working children (as well as their families and communities) engaged in the production, sale, and trafficking/pushing of drugs. A key process and by-product of this action-oriented research, were the capability-building initiatives and services given to service providers, mediating stakeholders/actors, and working children with their peers and families. The capability-building activities provided by the research partners included advocacy activities, community organizing/mobilization, training, and networking/linkaging. The community-based partners also provided counseling, referral and other support services like tutorial, library, and limited livelihood and education support.

The research project aimed to (1) identify and construct a profile of children/youth (including their families, peer networks, and communities) involved in drug-related activities; (2) understand the pattern of recruitment into the drug network and the strategies utilized by drug pushers to get them hooked; (3) explore how these children could be "weaned" or dislodged from the network and become part of the mainstream institutions of work, education and social networks of the community and (4) identify a strategic set of policy and program interventions to reduce the demand for drugs at the community, peer and child level. The last objective was realized through an "efficacy assessment" of the intervention strategies utilized by the research partners in the three research areas.

To achieve the above objectives, the research probed the context of the sales and distribution of drugs and the social networks and hierarchical structures underlying the involvement of children in drugs. The research then, explored how these are related to contextual factors, in particular, community and family structures/processes such as poverty, unemployment, living conditions, and access (or lack of it) to social services and opportunities. Informed by this analysis, the research partners piloted some feasible interventions to mitigate the effects of some of these factors that push children to drugs.

The organization of the research and training of research partners started in June 2002 while field work and data collection for the small-scale survey in the project sites started in June 2002. The feed-backing The research above objectives, this action research yielded the following outputs and activities: (1) profile of working children, their families, peer networks and their communities; (2) pattern/cycle of recruitment and integration to the drug network and the risks involved for the working children, employers, peers, and families; and (3) set of policy and program recommendations designed to formulate more timely and effective sets of interventions for children, their peers, families and communities. The recommendations were partly derived from the assessment made with the community-based research partners as to the efficacy of their activities/interventions with children engaged in the use, sale, and trafficking of drugs. The research organization collected the above data-sets by "piggy-backing" on the series

of activities organized by the community research partners (see detailed project proposal of each partners in the appendix).

Research as entry point for intervention. The research project became an entry point in providing support services for children/youth. These interventions included community mobilization and organizing, training, limited provision of support services such as education, livelihood, referrals to other services (e.g., rehabilitation, vocational/technical training) provided by other agencies, advocacy and networking.

The participatory action-oriented research was geared towards increasing our knowledge about children engaged in drug use and trafficking and how they were recruited and got entrenched in the drug network. The data-set and insights gathered from the action research and the program activities of community-based partners led to the identification of a strategic set of preventive and rehabilitative interventions. It also built the capabilities of the partner NGOs/POs with the children and their families served by the program activities. This action-oriented research utilized strategies and techniques associated with participatory research in urban areas (PAR-UA)¹ such as sample surveys and socio-technical profiling of children beneficiaries and their families/communities, key informant interviews (KIPs), focus group discussion (FGD), social mapping and narratives of children's life stories.

The central principle here is putting the research process in the hands of research partners so that the process becomes a tool for their planning and implementation of activities that will redound to their benefit and ultimately their empowerment and development. The activities of the research partners became the entry points for the children and their families to become partners with the facilitation of the implementing NGOs and CBOs. Moreover, these activities served as the venue for the children/parents/peers to understand the social, political and economic conditions of themselves, their families, and their communities in relation to their involvement in the sale, trafficking/pushing of drugs. This understanding led the program implementers to formulate strategies and techniques to respond to the risks that they experience in the drug use cycle and the drug network.

Research steps and project implementation. The first step in this action-oriented research was the production of a situationer (i.e., situation analysis) of the children engaged in the use/abuse, trading and trafficking of drugs and the contextual factors surrounding their drug-related practices. The situation analysis was accomplished through a small-scale sample survey, key informant interviews, focus groups, narratives of children/parents and community social risk mapping done in collaboration with the NGO/CBO research partners in each of the project site. These methods produced a profile of communities in terms of their availability/lack of resources and social services (i.e., the

¹ For an elaboration of this methodology, please refer to the Participatory Research Action Handbook published by the team of Robert Chambers at the Institute of Development Studies (Sussex). Other references include RRA Notes on Participatory Tools and Methods for Urban Areas (1994) published by the Institute of International Education and Development (IIED).

level of poverty), social risk maps of the community and profile of children in drugs and their initiation and recruitment to the drug networks.

The results of the situation analysis guided the formulation of feasible interventions in the planning session(s) conducted by the community-based research partners. The project activities were assessed through an internal midterm and final evaluation of the interventions of the research partners. The insights gained from the process documentation partly became a basis for fine-tuning or re-calibrating the project interventions after the mid-term evaluation.


It should be noted that the sharing and feed-backing of information was done selectively because of the sensitive nature of the project data. Thus, the profile of children in drugs and their social situation was only shared with the program implementers because of the risks involved. Some members of the community expressed their fear of being reported to the police. The respondents of the survey were assured of complete confidentiality regarding the data collected from them.

Research Monitoring and Evaluation. Process monitoring and documentation was done during the course of the project. The research and implementation process of the support services provided by the project was documented through monitoring visits and the accomplishment of monitoring forms (see sample of monitoring form in the appendix).

The monitoring visits/forms tracked the situation of the children with regards to: 1) their domestic status as whether the family is supportive to the child or fraught with tensions/problems, 2) schooling status (out-of school or continuing schooling), 3) drug status (highly at risk to drug use/trafficking because their family, friends and relatives are engaged in it; low risk because they are not using and know only someone not too close to them who is engaged in drug sale/trafficking), and 4) the services provided by the community-based NGO/PO and the outcomes of these interventions.

The project also conducted internal midterm and final evaluation to assess the efficacy of different activities and interventions made by the community-based partners. These evaluation sessions focused on examining the status of the children and the effects of the NGO/PO's support services on the children, their families and communities. These sessions also identified the accomplishments and risks/challenges facing the project in each community as well as provide opportunities to learn and refine some of the project strategies and techniques.

Figure 2. The Participatory Action-oriented Research Design.



Part III. 1. Changing Drug Contexts and Policy Framework

A. Social and Historical Contexts of Drug Use in the Philippines

Changing Drug Contexts. During the 1960s and 1970s drug production was poppy based and easy to track. US space satellites could pinpoint and monitor plantations maintained by drug lords. Between the 1970s and late 1980s, the drug problem in the Philippines was domestic in scope and marijuana was the drug of choice. However, in the 1990s, with the entry of methamphetamine hydrochloride or *shabu* and its transnational character, this drastically enlarged the scope of the problem and the landscape of drug operations. From a major trans-shipment point in the early 1990s, the Philippines became a net producer and exporter by the late 1990s.

Shabu began in the 1990s as the drug of choice among the affluent, but over the past decade it has filtered down into the masses and has become very popular among the lower classes. It has come to be known as “the poor man’s cocaine”. “Designer drugs” such as ecstasy² and the more elusive sorts such as ketamine³ and date rape drugs such as GHB⁴ and Rohypnol⁵ are fairly new to the Philippine drug scene but have become increasingly popular among the upper classes because of their trendy appeal. However, shabu remains the number one drug of choice overall, especially among the poor. It now accounts for most of the revenue earned by the illegal drug industry.

In 1972, there were only 20,000 known users and were mostly poly-users combining marijuana with other drugs. In 2003, there were 1.8 million regular drug users, with shabu being the favored drug. But this number almost doubled in the span of a year with 3.4 million drugs users according to PNP estimates in July 2004. However, the intensity of recent drug campaigns has driven the street prices of shabu, making it more difficult to buy. Drug users are slowly beginning to shift back to being poly-users going back to cheaper, more accessible drugs like marijuana in order to maintain their habit. In 1999, the National Drug Law Enforcement and Prevention Coordinating Center (NDLEPCC) reported that 14 percent (6,020) of the country's 42,979 barangays⁶ were considered most seriously affected by drugs. However, in 2002 the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) said that 3,489 barangays (or 8 percent of the total) were classified as drug-affected which shows a 6 percent decrease over 3 years. In 2002, the PDEA identified 215 local drug syndicates and targeted the neutralization of 175 for 2003.

In 2000, Police Director Coronel pointed out that court records also reflect the increasing magnitude of the drug problem. There are at 20,000 pending drug cases and 70 percent of heinous crimes filed in court are drug-related. Out of the 36,739 suspects apprehended for illegal drugs, only 1 percent had been jailed. Furthermore, 65 percent to 75 percent of

² Known as MDMA (3-4 methylenedioxymethamphetamine), it is synthetic, psychoactive drug with stimulant and hallucinogenic properties.

³ An anesthetic approved for both human and animal use also known as “vitamin K”

⁴ Gamma hydroxyamphetamine, a central nervous system depressant also known as “easy lay”, “vita G”.

⁵ Flunitrazepam, which can incapacitate victims when mixed with alcohol also known as “roofies”.

⁶ Barangay is the smallest political-administrative unit of the Philippine government.

prison inmates are in jail for drug-related crimes. In terms of rehabilitative efforts, Coronel said that about 5,000 patients have already been admitted in 60 different centers and 30 to 40 more patients are being taken in every day.

B. Production, Transport and Distribution of Dangerous Drugs

Dr. Calvani of UNDCP reported that the world's primary source of amphetamine-type stimulants — known by enforcers as ATS — was Southeast Asia. He observed that global demand for drugs such as ecstasy and speed was growing because their use did not have the same level of social stigma attached to heroin and cocaine. Amphetamine factories can be easily hidden, unlike heroin and cocaine production facilities, and it is easy to recruit legal companies to produce precursor chemicals. The Philippine Government estimates that 95 percent of the methamphetamine hydrochloride sold in the country originated in China although much of the drug is already produced locally. According to the 2004 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Philippines is currently ranked third in the world as a top producer of methamphetamine hydrochloride.

According to the National Drug Law Enforcement and Prevention Coordinating Center (NDLEPCC), the Philippines used to serve as a transit point for heroin, cocaine, and precursors and essential chemicals (PECS). However, illegal shipments now are composed mainly of ephedra (essential in the production of shabu) and precursors and essential chemicals (PECS). This new development points towards increased production of shabu locally rather than the previous trend of importation of the finished product. A top United Nations anti-drugs official said that around 1,000 drug barons, mostly in Southeast Asia, are flooding global markets with synthetic drugs such as ecstasy and speed as they switch from heroin and cocaine production. Currently, 215 major drug gangs operate in the Philippines, more than 24 of them are foreign - most of which are Chinese.

Drug trafficking in the Philippines earns more than \$5 billion (roughly P277 billion) a year or about 8 percent of the gross national product (GNP). Police Director Miguel Coronel said that shabu is imported from China, Taiwan and Hong Kong while the money earned from the drug trade is laundered in Philippine banks because local banks lack anti-laundering laws. The vast and often unguarded coastline of the Philippines along with its porous borders makes the movement of illegal substances an easy and uncomplicated process. The Philippines is considered part of the triad network of drug distribution in Asia.

In 2004, Usec. Jose Calida, Director of the Dangerous Drug Board, identified marijuana as second most popular drug used by Filipinos. According to the US DoS report, most of the marijuana cultivated in the Philippines is consumed locally while the rest is smuggled into Australia, Japan, Malaysia, Taiwan and Europe. Wholesale prices of marijuana are estimated at P11,160.00 per kilogram although street prices vary depending on the quality. Still, the seizures of marijuana and marijuana-based products pale in comparison to the amount of shabu and shabu-related products seized.

Over the years, users shifted to shabu because it was relatively cheaper than marijuana and gave users more "high." The trade in shabu is highly profitable because it does not require large capital investments. Drug producers only invest P10.00 to produce a gram of shabu worth P2,000.00. Before the government's aggressive campaign in 2001, street prices for shabu dipped as low as P800.00 per gram. In the months that followed the drug campaign, prices rose steeply. According to the PDEA Director, Usec. Anselmo Avenido, there are areas where the price of shabu ranges up to P3,000.00 to P5,000.00 per gram. He also said, "Sometimes drug pushers sell fake or adulterated shabu, mixing it with *tawas* (alum) crystals". Recent developments in the aggressive anti-drug campaign of the government have made shabu supplies scarce and have driven street prices up.

According to Usec. Jose Calida, the Director of the Dangerous Board, ecstasy is the third most popular drug among Filipinos. Like shabu, ecstasy is imported mostly from China and comes in various types such as G2000, 747, yellow tower, peach mango, and green marijuana. The tablets are sold at roughly P1,200.00 to P1,500.00 per piece. In 2004 the Philippine government reported a surge in the use of ecstasy in bars and clubs. The users of ecstasy are generally young, prosperous adults.

In order to evade law enforcers, drug pushers have found creative ways of importing and distributing their goods. In March 1999, at least 17 drums of liquid ephedrine and other raw materials were seized. in Camiguin, Calayan Islands, Cagayan province in the northern tip of Luzon. If processed, this would translate to about 800 kilos of shabu, worth P1.6 billion.

The Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) reported the following figures corresponding to its various activities for the year between July 2002 and July 2003:

- more than P10 billion in illegal drugs, chemicals and equipment for drug manufacture were seized including marijuana leaves and seeds, cocaine, ecstasy tablets and methamphetamine hydrochloride, popularly known as shabu;
- 11,242 drug operations conducted;
- 37 out of 215 local drug syndicates were neutralized;⁷
- 1 out of 24 transnational groups was neutralized;⁸
- 6,700 drug traffickers (including several big-time drug lords) were arrested;
- 881 suspected drug users arrested;
- 6,803 suspected pushers as well as drug cultivators and importers arrested;
- 249 policemen arrested for involvement in illegal drugs;
- 19 shabu labs raided; and
- at least 10,000 cases filed although there have been no convictions so far.

By November 2003, the Western Police District reported that there were only 325 drug-infested barangays left in the city.

⁷ The Office of the President reported 143 local drug rings neutralized.

⁸ The Office of the President reported 12 international drug syndicates neutralized

C. Legal Framework and Policy Responses to Children in Drugs

The Philippines is signatory to the international agreements (e.g., The Single Convention on Narcotics Drugs and the Agreement on Psychotropic Substances) designed to achieve coordination and uniformity in the war against drug abuse. In January of 1999, President Joseph Estrada signed Executive Order No. 61 creating the National Drug Law Enforcement and Prevention Coordinating Center (NDLEPCC) under the Office of the President to consolidate the drug law enforcement efforts of national government agencies, local government units (LGU's), and non-government organizations (NGO's). The government's policy on dangerous drugs is a balanced combination of the prohibition or the legal approach and the social or preventive approach. The Philippine government's strategy to curb drug abuse is basically two-pronged, offering a balance of punitive and preventive actions. It aims at denying/reducing supply and preventing/reducing demand with special focus at neutralizing "big-time" or high-volume drug traffickers, planters, and manufacturers while providing rehabilitation to the victims of drug abuse.

During the 11th Congress a measure was passed to penalize members of law enforcement agencies and other government officers and employees who, after due notice, fail or refuse intentionally or negligently to appear as witnesses in the prosecution of acts that are violative of the Dangerous Drugs Act. In the same period, roughly 41 bills related to drugs were introduced in the Philippine Congress.

Republic Act (RA) 6425, otherwise known as the Dangerous Drugs act of 1972, is an example of the first approach which prohibits drugs and stipulates penalties for violating this prohibition. Enacted to intensify the country's efforts against drug abuse and illicit trafficking, RA 6425 has been amended several times through Presidential Decree (PD) Nos. 44, 1675, 1683, 1708, Batasang Pambansa Bilang 179 and lastly, through RA 7659 or the death penalty law enacted in 1993. RA 7659 also amended specific provisions of RA 6435 and the Revised Penal Code.

Presidential Decree 1619 on volatile substances penalizes the use, possession or the unauthorized sale to minors of volatile substances such as rugby, for the purpose of inducing intoxication or in any manner changing, disturbing the auditory, visual or mental processes. Through RA 6425, the Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB) was created to serve as the national policy making and coordinating body of the government on all matters pertaining to drug abuse prevention and control.

On June 7, 2002, President Arroyo signed into law Republic Act No. 9165, otherwise known as the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002. RA 9165 repealed its predecessor, Republic Act No. 6425, the Dangerous Drugs Act of 1972. The new Act recognizes ecstasy and other "designer" or "man-made" drugs as prohibited and imposes punishments for those involved in the importation/ trade/ use/ sale of controlled precursors and essential chemicals, recognizing new forms or means of trading/trafficking in drugs.

Policy responses to child protection issues. The National Project on Street Children implemented by DSWD and a network of NGO under the National Council for Social Development (NCSD), now covers 27 cities and five urban municipalities. By the end of December 1997, approximately 70,000 street children and youth had been reached over a 10-year period. Over 400 GOs and NGOs are responsible for various programs and services

Following the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Philippine Congress passed Republic Act 7610 entitled, “An Act Providing Stronger Deterrence and Special Protection Against Child Abuse, Exploitation and Discrimination, Providing Penalties for its Violations and for Other Purposes”.

Republic Act 8369 was passed in October 1997, restoring the child and family courts that were abolished during the martial law period. The Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002 imposes severe punishments for the sale and offer to sell illegal substances to minors or the mentally impaired without written consent of parents or guardians. Other policy initiatives undertaken during the last few years include: the Anti-Violence Against Women and their Children Act passed by Congress in 2004; the Anti-Child Labor Law (RA 9231 of 2003) providing protection of working children; the Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act of 2003 (RA 9208) which protects the rights of children/women from being trafficked for adoption, prostitution, bonded labor, etc.; the Child Rights Center created by the Commission on Human Rights in April 1994; Executive Order No. 421 (series of 1997) which recognizes children as a separate sector under the Social Reform Council; the 1995, the Youth in Nation-Building Act (RA 8044) which paved the way for the establishment of the National Youth Commission (NYC); and, the Child and Youth Welfare Code (Presidential Decree 603 of 1974) which serves as the framework for promoting and protecting the well being of Filipino children and young people through the creation of the Council for the Welfare of Children (CWC) and the Barangay Councils for the Protection of Children (BCPC).

Supply and Demand Reduction. The Philippine government’s anti-drug strategy is anchored on supply reduction through police action and demand reduction through local government and community involvement, and rehabilitation.

The Narcotics Commission concentrates on high-volume international traffickers, manufacturers, and producers of dangerous drugs while the local PNP units concentrate on middle layer/street level dealers/pushers and users in coordination with local government units. In terms of policy and implementation, the Dangerous Drugs Board the Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB) was created to serve as the national policy making and coordinating body and the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) serves as the implementing arm of the DDB, and is responsible for the efficient and effective law enforcement of all the provisions of Dangerous Drugs Act. On the local level, the barangay Anti-Drug Abuse Council (BADAC) has been designated as the lead unit in making their respective communities drug-free in collaboration with local police while other agencies provide local support.

To counteract the increasing drug trafficking, several operations have been initiated by the President and the police such as: Operation Gateway, which addresses trafficking of illegal drugs in mail, parcels, and packages as well as human couriers; Shabu Watch Teams, which have been organized and activated in strategic areas; Operation Plan Banat coordinates law enforcement efforts against drug trafficking and abuse; Project Himagsik brings together government agencies with youth/student organizations, religious groups and civil society to generate public awareness on the evils of illegal drugs; *Barkadahan Kontra Droga*, launched in early 2004 by the DDB, is geared to prevent young people from drug involvement; and, Kontra Droga 2004, the government's general anti-illegal drugs campaign, which brings together various groups and agencies in the war against drugs.

Rehabilitation is an important component of the government's demand reduction efforts. Drug abusers are arrested and charged in court but, if they are addicts, their rehabilitation takes precedence over criminal action. Those who voluntarily surrender are absolved of their criminal liabilities but are brought to rehabilitation centers for examination, treatment and rehabilitation. Unfortunately, rehabilitation centers suffer from a gross lack in funding and there is a wide gap between the number of drug-users needing rehabilitation and centers available. Nationwide, there are only 64 residential rehabilitation centers of which only 46 of these are accredited while the remainder have a temporary permit to operate. Outpatient centers are even fewer with only 23 nationwide out of which only 13 are accredited while 9 have temporary permits and 1 is up for re-accreditation.⁹

Drug demand reduction covers preventive education and community information programs, treatment and rehabilitation programs, and studies and research programs. The following sectors are tasked with these responsibilities: Local governments, Citizens Drugwatch, NGOs to initiate preventive information and education campaign; students, teachers and parents to conduct school-based anti-drug activities; media, civic and religious groups to disseminate hazards of drug abuse and to expose corruption in the criminal justice system.

Other agencies are also tasked with supporting the government's drug demand reduction efforts. The Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS) has coordinated with various concerned agencies to conduct education, training and mobilization programs against drug abuse such as the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) which was integrated into the elementary curriculum of private and public schools. The Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) has been designated to provide a workplace-based program for the prevention and control of alcohol and drug abuse in the labor force. Under the DOLE, the Occupational Safety and Health Center works towards a drug-free workplace this goal through research, training programs, technical services and program development with various public and private agencies. Drug abuse prevention and control programs have become mandatory for all private establishments with 10 or more workers and workplace policies and programs are required to include components of : advocacy,

⁹ http://www.oshc.dole.gov.ph/policy_subs_abuse_directory.htm

education and training, drug testing for officers and employees, treatment, rehabilitation and referral, and monitoring and evaluation.

The government's preventive approach is accomplished via an information and education drive and voluntary submission to treatment and rehabilitation is a major thrust. The emphasis here is preventive therapy instead of punitive action.

Summary. The drug problem in the Philippines assumed a transnational character in the 1990s with the introduction of shabu. In the early 1990s, shabu was a drug mainly used by upper and middle-classes. By mid-1990s, the proliferation of cheaply processed shabu made it the poor man's cocaine. It is estimated that there are up to 9 million drug users. Ninety-four percent of drug users are addicted to shabu. Since the introduction of shabu, majority of Filipino drug users shifted from poly-users to mono-users (i.e., shabu only) but slowly, users are shifting back to poly-use because the aggressive anti-drug campaign of the government has driven shabu prices up and made it less accessible. PNP statistics show that 65 to 75 percent of heinous crimes are drug-related. In terms of illegal drugs seized, the Philippines ranks 6th among Asian nations. It is no longer just a transit point for illegal drug. Instead, the Philippines had become a major manufacturing center for shabu as well as a major consumer. Also, in the 2004 report of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the Philippines is currently ranked third in the world as a top producer of methamphetamine hydrochloride. The same report revealed that "throughout 2003, Philippine authorities drew clear linkages between drug trafficking activities and terrorist organizations."

The political and institutional framework of the campaign against drug in the Philippines is mainly anchored on the assumption that to tackle the drug problem is to reduce the supply of drugs. In the process, the demand for drugs from the users also decreases. Reduction of drug supply relies mainly on police action and assumes a determined effort to arrest traffickers and manufacturers and confiscate/seize and destroy illegal drugs.

Meanwhile, demand reduction is anchored on the involvement of local governments and communities in the control and rehabilitation of drug users. The government has created the appropriate structures and processes designed to reduce the supply of illegal drugs in the country. The Arroyo administration has aggressively pursued drug pushers, suppliers and laboratory owners as part of its intense anti-drug campaign. Law enforcers have reported record numbers of raids, seizures and apprehensions. The efforts to reduce demand for drugs include apprehension and rehabilitation of drug abusers, and preventive education. Several drug and crime watch groups have also been organized at national, institutional, local government, and community levels. Local governments and community organizations have been designated as "keepers of the community" with increased responsibilities in managing local drug problems. Several police operations, however that the country has become a major supplier and supplier of shabu.

The changing landscape of drugs in the Philippines is demonstrated in the catch phrases used in anti-drug campaigns. In the 1980s and 1990s the slogan was "Save the user, Jail

the pusher” but the most recent slogan being promoted by the government is “Report the pusher. Report drug labs. Rehabilitate the user.”

Part III. 2. Profile of Children and Parents in the Project Sites¹⁰

This section shall discuss the key findings of the study. The first part covers the profile of children/ youth and their families and communities and the specific characteristics. This part concludes with the specific characteristics and patterns of recruitment of children/ youth to the drug network. The second part describes the outcomes and results of interventions provided by the project. The profile of children and parents are presented in the order of the project sites of Tatalon, Pasay and Paco-Pandacan.

A. Research Site: Tatalon

Profile of Children

Socio-demographic Characteristics. Children in Tatalon had an average age of 14-15 years. The population was also male-dominated (73 percent) with females constituting 27 percent in 2003. The proportion of female children in the research population increased to 36.7 percent in 2004.

Household Situation. The following section describes the children's living situation, relationship with their parents, exposure to and effect of parents conflicts, vices and substance abuse, and how they were disciplined by their parents.

Living Arrangements. About 79 percent of the children lived with both parents while about 21 percent lived with a single parent or relatives. The number of children living with both parents dropped slightly (about three percent) in 2004. However, death of one or both parents did not completely account for the living arrangements of the children. In some cases, parents separated or children voluntarily left home. In terms of legitimacy of marriage, 80 percent of children said their parents are legally married while the remaining 20 percent had parents living together.

Status of Parents' Relationship. Three-fourths of children in Tatalon perceived that their parents have a good to excellent relationship. The other fourth felt that their parents relationships that are either not good but not bad, or outrightly bad. This was evidenced by the frequency of fighting between parents where only 15 percent quarreled seldom or never, 69 percent quarreled sometimes and about ten percent quarreled often or always. More than half of these quarrels led to violence at varying frequency with only 48 percent reportedly not leading to violence. The main reason for household conflict was financial in nature, primarily lack of funds to meet subsistence needs of the family (35.5 percent). Still, 17 percent said it was due to the vices of either or both parents while 14

¹⁰ Two small scale surveys were conducted. The 2003 survey covered 300 children (100 per site) and 150 parents (50 per site) while the 2004 post-test small scale survey covered 90 children (30 per site) and 30 parents (10 per site).

percent cited other problems. In 2004, more children perceived that their parents have good to excellent relationships (83.4 percent). Frequency of quarrels went down with 26.6 percent fighting seldom or never.

Exposure to and effect of parents' quarrels. Most of the children (85 percent) were exposed to their parents' conflicts with most of them hearing and seeing their parents fight. Effects of the fighting are shown by the somewhat high number (25 percent) of children that report they are hurt directly (when parents hit them during or after these quarrels) or indirectly (when they feel hurt and cry). Despite everything, some 31 percent says they have gotten used to it and it does not affect them anymore. In 2004, physical injury was not a major effect of parents' quarrels as it has dropped from 25 to 3.8 percent. Instead, more children (34.6 percent) felt emotional pain when they were exposed to their parents' fighting.

Parents' vices and effects. Most children (81 percent) reported that their fathers have vices. Among the fathers, 86 percent drink alcohol, 39 percent smoke, 37 percent gamble, nine percent have extra-marital relationships and seven percent use drugs. In 2004, drinking dropped to 64.3 percent, gambling increased to 42.9 percent and drug use rose to 16.6 percent. Notably, 53 percent of the fathers had multiple vices. In terms of effects, the vices led to fights with their spouse (25 percent), causing disturbances (18 percent), more financial difficulties (14 percent), and a loss of respect from the children (12 percent). These effects did not differ much in 2004. Roughly one-third of children whose fathers have vices did not say whether it has affected them or not.

Among the children, roughly one third (30 percent) reported that their mothers have vices. Vices of mothers included smoking (48 percent), drinking (38 percent), gambling (29 percent), having extramarital affairs (5 percent) and using drugs (5 percent). In 2004, all types of vices among mothers dropped considerably. There are about 19 percent who have multiple vices. Generally, most children (81 percent) whose mothers have vices say that it does not affect them at all. Of those who feel affected by the vices, 14 percent say they experience neglect while one child said it made him disrespect his mother.

Instilling discipline in children. Whenever children make mistakes, fail to do their chores or misbehave, parents in Tatalon resorted to hitting their children to instill discipline. The survey also shows that a little more than 60 percent of fathers hit their children while about 29 percent resort to verbal means, which includes cursing and other forms of verbal abuse. Mothers though were more or less divided equally between those who hit their children and those who use verbal ways of disciplining their kids. In 2004, roughly the same percentage of children experienced physical discipline from their fathers but 70 percent also reported that their fathers would discuss or scold them. On the other hand, most mothers (73.3 percent) resorted to verbal discipline using discussion or scolding.

Education. Among the three research sites, more (67 percent) children in Tatalon attended school. Although this percentage dropped off to 56.7 percent in 2004, it was still

the highest among the three. The children finished an average of eight years schooling or sophomore high school. More children in Tatalon had some high school education compared to the children in the other sites and it was the only area where some children were able to attend college (seven percent). Consequently, these children spent more hours (8 hours/day) in school than in the other areas. Thus, school-related expenses of parents in Tatalon was highest, with an average of P5,119.00 in 2003 and P8893.00 in 2004.

These children who study are not free from risks and fears. Some 42 percent say that they are frightened of their teachers who they aptly label as “terrors”. Another 16 percent fears the existence of fraternities in school, which they are aware, could influence them negatively. Another 13 percent report that schoolmates who bully them are threatening. Also, 11 percent fears they might fail their subjects while another five percent say that drug addicts and “trippers” who hangout just outside their school frightens them. Other sources of worry include getting caught cheating, not being able to attend class due to lack of money, being asked to see the guidance counselor or simply being asked to recite in front of the class.

When these children were asked how they manage these risks, the most popular response was to stay away from fraternities and bullies. Being obedient to teachers or just simply staying quiet in class were other often used strategies.

Given the 31 percent of children who were not attending school, 36 percent of these children admit that they do not attend school because either they are admittedly lazy, they have lost interest or they just simply does not like studying at all. Same number of children said that they are not studying because their family does not have the money to support their studies. It should be noted however that a growing number of children do not attend school because of fear of fraternities and other kids in schools who they know steals (about 9 percent). Despite the increasing number of children out of school, almost all children (93.3 percent) recognized the importance of education. They said that it was important in order to find a good job and to secure their future.

Recreation. Tatalon children were fond of sports such as volleyball, billiards, table tennis, lawn tennis, biking and playing chess, but basketball remains to be the most popular choice. Aside from sports, video games are steadily gaining popularity among children. Others also play street games with other children. As regards indoor activities, more children say they spend leisure time singing away, reading or watching television either in the comforts of their homes or at their neighbor’s houses. It can be noted that more children regard some of their household chores (such as fetching water or cleaning the house) as recreation. Engaging in these leisure activities vary in frequency from daily, to whenever they have opportunities to do so.

Work situation. In 2003, half of the child respondents in Tatalon were working. Thirty-one percent of the working children have more than one job. In terms of type of jobs children had, 79 percent had non-street jobs which included working as helpers in various establishments such as canteens, factories and houses, construction work and vending at

nearby market areas. The remaining 21 percent are into street-based jobs such as delivery, garbage collection, ambulant vending and watching over cars. However, in 2004, the number of children not working rose sharply to 72.4 percent. Of those working, only 25 percent had non-street jobs while 75% were involved in various street or market services such as vending, repacking and garbage collecting.

Decision to work and recruitment process. Most of the working children in Tatalon decided to work themselves (53 percent). Still, family played a very important role in pushing these children to work (33 percent) in order to help augment their low household income. Peer groups showed less influence with only five percent of the children deciding to work because of peer influence. In terms of finding work, there were more children (39 percent) who learned of possible income sources from their parents or siblings, while a close 36 percent found jobs themselves. The other 26 percent learned of possible jobs from their friends.

Work conditions. Employers of children in Tatalon were mostly people who are not related to them (65 percent). Others worked with their peers (20 percent) or with other family members (14 percent). While 24 percent of these working children did not experience any forms of risk at work, 35 percent reported that they have become sick (e.g. dengue, fever, flu, body pains). Others (29 percent) have experienced accidents or harm at work such as being run over by vehicles or having been wounded at work. The remaining 12 percent have reportedly been either caught by policemen, or manhandled by their workmates. Half of the children who experienced work-related risk said that they did not receive any form of protection, 40 percent said they received assistance, while the remaining ten percent made no comment.

The children worked an average of seven hours a day, mostly in the mornings (49 percent) or often both mornings and evenings (38 percent). Those who worked at night constitute 13 percent. In relation to their working conditions, 65 percent perceived their work as acceptable, 30 percent thought work was good while five percent felt that work was bad.

Income and income utilization. Children earned an average of P1,784.00 a month, but the distribution of income in the area was negatively skewed given the median of P425 and the mode of P85, implying that more children earned either much less or much more than the average. The average income of children in 2004 was considerably lower at P1319.00 per month.

Eighty percent of these children said that they do not receive the same income as adults who are into the same line of work. Fifteen percent thought there was no difference between the income of children and adults. Similar proportions prevailed in 2004.

Most of the children (69 percent) collected their earnings themselves. The other 28 percent had parents collecting their wages for them. All of the working children said that their income was for personal use but more than half also said that they gave money

to their parents for household needs. Less than half of the working children tried to save any amount from their income.

Effect of work, alternatives and aspirations. When asked what effects they saw resulting from their work, 77 percent of working children in Tatalon perceived positive ones. They cited the following: additional income for the family augmenting their financial difficulties, having enough money for allowance and school requirements, and gaining work experience. The 23 percent who felt their work had negative effects cited not being able to study, having difficulties at work and having meager wage. Still, when asked of their alternatives, 90 percent specified finding another form of work and 10 percent said they do not have any choice at all.

Over and above these, most of the working children in the area aspired to finish their studies had they been given a chance (87 percent), ten percent had accepted their situation and do not aspire for anything more and three percent aspired to have better jobs.

Exposure to drugs. Compared to the other research areas, Tatalon had the lowest number of children having drug-related work with only eight cases in 2003 and 3 cases in 2004. Most of them, three-fourths were into drug running while the remainder were into posting/watching. In 2004, only one case was involved in drugs as a watcher. It was quite disturbing though that 96 percent of all the children in the area were familiar with drug users. This can be broken down as follows: 51 percent from their own family, 34 percent are their peers and 14 percent are other people, most of who are their neighbors. These numbers shifted to reflect that the children knew parent/s (26.7 percent), sibling/s (23.3 percent), relative/s (41.2 percent), friend/s (43.3 percent), and neighbors (47 percent) who were drug users.

In terms of familiarity with people involved in drug trade, in 2003, 18 percent of the children had friends involved in illegal drug trade, 11 percent had parents who were involved, six percent had siblings who have drug-related work and one percent admits that they themselves are into drug trading. In 2004, there seemed to be an increase in the drug trade involvement of people within the respondents' environment. They reported that they had friends (30 percent), parents (three percent), and siblings (ten percent) involved in drug trade. Two children were involved as runners.

Drug use among children. Among the children who had tried drugs, all of them have tried marijuana, 57 percent have used shabu and 14 percent each for rugby and cough syrup. In terms of the drugs that they first used, marijuana constitutes 43 percent, followed by marijuana combined with shabu (29 percent) and shabu and/or various drug combinations (seven percent each). Some data implies that some 43 percent of these children have been initiated into drug use through multiple types. The drug use profile among children did not change much in the span of a year. In 2004, among the child respondents the most popular drug was marijuana (30 percent) followed by shabu (16.7 percent) and cough syrup (ten percent). Among the drugs first used, marijuana was still

most popular (50 percent) followed by shabu (20 percent). Cough syrup, shabu-dugr combinations and cigarettes and/ or alcohol followed with ten percent each.

Although the children first used drugs at 15 years old in 2003, the average age of first use dropped to 14.6 years old in 2004. Most of them say that they tried drugs because of the influence of their friends (69 percent) while others reason out that they were curious (23 percent) or they wanted to escape the family's problems (8 percent). It is sobering to note though that 77 percent of these children who have used drugs say they do not use anymore. Still, 15 percent were into drug use and eight percent still used drugs whenever they have the money.

Drug use among people children are familiar with. Drug users who the children were familiar with mainly used multiple drugs. About half primarily used shabu in combination with one or more other types of drugs such as rugby, marijuana and cough syrup. Mono-users are broken down as follows: 40 percent used shabu, and the remaining ten percent use either marijuana or rugby. In 2004, this drug use pattern shifted slightly because the data showed that more than half of all users used shabu exclusively, especially among adults (87.5 percent of parent users used shabu exclusively). Poly-use was more evident among the childrens' friends or peers with almost 60 percent using various drug combinations.

Profile of Parents and Guardians

Ethnicity and length of stay. Most of the parents of children-beneficiaries in Tatalon came from the Tagalog Region, the Bicol Region and the Visayas. The rest came from other areas in Metro Manila. In terms of length of stay, the many of the parents had lived in the area for more than ten years with an average length of 14 years.

Community involvement. In comparison to the other research areas in 2003, more parents in Tatalon were involved in community activities with 76 percent. This number dropped slightly to 60 percent in 2004. They were involved either as members or officers of various community-based organizations such as women's and youth-related groups, volunteer for bantay-bayan or taking part in community cleanliness drives. Some even help in the community health center. The other 24 percent who did not take part in any community activities cited lack of time as reason for not getting involved.

Family finances. Survey data showed that the average household income in Tatalon was P2,393.00 a month in 2003. In 2004, Tatalon had the lowest average household income among the three areas, with a total of P4070.00 per month. Given this figure 76 percent of the parent-respondents said that their income was insufficient. As such, parents incurred debts from various sources to augment their finances. The most common source of debt in the area is from middle-eastern usurers, commonly referred to as "Bombay", who lend money with steep interest rates (known as 5-6, which means that interest rates are roughly 20 percent per month). Twenty-seven percent of respondents borrowed money from such types of usurers. Some opted to get commodities from nearby sari-sari stores through deferred payment (19 percent) or borrow money from their neighbors (10

percent). The main reason cited for incurring debt is for use as capital in small-scale or home-based business ventures. Other reasons were related to household and family expenses. In 2004, fewer parents borrowed from usurers (10 percent) but more borrowed directly from smaller stores and markets (40 percent). Seventy percent of the parents said they were in debt because of basic household and family expenses, such as food and education. Others incurred debt because of a lack in income, to use for business/livelihood and to pay off other loans (10 percent each).

Education of children. School-related expenses was one of the most common reasons for experiencing financial difficulties. In 2003, parents in the area spent an average of P435 for uniform, P159 for tuition and fees and P36 for transportation allowances. In 2004, more detailed survey information showed that the average total school expenses for one year was P9936.00 – more than double the average monthly household income. Parents would spend this amount on: uniforms (P320.00), supplies (P325.00), daily allowance (P7,714.00), transportation (P2,650.00), projects (P175.00), and contributions (P250.00). These figures show that even though tuition is free, parents are saddled by many other expenses when they decide to send their children to school. Parents of children who are in school were also aware of some common risks encountered by their children such as bullying and difficulties in submitting requirements particularly projects. In order to manage these risks, parents cited the following means: they talk to children to bullies their kids, borrow money to be used for their children's projects or instructing their children to ignore bad influences in school.

Sources of income. Most of the parents in Tatalon were employed in the informal sector, having jobs such as vending, electrician, doing the laundry or employed as driver. Some five percent of them though are formally employed through jobs such as teaching or factory work. In 2003, Many of these parents are assisted by some (if not all) of their children in making ends meet. Most of their children were also employed in the informal sector, with a growing number being employed as attendants in fast-food chains or department stores. Although, in 2004, fewer children were working to help their parents financially. Due to the irregularity of employment and underemployment, families continue to experience financial difficulty.

Children's work. Out of the limited number of parents who had working children, 47 percent were aware that their children were working while 32 percent were not. The other 21 percent chose not to talk about it. In terms of arriving at the decision to work, 38 percent say that it was their decision and the same number say it was their children's own initiative. Thirteen percent say that the matter was a decision shared by both parent and child while another 13 percent say it was based on the combined decision of the parents, their children and their children's close friends. In terms of work schedule, 88 percent of parents say that their children work in the mornings while 13 percent says they work in the afternoons until evenings.

When asked whether their children had encountered any forms of accident, threats or risks at work, 86 percent of the parents said no while 12 percent said yes. All of these parents who were aware of risks cited accidents such as getting wounded or illness as examples. Still, half of the parent-respondents perceived their children's work as good

because it helped the family financially, 25 percent said it was acceptable, and another 25 percent said it was bad due to the exposure of the children to danger and the loss of interest in education when the children earn their own income.

B. Research Site: Pasay

Profile of Children

Sociodemographic characteristics. Children in Pasay were generally younger than the others, with a mean age of 13.24 years. The respondents were predominantly male (70 percent) as females made up only 30 percent of the population.

Household situation. These children belong to households with an average of six members. In 2003, the average monthly household income in Pasay was pegged at P6,858.00. A year later, it fell to P6,318.00 per month. Almost all the children felt that their family's income was insufficient.

Living arrangements. In terms of living arrangements, Pasay has the smallest number of children living with both parents with only 40 percent living with both parents. The other children lived with only one parent (35 percent) or with other relatives (25 percent). In 2003, 27 percent of the children had one or both deceased parents. This number rose slightly to 30 percent in 2004. Although the death of one or both parents largely accounted for the types of living arrangements, the 2004 data showed that while 70 percent of the children had both parents living, only 43.3 percent lived with both parents. More than one fourth were living with others – the highest percentage among the three communities. These figures point to possible breakdowns within the family structures of children from Pasay.

In 2003, there was a more or less equal distribution of parents who were legally married and those who were not. This pattern was radically different a year later where survey data showed that only 30 percent of the parents were legally married while over 60 percent were not legally married but living together. Such arrangements have potentially large impacts on the children in terms of birth legitimacy and parent responsibility.

Status of parents' relationship. About 59 percent of children in Pasay said that their parents have a good to excellent relationship. The remaining 41 percent felt that their parents have relationships that are neither good nor bad or outright bad. In 2004, the relationship of the children's parents seems to have deteriorated because none felt that their parents have an excellent relationship while only 26.7 percent felt their parents have a good relationship. However, half of the children felt that the relationship of their parents was neither good nor bad or just bad.

In terms of frequency of their parents' quarrels, only seven percent said their parents never quarrel. Most, about 48 percent, said their parents sometimes quarrel and 11 percent each for seldom, often and always. Of these, only 28 percent did not lead to violence, 25 percent led to violence sometimes, 17 percent seldom, 10 percent always and

8 percent often. In 2004, one third of the children said that their parents' quarrels sometimes led to violence but almost half did not comment on the level of violence present in their household. The main reason for household conflict in Pasay was largely financial, lack of money for payment of bills and for household needs (48 percent). Twenty-six percent of children say that quarrels were due to the vices of either one or both parents.

Exposure to and effect of parents' quarrels. About 16 percent of children in Pasay were not exposed to their parents' quarrels. The remaining 84 percent were mostly exposed through both seeing and hearing their parents' conflicts (34 percent), seeing them (27 percent) or hearing them fight (23 percent). Their parents' quarrels have various effects on the children. Some said they feel bad and hurt that their parents quarrel (24 percent), or they fear their fathers (15 percent). Others felt sad and helpless or confused and did not know what to do (8 percent each). Yet, about 12 percent said it had no effect at them at all.

Parents' vices and effects. Most of the fathers of children in Pasay had vices (80 percent). Of those, 74 percent drank, 59 percent gambled, 39 percent used drugs, 18 percent had extramarital affairs and 14 percent smoked. Similar patterns in vices were observed in 2004. It should also be noted that 74 percent of these fathers have multiple vices, mostly gambling combined with any or some of the other types. In terms of the perceived effects of these vices, about 17 percent of the children say that it has led to fights with their mothers, 16 percent say that money was spent for vices instead for household needs, 11 percent says they get scared of their fathers, 10 percent says their father's vices caused the separation between their parents and six percent says it makes their father make disturbances like noise. Some 12 percent of children said it made their fathers unable to go to work or neglect their duties at home. In 2004, the top three effects were quarrels with spouse (45.5 percent), increased expense (43.3 percent) and separation of parents (13.6 percent).

In the case of the mothers, there was a small margin between those with vices (48 percent) than those without (52 percent). Of those with vices, 54 percent gambled, 35 percent drank, 17 percent smokes, 15 percent used drugs and 6 percent had extramarital affairs. Some 29 percent of these mothers had multiple vices, mostly gambling in combination with the other types, similar to vices of men. With regard to the perceived effects of these vices, 40 percent of the children felt that there was no effect at all, 19 percent said expenses were increased, and 13 percent felt neglected. In 2004, fewer children reported that their mothers had vices and effects felt were mostly related to the insufficiency of income.

Instilling discipline. There were more fathers who tend to instill discipline on their children through verbal means (49 percent) than hitting (about 37 percent) in Pasay. Same thing also applies to mothers, with 57 percent who verbally disciplines their children and 34 percent to tend to hit their kids. In 2004, few children commented on their parents' style of discipline. Of those who identified the disciplinary methods of their parents, most said that the discipline was verbal rather than physical for both parents.

Education. In Pasay, there were an equal number of children who attend class and those who are not going to school, 50 percent for each. The area also registered the lowest average length of stay in school with 4 years. This shows that the average student in the area did not even finish primary school. These children also had the lowest average number of hours of stay in school with six hours a day. In 2004, education statistics turned for the worse with the number of children out of school soaring to 73.3 percent. The area still registered the lowest average number of years on school with most of the children only having some grade school education (62.5 percent) and none had graduated from high school. Average number of hours in school was reduced from six hours to five hours a day.

The average school-related expenses, combining tuition and other fees, uniform, and allowances, is P1,103.00. This low figure may have been due to the proximity of schools in the area, thus, children only walk to school and not spend anything on transportation. School-related expenses rose sharply to P5,105.00 in 2004 with supplies being the single largest expense (P3,500.00).

When asked about the things that frighten them or things that they think are risky while studying, 38 percent there are none. Some 16 percent said that they fear schoolmates who bully, 14 percent thought that their teachers were frightening, 12 percent feared having no assignment while ten percent feared having low grades. A few students in Pasay feared a supernatural “presence” in the school’s bathroom as well as “trippers” who would hang out just outside the school premises. In 2004, fewer school related risks and difficulties had to do with other children. Sixty percent of the children experience academic difficulties and ten percent had teachers who would shout at or be angry with them. Thirty percent reported having some difficulty with troublemakers in school.

Given these risks, the children engaged the following solutions: in order to settle problems related to their studies, children talked to their teachers, studied well, copied assignments from their classmates or went to school early. With regard to the bullies, children avoided them or went around in groups. Still, some students choose to fight back when confronted by classmates or other children in or outside the school.

The children who did not attend school blamed lack of money to support their academic pursuits (48 percent), their own lack of interest in studying and the decision work instead (18 percent), having problems with documents and other requirements of the school (8 percent), or being frightened by bullies in the school grounds (two percent).

Despite the number of children out of school, most of the children acknowledged the relevance of education for their future. Forty-one percent felt that finishing school ensures better life chances, 31 percent said that it ensures finding better jobs in the future, 26 percent appreciated the knowledge they gain from education. Only two percent felt education was not relevant at all.

Recreation. Sport and games were the most common recreational activities of children in Pasay. Basketball remained the most popular sport followed by billiards and badminton

as well as chess and checkers. Playing outdoors was also popular as well as spending time outside their homes with their friends. Video games were also becoming more popular among the children. There were a few cases who engaged in vices such as smoking, gambling and drinking.

Work situation. In 2003, 80 percent of children in Pasay were working, implying that here too, a growing number of school youths also work but this number dropped to 50 percent in 2004. Some 28 percent of these children have more than one job. Since the area is very close to the marketplace, most of the types of work were market-related. Those who were into non-street-based jobs such as hired help, construction and vending constitute 53 percent. The remaining 47 percent were into street-based jobs such as begging, garbage collecting, portering and ambulant vending and running errands. It was noted however that there are two cases of females admitting that they are into prostitution and another two who are working in nightclubs as waitresses. These cases did not reappear in 2004.

Decision to work and recruitment process. In deciding to work, 68 percent of the children decided for themselves followed by 20 percent having been influenced by their family and less than ten percent owing it to their friends. Same trend was seen in terms of recruitment with 41 percent of children finding jobs on their own, 25 percent having been recruited by relatives or informed by their parents and siblings and 21 percent learning about job vacancies from their friends.

Work conditions. In Pasay, most of the children worked with people who are not related to them (73 percent). The other children were equally divided between those who were working with family members and those working with friends. All working children in the area had experienced some form of risk. Thirty-six percent reported illness which ranged from athlete's foot to throwing up blood, 31 percent said they met accidents, 29 percent fought with employers/customers while the remaining six percent said that they were victims of theft. Most of these children did not receive any form of protection from harm and risk (70 percent).

Similar to children in Tatalon, children in Pasay worked an average of seven hours. Almost half of them (47 percent) worked in the mornings. Twenty-four percent work from the afternoon to night. The remaining 28 percent work from morning to night. Half of the population of working children perceived their job as acceptable, 38 percent said it was good and 13 percent thought their work was is bad. In 2004, although fewer children were working, half of them felt that working was bad for them.

Income and income utilization. In 2003, the average monthly earning of children in Pasay was pegged at P1,992.00 - the highest among the three research areas – which may explain why more children chose to work rather than study. Although the average monthly income in Pasay rose to P2,107.00 in 2004, it was no longer the highest among the three. As with the other two areas, children in Pasay also felt that the income they make in their jobs is not similar to what adults make for the same line of work (74 percent).

Children who collected their own wages constitute 57 percent, while those whose parents collected their income made-up 28 percent. Many children gave their money to their parents to be used for household needs or their education but half of the working children population says they use their money to buy a few things. Twenty-three percent of these children try to save some of their income. Among those who worked in 2004, all used their wages for personal purchases and only a fourth gave some of their wages to their family.

Effect of work, alternatives and aspirations. A large number of children (79 percent) perceived work to be positive, 14 percent cited negative effects and a remaining seven percent did not see any effect at all. Positive effects enumerated include helping their families get by and meet everyday needs, learning to work and even getting back to school. Negative effects are having no assurance in life and not making enough to save for the future. Almost all of the children cited finding other jobs as their alternatives; only one percent thinks of going back to school and two percent does not have any other alternative.

Finishing school remained the aspiration of most of the children in Pasay (76 percent). Others aspired towards better paying jobs (23 percent) while a few had no aspirations at all (one percent).

Exposure to drugs. In 2003, there were 17 cases of children who are involved in illegal drug trade in Pasay. Those who were working as watchers and those who were into drug running each constituted 41 percent. Another six percent were into posting. In 2004, there were 10 children involved in drug work, 8 of whom were runner and 2 were posters. Still, similar to the other areas, almost all of the children are familiar with drug users (89 percent), most of who are members of their own family (66 percent), their friends (31 percent) or neighbors and acquaintances. This pattern changed in 2004 because 100 percent of the children were familiar with drug user/users. The drug users they were exposed to were friends (100 percent), neighbors (75 percent), parents (36.7 percent), siblings (33.3 percent), and relatives (25 percent).

Drug use among children. Children who used drugs in Pasay posted the youngest average age of 12 years. Sixty-six percent of these children used shabu, 55 percent used marijuana, 41 percent used rugby and ten percent used cough syrup. They were initiated into drug use mostly through marijuana or rugby (with 27 percent each), shabu (15 percent) or through a combination of two or more of the aforementioned drug types (31 percent). When asked why they used drugs, 44 percent say they did because of peer pressure, 30 percent say they wanted to forget their problems, 13 percent say out of curiosity and another 13 percent cited various reasons including being influenced by their own parents. At present most of these children are still using drugs (59 percent) while 37 percent says they have stopped. Still, some four percent would use drugs whenever they have the means.

In 2004, 80 percent of the respondents had tried drugs – the highest percentage among the three areas with almost double the number of either two. The children who used drugs enumerated the types of drugs they have tried/used: 75 percent used shabu,

66.7 percent use marijuana, 40 percent used rugby, and 12.5 percent used cough syrup. The overlapping percentages show that the children do not use one drug exclusively, rather, they use different kinds of drugs depending on their mood, drugs availability and what they can afford. Age of first use was still lowest in Pasay with an average of 12.36 years. Shabu figures prominently in their first use with shabu in combination with other drugs being the most often (45.8 percent) followed by rugby (29.2 percent), shabu only (12.5 percent), marijuana (8.3 percent) and solvent (4.2 percent). Among the reasons for using drugs, the data shows that peer influence is a major factor as it is cited 69.7 percent of the children. Other reasons are problems in combination with peer influence (29.7 percent) and family problems (4.3 percent).

Drug use among people children are familiar with. Shabu remained to be the most popular drug being used by people the children know (62 percent). Those who used either marijuana or rugby constituted three percent each. It should be noted however that 34 percent of these people are multiple users. The profile was similar in 2004 with shabu being used by parent users (54.5 percent) but the shabu-marijuana combination was most popular among siblings, friends and others (90 percent, 35.7 percent and 50 percent, respectively). The greatest variation in drug combination was found among the children's peers. Combinations were mainly composed of shabu with a varying number of other drugs.

Profile of Parents and Guardians

Ethnicity and length of stay. More than half of the parent respondents in Pasay were born there (59 percent). The others migrated from Central Luzon provinces (21 percent), the Visayas (15 percent), or from Mindanao (six percent). On the average these families have stayed in Pasay for about 22 years.

Community involvement. Most of the parents, 74 percent, in the area were not involved in any community activity. Reasons cited, according to rank, include lack of time, no awareness and disinterest. Those who were involved took part as members of various community organizations, worked as *bantay-bayan*, and took part in livelihood projects. Two parents were involved as community officials.

Family finances. Based on the financial data disclosed by parents in Pasay, the average monthly household income of families (combining what parents and working children make) amounted to P4,681.00 in 2003 and rose slightly to P5365.00 in 2004. The area registered the highest average household income. However, it should be noted that the parent-respondents were widely dispersed given the mode of only P150 and a median set at P3, 000. This means that while there were some families who earned well, there was a greater number who earned low wages. This may be the reason why 82 percent felt that their household income was insufficient while 18 percent were able to make ends meet. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents borrowed money from Middle-Eastern usurers. Those people who incurred debts used the money primarily for capital and for their everyday needs. 2004 seemed to have been worse, economically for the parents because even though the average monthly income rose by a small margin it was earned by an

average of four workers in the family. Also, all the respondents felt their incomes were insufficient. Eighty percent borrowed money from usurers while 50 percent had availed of formal loans. Reasons for debt were split between basic needs and business/ livelihood (38.5 percent each).

Education of children. In terms of school-related expenses, parents in Pasay spent an average of P626 for school uniform, P329 for tuition and other fees, P424 for transportation costs, P300 opportunity cost among those with working children for a total of P1,679.00. In 2004, school-related expenses increased considerably to P6,768.00 per year. Despite the amount of money spent, there was still some level of concern among parents because they were aware of the risks their children face in school: lack of money for making projects, paying the tuition or even having enough allowance; their children having low grades and performing poorly in class; and the possibility of their children dropping out of school. Faced with these issues, parents have tried managing them by working harder to augment the family income and talking to their children to make them realize the importance of education.

Sources of income. Similar to parents in Tatalon, those from Pasay were also mostly employed in the informal sector with job such as vending, carpentry, garbage collecting and househelp. Others also found work in the barangay as *bantay-bayan* members or working in various establishments. In many families, the household income was augmented by their children who were employed in similar jobs.

Children's work. Seventy-six percent of parents with working children were aware of their children's income-generating activities. Seventy-one percent said that the decision to work was made by the children themselves, 24 percent said the encourages their children to work and five percent said their children were influenced by their peers. The data shows that working children in Pasay worked extended hours with 88 percent working both mornings and evenings. The others worked either in morning only (28 percent) or evenings only (33 percent).

With regard to the forms of work-related hazards their children experienced, 89 percent of the parents said their children never encountered any. However, 17 percent of parents shared that their children had been run-over by vehicles, gotten into fights with co-workers, been involved in riots or have gotten sick. With this considerably low level of work-related risks, it is not surprising that majority of the parents perceived their children's work as good (67 percent) or acceptable (11 percent). Those who thought their children's work was bad constitute 28 percent.

C. Research Site: Paco-Pandacan

Profile of Children

Sociodemographic characteristics. In Paco-Pandacan, the average age was computed at 13.98 years with a median of 15. This implies that there were more children in the older end of the range. The males made up larger part of the population, 62 percent, while the females constituted 38 percent.

Household situation. Children belonged to households with an average size of seven members. Their families earned an average monthly income of P1,218.00 in 2003. A year later, the average monthly household income was P6,453.00. The low income levels in 2003 are reflected in the perception of 80 percent of the children that the household income is insufficient. Their situation seemed to take a turn for the better in 2004, because although 59.1 percent still thought their family's income was insufficient, 44.4 percent thought their parents earned enough. This may point towards a higher satisfaction level among the children.

Living arrangements. Although about 88 percent of children had both parents living, only 63 percent of these children lived with both parents while 28 percent lived only one parent and around eight percent live with other relatives. A similar pattern emerged in 2004 with 85 percent having both parents living but only 70 percent lived with both parents despite the fact that 81.5 percent of the parents were legally married. Around 26 percent lived with single mothers and 3.7 percent lived with other people.

Status of parents' relationship. Children in Paco-Pandacan were almost equally divided into three groups: those who felt their parents have a good to excellent relationship, those who felt their parents' relationship was neither good nor bad, and those who felt their parents had bad relationships. In terms of the frequency of domestic conflict, about 45 percent of children reported that their parents quarrel often to always, 38 percent said sometimes and 13 percent said seldom. Only 3 percent said their parents never quarrel. A little more than half, roughly 56 percent of these quarrels led to violence. The remaining 44 percent said it seldom happened. The reason for these conflicts, unique to this area, was primarily due to the vices of either or both parents (44 percent). Financial difficulties, though, did not trail far behind with 37 percent. In 2004, family relationships seem to have become more stable with because close to 67 percent said their parents had a good to excellent relationship and 66 percent said that the frequency of quarrels was only sometimes/ seldom. However, more than half of the children (55.6 percent) still reported some form of violence during their parents' quarrels or fights.

Exposure to and effect of parents' quarrels. Given the relatively high incidence of domestic conflicts in Paco-Pandacan, it is understandable that most of the children are exposed to these fights either through both seeing and hearing them (33 percent), simply bearing witness them (another 33 percent) or through simply hearing their parents argue (22 percent). It seems that because of this marked exposure to their parents' conflicts, some 60 percent of the children felt impervious and that the quarrels had no longer affected them. The remaining 40 percent were subject to many various experiences such as separation of their parents, fear of their parents, shame, and many more. This was slightly different in 2004 where close to 60 percent said they felt emotional pain when their parents fought while 33.3 percent felt anger and 29.6 percent used rebellion to deal with their feelings.

Parents' vices and effects. Almost all fathers of these children, a whopping 93 percent, have vices. They drink (82 percent), gamble (41 percent), do drugs (41 percent), smoke (11 percent) or have extramarital affairs (7 percent). It can also be noted that 59

percent of these fathers with have multiple vices, primarily drug use in combination with one or more of the other types. In 2004, numbers still remained high. Fathers in Paco-Pandacan had the highest incidence of involvement in vice among the three communities in all vices except drug use. According to the children, they feel that their fathers' vices lead to either the separation of their parents (20 percent), disturbances at home that renders their households without peace (18 percent), gets their family entangled in more financial problems (12 percent), makes them feel afraid or angry of their father (9 percent) or makes them stay out of the house, hang out with peers and engage in vices, or worst, do drugs. Still, some 18 percent of these children have already gotten use to their fathers' vices that they feel it has not at all affected their family.

Similar to other areas, there are fewer mothers in Paco-Pandacan who have vices compared to the fathers. Some 37 percent reportedly have vices while 63 percent have none. It was disturbing though to note that 59 percent of mothers with vices are into drugs. The others are into gambling (36 percent), drinking (14 percent) or engage in extramarital affairs (5 percent). It was also noticeable that 14 percent of these women have multiple vices, primarily drug use in combination with one or more of the other types. However, the pattern of involvement in vices changed in 2004. Gambling and infidelity decreased to 7.4 percent, smoking was at 25.9 percent, drug use and drinking were both down to 3.7 percent. In 2003, the perceived effects of these vices were largely negative with 23 percent saying they led to the separation of their parents, 18 percent saying that their mothers neglected their children and other household responsibilities, 9 percent each said vices made their parents quarrel, have domestic disturbances, get into more financial problems and led to the children stopping attending school. Around 5 percent of children left their homes and stayed with other relatives. In 2004, the effect of their mothers' vices were mainly increased expense and quarreling with their spouse.

Instilling discipline. In Paco-Pandacan, there were a few more fathers who hit their children to instill discipline (35 percent) and those who use verbal means (roughly 37 percent) than in other areas. In the case of the mothers, some 33 percent hit while 42 percent tended to verbally discipline their children.

Education. In 2003, education was clearly a major concern in Paco-Pandacan with more children not studying (54 percent) than those who were (46 percent). Those who did study stay an average of six years in school, enough to finish elementary education. With a mode of eight years, children in the area were more likely to reach sophomore high school. Children also tended to stay in school at an average length of seven hours a day. The average school-related expenses, combining tuition and other fees, uniform, and allowances, was P296, owing primarily to not spending a lot for uniform because the children use hand-me-downs and fewer transportation expenses because schools were within walkign distance. The education situation seemed to have deteriorated with 74.1 children out of school. Among the children who remained in school, the average number of years spent studying increased to 7 years but time spent in school was almost halved at 4 four hours. It was interesting to note that among the three communities, only Pasay had students in vocational school with 62.5 percent enrolled in vocational school. This can be

credited to the services and linkages provided by FCED. School expenses were lowest in Paco at P3,071.00 per year.

In terms of school-related risks, the 46 percent of the children who attend school related the following. Thirty-five percent are afraid of failing school because of not being able to submit projects and other school requirements, while being frightened of their teachers who were generally regarded as “strict”/“always angry”/“scolding” follows with 30 percent. Another 22 percent regard bullying of schoolmates or people who hang out within the proximity of the schools as source of anxiety. The remaining 14 percent identify financial problems as having an impact on their education through not having any allowance or money for school projects.

In order to deal with the aforementioned risks or sources of fear and anxiety, children have decided not to attend classes at all or to cut classes of specific teachers. Some decided to continue attending school even without any allowance, or work during their spare time to earn enough money for school projects. Other means cited include hanging out with friends and staying away from bullies, deal with them nicely or even have their mothers or grandmothers talk to the teachers concerned or for the latter to extend financial help.

With regard to those who were not studying, 40 percent did not give any specific reason. The remaining 60 percent related the following: 13 percent each for lack of financial sources or due to the negative influence of peers; ten percent admits to have lost interest in studying; and seven percent each for their parents’ decision or because one way or another they are ashamed. Other reasons cited include missing documents, too many subjects failed and even marrying at a very young age.

In terms of their perception of the importance of an education, almost all the children in Paco-Pandacan acknowledged its importance albeit in varying degrees and for various reasons. More than half (some 57 percent) of the children felt that education was the means for them to achieve better lives in the future. This is followed by 19 percent who thought education would lead to better jobs. Similar responses emerged in 2004.

Recreation. Aside from the usual sports, primarily basketball, hanging out with friends (also known as “tambay”) is popular among children in Paco-Pandacan. Similar to the other areas, playing basketball was the most popular outdoor sport. Popular indoor activities were billiards and video games. It should be noted however that there were three cases who specifically stated that they spent their leisure time attending workshops, seminars and activities sponsored by FCED.

Work situation. In 2003, Paco-Pandacan registered the lowest number of working children, with only 38 percent and this dropped even further to 9.5 percent in 2004. Twenty-one percent of these had more than one job. Despite relatively low levels of working children, the area had the highest number of children who were into street-based work with 59 percent. These children beg on the streets, delivering goods, collecting garbage, wiping cars, and fetching water. The remaining 41 percent were engaged in non-

street-based work. It should be noted however that one boy admitted that he worked as a snatcher and two females were working as waitresses in nearby clubs of ill repute.

Decision to work and recruitment process. Similar to the other two areas, children in Paco-Pandacan mostly decided to work on their own accord (62 percent). Family influence accounted for 15 percent and peer pressure constituted eight percent. Learning where to work also largely came from the children's own initiatives (38 percent), with family members and relatives contributing to 33 percent of the children and finally 29 percent being informed by their own friends.

Work conditions. Working children in Paco-Pandacan either worked for other people (67 percent) or for members of their own family (33 percent). Most of these children (52 percent) did not experience any forms of work-related risk. The others have gotten sick (24 percent), have been wounded, run-over by vehicles or have fallen into the river (19 percent) or have been caught by policemen (five percent). Almost all of these children did not receive any form of protection from the risks they encounter (93 percent).

Children in Paco-Pandacan tended to work longer than children in the other two areas – an average of eight and a half hours a day. Given this longer work period, most of these children worked from mornings till night (55 percent). Those who worked in the evenings constituted 24 percent, followed closely by those who worked in the morning with 21 percent. It is interesting to note however that more children perceived work as bad (54 percent) while 31 percent said it is good. Those who say their work is acceptable made up the remaining 15 percent.

Income and income utilization. Given the nature of the jobs these children have, it is notable that the average income of children in the area, computed at P530 a month, is the lowest across the three research areas. Most of the street-based jobs of children in Paco-Pandacan give irregular and low income. Just like the working children in the other areas, most of these children (81 percent) feel that their income does not compare to the income of adults with the same jobs. The working children in Paco-Pandacan experienced the greatest income increase in the span of one year with an average monthly income of P2800.00 – the highest among the three areas.

The ratio of children who collected income themselves to those whose parents got their wages is 70 to 30. All of them used their income to buy things either for themselves or for their family and 94 percent of them also gives money to their parents to be utilized for household use. In 2004, none of the children's income was spent or saved, rather it was given to the family. However, in the 2004 survey, there were only two working children.

Effect of work, alternatives and aspirations. In Paco-Pandacan, 46 percent of working children said that their work had positive effects, 39 percent said there was no effect at all while 15 percent said it affected them negatively. Among the positive effects the children gave were: having enough money to spend for themselves, for school and for

their family and learning not to depend on their parents. Negative effects stated were: difficult kind of work that leads them too tired and having their futures destroyed. In terms of alternatives, more children there were more children in Paco-Pandacan who thought of going back to school (12 percent). Still, most of them preferred to have other types of jobs that were better paying and more secure (56 percent). Sadly, 32 percent of the children felt that they did not have any other alternative. When asked of their aspirations at this point in their lives, most children (59 percent) cited being able to finish school and the remaining 41 percent hoped to find good jobs.

Exposure to drugs. Paco-Pandacan registered the highest number of children involved in illegal drug trade. They were working either as runner (21 percent), post or watcher (17 percent each), courier (13 percent). Similar to children in Tatalon some 33 percent of the children in the area regarded drug use as an involvement in illegal drug trade. Although the types of drug work enumerated by respondents remained the same in 2004, Paco-Pandacan no longer had the most children involved in the drug trade.

Almost all the children were familiar with drug users, with those who do not know anyone constituting a meager two percent only. These people include family members (68 percent), their friends (22 percent) and other people in the area (ten percent). In terms of familiarity with people involved in drug trade, children know more friends (45 percent) followed by parents (27 percent), the respondents themselves (14 percent) and their siblings (13 percent). Similarly, in 2004, all the children were exposed to drug users. Children reported they were exposed to parents (29.6 percent), siblings (22.2 percent), friends (66.7 percent), neighbors (58 percent) and relatives (36 percent)>

Drug use among children. In 2003, the average age of children who used drugs was pegged at 14 years old. They got into drug use mainly out of the influence of their friends (46 percent) but curiosity still plays a vital part (32 percent) and so does the need to escape from problems (18 percent). In 2004, drug used was strongly influenced by peers (70 percent) and a third of the children used drugs because of family problems.

In 2003, more children used shabu (52 percent), marijuana (22 percent) and rugby (four percent). When they first tried drugs, half of the children users started with rugby. About 14 percent were mono-users, initially using either shabu or marijuana. Yet, about 37 percent of these children used multiple drugs when they were introduced to the vice. More than half (55 percent) of children who have used drugs have stopped using, 32 percent were still using and 14 percent would still occasionally, only being limited by a lack of money.

The drug profile of the children in 2004 was quite different. Shabu use was down to 37 percent but marijuana and rugby use were up to 29.6 percent and 22 percent, respectively. It is highly likely that this shift occurred as a response to the aggressive government crack down on drugs which drove up shabu prices. With regard to first use, shabu figured prominently as 50 percent of the children started with shabu alone or in combination with other drugs. About 21 percent started with marijuana only and 8.2 percent started by using rugby. Of interest were the 21 percent who identified cigarettes

and alcohol as “gateways” to drug use. Of those who said they had tried drugs 63.6 percent had stopped already.

Drug use among people children are familiar with. Most of the users children are aware of in Paco-Pandacan are mono-users, 77 percent using shabu and about two percent using marijuana. The remaining nine percent are multiple users, primarily shabu in combination with one or more of the other drug types. A slightly different pattern emerged in 2004. Although adults tended to be mono-users (mainly of shabu), younger drugs users like as siblings and friends were largely poly-users, combining shabu with a variety of drugs such as marijuana, ecstasy and occasionally, rugby.

Profile of Parents and Guardians

Ethnicity and length of stay. Most of the Paco-Pandacan parent respondents were born in the area (68 percent). Others have originated from Bicol (20 percent), Leyte (8 percent) or La Union (4 percent). On the average these families have stayed in the area for 30 years.

Community involvement. Sixty percent of parents in Paco-Pandacan were involved in various community activities. These activities included membership in organizations, volunteer work, and taking part in the projects sponsored by community-based NGOs. The other 36 percent who said they were not involved in any community activities mostly lacked time to participate. In 2004, parents in this area remained the most active among the three communities.

Family finances. The average monthly household income of families (combining what parents and working children make) amounted to P1,898.00. Similar to Tatalon, this income distribution was negatively skewed with more families earning below average and few earning much more than the average. However, in 2004, Paco-Pandacan had the highest average income at P7,798.00. Still, 76 percent of the parents-respondents felt that their income was insufficient. Despite financial difficulties though, only a limited number of parents say they have debts. Those who do borrow money mostly from their neighbors (20 percent), gets products from the nearby store at deferred payment (16 percent) or borrow money from the usurer (8 percent). The primary reason cited for incurring debts is meeting their need for food followed by using the money for their everyday needs. The area had the lowest eventuality of parents borrowing money to engage in small-scale business ventures.

Education of children. On the average, parents of in-school youth in Paco-Pandacan spend a one-time P494 for uniforms, P354 for tuition and other fees and P270 for transportation and other allowances per month. School expenses in 2004 were highest in this area at P12,332.00 which may be partially explained by the large percentage of children who had been enrolled in vocational school. School-related problems they encountered were: lack of money for allowance/ projects/ school requirements, the negative influence of their children’s peers and teachers who did not get along with the children. The strategies used by the respondents were: looking for additional work and borrowing money to be used for school projects and for payment of school bills; talking

to their children to ensure their friends are of the right sort; and helping their children make their assignments and teaching them when they have time. In one case, financial difficulties forced the parents to decide that their children would take turns in going to school.

Sources of income. Most of the parents in Paco-Pandacan are self-employed, working as house-help, delivery services, begging and into ambulant vending. There is one case of parent who is employed as a real estate agent. The other source of income of these parents is mainly what their working children contribute. But these, too, are unreliable since most of the children also have similar work with their parents. Employment patterns shifted in 2004 because few parents were self-employed. Rather, many worked in the informal sector doing work like laundry, construction services and vending.

Children's work. Sixty-five percent of parents with working children were aware of their child's work. Fifty percent said that the decision for the child to work was made by the children themselves, 33 percent said that the parents and their other children made the decision and sixteen percent said that the decision was made by both parents and children. The data showed that most working children worked in the evenings (46 percent) while others work either in the morning only or both morning and evenings (27 percent each).

In terms of forms of work-related hazards their children experience, 60 percent of the parents said their children never encountered any harm. The other 40 percent related their children's experiences with getting run-over by fast vehicles, getting burned or even getting caught by policemen. One parent shared that his/her child was put in jail. With regard to parents' perception of their children's work, more parents regarded it favorably with 42 percent said it is good and 25 percent said it is acceptable. Thirty-three percent felt their children's work is bad.

Summary: Profiles of Children and their Families and Shifts in Patterns of Drug-Related Issues

In general, the urban communities where the children reside possessed the following characteristics: (1) mostly informal settlers in congested housing conditions, (2) residents had irregular/insecure income sources, (3) High levels of unemployment among adults and high levels of child workers, (4) Low levels of education, and (5) Inadequate access to social services.

Of the three communities, Tatalon seemed to have a greater number of stable, complete families. There were higher proportions of children still in school and they had higher educational attainment rates. Also, the area reflected the lowest number of children who had ever tried drugs and use tended to be only when money or drugs are available.

On the other hand, children in Pasay seemed to have the burden of more disadvantages. Families in the area had the lowest household income. Furthermore, families seemed to be less cohesive as evidenced by the high number of children who lived with only one

parent (despite both parents being alive) or who did not live with either parent. Children in Pasay also had lower levels of education and stayed in school the shortest period of time. Also, there were more working children who work longer hours and under more difficult circumstances doing heavy, adult work. In a few cases, children were main income earners in the family. For those involved in the drug trade, involvement has not changed because they have continued to be involved. In relation, Pasay has the highest number of sellers. Involvement in drugs has become, for quite a few, their primary income source/ livelihood. Children are far more exposed to drug use and drug activity. All respondents reported that they had friends who use drugs and a considerable number knew of friends or family involved in drug-related work.

Paco-Pandacan falls between the two other communities in many aspects. Education, income and family arrangements are neither very high nor very low. The parents and children take advantage of the vocational course opportunities provided by the NGO in the area. Although the area has the fewest working children it also has the highest number of out of school youth. This means there is a large youth population that needs to be provided with activities and opportunities to keep them from becoming involved in drugs. Of particular interest was the high number of parents active in community activities and the wide range of activities they are involved in.

Profile of Children/Youth Patterns of Drug Use/Trafficking and Recruitment to Drug Networks. Most of the children engaged in drug use/trafficking were male, 9-15 years old, were out of school, and came from families fraught with economic problems, high level of domestic violence, and substance abuse and vices. Children are initiated into drugs and the drug network because of curiosity, to assert one's identity and power, and to escape from family problems/tensions as well as an economic alternative. Aside from economic reasons, the twin needs of identity and belonging seem to be crucial factors for children to be involved in the drug network.

They are initiated and recruited to the drug network by people close to them such as their peer (*barkada*), family/ relative, and neighbors engaged in drug use, sale, and trafficking. While peer influence is key in the initiation, children are mainly used by adults as runners, scorers or watchers (*poste*); authorities do not immediately suspect them

Across the three communities combination drug use has resurfaced. Shabu was combined with marijuana and/or rugby to create an upper-downer mix. Shabu was hardly used exclusively by the youth, probably because of several factors such as: government anti-drug campaign which drives the prices up along with the bad economy/ lack of employment which means they have less income available to spend on drugs. In many cases, respondents reported that spending for vices (including drug use) resulted in a lack of money for basic needs. From 2000 to 2003, there was an increase in exclusive use of shabu (previous use was mixed drugs), a decrease/ phasing out of rugby and solvent use and the emergence of cough syrup used as a drug. From 2003 to 2004, there was an increase in mixed or poly use – mainly shabu used in combination with other drugs. There was also the slow emergence of ecstasy and a decrease/ phasing out of cough syrup and solvent. Sadly, the research uncovered an increase in respondent involvement in

drugs. Peer influence emerged as a major factor in the drug use of children in 2003 and was strengthened in 2004 to become the primary factor. Family problems became a secondary factor, taking the place of curiosity. Children involved in the drug trade were mainly used as runners by their parents or other adults. The attraction was the large financial reward for relatively easy work.

Part III. 3. Outcomes of Project Inputs and Activities

This section of the report mainly comes from the monitoring and evaluation sessions, focus groups and post-test small scale survey conducted by the research organization with the action program implementers.

Project activities and support. The ILO-IPEC project provided the following support to the children and their families: community organization (e.g., federation of children/youth groups) and mobilization through anti-drug campaigns and awareness raising activities, and anti-drug advocacy and training. Through the initiative of the project implementing organizations, they also sourced other assistance from GO/NGOs to provide limited education support (e.g., tutorial sessions and referrals to vocational and technical education), and livelihood assistance (e.g., soap/candle making, children’s cooperative and savings mobilization).

A. Project Intervention Strategies, Approaches, Outputs

Table 1. Project Strategies, Activities, and Outputs of KKPC in Tatalon, Quezon City

| Strategies/ Activities | Accomplishments |
|--|---|
| Setting up of 3 prevention and rehabilitation centers and improve the services of existing centers | 100% accomplished; 3 healing centers (prevention/rehabilitation) established; 1 existing center strengthened |
| Provision of support services to children such as cooperatives, library, and sports activities | 25 children and their parents are now members of a cooperative; 4 libraries (one per area) has been set up in the area; organized inter-community sportsfests (e.g. basketball, table tennis, chess, volleyball, badminton and scrabble); Exceeded Target |
| Enhance capabilities of leaders and volunteers in each of the 4 communities in drug prevention research, community education, counseling and crisis intervention work | Has trained 24 community workers and community leaders; 100% accomplished |
| Increase level of participation of various sectors particularly the youth, local organizations and barangay officials in addressing drug abuse problems among at-risk children and youth | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KKPC Youth Federation (14 youth organizations) launched in November 2003; conducted anti-drug activities. • Established Anti-drug Abuse Program (ADAP) Committee. Exceeded target of 4 youth groups • Organized cultural performance group (30 children). 100% accomplished • Provide seed capital to 25 children and their families; 100% accomplished |
| Linkages and networking | Forged linkages with GO, NGO, PO networks (e.g., KKFI, QCADC, DDB) to support anti-drug activities |

Table 2. Project Strategies, Activities, and Accomplishments of Addictus-Philippines

| Strategies/ Activities | Accomplishments |
|---|--|
| Develop and disseminate IEC materials | Streamers, posters, pamphlets, slogans set up and distributed in the community; 100% accomplished |
| Children/youth and adult community members capacitated for protection and prevention work | Trained 24 leaders and 9 prevention workers; trained 40 children on talent enhancing and confidence-building; 100% accomplished |
| Provide support services to 100 children/youth at risk identified by community leaders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tutorial services for 50 children/youth as part of “back to school” program. 100% accomplished To enrich above initiative, set up library a library in partnership with De La Salle University (book donations/volunteer teachers). 4 barangays and 4 POs (homeowner’s associations) mobilized for anti-drug activities. 100% accomplished |
| Community groups mobilized and mechanisms for sustainability set up | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership training for 24 core group members (12 youth; 12 parents) who helped in community organizing. Formed sub-task force on drug watch, organizing, fund-raising and family counseling. 100% accomplished |
| Linkages and network established | Forged partnerships with: Pasay City Government and the City’s Network for the Protection of Children, DSWD, Center for Family and Services Inc. (CFSI), De La Salle University, and the University of the Philippines. 100% accomplished |

Table 3. Project Strategies/Activities of FCED in Paco-Pandacan, Manila

| Strategies/ Activities | Accomplishments |
|--|--|
| Provide direct services and opportunities (livelihood*, home visits, value-formation, sports) to 60 direct beneficiaries. *capital provided by NGO | 57 youths organized for sports activities and provision of sports equipment 25 participated in therapeutic art sessions. 20 children given values formation; 10 participated in com. mob. 25 OSY given reproductive health, para-legal sessions 35 trained in livelihood skills (25 soap making; 10 silk screen) 100% accomplished |
| Referrals for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> rehabilitation centers for medical and psychosocial services back to school programs vocational courses | 2 children/youth referred to Philippine Mental Health Association for psychosocial evaluation 2 children/youth to Tahanan Sta. Lusia for recovery and temporary shelter 20 OSY enrolled in formal school 25 OSY enrolled/graduated in vocational courses (e.g., automotive mechanics, refrigeration, etc.)through ERDA and EARIST → 5 obtained employment 12 OSY enrolled in 1-year skills enhancement at ERDATECH 100% accomplished |
| Empowerment of youth and community members towards reduction of drug trafficking through community mobilization for advocacy and capacity building interventions | 40 youth trained as junior advocates, 20 became trainers and conducted advocacy sessions. 100% accomplished 20 parents trained as adult advocates 350 children given advocacy training. 100% accomplished 400 parents given advocacy sessions on substance abuse prevention, CRC, ILO Convention 182/138. 100% accomplished |
| IEC materials | Posters, pamphlets from Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB). enrichment of strategy |
| Assist youth and children through psychosocial counseling (individual and group counseling) | Counseling sessions given to 60 beneficiaries from the 4 target sites; once-a-week regular meeting and counseling sessions with 45 direct beneficiaries. 100% accomplished |
| Linkages and networking | Established linkages with GO, NGOs, POs (e.g. Tahanan, PMHA, ERDATECH, EARIST, etc.) |

The effects of the project activities and inputs seemed evident in two levels: (1) the level of the children and their families and (2) the level of project implementers and the project communities.

The training and advocacy programs given by to the children/youth, parents and community leaders increased their knowledge about drugs. Particularly, it made them appreciate how children are recruited into the drug network and how they can be weaned out of the system. These activities also built their capabilities in responding to the children's needs.

The sports (e.g., basketball/badminton tournaments) and cultural activities like talent enhancement programs (e.g., singing and other cultural performances) promoted community solidarity and cohesion. First, the organization of the activities by the program implementers and the children and parent beneficiaries promoted solidarity and cohesion among them. Meanwhile, these activities (especially the talent enhancement activities like painting, poster making, singing and other cultural performance contests) seemed to have increased the self-confidence, poise and self-esteem of the children.

Inter-community sports and cultural activities seemed to have promoted community understanding and solidarity, particularly evident in the two communities in the Paco-Pandacan areas.

B. Reduction of Risks to Drugs

Profile of risk. Majority of the children were highly at risk to being used in the drug trade or using drugs because they were exposed to someone close to them (parents, uncles, and friends) and were using, selling and/or trafficking in drugs. Most of the parents who were either using or trading in drugs had very bad domestic situations (constantly quarreling, high level of verbal/emotional abuse both to their spouse and children or no communication at all). Exposure of the children to relatives and peers who were trading or using drugs put them in very risky situations (police raids, violence usually erupting from drug deals).

Reduction of drug-related risks. The project activities implemented by the research partners diminished, to a certain extent, the risks posed by drug users, pushers and traders in their communities. The reduction of risks was mainly accomplished through anti-drug training and advocacy sessions. These training programs raised their awareness of the dangers and risks involved in drug use and trading as well as strategies for avoiding the drug-related risks in their neighborhood.

The participation of the children in the project reduced their risks of being recruited to drug use and trade. Another strategy that program implementers found useful in reducing the recruitment of children to drug use, sale, and trafficking is to engage the children in a series of activities and engagements like sports, anti-drug campaigns and talent enhancement activities.

According to the children, before the project “*pagala-gala lang sila*” (they were just loitering around for lack of anything to do as their parents did not have money to send them to school). With their participation in the ILO-IPEC supported activities initiated by the program implementers in their communities, they were able to link up with other youth and were able to use their time and energies in productive activities like sports, anti-drug campaigns, advocacy and training sessions. These activities made them feel happy and fulfilled as they felt they were doing something meaningful and important. Before the project, most of the children did not feel they were part of a group or a meaningful community.

Increased knowledge about drugs and drug-related risks. One of the major outcomes of the project is that the anti-drug training and advocacy sessions led to increased knowledge among children and program implementers about drugs and the risks they posed to the children and their families.

The children advocates trained in this project expressed increased knowledge and confidence in discussing and campaigning against drugs before their peers. Through these training, they gained confidence in speaking before the public about the risks involved in drug use, sale and trafficking. They have learned how drugs compromised the lives of children and their future.

The project implementers also realized that the main problems/needs of children are:

- Education (out-of-school youth more likely to get involved than in-school youth);
- Family nurturance and support as children in drugs seem to have families with high levels of tensions/conflicts or disintegration;
- Support services (leisure/sports, access to social services) as children who gets involved in drugs do not seem to have alternative activities to occupy him nor a support system (e.g., a big brother (kuya) or a big sister (Ate));
- Young addicts need child-friendly and community-based rehabilitation or healing centers as city rehabilitation centers broaden children's drug networks

Provided support services and built the capabilities of community-based research partners and beneficiaries. The project provided training and support services to 260 target children/youth (education, tutorial, advocacy training, counseling, referrals for services, sports, cultural activities, cooperatives, library). Through these activities, the project built the capabilities of community-based partners/beneficiaries to respond to the problems of children in drugs through: (1) workshops, training programs, (2) advocacy activities, (3) networking/linkaging with GOs/NGOs/Pos, (4) training of junior/peer advocates, (5) training of family support workers, (6) psycho-social counseling (e.g., harms-reduction), (7) training in PAOR for some of the project partners.

Increased community awareness on drugs and community organizing. The project activities also raised awareness about drugs through community mobilization, organizing, and IEC activities. Children and parents groups were organized into committees, task forces and youth organizations/federations.

Enhanced capabilities of leaders and volunteers in drug prevention, community education, counseling and crisis intervention work.

Increased level of participation of the children/youth, local organizations and officials in addressing drug abuse problems among at risk children/youth.

Established 3 prevention and community-based rehabilitation centers (known as healing centers in Tatalon, Quezon City)

Provided limited number of livelihood training/assistance (cooperative, candle and soap-making).

Sourcing of education and other social services for children. Because the ILO-IPEC project did not provide for education and livelihood, the project managers had to partner with other institutions in order to source out other services needed by the children. These include training in harms reduction counseling in drugs (Paco-Pandacan), the establishment of community-based healing or wellness centers for drug dependents (Tatalon) and collaboration with a university (e.g. Pasay) to provide tutorial and library services.

Increased linkages and referral networks for project implementers. Among program implementers the ILO-IPEC supported activities led them to source out linkages with other institutions that can help them provide education, health, and livelihood support to the children at risk to drugs. In some extreme cases, they had to link with rehabilitation centers or police officers in order to help children who were involved in drugs. This is very important as one of the lessons that project managers have learned in this project in that providing support to children at risk to drugs need the support of a wide range of institutions.

Part IV. Good Practices

Three good practices of the community-based NGO/PO research partners of the project are highlighted here, namely, (1) the community-based-healing center in Tatalon, Quezon City, (2) training of junior anti-drug advocates in Paco-Pandacan, Manila, and (3) alternative anti-drug information, education, campaign strategy in Barangay 91, Pasay City.

Community-healing centers in Tatalon

Due to its location and physical organization, Tatalon is a close-knit community that is somewhat hidden from sight. Community members generally know each other and each other's business – as well as individual and family problems and addictions. The proliferation of drug users and pushers in this community populated by many children and teens became a cause for concern. The lack of support from the barangay officials prompted community members to form the Kapatiran Komunidad People's Coalition (KKPC), a community-based people's organization which has taken the lead role in finding solutions to the area's drug problem. The organization sought total community involvement and, through its various programs has enhanced skills of parents and community workers as well as increased the level of participation of various sectors, particularly the children/youth. These programs include community organizing (organization and federation of children/youth groups), mobilization of the community through anti-drug campaigns,

A key learning was that a community's drug problems are best solved within the community itself coupled with the knowledge that children sent to rehabilitation often return to their drug involvement once they return to their community and their peer groups. These realizations led KKPC to develop a unique method for the rehabilitation of child/youth drug users. KKPC initiated the establishment of three community-based healing centers for children/youth engaged in drug use and trafficking. In the center, the children are provided counseling/healing/therapy sessions, tutorial, library, sports and recreation activities by the Anti-Drug Abuse Program Committee and other members of the children/youth and parents' groups/federation. These activities are also supported by a children's cooperative, cultural performance group, and other community-based organizations and institutions providing access to social services.

The name "healing center" removes the stigma of rehabilitation from the child while its community-based strategy provides support from peer groups, family and community institutions and networks while eliminating the problems associated with the reintegration of the child back to the family and community. KKPCs guiding principle is total community rehabilitation so that the environment does not pose a threat to the children and youth and at the same time users/addicts can be successfully rehabilitated or healed without having to leave the community.

Community-based IEC Techniques and Education Support for Children in Pasay City

The community of Barangay 91 is disadvantaged by low incomes, low education levels, and high levels of drug use and trafficking. In order to address the growing drug-related problems in the community, Addictus-Philippines partnered with the local development council of Barangay 91 in Pasay City. The barangay council involvement and support is a unique feature of Addictus-Philippines program, an NGO focused on drug issues. Together with the community leaders and elders, they organized a systematic education support system for children that includes tutorial sessions, talent enhancement activities, and IEC material development as a response to the needs of children/youth who were mostly out-of-school. Other activities also include livelihood support through a children's cooperative and promotion of reading through the establishment of a community library.

The tutorial sessions were part of a back-to-school program to enable children in school to keep up with daily lessons and to enjoin out-of-school youth to go back to school. A close partnership with the De La Salle University benefited the community through the provision of volunteer teachers and book donations for the community library. Another strategy they used to raise the level of confidence/self-esteem of children and also build their capabilities was the "Talents Enhancement Program". Throughout the duration of the project, they organized various art, cultural performance, and sports activities. This was an important strategy in keeping children off the streets and off drugs by giving them rewarding activities to occupy their time with, provide leisure and recreation, discover their skills and talents as well bond with their peers. The enhancement of their art skills was also closely tied to their anti-drug IEC campaign wherein materials (streamers, posters, pamphlets and slogans) created by the children were developed and disseminated within the community. These strategies built the capabilities of the children and youth and were quite empowering.

The above strategies were effective because of the leadership trainings, seminars and workshops and advocacy campaigns and seminars provided by Addictus-Philippines in partnership with the local development council leaders and other partners from the community and Pasay City Council.

Anti-Drug junior advocates in Paco-Pandacan

The Paco-Pandacan area is characterized by a large children/youth population. The presence of gangs in the community often led to frequent violence in the form of fights and “rumbles” as well as an increasing drug use/trafficking and other risky behavior (e.g., smoking, drinking, gambling) among the youth.

In response to the community's situation, the Families and Communities for Empowerment and Development (FCED) pioneered in training children/youth advocates (also known as junior advocates) to mobilize and train their peers for anti-drug campaigns and activities in the community. FCED believed that the best way to address the children/youth problem was through the children/youth themselves. The children and youth are empowered towards reduction of drug use and trafficking through community mobilization for advocacy and capacity building interventions (e.g., education and training, workshops, advocacy sessions). Another feature of the FCED programs are the specialized counseling sessions (i.e., harms reduction counseling/therapy) they offer to the children/ youth. Their beneficiaries are given individual or group counseling by a social worker trained in harms reduction counseling and therapy. Meanwhile, junior advocates are also trained to give peer counseling. FCED also provides referrals to rehabilitation centers for medical and psychosocial services, back-to-school programs and vocational and technical courses. A key learning gleaned from these activities is that in formulating programs and implementing programs for children/youth is that they themselves are the key sources of information, solutions and feedback. It is they who can best articulate their problems and needs and by making them an integral part of the program inception and development, the outputs and impacts are more effective in reaching other children/youth.

Part V. Lessons Learned

The implementation of the project yielded the following lessons:

1. Participation of children/youth, their parents and the community officials is key to project success but there is a need to select appropriate types of participation (e.g., articulating the needs of children must come from children not from the assumptions of adults; limited participation in data collection and analysis).
2. Research made entry of project activities easy and raised the awareness of research partners regarding the connection of data/information to action programs.
3. Central needs of children (family nurturing/support, education, social services) can only be facilitated by the project but point to the more fundamental need to strengthen support for family, community support systems, schools, and other institutions.
4. Practical, useful preventive programs that help children construct their future (schooling, career building, livelihood)
5. Rehabilitation centers must be child-friendly and community-based as outside centers tend to increase the drug networks/expertise of children.
6. Skills needed to respond to children in drugs are quite specialized (need training in harms-reduction counseling, detoxification, etc.).
7. More attention should be given to the link between sex, crime and drugs, e.g., reproductive health education.

Part VI. Project Challenges

Complexity of the issue. The risks and dangers involved in research and providing services for children/youth engaged in the illicit activity of drug use and trafficking posed several challenges for both the researchers and program implementers in the communities.

Effects of external factors. Several external factors affected the implementation of the project. One major factor was the anti-drug of the government of Macapagal-Arroyo.

Issues not addressed/beyond the reach of the project. Several issues could not be addressed or were beyond the capabilities of the project implementers. This include, among others, the rehabilitation and re-integration needs of children in drug use and trafficking.

Part VII. Implications/ Recommendations

1. The child/youth is the central actor and vehicle for change. Any program must bear in mind that change starts with the involvement/participation of children in the formulation and implementation of activities designed wean them away from drug use and trafficking.
2. Support of community officials and institutions is key factor in the success of project.
3. Recognize the need for protection/support for children/youth in drugs.
4. Develop the capacity of the police and justice system to deal with children in drugs.
5. There is a need to build drug-specific awareness and capabilities of program implementers in children/youth programs.
6. There is a need to advocate for child and gender sensitive policies/programs specific to children/youth in drugs.
7. Information, education, campaign and training materials specific to children/youth in drugs are badly needed.

Part VIII. Postscript: The National Conference on Children in Drugs

Given the above achievements and lessons in formulating and implementing preventive anti-drug programs for children/youth in three cities in Metro Manila, the project decided to organize a national conference on children in drugs. In general, the conference aimed to market the community-based, anti-drug models to the larger community of stakeholders, similarly engaged in child protection and in the process increasing their knowledge and capabilities to respond to children in drug trafficking. More specifically, the conference aimed to: (1) present the major findings and recommendations of the project, (2) showcase and highlight the salient points of the community-based, preventive anti-drug models, with special focus on demand reduction strategies, and (3) identify follow-up strategies and activities to build a larger community of stakeholders.

Participants. The conference was participated by a total 100 participants from the Philippine Congress¹¹, government agencies¹², media, non-government organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations (CBOs) and local development councils. The presence of these representatives from the different levels of government (legislative, executive, and judicial), and the NGO/PO sector reflected their interest and recognition of CDT as a central problem in Philippine society. Fifteen people from the media came for the press conference.

Table 4. Conference Participants.

| Sector | Number |
|---|--------|
| NGOs/ CBOs/ POs/ Academe | 40 |
| Government Agencies/ Local Development Councils | 25 |
| Community Children | 20 |
| Media | 15 |

Activities of the conference. The first half of the day was devoted to presentation of the community-based models implemented by the project and by other stakeholders. The latter included the community-based model of Kaugmaon Foundation in Davao City, Southern Philippines and of the Red Cross in Metro Manila; the harm reduction model of the University of Southern Philippines (USP) in Cebu City, central Philippines, and the *Barkada Kontra Droga* (Peer Groups Against Drugs) while the second half was devoted to policy implications and recommendations. The first day was highlighted by a heart-rending cultural performance of the children who presented a situationer of children in drugs and their wishes for a better life (see below). The morning of the second day was devoted to the press conference while the afternoon was focused on formulating strategies for deepening the initiatives for demand reduction among children/youth in drugs. It was noted that effective

¹¹ Senator Maria Consuelo Madrigal from the Philippine Congress participated in the press conference held in the second day.

¹² High level government officials include Usec. Lourdes Balanon of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Usec. Josephus Jimenez of the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), Exec. Dir. Lina Laigo of the Council for the Welfare of Children (CWC), and Asec. Romel Garcia.

community-based models had the following components: research and documentation, advocacy, networking, and direct provision of services.

Accomplishments. The project succeeded in increasing the knowledge of public institutions with regards to the conditions of children in drug/drug trafficking.¹³ This knowledge base was also reinforced by the coverage of the conference in major television networks and newspapers/magazines. It also broadened the network of stakeholders committed to the prevention and rehabilitation of children/youth in drug trafficking. Proof of this commitment is their eagerness to create a structure and process where the participants of the conference can share expertise, resources, and provide support for each other as they pushed for anti-drug and child/youth protection programs. This can also be seen in a follow-up activity organized by ILO-IPEC last September 30, 2004, where stakeholders enthusiastically participated and continued to pressure the former for a more systematic program follow-up for CDT.

The project succeeded in engaging the key agencies of the government, NGOs and CBOs to support the promotion of policies and programs for CDT.

Wish list prepared by the community children:

1. Sana magkaroon na ako ng magulang na magmamahal sa akin.
2. Sana matulungan ang mga katulad namin ng ating pamahalaan at sana makapag-aral ako ng libre.
3. Sana ay maintindihan, maunawaan at dinggin kaming mga kabataan.
4. Sana mabawasan at mabigyan katarungan ang mga batang naabuso katulad ko. At sana rin makapag-aral ako.
5. Sana mawala na ang mga bugaw na nagsasamantala sa kahinaan ng mga kabataan.
6. Sana ang mga malalang sitwasyon ng mga kabataan sa lansangan ay maiwasan at sana mabawasan ang bilang ng mga batang nasa lansangan.
7. Sana ang mga kabataang tulad ko ay hindi na sa pabrika pumapasok kundi sa maayos at malinis na paaralan.
8. Sana mabigyang aksyon ng pamahalaan ang mga batas na ipinapatupad nila upang kaming mga kabataan ay hindi na maapektuhan.
9. At, sana magkaroon ng kaalaman o edukasyon ang mga magulang upang hindi na lumala ang sitwasyon ng mga bata at magulang na naabuso.

¹³ For details, please see conference documentation/assessment.

**Working Children in Drugs in the Philippines:
A participatory action research for child/family and community empowerment**

Annexes and Appendices

Annex A. Map of Greater Metro Manila

Annex B. Map of Showing the Research Sites and the Urban Poor Areas in Metro Manila

Annex C. Social and Historical Contexts of Drug Use in the Philippines

Annex D. List of Sources

Annex E. Institutional Framework of Working Children in Drugs in the Philippines

Annex F. Protocol Forms and Research Instruments for PAOR

Annex G. Interview Schedules

Annex H. Sample of Community Social Risk Maps

Annex I. Sample of Community Profile

Annex J. Sample of Monitoring and Assessment Form

Table 5. Selected Findings: Youth in Drugs, 2000

Table 6. Selected Findings on Working Children/Youth in Drugs, 2003


Table 7. Selected Findings on Working Children/Youth in Drugs, 2004

Table 8. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004

Annex A. Map of Greater Metro Manila



Annex B. Map of Showing the Research Sites and the Urban Poor Areas in Metro Manila



Annex C. Social and Historical Contexts of Drug Use in the Philippines

A. Dangerous Drug Use: A Background

During the 1960s and 1970s drug production was poppy based and easy to track. US space satellites could pinpoint and monitor plantations maintained by drug lords. Between the 1970s and late 1980s, the drug problem in the Philippines was domestic in scope and marijuana was the drug of choice. However, the entry of methamphetamine hydrochloride or shabu in the 1990s, with its transnational character, has drastically enlarged the scope of the problem and the landscape of drug operations. Before the Estrada regime (1997- 1999), the Philippines was just one of the trans-shipment points of drug distribution in Asia. The drugs came from other parts of Asia and elsewhere and shipped through Manila. However, the Council on Philippine Affairs (COPA) of the State Department in the US had confirmed that such is no longer the case. From a shipment point, the Philippines has now become a manufacturing center. The shift from organic- to chemical-based drug use bore dire consequences on the monitoring and controlling ability of the government. Nowadays, the US satellites are useless in monitoring the production of illegal drugs because these gadgets cannot penetrate roofs and monitor what goes on indoors. It was when drug production took on new forms as utilized new processes that the Philippines became a suspected manufacturing center as well as major user.

Shabu began in the 1990s as the drug of choice among the affluent, but over the past decade it has filtered down into the masses and has become very popular among the lower classes. It has come to be known as “the poor man’s cocaine”. “Designer drugs” such as ecstasy¹ and the more elusive sorts such as ketamine² and date rape drugs such as GHB³ and Rohypnol⁴ are fairly new to the Philippine drug scene but have become increasingly popular among the upper classes because of their trendy appeal. However, shabu remains the number one drug of choice overall, especially among the poor. It now accounts for most of the revenue earned by the illegal drug industry.

In 1972, when marijuana was the primary illegal drug, there were only 20,000 known users. Recent counts of drug users vary widely. The Philippine National Police reported that there are only 1.8 million users in the country while Rep. Antonio Cuenco of Cebu City disclosed that in 2001 there were 4 million drug users and that although the reported number for 2003 is 3.4 million (of which 1.8 million are regular users and the rest are occasional users), the actual number may be close to 9 million. Dr. Sandro Calvani, the United Nations Drug Control Program Representative for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, observed that shabu is the favored drug for consumption in the Philippines, adding that up to 10 percent of the population are drug-dependent. According to Dr. Rosendo Sualog, Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB) medical specialist, 94 percent of Filipino drug

¹ Known as MDMA (3-4 methylenedioxymethamphetamine), it is synthetic , psychoactive drug with stimulant and hallucinogenic properties.

² An anesthetic approved for both human and animal use also known as “vitamin K”

³ Gamma hydroxyamphetamine, a central nervous system depressant also known as “easy lay”, “vita G”.

⁴ Flunitrazepam, which can incapacitate victims when mixed with alcohol also known as “roofies”.

dependents are addicted to shabu, while 37 percent use marijuana and other drugs. Since shabu has been introduced, the majority of Filipino drug users have shifted from being poly-users (using multiple drugs) in the 1980s to mono-users in the late 1990s. However, the intensity of recent drug campaigns has driven the street prices of shabu and made it more difficult to buy. As a result, drug users are slowly beginning to shift back to being poly-users going back to cheaper, more accessible drugs like marijuana in order to maintain their habit. This was confirmed by a report released by the UNODC in 2004 which stated that shabu consumption was down in the Philippines. Despite the decrease in shabu use, the report also stated that the Philippines was the third largest consumer of amphetamine and methamphetamine (components of shabu), based on population percentage. Despite the decrease in consumption, production levels increased. In the same report, the Philippines was identified as one of the three largest producers of shabu. The Philippine government, however, released a statement in July 2004 saying that the US Department of State had overstated the drug situation in the Philippines and that major headways had already been made in overcoming the drug threat in the country.

In 1999, the National Drug Law Enforcement and Prevention Coordinating Center (NDLEPCC) reported that 14 percent (6,020) of the country's 42,979 barangays⁵ were considered most seriously affected by drugs. However, in 2002 the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) said that 3,489 barangays (or 8 percent of the total) were classified as drug-affected which shows a 6 percent decrease over 3 years. In 2002, the PDEA identified 215 local drug syndicates and targeted the neutralization of 175 for 2003.

Police Director Miguel Coronel of the National Drug Enforcement Coordinating Council (NDECC) cited recent figures that showed that in 2000, 1.2 million (out of 1.7 million) drug users were from the youth sector. Data from the Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP) show that in 1998 some 1.5 million workers were dependent on drugs. Presidential Anti-Organized Crime Commission (PAOCC) former Technical Services Chief Domingo Maristela, Jr. said that the drug situation has become alarming because most drugs users and pushers now come from the youth sector. Even the police are not spared, the Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB) data show that 12.3 percent of 218 officers surveyed in Metro Manila, Laguna, Batangas and Mindoro Oriental are hooked on illegal drugs. Furthermore, 30 percent of police officers believe that many of their colleagues are using drugs. However, only 39 percent of the officers passed a "drug knowledge" test administered by the DDB.

In 2000, Police Director Coronel pointed out that court records also reflect the increasing magnitude of the drug problem. There are at 20,000 pending drug cases and 70 percent of heinous crimes filed in court are drug-related. Out of the 36,739 suspects apprehended for illegal drugs, only 1 percent had been jailed. Furthermore, 65 percent to 75 percent of prison inmates are in jail for drug-related crimes. In terms of rehabilitative efforts, Coronel said that about 5,000 patients have already been admitted in 60 different centers and 30 to 40 more patients are being taken in every day.

⁵ Barangay is the smallest political-administrative unit of the Philippine government.

In July of 2004, the PNP admitted that despite the government's strong anti-drug campaign the drug situation was getting worse. When the government launched its crack down on drugs in June of 2003, it was reported that there were 1.8 million drug users in the Philippines. A year later, in July of 2004, the PNP estimated that there were 3.4 million drug users. The lack of rehabilitation centers was cited by PNP Deputy Director Aglipay as one of the factors in the increase in drug use.

B. Production, Transport and Distribution of Dangerous Drugs

Dr. Calvani of UNDCP reported that the world's primary source of amphetamine-type stimulants — known by enforcers as ATS — was Southeast Asia. He observed that global demand for drugs such as ecstasy and speed was growing because their use did not have the same level of social stigma attached to heroin and cocaine. UN officials say amphetamine factories can be easily hidden, unlike heroin and cocaine production facilities, and it is easy to recruit legal companies to produce precursor chemicals. Similarly, a 2002 report by the US Department of State identifies the Philippines as the main transshipment point of illegal drugs to Japan, Korea, Australia, the United States, Guam and Saipan. The Philippine Government estimates that 95 percent of the methamphetamine hydrochloride sold in the country originated in China although much of the drug is already produced locally. In 2004, however, a report commissioned by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC) said that Burma, China and the Philippines were the top producers of methamphetamine hydrochloride in the world.

According to the National Drug Law Enforcement and Prevention Coordinating Center (NDLEPCC), the Philippines used to serve as a transit point for heroin, cocaine, and precursors and essential chemicals (PECS). However, illegal shipments now are composed mainly of ephedra (essential in the production of shabu) and precursors and essential chemicals (PECS). This new development points towards increased production of shabu locally rather than the previous trend of importation of the finished product. A top United Nations anti-drugs official said that around 1,000 drug barons, mostly in Southeast Asia, are flooding global markets with synthetic drugs such as ecstasy and speed as they switch from heroin and cocaine production. Currently, 215 major drug gangs operate in the Philippines, more than 24 of them are foreign - most of which are Chinese.

Drug trafficking in the Philippines earns more than \$5 billion (roughly P277 billion) a year. It is estimated to be equivalent to 8 percent of the gross national product (GNP). Police Director Miguel Coronel said that shabu is imported from China, Taiwan and Hong Kong while the money earned from the drug trade is laundered in Philippine banks because local banks lack anti-laundering laws. China itself supplies much of the ephedrine circulating in the region. Ephedrine is commonly used in making Chinese medicine but it is also used to produce drugs such as "ice," and its diluted form known here as "shabu". A large amount of ephedrine, PECS and other chemicals and materials used in drug production are smuggled into the country through China and Taiwan. The vast and often unguarded coastline of the Philippines along with its porous borders makes the movement of illegal substances an easy and uncomplicated process. News reports in

July 2001 confirmed that the Philippines is considered part of the triad network of drug distribution in Asia. In March of 2004, the Philippines was identified by the UNODC and the US Department of State as one of the three largest "shabu" producers in the world with its products reaching as far as Australia and the United States.

Citing Philippine National Police (PNP) statistics, Col. Jewel Canson, former police director and executive director of the NDLEPCC, asserted that the Philippines is net producer, exporter, and one of the biggest consumers of shabu. From 1990 to 1998, the total value of illegal drugs seized reached over P20 billion, compared to P400 thousand seized from 1979 to 1989. In 1999, the police seized a total of 1,750 kilos of shabu worth P3.5 billion. From 2002 to 2003 the PDEA reported it had seized more than P13 billion in illegal drugs, chemicals and equipment for drug manufacture (including marijuana leaves and seeds, cocaine, ecstasy tablets and shabu).

In 1972, there were only nine identified sites engaged in marijuana cultivation. Recent figures (2003) show that there are now 98 drug-source barangays located in nine regions. While some marijuana is still imported, increasingly large amounts are already grown and processed locally for both domestic and international distribution. In the 1990s, the Philippines became a significant source of cannabis with supply lines to Europe. Drug law enforcement authorities report that the Philippines has been the largest exporter of marijuana in Southeast Asia. The International Narcotics Control Strategy Report of 2001 estimated that marijuana sales reach \$900 million a year. It is believed that at that time, Marijuana use and trafficking receded due to the sharp increase in the use of shabu. However, an annual report released by the US Department of State in March of 2004 reported that considerable marijuana production, consumption and export was taking place in the Philippines. Marijuana is generally believed to be cultivated in inaccessible areas and controlled by insurgent/terrorist groups. In 2004, Usec. Jose Calida, Director of the Dangerous Drug Board, identified marijuana as second most popular drug used by Filipinos. According to the US DoS report, most of the marijuana cultivated in the Philippines is consumed locally while the rest is smuggled into Australia, Japan, Malaysia, Taiwan and Europe. Wholesale prices of marijuana are estimated at P11,160.00 per kilogram although street prices vary depending on the quality. Still, the seizures of marijuana and marijuana-based products pale in comparison to the amount of shabu and shabu-related products seized.

Over the years, users shifted to shabu because it was relatively cheaper than marijuana and gave users more "high." The trade in shabu is highly profitable because it does not require large capital investments. Drug producers only invest P10.00 to produce a gram of shabu worth P2,000.00. Before the government's aggressive campaign in 2001, street prices for shabu dipped as low as P800.00 per gram. In the months that followed the drug campaign, prices rose steeply. According to the PDEA Director, Usec. Anselmo Avenido, there are areas where the price of shabu ranges up to P3,000.00 to P5,000.00 per gram. He also said, "Sometimes drug pushers sell fake or adulterated shabu, mixing it with *tawas* (alum) crystals". Recent developments in the aggressive anti-drug campaign of the government have made shabu supplies scarce and have driven street prices up.

According to Usec. Jose Calida, the Director of the Dangerous Board, ecstasy is the third most popular drug among Filipinos. Like shabu, ecstasy is imported mostly from China and comes in various types such as G2000, 747, yellow tower, peach mango, and green marijuana. The tablets are sold at roughly P1,200.00 to P1,500.00 per piece. In 2004 the Philippine government reported a surge in the use of ecstasy in bars and clubs. The users of ecstasy are generally young, prosperous adults.

In order to evade law enforcers, drug pushers have found creative ways of importing and distributing their goods. In March 1999, at least 17 drums of liquid ephedrine and other raw materials were seized. in Camiguin, Calayan Islands, Cagayan province in the northern tip of Luzon. If processed, this would translate to about 800 kilos of shabu, worth P1.6 billion.

In 2003, a group of young, Filipino men between the ages 25-32 called “The Corinthian Boys”, named after the upper class subdivision they all lived in, were caught smuggling into the country Ecstasy tablets through the mailing system. They were caught with 472 pieces of the banned Ecstasy tablets worth at least P708,000.00. They were smuggling their supply of Ecstasy tablets into the country through through the packages or the airport facilities. The largest ecstasy haul for 2003 was 600 tablets worth P720,000.00 found in the possession of Chinese national based in Binondo.

November 2003 marked a month of major drug busts. Over P1 billion worth of illegal drugs and substances were seized by joint police operatives from a warehouse in Valenzuela City in November 2003. Agents from the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) and police officers seized at least 150 kilos of refined shabu and 1,500 kilos of ephedrine and other chemicals used in manufacturing the drugs which were neatly stashed in five-kilo bags inside 35 living room sets and furniture, just as they were being readied for delivery to dealers in the Visayas and Mindanao. The arrested suspects were 5 Chinese nationals and their Filipino-Chinese cohort. Police intelligence reports indicate Valenzuela City is being used as distribution point by the suspects. On November 29, 2003, police arrested six people for allegedly trying to sneak into the country a ton of ephedrine — a chemical ingredient used for manufacturing shabu — worth P2 billion which was seized at the Manila International Container Port. Authorities said the chemical was declared as bleaching powder. Cans of bleaching powder were found in the van, said Superintendent Neri Ilagan, who led the raiding team. Authorities said the chemical originated from China but the shipment’s documents stated that it came from India. Customs Commissioner Antonio Bernardo said drug traffickers may be trying to smuggle in raw materials via container vans and pass them on as legitimate imports, hoping they would remain undetected. In the same month, the largest shabu bust ever took place in Barangay Mambungan, Antipolo City. It was believed to be the largest shabu factory in the Philippines. A record P2 billion worth of shabu and other chemicals were seized. Four Chinese nationals and a Filipino were captured.

The Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) reported the following figures corresponding to its various activities for the year between July 2002 and July 2003:

- more than P10 billion in illegal drugs, chemicals and equipment for drug manufacture were seized including marijuana leaves and seeds, cocaine, ecstasy tablets and methamphetamine hydrochloride, popularly known as shabu;
- 11,242 drug operations conducted;
- 37 out of 215 local drug syndicates were neutralized;⁶
- 1 out of 24 transnational groups was neutralized;⁷
- 6,700 drug traffickers (including several big-time drug lords) were arrested;
- 881 suspected drug users arrested;
- 6,803 suspected pushers as well as drug cultivators and importers arrested;
- 249 policemen arrested for involvement in illegal drugs;
- 19 shabu labs raided; and
- at least 10,000 cases filed although there have been no convictions so far.

By November 2003, the Western Police District reported that there were only 325 drug-infested barangays left in the city.

The drug situation since then has changed quite drastically since the 1990s. Recent drug busts show that local manufacturers proliferate and the amounts of money and drugs involved are immense. Aside from producing and processing more shabu locally, laboratory operators are beginning to engage in research and development. In laboratory raid in late 2003, law enforcers found chemicals and ingredients for developing flavored shabu. Initially, the emerging pattern of production pointed to warehouse-based production facilities in remote areas within Metro Manila. However, of late, there have been an increasing number of shabu laboratory raids in quiet residential areas in Quezon City or other suburban areas of the metropolis. Both warehouse and residential sites are often owned by Chinese nationals and their Filipino or Chinese-Filipino partners. The deep involvement of Chinese nationals in the local drug scene is undeniable. It is estimated that most of the two dozen large drug gangs operating in the Philippines are run by Chinese nationals. Between 2002 and 2003 PDEA arrested 38 foreign nationals on drug-related charges, 50% of them were Chinese. In June 2004 PDEA reported that 175 local drug syndicates operated in the Philippines and that there were 45,000 drug pushers.

Summary. The drug problem in the Philippines assumed a transnational character in the 1990s with the introduction of shabu. In the early 1990s, shabu was a drug mainly used by upper and middle-classes. By mid-1990s, the proliferation of cheaply processed shabu made it the poor man's cocaine. It is estimated that there are up to 9 million drug users. Ninety-four percent of drug users are addicted to shabu. Since the introduction of shabu, majority of Filipino drug users shifted from poly-users to mono-users (i.e., shabu only) but slowly, users are shifting back to poly-use because the aggressive anti-drug campaign of the government has driven shabu prices up and made it less accessible. PNP statistics show that 65 to 75 percent of heinous crimes are drug-related. In terms of illegal drugs seized, the Philippines ranks 6th among Asian nations. It is no longer just a transit point for illegal drug. Instead, the Philippines had become a major manufacturing center for

⁶ The Office of the President reported 143 local drug rings neutralized.

⁷ The Office of the President reported 12 international drug syndicates neutralized

shabu as well as a major consumer. US 2004 reports revealed that “throughout 2003, Philippine authorities drew clear linkages between drug trafficking activities and terrorist organizations.”

C. Legal Framework and Policy Responses to Children in Drugs

The Philippines is signatory to the international agreements (e.g., The Single Convention on Narcotics Drugs and the Agreement on Psychotropic Substances) designed to achieve coordination and uniformity in the war against drug abuse. In January of 1999, President Joseph Estrada signed Executive Order No. 61 creating the National Drug Law Enforcement and Prevention Coordinating Center (NDLEPCC) under the Office of the President. The Center’s mandate is to orchestrate and consolidate the drug law enforcement efforts of national government agencies, local government units (LGU’s), and non-government organizations (NGO’s). The government's policy on dangerous drugs is a balanced combination of the prohibition or the legal approach and the social or preventive approach. The Philippine government's strategy to curb drug abuse is basically two-pronged, offering a balance of punitive and preventive actions. It aims at denying/reducing supply and preventing/reducing demand with special focus at neutralizing "big-time" or high-volume drug traffickers, planters, and manufacturers while providing rehabilitation to the victims of drug abuse. During the 11th Congress a measure was passed to penalize members of law enforcement agencies and other government officers and employees who, after due notice, fail or refuse intentionally or negligently to appear as witnesses in the prosecution of acts that are violative of the Dangerous Drugs Act. In the same period, roughly 41 bills related to drugs were introduced in the Philippine Congress.

Republic Act (RA) 6425, otherwise known as the Dangerous Drugs act of 1972, is an example of the first approach which prohibits drugs and stipulates penalties for violating this prohibition. Enacted to intensify the country's efforts against drug abuse and illicit trafficking, RA 6425 has been amended several times through Presidential Decree (PD) Nos. 44, 1675, 1683, 1708, Batasang Pambansa Bilang 179 and lastly, through RA 7659 or the death penalty law enacted in 1993. RA 7659 also amended specific provisions of RA 6435 and the Revised Penal Code.

According to Philippine Law, prohibited drugs⁸ are composed of narcotics (such as opium, morphine, heroin, codeine), stimulants (such as cocaine, alpha and beta eucaine), and hallucinogens (such as marijuana, LSD, and mescaline). Regulated drugs, on the other hand, are composed of barbituates (such as Luminal, Veronal, Amytal and Butisol), hypnotics (such as Nembutal, Surital, Penthothal and Sernyl), and amphetamines (such as Mandrax, Quaalude, Benzedrine, Dexedrine and preludin). According to law, regulated drugs can be dispensed only by licensed physicians for medical purposes. In the same manner, drug trafficking/pushing is classified as a heinous crime under certain conditions punishable by Reclusion Perpetua (life imprisonment) to death. A fine is also imposed and proceeds from instruments used in the crime are likewise confiscated. The penalties for other punishable acts involving prohibited and regulated drugs are similar.

⁸ In practice, prohibited drugs are often used by children in combination with rugby and/or cough syrup.

Presidential Decree 1619 on volatile substances penalizes the use, possession or the unauthorized sale to minors of volatile substances such as rugby, for the purpose of inducing intoxication or in any manner changing, disturbing the auditory, visual or mental processes. Volatile substances are any liquid, solid or mixed substances which have the property of releasing toxic vapors of fumes containing one or more of the following chemical compounds: methanol, ethanol, isopropanol, ethyl acetate, naphthalene ether or chloroform or any other chemical substance which when sniffed, smelled, inhaled or introduced in to the physiological system of the body, produces a condition of intoxication inebriation, excitement, stupefaction, dulling of the brain or nervous system, depression, giddiness, paralysis, irrational behavior, distortion or disturbance of the auditory, visual or mental processes.

Through RA 6425, the Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB) was created to serve as the national policy making and coordinating body of the government on all matters pertaining to drug abuse prevention and control. All proceeds or instruments of dangerous drugs crimes are to be confiscated and turned over to the DDB. The Board is a collegial body composed of seven ex-officio members of cabinet rank from the Departments of Health, Justice, Finance, National Defense, Education, Culture and Sports, Social Welfare and Development and the executive director of the DDB. The permanent consultant is the director of the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI). The Chairman of the Board has the power to order the closure of drug establishments or the suspension or revocation of its authority to deal in dangerous drugs if the establishment is found guilty of violating the Dangerous Drugs Act.

On June 7, 2002, President Arroyo signed into law Republic Act No. 9165, otherwise known as the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002. RA 9165 repealed its predecessor, Republic Act No. 6425, the Dangerous Drugs Act of 1972. In its new form, the old law was given new teeth as part of President Arroyo's "all-out war" on drugs. In the new law, there is a sharp reduction in the amounts of various drugs that warrant the imposition of the death penalty when found in the possession of an individual. More importantly, the new Act recognizes ecstasy and other "designer" or "man-made" drugs as prohibited and imposes punishments for those involved in the importation/ trade/ use/ sale of controlled precursors and essential chemicals. It also takes into consideration new forms or means of trading/trafficking in drugs. Such changes are indicative of the changing landscape of drugs in the Philippines. Among other provisions, some noteworthy inclusions are:

- The reduction of minimum amounts warranting the death penalty for dealing or possession from 200g to 50g of shabu would be punished, 750g to 500 g of marijuana;
- The death penalty for dealing or possession of 10g of opium, morphine, heroin, ecstasy, cocaine and other newly introduced drugs and their derivatives;
- The death penalty for any government official found guilty of trafficking or of planting drugs;
- A life sentence for possession of more than 5g of hard drugs;
- A 12-year prison sentence for possession of less than 5g of hard drugs;

- Stiff new penalties for using cell phones or the Internet to make drug deals;
- Stiff new penalties for “dangerous drug financiers, protectors and coddlers”;
- Mandatory drug tests for persons seeking drivers’ licenses and weapons permits;
- Mandatory drug tests for candidates for public office;
- Mandatory drug tests for persons charged with a crime punishable by more than six years in prison;
- Random drug tests for students and workers in government and the private sector; and,
- Compulsory drug education in all school levels.

Below is a summary of punishment of drug-related acts:

| PUNISHABLE ACT | PROHIBITED DRUGS | REGULATED DRUGS | CONTROLLED PRECURSORS AND ESSENTIAL CHEMICALS | VOLATILE SUBSTANCES |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Illegal importation | Reclusion Perpetua to death and a fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | Reclusion Perpetua to death and a fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | 12 years and 1 day to 20 years and a fine of P100,000 to P500,000 | |
| Illegal manufacture | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | 12 years and 1 day to 20 years and a fine of P100,000 to P500,000 | |
| Illegal possession or use | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | 12 years and 1 day to 20 years and a fine of P100,000 to P500,000 | 6 months and 1 day to 4 years imprisonment and fine of P600.00 to P4,000.00 |
| Illegal sale, administration, delivery, giving away, distribution, transportation or acting as broker in any transactions | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | 12 years and 1 day to 20 years and a fine of P100,000 to P500,000 | 4 years and 1 day to 8 years imprisonment and fine of to P4,000.00 to P8,000.00 |
| Maintenance of den, dive or resort (establishments) for prohibited drug users | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | 12 years and 1 day to 20 years and a fine of P100,000 to P500,000 | 4 years and 1 day to 8 years imprisonment and fine of to P4,000.00 to P8,000.00 |
| Working in/ visiting of den, dive or resort (establishments) for prohibited drug users | 12 years and 1 day to 20 years and a fine of P100,000 to P500,000 | | | |
| Cultivation of plan(t?)s which are sources of prohibited drugs | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | | | |
| Possession or use of prohibited drugs during social gatherings | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | | | |

| PUNISHABLE ACT | PROHIBITED DRUGS | REGULATED DRUGS | | VOLATILE SUBSTANCES |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| Unlawful prescription | 8 years and 1 day to 12 years imprisonment and fine of P4,000.00 to P13,000.00 | 4 years and 1 day to 8 years imprisonment and fine of to P4,000.00 to P8,000.00 | | |
| Unnecessary prescription of prohibited drugs | 4 years and 1 day to 12 years imprisonment and fine of P4,000.00 to P13,000.00 | 6 months and 1 day to 4 years imprisonment, fine of P600.00 to P4,000.00 and revocation of license | | |
| Illegal possession of opium pipes and other paraphernalia | 6 months and 1 day to 4 years imprisonment and fine of P600.00 to P4,000.00 | | | |
| Sale and offer to sell of substances to minors/ the mentally impaired w/o written consent of parents or guardians | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | Reclusion Perpetua to death and fine of P500,000 to P10,000,000 | 12 years and 1 day to 20 years and a fine of P100,000 to P500,000 | 6 months and 1 day to 4 years imprisonment and fine of P600.00 to P4,000.00 |
| Sale and offer to sell to minors of liquors or beverages with alcoholic content of 30 percent or above (60 proof or above) | | | | 6 months and 1 day to 4 years imprisonment and fine of P600.00 to P4,000.00 |

Through RA 9165 the scope and responsibilities of the DDB were reaffirmed while the PDEA was created, it's responsibilities outlined as follows:

“Section 82. Creation of the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) – To carry out the provisions of this Act, the PDEA, which serves as the implementing arm of the board, and shall be responsible for the efficient and effective law enforcement of all the provisions on any dangerous drug and/or controlled precursor and essential chemical as provided in this Act...”⁹

The PDEA was designed to be an “anti-drug superboby” given immense power and authority in the areas of drug prevention and control. It is headed by a Director General with the rank of Undersecretary who is responsible for the general administration and management of the Agency. Under the Director General are two deputies director general with the rank of Assistant Secretary. It is required to have the following services: Intelligence and Investigation; International Cooperation and Foreign Affairs; Preventive Education and Community Involvement; Plans and Operations; Compliance; Legal and Prosecution; Administrative and Human Resource; Financial Management; Logistics

⁹ Republic Act No. 9165, otherwise known as the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002.

Management; and Internal Affairs. The PDEA is tasked with the establishment and maintenance of regional offices in the different regions of the country.

Currently, one of the greatest problems of the PDEA is lack of finances. Although the agency has been given great authority and power, it has not been supplied with the funds necessary for effective operation. Initially it was given a budget of only P143 million for the year 2003. Although there have been commitments of an additional P1 billion for a 3-month anti-drug campaign and another P1 billion as budget increase, it is not yet clear where the funds will originate from and how they will be allocated.

President Arroyo has been very direct and aggressive in pushing forward her anti-drug campaign. She issued Executive Order 218 on June 18, 2000 which created several task forces to support PDEA's campaign against drugs. She specifically ordered the PDEA and other law enforcement agencies to produce "strategic and significant" results within the first three months of the executive order's implementation. Within the first month of implementation, law enforcement agencies reported seizure of the following:

- 4.58 kg of shabu;
- 878 marijuana plant;
- 1,492 marijuana seedlings;
- 4.79 kg dried marijuana;
- 3,038 tablets of ecstasy; and
- 732.54 g of cocaine.

On June 20, 2003, President Arroyo named former Sen. Robert Barbers as the "anti-drug czar" to spearhead the administration's renewed drive against illegal drugs. Barbers, who chairs the Senate committee on illegal drugs, will provide "operational directions" to the PDEA. The President also instructed Barbers to tap the services of former Manila mayor, ex-DILG secretary, and now Alfredo Lim to provide more muscle to the campaign. However, these instructions gave rise to several conflicts regarding protocol and claims of authority since a PDEA chief already existed. After the turf war that erupted over the appointment of several officials to lead the war on illegal drugs, Malacañang finally declared that Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) Director General Anselmo Avelino would be the lead official. The Presidential Spokesman clarified the situation by saying that, "As mandated by law, the lead agency here is definitely the PDEA. So the operations will have to be conducted all within the framework of the PDEA".

In June 2003, the chairman of the House committee on dangerous drugs estimated that about one-fourth of the country's elected officials have in one way or another profited from drug lords. Cebu City Rep. Antonio Cuenco disclosed that the government's anti-drug agencies and the congressional oversight committee, which he co-chairs with Sen. Robert Barbers, often receive reports of elected and appointed officials who have links to drug syndicates in varying degrees but the information is not enough to be used as evidence. Furthermore, Rep. Cuenco explained that based on studies, law enforcement agencies are achieving a measly 1 percent conviction rate for drug cases. This low rate of conviction is attributed to a systemic problem that spans various aspects from actual

arrest to legal procedures which often implicate police, agents, lawyers and even some judges.

In October of 2003, President Arroyo launched the second wave of her "all-out war" against illegal drug syndicates in the country. She formally enlisted the help of the barangay officials under the leadership of the Metro Manila mayors and police officials for the barangay anti-drug clearing operations. It was reported that at least 280 barangays have been cleared in Manila, 55 barangays in southern Metro Manila, 27 in Quezon City while only 14 barangays each were cleared in eastern and northern districts.

In November of 2003 the PNP began a nationwide anti-drug campaign dubbed "Oplan Banat," which coordinates all law enforcement efforts against drug trafficking and abuse. The President also launched a project called "The Nation's Outrage Against Drugs: Saving This Generation (Himagsik)". Under "Himagsik," government agencies tasked in the campaign against illegal drugs will be joined by youth and student organizations, religious groups and civil society to generate public awareness on the evils of illegal drugs. Law enforcement agencies like the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency, the Philippine National Police-Anti-Illegal Drugs Special Operations Task Force (PNP-AIDSOTF) under Deputy Director General Edgar Aglipay and Himagsik project director Marita Jimenez signed a manifesto with different sectors to come up with alternative projects for the youth in sports, arts, environment and other volunteer work. The project aimed to enhance the implementation of a more viable rehabilitation program for drug dependents.

Initially, President Arroyo imposed a ban on execution by lethal injection with the exception of those convicted for kidnapping. However, in December 2003 she announced that convicted high-profile drug dealers would not be spared from lethal injection.

In February 2004, Sec. Jose Lina, Jr of the DILG announced that drug users caught with small but substantial amounts of drugs would be offered the clearing of all charges against them in exchange for become state witnesses against their drug sources. It is hoped that street-level pushers, low-level drug suspects and their families will be able to provide law enforcement agencies with more information so that the drugs can be traced back to the major producers, suppliers and distributors.

Also in February of 2004, President Arroyo launched the "Anti-Illegal Drug Caravan" in with what is termed as her "all-out war against illegal drugs" and her plans to make the country drug-free by 2010. The caravan started in six satellite areas in the Philippines composed of one area in Mindanao, two areas in the Visayas, two areas in Northern Luzon and one area in Southern Luzon. This effort was supported by 13 government line agencies.

D. Selected Data on Children in Need of Special Protection.

Children and young people trapped into substance abuse represent seven percent or about 1.5 million and six percent or 1.3 million claimed to have sold illegal drugs, according to

survey of the Social Weather Station for the National Youth Commission in 1996. The number of children in conflict with the law is alarming. In 1996 alone, the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology reported 1,380 sentenced and detained child and youth offenders. Reports from the Bureau of Child and Youth Welfare of DSWD show even higher figures: 7,057 in 1996 and 3,181 for the first quarter of 1997.

According to census data, in 2000 there were 15.1 million Filipino youth and they constituted 19.7 percent of the total Philippine population. The University of the Philippine Population Institute (UPPI) and the Demographic Research and Development Foundation, Inc. (DRDF) conducted the Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study 3 (YAFS3) in 2002. This was a nationwide survey of approximately 19,000 male and female young adults, ages 15 to 24 from 15 regions¹⁰. In the same period, the Population Commission of the Philippines (POPCOM) came out with the “State of the Philippine Population Report 2nd Edition (SPPR02)” which presented information on the Filipino youth based on the analysis of data produced by several agencies and individuals (YAFS3 and national census included). Although both studies tended to focus on sexual behavior, information on non-sex related risk behaviour such as smoking, drinking and drug use was obtained. The findings of this study include the following:

Pattern of abuse. In all the YAFS studies (1, 2 and 3), males have far outnumbered females in their involvement in smoking, drinking and drugs. It is important to note that, YAFS3 results showed an increasing feminization in these risk behaviors because although the absolute numbers of females remained below those of males, the percentage increases in prevalence from 1994 to 2002 was greater among females than among males. The data also showed that working and out-of-school/ idle youth exhibit far greater levels of risk behaviour than those in school. They are more prone to smoking, drinking and drugs than youth who are still studying.

Of those that had ever engaged in smoking, drinking and drugs, there are those who do not fall into the habit. Some of the youth seem to be only temporarily involved in smoking and drugs. Of those who had ever tried smoking, only 40 percent continue the habit. Among all those who had ever experimented with illegal drugs, 25 percent are still currently hooked on drugs. However, the reverse is true for drinking. The number of drinkers increased with age and 60 percent of those who had ever tried drinking have continued the habit.

Prevalence of abuse. Smoking prevalence among males increased from 60 percent in 1994 to 64 percent in 2002. There was a larger increase (13.8 percent) in the smoking prevalence among females which rose to 30.3 percent from only 16.5 percent in 1994. Of the total youth population, 46.5 percent have tried smoking. Applied to the 2000 census figures, these imply about 7 million young smokers.

In 1994, 54.5 percent of the youth had tried drinking but this number ballooned to 70.1 percent in 2002. Drinking prevalence among males rose by 7.4 percent to 81 percent. However, having tried drinking was practically universal (93.9 percent) among males

¹⁰ ARMM not included.

aged 20-24. Among females, drinking prevalence rose by 23.7 percent from 36.5 percent in 1994 to 60.2 percent in 2002. These add up to more than 10.5 million youth drinkers. Although the percentages were not presented, the report noted that drinking was more acceptable than smoking among the females. Also, the report mentioned that young people have developed a greater acceptance of drinking as a result of the beverage industry's aggressive marketing and advertising strategies that promote drinking as a social activity.

Current figures from YAFS also show that 1.66 million youth have tried drugs. This is more than double the 1994 estimate of approximately 780,900 youth drug-users. Drug prevalence among males almost doubled from 10.9 percent in 1994 to 19.7 percent in 2002. Among females, the numbers tripled from one percent in 1994 to 3.2 percent in 2002.

Among the surveys of street children, Lamberte (1996) uncovered substance abuse among Metro Manila's street children. Among the 700 street children surveyed, 40.0 percent admitted using prohibited drugs. Of these, 66 percent were users of solvent/rugby, 14 percent of cough syrup, 5 percent of marijuana, 2 percent of shabu and 12 percent of other types of drugs. Daily use was admitted by 35 percent of the drug users while 38 percent reported using drugs three times a week.

Responses to child protection issues. The National Project on Street Children implemented by DSWD and a network of NGO under the National Council for Social Development (NCSO), now covers 27 cities and five urban municipalities. This interagency body carries out continuing situation analysis, training and capability building, advocacy and resource generation, organizing families, and providing direct services. It estimates that approximately 70,000 street children and youth had been reached during the past 10-15 years. Over 400 GOs and NGOs are responsible for various programs and services, These include education and vocational training; livelihood; micro-credit and employment assistance; legal protection; health and prevention education for substance abuse; STD and HIV/AIDS ; crisis counseling and other psychosocial services, restoration of family ties; and opportunities for participation and building of self-esteem. These services are implemented in the context of three major strategies that evolve over the years: centre-based, street-based, and community-based programmes.

Policy and legislative initiatives on child protection. Following the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Philippine Congress passed Republic Act 7610 entitled, "An Act Providing Stronger Deterrence and Special Protection Against Child Abuse, Exploitation and Discrimination, Providing Penalties for its Violations and for Other Purposes". This act provides stronger legislation and public policy for the care and protection of children in need of special protection.

Republic Act 8369 was passed in October 1997, restoring the child and family courts that were abolished during the martial law period. The law is a response to the recommendation by the "Committee on the Rights of the Child" for a comprehensive

reform of the juvenile justice system. These laws are expected to help children receive appropriate and fair treatment and genuine justice.

The Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002 imposes severe punishments for the sale and offer to sell illegal substances to minors or the mentally impaired without written consent of parents or guardians. This is part of the government's effort to eradicate drug-related problems by making anti-drug laws stricter and harsher.

Other policy initiatives undertaken the last five years:

- The Commission on Human Rights created a Child Rights Center in April 1994. The Center's mandate is to monitor child rights violations, and provide legal and financial assistance to victims of human and child rights violations. The Commission also signed a memorandum of agreement with the Department of Interior and Local Government in October 1994 to train Barangay Human Rights Action Officers and set up Barangay Human Rights Action Centers in 41,936 barangays nation-wide.
- The Social Reform Agenda or poverty alleviation programme has given special attention to the rights and well being of children. Executive Order No. 421 series of 1997 recognises children as a separate sector under the Social Reform Council. This ensures that children are represented and participate in carrying out poverty alleviation and disparity reduction. This is a significant step since reducing poverty and promoting social equity is the key to addressing situation of children in drugs.

The 1974 Child and Youth Welfare Code (Presidential Decree 603) likewise continues to serve as the framework for promoting and protecting the well being of Filipino children and young people. The code defines the rights of children, the rights and liabilities of parents, and the roles of other institutions (community, religious groups, schools, etc.) in promoting the welfare of Filipino children. It created the Council for the Welfare of Children (CWC), which coordinates and monitors the implementation of all laws, policies and programmes for children. It also created the Barangay Councils for the Protection of Children (BCPC).

In 1995, the Youth in Nation-Building Act (RA 8044) was passed and it paved the way for the establishment of the National Youth Commission (NYC). The NYC is the sole policy coordinating agency of the government in youth development. Their health care and drug policies/programs include the following adolescent/youth health development related advocacies:

- Youth Smoking Prevention Bill (RA 9211) – which prohibits the purchase and sale of cigarettes to persons below 18 years old and bans public smoking in youth facilities;
- Bang! An anti-drug campaign which focuses on peer involvement;
- Special drug education centers in cooperation with the DSWD;
- Ex-Officio membership on the Dangerous Drugs Board; and
- Random drug testing in schools advocacy.

E. The Politico-Institutional Framework of Drug Use in the Philippines

Supply reduction. The Philippine government's anti-drug strategy is anchored on supply reduction through police action and demand reduction through local government and community involvement, and rehabilitation. Supply reduction assumes a determined effort to interdict supply by arresting the traffickers, manufacturers and to confiscate/seize and destroy illicit drugs wherever they may be found in the country. It encompasses legislative and regulatory programs, law enforcement programs and domestic and international cooperation, tasked as follows:

- The Narcotics Commission concentrates on high-volume international traffickers, manufacturers, and producers of dangerous drugs.
- Local Philippine National Police (PNP) units concentrate on middle layer/street level dealers/pushers and users in coordination with local government units.
- The Dangerous Drugs Board (DDB) was created to serve as the national policy making and coordinating body of the government on all matters pertaining to drug abuse prevention and control.
- The Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) serves as the implementing arm of the DDB, and is responsible for the efficient and effective law enforcement of all the provisions of Dangerous Drugs Act.
- The barangay Anti-Drug Abuse Council (BADAC) has been designated as the lead unit in making their respective communities drug-free in collaboration with local police.
- Other agencies provide local support.
- Local officials/citizens drugwatch/other civic groups provide information on users, pushers, traffickers and involved law enforcement agents.

Under the government's anti-drug campaign, a barangay is considered "clear" only if it is 100 percent drug-free. Police chiefs in Metro Manila have requested that this definition be modified because they feel that clearing communities to make them 100 percent drug-free is impossible. They have suggested that "empowerment" be the basis for declaring a barangay "cleared" rather than actual numbers. Furthermore, they suggested that the BADAC take on the bulk of the work in reinforcing drug awareness campaigns and in neutralizing/ identifying drug users/pushers. They also requested other interventions, such as comprehensive rehabilitation, take place to maintain successes brought about by "drug clearing".

To counteract the increasing drug trafficking, several operations have been initiated by the President and the police such as:

- Operation Gateway, which addresses trafficking of illegal drugs in mail, parcels, and packages as well as human couriers.
- Shabu Watch Teams, which have been organized and activated in strategic areas along the coastal provinces of Luzon.
- Operation Plan Banat coordinates all law enforcement efforts against drug trafficking and abuse.

- Project Himagsik brings together government agencies with youth/student organizations, religious groups and civil society to generate public awareness on the evils of illegal drugs.
- Kontra Droga (2003) is the government's general anti-illegal drugs campaign for 2004 and it brings together various groups and agencies in the war against drugs.

From 2002-2003, in intensified efforts to reduce drug supplies, drug law enforcement teams have conducted 11,242 drug operations. Thirty-seven local and 1 foreign drug syndicates were neutralized. PDEA figures show that they were able to arrest 6,700 drug traffickers, 8,881 suspected drug users and 6,803 suspected drug pushers. In addition, over P10 billion of illegal drugs, chemicals and equipment for drug manufacture were seized.

Demand reduction. Demand reduction aims to keep the drug abusers and potential victims away from drugs. Abusers are arrested and charged in court. If they are addicts their rehabilitation shall take precedence over criminal action. Those who voluntarily surrender are absolved of their criminal liabilities but are brought to rehabilitation centers for examination, treatment and rehabilitation. Drug demand reduction covers preventive education and community information programs, treatment and rehabilitation programs, and studies and research programs. The following sectors are tasked with these responsibilities:

- Local governments, Citizens Drugwatch, NGOs to initiate preventive information and education campaign.
- Students, teachers and parents to conduct school-based anti-drug activities.
- Media, civic and religious groups to disseminate hazards of drug abuse and to expose corruption in the criminal justice system.
- Rehabilitation centers

The Philippine National Police Center for the Ultimate Rehabilitation of Drug Dependents (CUREDD) in Taguig is known as Asia's "largest drug rehabilitation center". It currently houses 2,203 patients and offers drug treatment for free. Aside from its regular residents, the Center takes in an average of 10 to 15 drug dependents a day. Police Superintendent Bonaparte Francisco, CUREDD head, told *The Philippine STAR* in an interview that the drug rehabilitation center receives "very limited assistance" from the PNP. "For now, the PNP supports the rehab aside from the Dangerous Drugs Board but it is a very limited assistance that President Arroyo (recognizes) to be not enough," he said. It is given P17 a day — that includes food provisions — for every patient, he added. CUREDD maintains a staff of nine full-time psychologists, social workers and nurses. Francisco said facilities in government-funded drug rehabilitation centers must be improved and that more of these foundations should be set up in provinces or regions where there are "high incidences of the drug problem". He added that the establishment of more drug rehabilitation centers nationwide would greatly help in the recovery of a drug user, who will also need support from their families. CUREDD offers a family-oriented community to patients and provides them secondary education and vocational courses. It is purported to be the only drug rehabilitation center in the world where anti-narcotics policemen take care of drug dependents.

Most of CUREDD's patients are males — only 211 inmates are females — and a majority are "mono-drug users" of shabu. It has 25 dormitories divided into age groups of 16 years old to 22; 23 years of age to 27; 28 to 35 years old; and above 35. Among adult patients, the youngest is 22 years old and the oldest is 62. Among the 325 children undergoing treatment in CUREDD, the youngest is seven years old and most of those aged 17 and below are males. There are only 51 female and 274 male children confined. The Center has "satellite centers" in Bicol, Iloilo and Cebu, but none in Mindanao.

At the PNP compound for drug rehabilitation, which includes the Bahay ng Bagong Buhay Rehabilitation Center (BBBRC) for streetchildren, there are 2,203 adult drug patients whose age ranges from 22 to 62. On average, most drug dependents confined in rehabilitation centers around the country are 27 years old, and most of them are males.

Aside from a gross lack in funding, there is a wide gap between the number of drug-users needing rehabilitation and centers available. Nationwide, there are only 64 residential rehabilitation centers. Only 46 of these are accredited while the remainder have a temporary permit to operate. Outpatient centers are even fewer with only 23 nationwide. Only 13 outpatient centers are accredited while 9 have temporary permits and 1 is up for re-accreditation.¹¹

The Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS) has coordinated with various concerned agencies to conduct the following:

- intensified curriculum integration of drug education concepts in both the elementary and secondary level;
- lecture for parents and teachers on drug abuse prevention during Parent, Teachers and Community Assemblies (PTCA);
- mobilization of Boy and Girl Scouts leaders in the campaign against drug abuse in schools;
- intensified advocacy on drug abuse by school health personnel;
- implemented Campus Security Management Project in coordination with the Philippine National Police in the saturation areas (areas with confirmed drug-related activities present) in the different regions; and
- a national workshop on drug education with GOs and NGOs involved in drug abuse prevention in order to come up with a Resource List of Drug Education Core Messages/ Concepts for all levels of education and specific target groups.

In the Philippine Congress, House Bill No.2050 integrated the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) into the elementary curriculum of private and public schools. The bill was supported by the Drug Abuse Rehabilitation Center (DARC).

The stressful environment in the workplace has often been linked to incidences of drug use. In response to the growing problem of alcohol and drug abuse, and in line with the provisions of the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002, the Department of Labor

¹¹ http://www.oshc.dole.gov.ph/policy_subs_abuse_directory.htm

and Employment (DOLE) has been designated to provide a workplace-based program for the prevention and control of alcohol and drug abuse in the labor force. As part of this effort, the Occupational Safety and Health Center has committed itself to the goal of drug-free workplaces. It works towards this goal through research, training programs, technical services and program development with various public and private agencies. The Center's current strategies are:

- the collection of data by the World Health Organization and the International Labor Organization to study the social, economic and cultural driving forces in demand reduction;
- identifying documents and disseminating good practices in prevention and treatment;
- coordination of work with NGOs in specific areas;
- combination of police-community and intelligence, investigation and operation activities;
- prevention of alcohol abuse in the maritime sector; and
- the creation of an active Inter-Agency Committee on the prevention of substance abuse in the workplace which will lobby for laws, create awareness programs on the ill effects of substance abuse and promote pre-employment testing under Civil Service Memorandum Circular No. 34, Series of 1997;
- making drug abuse prevention and control programs mandatory for all private establishments with 10 or more workers;
- workplace policies and programs are required to include components of advocacy, education and training, drug testing for officers and employees, treatment, rehabilitation and referral and monitoring and evaluation.

In 2004, Usec. Jose Calida, Executive Director of the Dangerous Drugs launched the Barkada Kontra Droga program. It is designed to prevent substance abuse through education and information. The program is focused towards young individuals and hopes to empower them and enable them in two-fold manner – personally, to be able to resist substance abuse and socially, to become models or catalysts within their peer groups, influencing their social groups positively.

Prevention. Aside from the aforementioned punitive actions, which are basically areas of the criminal justice system, the preventive approach via an information and education drive and voluntary submission to treatment and rehabilitation is also a major thrust. According to Section 30 of the Dangerous Drugs Act, the voluntary surrender of a drug dependent for confinement, treatment and rehabilitation exempts the drug dependent from criminal liability under Sections 11 and 15 (the range of penalties for which are Reclusion Perpetua to death and a fine of P500,000.00 to P10,000,000.00). The emphasis here is preventive therapy instead of punitive action. These twin efforts balance our punitive efforts and also serve to promote reduction of supply and demand.

F. Issues and Tensions

Limitations of the Dangerous Drugs Act. It should be noted that in the law, the sale and offer of substances to minors without written consent of parents or guardians is

articulated as a punishable act only for volatile substances. While the assumption that the drug problem among minors primarily involves the abuse of volatile substances may be valid, the legal framework fails to recognize the growing involvement of minors in the use and abuse of prohibited drugs. The research findings show **that there is a need to recognize the drug problem among minors as they have become increasingly involved in drugs previously thought to be used by adult users.** Structuring interventions and/or responses to problems along this line become problematic when provisions and regulations regarding minors are not fully expressed. This is reflected in the current drug rehabilitation situation in the country, where there are very few separate facilities for drug-addicted minors.

The Dangerous Drugs Act also assumes that prohibited and regulated drug-related activities such as possession, use, delivery, or distribution are confined to adults because the penalty for these activities ranges from life imprisonment to death, neither of which are applicable to minors. This assumption is contradicted by the research findings that the involvement of minors in punishable drug-related activities does exist, albeit to an unconfirmed degree. Thus, **laws governing the prohibition and regulation of dangerous drugs must be reconfigured in order to recognize and efficiently respond to the problem of drugs and drug-related activities among minors.**

National and local government actions/initiatives. As mentioned earlier, the national government through DDB/PDEA in collaboration with DILG, NDEPCC, and the PNP, has implemented various strategies for drug eradication. However, some of these actions are contentious, as with the case “reward campaign” of the PDEA wherein a reward of roughly P50,000.00 per kilo is promised to those who give information leading to the direct arrest of major drug pushers or raids/seizures of drug laboratories. There are also separate rewards for the officers involved in raids, seizures, captures and arrests. This is highly contentious because it is not clear where the reward money will come from. As it is, the PDEA grossly lacks the funding for regular operations. In addition, "Citizens Drug Watch" groups, which have been initiated and formed across the nation by the government, have been criticized as having become tools of the state.

At the local government level, local ordinances have been enacted and implemented in various cities and municipalities to battle the problem of drugs. One such case is the city of Marikina, where the mayor has launched the "Anti-drug Quarantine Program" which secures and monitors the city. Incoming and outgoing traffic is routinely checked because it has been found that drug sales and supplies are brought into the area by outsiders or non-residents. However, these efforts are often thwarted because despite the numerous apprehensions of drug pushers, a significant number of pushers manage to negotiate for their release even before they reach the police station. Moreover, the government is now willing to let petty pushers go in exchange for information about major producers and suppliers.

Summary. The political and institutional framework of the campaign against drug in the Philippines is mainly anchored on the assumption that to tackle the drug problem is to reduce the supply of drugs. In the process, the demand for drugs from the users also

decreases. Reduction of drug supply relies mainly on police action and assumes a determined effort to arrest traffickers and manufacturers and confiscate/seize and destroy illegal drugs.

Meanwhile, demand reduction is anchored on the involvement of local governments and communities in the control and rehabilitation of drug users. The government has created the appropriate structures and processes designed to reduce the supply of illegal drugs in the country. The Arroyo administration has aggressively pursued drug pushers, suppliers and laboratory owners as part of its intense anti-drug campaign. Law enforcers have reported record numbers of raids, seizures and apprehensions. The efforts to reduce demand for drugs include apprehension and rehabilitation of drug abusers, and preventive education. Several drug and crime watch groups have also been organized at national, institutional, local government, and community levels. Local governments and community organizations have been designated as “keepers of the community” with increased responsibilities in managing local drug problems. Several police operations, however that the country has become a major supplier and supplier of shabu.

The changing landscape of drugs in the Philippines is demonstrated in the catch phrases used in anti-drug campaigns. In the 1980s and 1990s the slogan was “Save the user, Jail the pusher” but the most recent slogan being promoted by the government is “Report the pusher. Report drug labs. Rehabilitate the user.”

Appendix D. List of Sources

“Drug center of Asia.” Inquirer News Service. July 08, 2001.

http://www.inq7.net/vwp/2001/jul/09/text/vwp_2-1-p.htm

“Palace downplays US report on illegal drugs.”

<http://www.abs-cbnnews.com/FlashNewsStory.aspx?FLashOID=15490>

“PDEA: P4.6B in illegal drugs seized in a year.” Philippine Daily Inquirer.

http://www.inq7.net/brk/2003/jul/12/text/brkpol_11-1-p.htm

“Philippine Enacts Death Penalty for Drug Dealing, Possession of a Pound of Marijuana or Ten Grams of Ecstasy”

<http://www.stopthedrugwar.org/chronicle/241/philippines.shtml>

“Philippines: President Arroyo’s War on Drugs – A Special Press Summary” Virtual Information Center. <http://www.vic-info.org/RegionsTop.nsf/>

“RP among top shabu makers says UN report.” The Philippine Daily Inquirer. 19-222: 19 July 2004. A1

Agence France-Presse. “15,718 arrested for drugs raps over past year — PDEA.” The Philippine Star. Sunday, June 29, 2003.

Alquitran, Non. “Ecstasy smuggled through mail.” The Philippine Star. Monday, June 02, 2003.

Alquitran, Non. “14 Parañaque cops to receive P400 T reward for shabu bust.” The Philippine Star. Monday, June 02, 2003.

Alquitran, Non with Rey Arquiza. “P2-B ephedrine seized at container port.” The Philippine Star. Saturday, November 29, 2003.

Arroyo, Dennis M. “Drug money leads to narco-politics.” Inquirer News Service. September 02, 2001.

http://www.inq7.net/bus/2001/sep/03/text/bus_21-1-p.htm

Balana, Cynthia D. “Harsher drugs bill OKd: 99g of shabu means death.” Inquirer News Service. February 28, 2002.

http://www.inq7.net/nat/2002/feb/28/text/nat_4-1-p.htm

Burgonio, TJ. “RP tops amphetamine abuse, says int'l drugs body.” Inquirer News Service. March 02, 2002.

Clapano, Jose Rodel. “Drugs a P250-B-a-year business.” The Philippine Star. Sunday, June 22, 2003.

Corpuz, Jowie “US tags RP as major drug hub.” The Manila Times Internet Edition.
http://www.manilatimes.net/national/2004/mar/04/yehey/top_stories/20040304top7.html

Corvera , Ann. “Fund lack hounds Asia’s biggest drug rehab center.” The Philippine Star. Sunday, July 06, 2003.

Echeminada, Perseus and Non Alquitrán. “House leader: PDEA a ‘toothless tiger’ without funds.” The Philippine Star. Monday, June 30, 2003.

Escandor, Juan. “‘Shabu’ now P250-B industry, says cop.” Inquirer News Service. April 21, 2001.

Esguerra, Christian “3.4 million Filipinos now use drugs.”
http://beta.inq7.net/metro/index.php?index=1&story_id=881

Flores, Nelson “Rising Price of Shabu: DILG chief claims success in anti-drug campaign.” The Philippine Daily Inquirer.
http://www.inq7.net/nat/2004/jun/02/nat_9-1.htm

Javellana, Juliet, Christian V. Esguerra and Carlito Pablo. “Palace: Drug lords also face execution” Philippine Daily Inquirer. 8 December 2003. A1

Lacanalale, Albert and Ria Isidro de Fiesta. “Anti-illegal drug caravan launched.” Sun.Star Pampanga.
<http://www.sunstar.com.ph/static/pam/2004/02/18/news/anti.illegal.drug.caravan.launched.html>

Mananghaya, James. “Now, it’s ‘Himagsik’ vs drugs.” The Philippine Star. Sunday, November 30, 2003.

Mendez, Christina. “PNP to brief GMA today on anti-drug drive.” The Philippine Star. Monday, November 10, 2003.

Romero, Paolo and Sheila Crisostomo. “Lawmaker: One-fourth of public officials funded by drug barons.” The Philippine Star. Thursday, June 26, 2003.

Salaverria, Leila and Edson Tandoc, Jr. “Drug raids mount in Metro” Philippine Daily Inquirer, 16 November 2003.A23


Tubeza, Philip C. and Edson C. Tandoc Jr. “NBI bag biggest Ecstasy haul.” Inquirer News Service. April 24, 2002.
http://www.inq7.net/met/2002/apr/25/text/met_1-1-p.htm

Villanueva, Marichu. “Arroyo vows all-out war on illegal drugs.” The Philippine Star. Wednesday, October 29, 2003.

Villanueva, Marichu with Christina Mendez, Jess Diaz, Sammy Santos. "PDEA chief to call the shots." The Philippine Star. Thursday, June 26, 2003.

Villanueva, Marichu with Jess Diaz, Jose Rodel Clapano. "Barbers named anti-drug czar." The Philippine Star. Saturday, June 21, 2003.

Annex E. Institutional Framework of Working Children in Drugs in the Philippines



Annex F. Protocol Forms and Research Instruments for PAOR

A. COMMUNITY PROFILE

Note: Data for the community profile can be acquired through use of secondary data sources (e.g. publications, updated statistics, annual reports etc.), direct observation of the community, interview of key informants and walk through, among other means.

Community Settlement History

How can the residents of the community be grouped according to the following:
Papaano maaaring igrupo ang mga residente ng komunidad ayon sa:



| Categories/ <i>Kategorya</i> | # of Households/ <i>Dami ng Pamilya</i> | Location of households/ <i>Kinalalagyan ng mga pamilya</i> (Clustered/ <i>grupo-grupo</i> ; Random/ <i>Hiwa-hiwalay</i>) |
|--|---|--|
| Ethnicity/ <i>Wikang ginagamit sa bahay</i> | | |
| Province of origin/ <i>Probinsyang pinagmulan</i> | | |
| Mode of ownership/ <i>Pag-mamay-ari</i> (owner/ <i>may-ari</i> ; renting/ <i>nangungupahan</i> ; bedspace/ <i>nanunuluyan</i> , others/ <i>atbp.</i>) | | |


What changes in in the community has a bearing on:
Anu-anong mga pagbabago sa komunidad ang nakaapekto sa:



- Recreation of children/ *Paglilibang ng mga bata* (e.g. *pagtatayo ng mga "game stations", bilyaran, etc.*)
- Education of children/ *Pag-aaral ng mga bata* (e.g. *pagkakaroon ng mga day care centers, pagpapatayo ng mga paaralan, etc.*)
- Work of children/ *Pagtatrabaho ng mga bata* (e.g. *pagtatayo ng mga palengke at iba pang lugar ng kalakalan*)

| Categories/ <i>Kategorya</i> | Changes that occurred/ <i>Mga pagbabago</i> |
|------------------------------|---|
| Recreation | |
| Education | |
| Work | |

What significant events or processes related to child labor and drug use



have occurred in the community in the last ten years? (probe)
Anu-anong mahahalagang kaganapang may kinalaman sa pagtatrabaho ng mga bata at/o paggamit ng droga ang nangyari sa kunmunidad sa nakalipas na sampung taon?

| | |
|--|--|
| Events and processes related to: <i>Kaganapan at proseso na may kinalaman sa:</i> | Events and processes/ <i>Kaganapan at proseso</i> |
| Child labor/ <i>Pagtatrabaho ng mga bata</i> | 1. |
| | 2. |
| | 3. |
| Drug use/ <i>Paggamit ng droga</i> | 1. |
| | 2. |
| | 3. |

Physical Characteristics

Socio-economic Features

- Population (census data): disaggregated in terms of age groups, sex per area
- Populasyon batay sa sensus na hinihiwalay ang mga grupo ayon sa edad, kasarian sa bawat lugar*

Get the barangay data if available

| Location/ <i>Lugar</i> | # of Households | # of residents | Age | | | Sex | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----|------|-----|-----|---|
| | | | 0-7 | 8-17 | >17 | M | F |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

- Income Sources (primary, secondary)
- Pinagkakakitaan (pangunahin at iba pang mga pinagkukunan)*

| <i>Income Source/ Pinagkakakitaan</i> | <i>Average Income/ Karaniwang</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Primary/ Pangunahin</i> | |
| | |
| | |
| <i>Secondary/ Iba pang pinagkakakitaan</i> | |
| | |
| | |

- Basic Services according to type (housing, water, electricity, education, etc.), provider, extent, etc.
- Mga pangunahing serbisyo ayon sa uri (pabahay, tubig, koryente, edukasyon, atbp.), anong ahensya ang nagbibigay, gaano kalawak ang naaabot at iba pa.*

| Basic Service/ <i>Pangunahing Serbisyo</i> | Organization/ <i>Organisasyon</i> | No. of households served/ <i>Dami ng pamilyang naseserbisyuhan</i> |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| Water/ <i>Tubig</i> | | |
| Electricity/ <i>Kuryente</i> | | |
| Education/ <i>Edukasyon</i> | | |

- Housing situation (tenure, construction material, etc.)
- *Kalagayan ng pabahay (pag-mamay-ari, ayon sa ginamit na materyal, atbp.)*

| Housing Situation/ <i>Kalagayan ng Pabahay</i> | # of households/ <i>dami ng pamilya</i> |
|---|--|
| Tenure/<i>Pagmamay-ari</i> | |
| Owned/ <i>May-ari</i> | |
| Rented/ <i>Nangungupahan</i> | |
| Bedspace/ <i>Nanunuluyan</i> | |
| Material used/<i>Materyal na ginamit</i> | |
| Concrete/ <i>Konkreto o sementado</i> | |
| Light/ <i>Magagaang materyal</i> | |
| Mixed/ <i>Magkahalong materyal</i> | |

- Environmental Threats (flooding, fires and other disasters/calamities)
- *Mga kalamidad na bunsod ng kalikasan tulad ng baha, sunog, atbp.*

| Environmental Threats/ <i>Mga kalamidad</i> |
|---|
| 1. |
| 2. |
| 3. |

o **Location/Accessibility of Key Service Centers**

Where are key service centers such as market, religious, education and youth/children-oriented groups located? Are they accessible to community residents?

Saan-saan matatagpuan ang mga sentro ng serbisyo tulad ng palengke, simbahan, eskwelahan at mga grupong nagbibigay-tulong sa mga kabataan? Madali ba itong matunton ng mga residente?

| Key Service Centers/ <i>Sentro ng Serbisyo</i> | Location/ <i>Lugar</i> | Accessibility/ <i>Madaling Matunton</i> | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | Accessible/ <i>Madaling matunton</i> | Inaccessible/ <i>Di-madaling matunton</i> |
| Market/ <i>Palengke</i> | | | |
| Church/ <i>Simbahan</i> | | | |
| School/ <i>Eskwelahan</i> | | | |
| Youth groups/ <i>Grupo para sa mga kabataan</i> | | | |

o **Peace and Order Situation**

Has there been any domestic-related violence (e.g. homicide, theft, drunkenness, street fights, etc.) in the community? (probe)

May nangyari na bang karahasang tulad ng patayan, pagnanakaw, awayan sa kalye at iba pa sa loob ng komunidad? Talakayin.

| Domestic-related violence/ <i>Karahasan sa bahay</i> | Management and solution/ <i>Paano nalutas</i> |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Has there been occurrences of drug-related violence in the community? (probe)

May mga karahasang naka-uganay sa paggamit ng droga na bang naganap sa komunidad?

| Drug-related violence/ <i>Karahasang kaugnay ng droga</i> | Management and solution/ <i>Paano nalutas</i> |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

o **Risks and Categories of risk**

What are the usual forms of threat faced by members of the community (i.e. economic, security, political, etc.)? How, if ever, do they manage these threats?

Anu-anong mga kinatatakutan o pinagmumulan ng kaba ng mga tao sa komunidad (tulad ng pang-ekonomiya, seguridad, pang-politika, atbp.)? Sa papaanong paraan, kung sakali man, hinaharap ng mga tao ang kanilang mga kinatatakutan?

| Forms of Threat/ <i>Kinatatakutan o pinagmumulan ng kaba</i> | How managed/ <i>Paano hinaharap o nilulutas</i> |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |

What are the usual forms of threat faced by children and youth? How, if ever, are these managed?

Anu-anong mga kinatatakutan o pinagmumulan ng kaba ng mga kabataan sa komunidad? Sa papaanong paraan, kung sakali man, hinaharap ang mga takot na ito?

| Forms of Threat faced by children/ <i>Kinatatakutan o pinagmumulan ng kaba ng mga bata</i> | How managed/ <i>Paano hinaharap o nilulutas</i> |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |

What forms of drug-related risks do people in the community face and

how do the people collectively deal with these risks?

Anu-anong mga uri ng takot bunsod ng paggamit/paglaganap ng droga ang kinakaharap ng mga tao sa komunidad at paano nila ito hinaharap?

| Drug-related risks/ <i>Takot na bunsod ng paggamit o paglaganap ng droga</i> | How managed/ <i>Paano hinaharap o nilulutas</i> |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Annex G. Interview Schedules

G.1 Interview Guide for Working Children in Drugs

Interviewer: _____
Date: _____ Time Started: _____ Area: _____

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Name/Pangalan: _____

Address/ Tirahan: _____

Age/Edad: _____ (# of years/ # ng taon)

Sex/Kasarian: Female/Babae Male/Lalaki

School Status/ Estado ng pag-aaral: In-school/Nag-aaral
 Out-of-school/Tumigil sa pag-aaral

Work Status/ Estado ng pagtatrabaho: Working/Nagtatrabaho
 Not working/Di-nagtatrabaho

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

1. **Birth order.** Ika-ilan ka sa inyong magkakapatid? _____
2. **Living with Parents.** Are you living with your parents? *Kasama mo ba sa bahay ang inyong mga magulang?*

- Yes, both of them/ *Oo, pareho sila*
- With father only/ *Kasama ang ama lang*
- With mother only/ *Kasama ang ina lang*
- No/ *Hindi*

If no, who are you living with/ *Kung hindi, sino ang kasama mo?*

And: If no, why? *Bakit hindi ka nakatira sa mga magulang mo?*

3. **Sufficiency of Income.** Is your family's income sufficient to meet basic needs? *Sapat ba ang kinikita ng inyong pamilya para sa mga pangunahing mga pangangailangan?*

Yes/Oo No/Hindi Others/Iba pang sagot _____

4. **Income.** What income-generating activities are your family involved in? *Ano ang mga trabaho o pinagkakakitaan ng inyong pamilya?*

| | Age /Edad | Sex /Kasarian | Education /Pinag-aralan | Occupation /Trabaho | Income /Kita |
|--|--------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Respondent | | | | | |
| Other family members/ <i>Iba pang miyembro ng pamilya</i> | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | |
| 2. | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | |
| 5. | | | | | |

Total # HH Members

Total HH Income

5. **Marriage Legitimacy.** Are your parents married? *Kasal ba ang iyong mga magulang?*

Yes/Oo No/Hindi

6. **Living Parents.** Are your parents still alive? *Buhay pa ba ang iyong mga magulang?*

Both parents are still alive/ *Buhay pa silang dalawa*

Father is already dead/ *Patay na ang ama*

Mother is already dead/ *Patay na ang ina*

Both parents are dead/ *Patay na pareho*

7. **Parents' Relations.** How is your parents' relationship with each other? *Kumusta ang relasyon ng mga magulang mo?*

Excellent/ *Mahusay*

Good/ *Mabuti naman*

Not good, not bad/ *Hindi mabuti, pero di rin naman masama*

Bad/ *Masama*

8. **Parents' Quarrel.** Does your parents fight? *Nag-aaway ba ang mga magulang mo?*

Always/ *Lagi*

Often/ *Madalas*

Sometimes/ *Kung minsan*

Seldom/ *Hindi gaano*

Never/ *Hindi kailanman*

9. **Exposure to Parents' Quarrel.** How do you know that they are fighting? *Paano mo nalalaman na nag-aaway sila?*

I see them fight/ *Nakikita ko silang nag-aaway*

I hear them fight/ *Naririnig ko silang nag-aaway*

Others, specify/ *Iba pa, tukuyin.* _____

10. **Causes of Quarrel.** What are the usual causes of their fights? *Ano ang karaniwang sanhi ng kanilang pag-aaway?*
-

11. **Violence of Parents' Fights.** Did these quarrels ever lead to violence? *Umaabot bang nagiging bayolente ang awayan ng mga magulang mo?*

- Always/ *Lagi*
- Often/ *Madalas*
- Sometimes/ *Kung minsan*
- Seldom/ *Hindi gaano*
- Never/ *Hindi kailanman*

12. **Effect of quarrel.** How does their quarrel affect you? *Ano ang epekto sa iyo ng pag-aaway ng mga magulang mo?*

13. **Father's Vices.** Does your father have any vice? *May bisyo ba ang tatay mo?*

- Gambling/ *Pagsusugal*
- Drinking/ *Paglalasing*
- Infidelity/ *Pambababae*
- Others, specify/ *Iba pa, tukuyin*

14. How does this affect your family? *Paano nito naapektuhan ang pamilya nyo?*

15. **Mother's Vices.** Does your mother have any vice? *May bisyo ba ang tatay mo?*

- Gambling/ *Pagsusugal*
- Drinking/ *Paglalasing*
- Infidelity/ *Pambababae*
- Others, specify/ *Iba pa, tukuyin*

16. How does this affect your family? *Paano nito naapektuhan ang pamilya nyo?*

17. **Instilling Discipline.** How does your mother/father/guardian discipline you when you commit a mistake? *Paano ka dinidisciplina ng mga magulang o tagapag-alaga mo kapag nagkakasala ka?*

| Act | Father | | Mother | | Guardian | |
|---|--------|----|--------|----|----------|----|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Spanking/ <i>Pinapalo</i> | | | | | | |
| Talk/ <i>Pinagsasabihan</i> | | | | | | |
| Talk and Spanking/ <i>Pinagsasabihan at Pinapalo</i> | | | | | | |
| Others, specify/ <i>Iba pa, tukuyin</i> | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | |
| 2. | | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | | |

EDUCATION PROFILE

1. Do you attend school/*Pumapasok ka ba sa paaralan?* Yes/Oo
 No/*Hindi, Why/Bakit?* _____

If Yes/Kung Oo

A. **Type of school:** Public/*Pampubliko*
 Private/*Pampribado*

B. **# of Years in school:** _____

C. **# of Hours in school:** Per day/*Kada-araw* _____ hrs
 Per week/*Kada-linggo* _____ hrs
 Per Month/*Kada-buwan* _____ hrs

D. **Distance of school from house:** _____ kms
 _____ min walk/*lakad*
 _____ min ride/*sakay*

E. **School Expenses:** How much do you pay/spend to go to school? *Magkano ang ginagastos mo sa pag-aaral?*

- Uniform/*Uniporme* _____
- Tuition Fee/*Matrikula* _____
- Travel Costs/*Pamasahe* _____
- Opportunity cost of work/
Nawawalang kita dahil sa pagpasok sa paaralan _____
- **TOTAL (cost/gastos)** _____

F. **Quality of Education.** Do you think quality education is available to you? *Sa tingin mo ba ay mataas ang kalidad ng edukasyon na nakukuha mo sa paaralan?*

High Quality/*Mataas na kalidad:* (Well-educated and trained teachers, enough classrooms conducive to study, , good ventilation, enough lighting, updated books, etc./ *Mataas ang natapos at kasanayan ng mga guro, karampatang dami ng silid-aralan, tamang daloy ng hangin, tamang ilaw, bagong mga libro, atbp.*)

Also, maybe the children can judge this for themselves. Be open to categories that may come out. Probe whenever needed.

Medium Quality/*Tama lang na kalidad*
 Low Quality/*Mababang kalidad*
 Others, please specify/ *Iba pang sagot, tukuyin:*

H. What school-related risks do you face that affects your performance in school? How do you manage these? *Anu-anong mga takot o dahilan ng kaba ang hinaharap mo sa paaralan na nakaaapekto sa iyong pag-aaral? Paano mo nilulutas ang mga ito?*

| School-related risks/ <i>Mga sanhi ng takot o kaba sa paaralan</i> | Solution or management/ <i>Paano nilulutas</i> |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

I. Do you think education is relevant to your future? Why? *Sa tingin mo ba mahalaga ang edukasyon para sa iyong kinabukasan? Bakit?*

RECREATION PROFILE

2. **Types of Recreation.** What recreational activities do you engage in? *Anu-anong mga libangan o gawaing mapapagkaabalahan ang ginagawa/sinasalihan mo?*

3. **Frequency of Activities.** How frequent do you engage in these activities? *Gaano kadalas mong ginagawa ang mga ito?*

4. **Other Recreation Activities.** Are there other recreational activities that you are interested in? What are they? *Mayroon bang ibang libangan na interesado kang gawin? Kung mayroon, anu-ano ang mga ito?*

| Recreational Activities/ <i>Mga libangan o Pinagkakaabalahan</i> | Frequency of engaging in activity/ <i>Dalas na ginagawa ang mga ito</i> |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Other recreational activities/ <i>Iba pang libangan</i> | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

WORK PROFILE

5. Work History.

| Work History/ <i>Mga trabahong pinasok</i> | Age/ <i>Edad</i> | Length of Service/ <i>Tagal ng panunungkulan</i> | Experience of risk, accident and threat/ <i>Karanasan sa panganib at aksidente sa trabaho</i> (e.g. illness, abuse, harassment, etc.) | Receive Protection from risks/ <i>Proteksiyon sa mga panganib</i> | |
|---|---------------------|---|---|--|------------------|
| | | | | Yes/Oo | No/ <i>Hindi</i> |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

- 5a. What kind of jobs have you had? *Anu-anong uri ng trabaho ang napasok mo na?*
 5b. How old were you when you worked for each specific job? *Ilang taon ka nang nanilbihan o nagtrabaho sa iyong mga nabanggit?*
 5c. How many years have you been engaged in this kind of work? *Ilang taon ka na sa ganitong uri ng trabaho?*
 5d. What are the risks, threats and accidents (presence of physical/psychological/sexual abuse, exposure to dangerous places and tools, confinement in unhealthy spaces, performance of difficult tasks) in your occupation? *Anong mga panganib na kasama sa iyong trabaho (pang-aabuso, mapanganib na lugar o gawain, pagkakulong)?*
 5e. Do you receive protection against these risks, threats and accidents? *Napoproteksiyunan ka ba sa mga panganib na ito?*

6. **Recruitment Process.** How did you get started? *Paano ka nagsimula sa iyong trabaho?*

7. **Decision to Work.** How was the decision to work reached (respondent's own decision, family influence, peer pressure)? *Paano umabot sa desisyon ng iyong pagtatrabaho (sariling desisyon, impluwensiya ng pamilya at kaibigan)?*

- Respondent's own decision/ *sariling desisyon*
- Family Influence/*Impluwensiya ng pamilya*
- Peer Influence/ *Impluwensiya ng mga kaibigan*
- Others, specify/*Iba pa, tukuyin:* _____

8. **Work Condition.** What are the conditions you work in (physical and psychological)? Please describe your surroundings, the people you interact with, what you feel when you perform certain tasks, etc. *Pakilarawan ang kalagayan mo kapag ikaw ang nagtatrabaho (pisikal at hindi pisikal): ang iyong kapaligiran, mga taong kasama, ang mga naiisip at nararamdaman mo kapag ginagawa mo ang dapat mong gawin.*

| Work-related factors/ <i>Mga kalagayan sa trabaho</i> | Description/ <i>Paglalarawan</i> |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Surroundings/ <i>Kapaligiran</i> | |
| People you work with/ <i>Mga kasama sa trabaho</i> | |
| Kind of work/ <i>Uri ng trabahong ginagampanan</i> | |
| Others/ <i>Iba pa</i> | |
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |

9. **Others' Experience of Work-related Illness and/or Accident.** Do you know of anyone who has been involved in work-related accidents and/or illnesses? If so, what happened? *May mga kilala ka bang nadisgrasya o nagkasakit na may kaugnayan sa trabahao? Kung mayroon, ano ang nangyari sa kanya?*

| Person respondent is working with/ <i>Kasama sa trabaho ng respondente</i> | Description of illness and/or accident/ <i>Paglalarawan ng pagkakasait at/o aksidente sa trabaho</i> |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

15. **Perception of Work.** What are your perception about (the nature of) your work (i.e. good, bad, acceptable)? *Ano ang naiisip mo tungkol sa trabaho?*

- Good/*Mainam*
- Bad/*Hindi mainam*
- Acceptable/*Katanggap-tanggap naman*

16. **Similarity of Work between Children and Adults.** Do children have the same tasks as adults? *Pareho ba ng gawain ang mga bata at mga matatanda sa ganitong trabaho?*

- Yes/Oo
- No/Hindi
- Others/Iba pang sagot _____

17. **Hours of Work.** How many hours do you work? *Ilang oras ka nagtatrabaho?*

Per day/Kada-araw _____ hrs
Per week/Kada-linggo _____ hrs
Per Month/Kada-buwan _____ hrs

19. **Time of Work.** What is your time schedule? *Kailan ka nagtatrabaho?*

- Morning/Umaga
- Evening/Gabi
- Morning and Evening/Umaga at Gabi

20. **Income.** How much do you earn per month? *Magkano ang kinikita mo kada buwan?*

Base salary (Piece rate)/ Suweldo _____
Tips _____
Bonus _____
TOTAL _____

20a. How does this compare to adults for the same type of work? *Katulad ba ito ng kinikita ng mga mas nakatatanda na gumagawa ng trabahong tulad ng ginagawa mo?*

- Yes/Oo
- No/Hindi
- Others/Iba pang sagot _____

20b. Who collects your pay (respondent or respondent's parents/guardians)? *Sino ang kumukuha ng kita mo (ikaw o mga magulang/tagapagbantay mo)?*

- Respondent/Ako mismo
- Parent/Magulang
- Guardian/Tagapagbantay

21. **Use of Income.** What do you do with the money you earned (buy things, save, or give it to family)? *Ano ang ginagawa mo sa perang kinita mo (pinapambili, iniipon, binibigay sa pamilya)?*

- Buy/Pinapambili
- Save/Iniipon
- Give it to family/Binibigay sa pamilya
- Others (pls. specify)/Iba pa (tukuyin): _____

22. **Effect of Work.** What do you think this kind of work can do for your future? *Ano sa tingin mo ang magagawa ng ganitong trabaho para sa iyong kinabukasan?*

23. **Alternatives.** Do you see other future alternatives for employment/occupation? What are they? *May nakikita ka bang ibang gawain o trabaho na maaari mong pagkaabalahan? Ano ang mga ito?*

24. **Aspirations.** What are your aspirations in life and work? *Ano ang iyong mga pangarap sa buhay at sa trabaho?*

For Use of Researcher Only

25. What specifically do you do in this line of work? *Tukuyin kung ano ang iyong trabaho.*

- “Runner” (one who delivers drugs to buyer or courier of illegal drugs/ *tagabatid ng ipinagbabawal na droga sa bumibili o tagapagdala*)
- “Wrapper” or “Repacker” (repacks large volumes of substances into smaller units/ *tagabalot ng droga sa mas maliliit na lalagyan*)
- “Posting” (assigned to a specific area where one can buy drugs/ *nakatalaga sa isang tukoy na lugar kung saan may bentahan ng ipinagbabawal na droga*)
- Others, please specify/ *Iba pa, tukuyin:*

26. In your knowledge, in what other tasks in the trading of drugs are children involved? *Sa iyong pagkakaalam, sa anu-ano pang mga gawain sangkot ang mga kabataan sa bentahan ng ipinagbabawal na droga?*

This section contains sensitive issues that cannot out rightly be asked of the respondents but researcher can deduce.

Involvement in Drug Use, Production and Trade

Use of Illegal Drugs

28. Do you know of anyone who is using drugs? *May kakilala ka bang gumagamit ng droga?*

- Yes/*Oo*
- None/*Wala*
- Others/*Iba pang sagot* _____

- 28a. If yes, who are these individuals? *Kung oo, sinu-sino ang mga ito?*
 28b. What type of drugs do they use? *Anong uri ng droga ang kanilang ginagamit?*

| Drug User/ <i>Gumagamit ng Droga</i> | Type of Drugs/ <i>Uri ng droga na ginagamit (Shabu/ Marijuana/ Rugby/ Cough Syrup/ etc.)</i> |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/ <i>Magulang</i> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bro/ sis/ <i>Kapatid</i> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Friend/ <i>Kaibigan</i> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Others/ <i>Iba pa:</i> | |
| | |
| | |

29. Have you tried using illegal drugs? *Nasubukan mo na bang gumamit ng ipinagbabawal na droga?*

- Yes/ *Oo*
 No/ *Hindi*
 Others/ *Iba pang sagot* _____

30. What type of drugs have you tried or tasted? How often do you use these? *Anu-anong mga droga ang nasubukan o natikman mo na? Gaano mo kadalas ginagamit ang mga ito?*

| Drug Used/ <i>Ginamit/ natikimang Droga</i> | Frequency of Use/ <i>Dalas ng paggamit</i> |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Shabu | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marijuana | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rugby | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cough Syrup | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Others/ <i>Iba pa</i> | |
| | |
| | |

31. What type of drugs have you tried first? *Anong uri ng droga ang una mong natikman/ nasubukan?*

- Shabu
 Marijuana
 Rugby
 Cough Syrup
 Others/ *Iba pa* _____

32. How young were you when you first used drugs? *Ilang taon ka nang una mong nasubukang mag-droga?*

_____ (# of years/ *blg ng taon*)

33. Why did you use drugs? *Bakit ka gumamit ng droga?*

34. Until now, are you still using drugs? *Hanggang ngayon ba ay gumagamit ka pa rin ng droga?*

- Not anymore/*Hindi na*
- Oo/*Yes*
- Others (pls. specify)/*Iba pa (tukuyin):* _____

Involvement in Illegal Drug Trade

Involvement of Close Friends in the Illegal Drug Trade

35. Do you have friends who are involved in illegal drug trade? *Mayroon ka bang mga malapit kaibigan na sangkot sa bentahan ng ipinagbabawal na droga?*

- Yes/*Oo*
- None/*Wala*
- Others/*Iba pang sagot* _____

36. In what ways are your friends involved? Describe their involvement and the kind of drugs sold. *Sa paanong paraan sila nakasangkot? Ilarawan ang kanilang gamain sa bentahan ng ipinagbabawal na droga at tukuyin kung anong klase ng droga.*

Involvement of Parents in Illegal Drug Trade

37. Are your parents involved in illegal drug trade? *Nasasangkot ba ang iyong mga magulang sa bentahan ng pinagbabawal na droga?*

- Yes/*Oo*
- No/*Hindi*
- Others/*Iba pang sagot* _____

38. In what ways are they involved? Describe their involvement and the kind of drugs sold. *Sa paanong paraan sila nakasangkot? Ilarawan ang kanilang gamain sa bentahan ng ipinagbabawal na droga at tukuyin kung anong klase ng droga.*

39. Are your brothers/sisters involved in illegal drug trade? *Nasasangkot ba ang iyong mga kapatid sa bentahan ng pinagbabawal na droga?*

- Yes/Oo
- No/Hindi
- Others/Iba pang sagot _____

40. In what ways are your brothers/sisters involved? Describe their involvement and the kind of drugs sold. *Sa paanong paraan sila nakasangkot? Ilarawan ang kanilang gawain sa bentahan ng ipinagbabawal na droga at tukuyin kung anong klase ng droga.*

Involvement of Respondent in Illegal Drug Trade

41. Were you involved in illegal drug trade (i.e. trafficking or selling as runners, production and/or prepacking)? *Kasangkot ka ba sa bentahan ng illegal na droga (hal. bilang runner sa pagbebenta, produksyon o pagsasalin sa lalagyan)?*

42. Why were you involved in illegal drug trade? *Bakit ka nasangkot sa ganitong gawain?*

43. How did you get involved in this line of work? *Paano ka nasangkot sa gawaing tulad nito?*

Time finished: _____

Notes:

G.2 Interview Guide for Parents of Working Children in Drugs

Interviewer: _____

Date: _____

Time Started: _____

Area: _____

Introduction:

Good morning/afternoon. We are conducting interviews in this area/site to learn more about the issues/activities involving working children. Thank you very much for the time you are giving us.

Magandang umaga/hapon. Kami ay nakikipanayam sa lugar na ito para malaman ang mga isyu tungkol sa mga batang nagtatrabaho. Salamat sa oras na ibinigay ninyo sa amin.

1. **Name/Pangalan:** _____
2. **Address/ Tirahan:** _____

3. **Family size** (including parents). *Laki ng pamilya (kabilang ang mga magulang.* _____
4. **Family ethnicity.** *Wikang ginagamit sa bahay (Probe)* _____
5. **Length of stay.** How long has your family lived in this site/area? Since when? *Gaano katagal na kayong naninirahan sa lugar na ito? Mula kailan (anong taon)?*
6. **Place of Origin.** Original place of residence. *Pinanggalingang lugar.*
7. **Other places of residence.** *Iba pang lugar na tinitirhan.*

| Places of Residence/ <i>Mga lugar na tirahan</i> | Length of stay/ <i>Tagal ng paninirahan</i> |
|--|---|
| Present Area/ <i>Kasalukuyang Lugar</i> | |
| Other places/ <i>Iba pang lugar</i> | |
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |

8. **Sources of Income.** What income-generating activities are your family involved in? *Ano ang mga trabaho o pinagkakakitaan ng inyong pamilya?*

| | Relation/ <i>Relasyon</i> | Age <i>/Edad</i> | Sex <i>/Kasarian</i> | Education Level <i>/Pinag- aralan</i> | Currently enrolled/ <i>Pumapasok</i> | | Occupation <i>/Trabaho</i> | Income <i>/Kita</i> |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | | | Yes/ <i>Oo</i> | No/ <i>Hindi</i> | | |
| Respondent | | | | | | | | |
| Other family members/ <i>Iba pang miyembro ng pamilya</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | | | | | | | | |

Total # HH Members

Total HH Income

9. **Income Utilization.** Is your family income sufficient to meet basic needs? *Sapat ba ang kinikita ng inyong pamilya para sa mga pangunahing mga pangangailangan?*

Yes/Oo No/Hindi

Why/Bakit?

10. **Indebtedness.** Does your family have any debts? If so, what are the reasons for your indebtedness (death, illness, recruitment process). *May mga pinagkakautangan ba ang inyong pamilya? Kung mayroon, ano ang pinagmulan nito?*

| Source of Debt/ <i>Pinagkakautangan</i> | <i>Reason/Bakit nagka-utang</i> |
|---|---------------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

11. **Spouse's Relations.** How is your relationship with your spouse? *Kumusta ang relasyon ninyo ng iyong asawa?*

- Excellent/ *Mahusay*
- Good/ *Mabuti naman*
- Not good, not bad/ *Hindi mabuti, pero di rin naman masama*
- Bad/ *Masama*

12. **Quarrel.** Do you fight with your spouse? *Nag-aaway ba kayo ng asawa mo?*

- Always/ *Lagi*
- Often/ *Madalas*
- Sometimes/ *Kung minsan*
- Seldom/ *Hindi gaano*
- Never/ *Hindi kailanman*

13. **Exposure of Children to Quarrel.** How do let your children know that you are fighting? *Nalalaman ba ng inyong mga anak na nag-aaway kayong mag-asawa?*

- They see us fight/ *Nakikita kaming nag-aaway*
- They hear us fight/ *Naririnig kaming nag-aaway*
- Others, specify/ *Iba pa, tukuyin.* _____

14. **Causes of Quarrel.** What are the usual causes of thei fights? *Ano ang karaniwang sanhi ng inyong pag-aaway?-*

15. **Violence of Fights.** Did these quarrels ever lead to violence? *Umaabot bang nagiging bayolente ang awayan ninyo?*

- Always/ *Lagi*
- Often/ *Madalas*
- Sometimes/ *Kung minsan*
- Seldom/ *Hindi gaano*
- Never/ *Hindi kailanman*

16. **Effect of quarrel.** How does your quarrel affect your children? *Ano ang epekto sa iyong mga anak ng pag-aaway ninyong mag-asawa?*

17. **Respondent's Vices.** Do you have any vice? *May bisyo ka ba?*

- Gambling/ *Pagsusugal*
 - Drinking/ *Paglalasing*
 - Infidelity/ *Pambababae*
 - Others, specify/ *Iba pa, tukuyin*
- _____
- _____

18. How does this affect your family? *Paano nito naaapektuhan ang pamilya nyo?*

19. **Spouse's Vices.** Does your husband/wife have any vice? *May bisyo ba ang asawa mo?*

- Gambling/ *Pagsusugal*
 - Drinking/ *Paglalasing*
 - Infidelity/ *Pambababae*
 - Others, specify/ *Iba pa, tukuyin*
- _____
- _____

20. How does this affect your family? *Paano nito naapektuhan ang pamilya nyo?*

21. **Instilling Discipline.** How do you and/or your spouse discipline your children when they commit a mistake? *Paano mo o ng iyong asawa dinidisciplina ang iyong mga anak kapag nagkakasala sila?*

| Act | Respondent | | Spouse | |
|---|------------|----|--------|----|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Spanking/ <i>Pinapalo</i> | | | | |
| Talk/ <i>Pinagsasabihan</i> | | | | |
| Talk and Spanking/ <i>Pinagsasabihan at Pinapalo</i> | | | | |
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |
| 3. | | | | |

22. **Education-related Problems.** What problems related to your children's schooling have you experienced? *Anu-anong problemang kakabit ng pag-aaral ng inyong mga anak ang inyong kinaharap? (e.g. paghinto ng anak sa pag-aaral)*

| School-related Problems/ <i>Problemanag kabit sa Pag-aaral</i> | <i>Resolution/Paano hinarap at sinolusyunan</i> |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |

23. **School-related Expenditures.** What are the costs involved in the child's schooling? *Magkano ang ginagastos para sa pag-aaral ng bata?*

- Uniform/*Uniporme* _____
- Tuition Fee/*Matrikula* _____
- Travel Costs/*Pamasahe* _____
- Opportunity cost of work/
Nawawalang kita dahil sa pagpasok sa paaralan _____
- **TOTAL (cost/gastos)** _____

24. **Community Involvement.** Is your family involved in any community activities? *Kasali ba ang inyong pamilya sa mga gawain o trabahong pang-komunidad?*

- Yes/*Oo*
 No/*Hindi*
 Others/*Iba pang sagot* _____

24a. If yes, what are these activities? *Kung oo, anu-ano itong mga gawaing ito?*

| Community Activities/ <i>Gawaing pang-komunidad</i> | <i>Involvement/Papel na ginampanan</i> |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

24b. If no, why? *Kung hindi, bakit?*

Awareness of Child's Occupation

25. **Awareness.** Are you aware that your child is working i? *Alam ba ninyong nagtatrabaho ang inyong anak?*

- Yes/Oo
- No/*Hindi*
- Others/*Iba pang sagot* _____

25a. If yes, what is his/her work/economic activity?

25b. What are some of the risks associated with his/her work?

| Economic Activities/ <i>Mga Gawain o Trabaho</i> | Risks/ <i>Mga Panganib sa Trabaho</i> |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

25c. What are the reasons why he/she had to work?

25d. **Decision-making.** Who decided that your child was going to enagage in this type of work? *Sino ang nagpasya na pumasok sa ganitong uri ng trabaho ang bata?*

- Child/*Bata mismo*
- Family/*pamilya*
- Peer/ *mga kaibigan*
- Others, specify/*Iba pa, tukuyin:* _____

25e. What are the bases for the decision (peer or family pressure, community, middleman, money needed, lack of alternatives)? *Ano ang mga dahilan na nagdulot ng ganitong desisyon (pangungumbinse ng pamilya, kaibigan, kakulangan sa pera o pagkakakitaan)?*

25f. **Length of work tenure.** Since when had the child been working in this line of work? *Gaano na katagal sa ganitong uri ng trabaho ang inyong anak?* _____

25g. **Recruitment Process.** How did the child enter this job? Please describe to us the recruitment process. *Paano nagsimulang magtrabaho ang inyong anak? Pakilarawan kung paano naganap ang pagpasok niya sa ganitong uri ng trabaho.*

25h. **Hours of Work.** How many hours does the child work? *Ilang oras nagtatrabaho ang bata?*

_____ per day/*kada araw*
_____ per week/*kada linggo*
_____ per month/*kada buwan*

25i. **Work Schedule.** What is the child's time schedule? *Kailan nagtatrabaho ang bata?*

- Morning/*Umaga*
- Evening/*Gabi*
- Morning and Evening/*Umaga at Gabi*

25j. **Work-related Accidents/ Illnesses.** Has the child been involved in any work-related accidents or illnesses? *Nadisgrasya o nagkasakit na ba ang bata kaugnay sa kanyang trabaho?*

- Yes/*Oo*
- No/*Hindi*
- Others/*Iba pang sagot* _____

25j.1. If yes, what are these? *Kung oo, anu-ano ang mga ito?*

26. **Economic Contribution.** How much does the child contribute to the family income? *Magkano ang naidadagdag ng bata sa kinikita ng inyong pamilya?* _____

27. **Perception of Child's Work.** What are your perceptions about the child's work for his/her future? *Ano ang naiisip ninyo tungkol sa trabaho ng bata para sa kanyang kinabukasan?*

- Good/*Mainam*
- Bad/*Hindi mainam*
- Acceptable/*Katanggap-tanggap naman*

27a. Why do you say so? *Bakit mo nasabi?*

28. Has the child experienced work-related problems? If so, what are these? *May mga problema ba ang bata na may kaugnayan sa trabaho? Kung mayroon, anu-ano ang mga ito?*

28a. What remedies do you suggest to overcome these problems? *Kung mayroon, ano ang mga solusyon na maimumungkahi ninyo?*


| Work-related Problem/ <i>Problema sa Trabaho</i> | Suggested remedies/ <i>Solusyong mungkahi</i> |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

29. Do you see other possible alternatives of employment/occupation for the child? *May nakikita ba kayong ibang trabaho o gawain na maaaring pagkaabalahan ng bata?*

Time finished: _____

Notes:

Annex H. Sample of Community Social Risk Maps



Annex I. Sample of Community Profile

Families and Children for Empowerment and Development
1120- H Mendiola Extension, Paco, Manila

PROTOCOL FORMS
 Barangay 821

A. COMMUNITY PROFILE
Checklist Data to be collected

Note: Data for community profile can be acquired through use of secondary data sources (e.g. publications, updated statistics annual reports etc.), direct observation of the community, interview of key informants and walk through, among other means.

Sa Community Settlement History How can residents of the community be grouped according to the following:
 papaano maaring iggrupo ang mga residente ng komunidad sa

RESIDENTIAL PATTERNS

| Categories? Kategoriya | No. of Households 250 | Location of households/ Kinalalagyan ng mga pamilya (Clustered/ grupo-grupo; Random/ Hiwa-hiwalay.) |
|---|---|--|
| Ethnicity/ Wikang ginagamit sa bahay | Tagalog, Visaya, Ilocano, Pangalatok at Bicolano. | Clustered |
| Province of origin/ Probinsyang pinagmulan | Vizayas, Ilocos, Ilocano, Bicol and Pangasinan | |
| Mode of ownership/ Pagmamay-ari (owner/ may-ari; renting/ nangungupahan; bedspace/ nanunuluyan, others/ atb | 20 % Renters 60 % Owners Awarded 20 % Squatters | |

PUBLIC USE OF SPACE

What changes in the community has bearing on :
 Anu-anong mga pagbabago sa komunidad ang nakakaapekto sa :

- Recreation of children/ Paglilibang ng mga bata (e.g. pagtatayo ng mga "game stations", bilyaran etc.)
- Education of children / Pag-aaral ng mga bata (e.g. pagkakaroon ng mga day care centers, pagpapatayo ng mga paaralan, etc.)
- Work of children/ Pagtrabaho ng mga bata (e.g. pagtatayo ng mga palengke at iba pang lugar ng kalakalan)

| Categories/ Kategoriya | Changes that occurred/ Mga pagbabago |
|------------------------|--|
| Recreation | Video games (Karera billiards station, Play station) |
| Education | One (1) public high school (Manuel A. Roxas High School) Three (4) public elementary school (Celedonio Elementary School, Silahis Elementary School, |

Annex J. Sample of Monitoring and Assessment Form

| INTERVENTIONS FOR WORKING CHILDREN IN DRUGS | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|-----|--------|---------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| MONITORING FORM | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AREA: TATALON MONTH: <u>November 2003</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NO. | NAME | ADDRESS | AGE | SEX | SCHOOL STATUS | WORK STATUS | DOMESTIC STATUS | | DRUG STATUS | | | INTERVENTIONS | |
| | | | | | | | LIVING WITH WHOM | PARENTS' RELATIONSHIP | WORK WITH DRUGS | DRUG USE | KNOW SOMEONE WHO USES DRUGS | TYPE | RESULTS |
| 1 | PEROMUCENO MARK | TATALON 5 | 17 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | EXCELLENT | | NO | YES | Table Tennis | Playing with his friends |
| 2 | CEBEDO, GILBERT | TATALON 7 | 16 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Youth Cooperative | Played w/ his friends |
| 3 | DELA CRUZ, ROBIN | TATALON 7 | 10 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Play Ping Pong | Playing w/ friends |
| 4 | LESTERIO, SHELBY | TATALON 7 | 16 | FEMALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Basketball Practice | Reading Books |
| 5 | TRESVALLES, RANDY | TATALON 7 | 15 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NA | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Youth Cooperative | Youth Cooperative |
| 6 | REGALA, JAY-AR | TATALON 7 | 15 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | participate sports | participate in sports |
| 7 | ALLI, LEA BETH | TATALON 7 | 9 | FEMALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Dance | participate in sports |
| 8 | ARROBIS, MARK ANTHONY | TATALON 7 | 14 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NA | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Youth Cooperative | Youth Cooperative |
| 9 | SARMIENTO, LOREFIL | TATALON 1 | 14 | FEMALE | OUT OF SCHOOL | WORKING | BOTH | BAD | POSTING | NO | YES | Books | Reading Books |
| 10 | GRAYDON, ROMINICK | TATALON 2 | 15 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | | BOTH | EXCELLENT | | NO | YES | table tennis/badminton | participate activities |
| 11 | SALANS, LEONORA | TATALON 6 | 14 | FEMALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Counseling | close relationship w/ parents |
| 12 | BARRITA, DANIESA | TATALON 2 | 16 | FEMALE | IN SCHOOL | | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | participate in sports | participate in sports |
| 13 | SIZOR, LAVERN | TATALON 7 | 16 | MALE | OUT OF SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | EXCELLENT | | NO | YES | cultural activities | participate in sports |
| 14 | PACHECO, JOSEPHINE | TATALON 7 | 15 | FEMALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | books | reading books |
| 15 | MAGBUTAY, ANIEL | TATALON 2 | 17 | MALE | OUT OF SCHOOL | WORKING | MOTHER | GOOD | | NO | YES | group activities | help of friends |
| 16 | PLARAN, FRANCIS | TATALON 7 | 15 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Books | Reading Books |
| 17 | FALCUTAN, LEO | TATALON 7 | 14 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Basket Ball | Played w/ his friends |
| 18 | DE JESUS, JAME | TATALON | 14 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | MOTHER | GOOD | | NO | YES | Basket Ball | Played w/ his friends |
| 19 | DINO, BERNIE | TATALON | 17 | MALE | OUT OF SCHOOL | WORKING | OTHER | GOOD | | NO | YES | Youth Cooperative | Youth Cooperative |
| 20 | DERVYADO, JOSEPH | TATALON 2 | 17 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | WORKING | BOTH | EXCELLENT | | NO | YES | Badminton | Played w/ his friends |
| 21 | DISMASO, CAROLYN | TATALON 7 | 12 | FEMALE | IN SCHOOL | | BOTH | EXCELLENT | | NO | YES | Volley Ball | Played w/ his friends |
| 22 | SULACAN, JULIUS | TATALON 2 | 13 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | | BOTH | EXCELLENT | | NO | YES | Volley Ball | Played w/ his friends |
| 23 | AMORAL, JUN | TATALON 7 | 15 | MALE | OUT OF SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | NOT GOOD | | YES | YES | Books | Reading Books |
| 24 | MONTILLA, HOW | TATALON 7 | 14 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | | OTHER | BAD | | NO | YES | books | Reading Books |
| 25 | DIVDOR, FERLYN | STO. DOMINGO | 14 | FEMALE | OUT OF SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | OTHER | NOT GOOD | | NO | YES | Basket Ball | Played this sport |
| 26 | UY, JEROME | TATALON 6 | 8 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Books | Reading Books |
| 27 | SAYSON, JOSEPH | TATALON 7 | 17 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | | BOTH | EXCELLENT | RUNNER | NO | YES | Basket Ball | Played w/ his friends |
| 28 | RAMORCA, ERNE | STO. DOMINGO | 17 | MALE | | WORKING | BOTH | GOOD | | NO | YES | Basket Ball | Played w/ his friends |
| 29 | DELA CRUZ, ALBERT | STO. DOMINGO | 7 | MALE | IN SCHOOL | NOT WORKING | FATHER | NOT GOOD | | NO | YES | Books | Reading Books |

Table 5. Selected Findings: Youth in Drugs, 2000

| Information | Tatalon | Paco |
|---|---|--|
| Family Size | Average Household Size: 7 members | Average Household Size: 8 members |
| Age | 82% are 15 to 17 years old 9% are 13 to 14 years old 9% are below 13 years old Modal Age: 16 years old | 53% are 15 to 17 years old 25% are below 13 years old 22% are 13 to 14 years old Modal Age: 17 years old |
| Gender/Sex | 82% are male 18% are female | 83% are male 17% are female |
| Education | 44% are studying 56% are not studying anymore Currently Studying: 12% are in elementary 23% are at the secondary level 3% have graduated high school Currently Not Studying: 29% stopped in high school 15% stopped in grade school 9% have graduated high school Mean - 7 years of education | 39% are studying 61% are not studying anymore Currently Studying: 31% are in elementary 8% are at the secondary level Currently Not Studying: 33% stopped in grade school 20% stopped in high school 8% graduated high school Mean - 5 years of education |
| Type of drug used | 30% shabu and rugby 20% shabu (only) 20% shabu, rugby & marijuana 9% rugby 9% shabu and marijuana 6% marijuana and rugby 3% rugby and solvent 3% shabu, marijuana, rugby and solvent | 41% shabu 14% rugby 14% rugby and solvent 8% shabu and rugby 6% solvent 3% shabu, marijuana & rugby 14% did not know any users |
| Type of drug sold | 20% shabu 15% shabu and marijuana 3% shabu and rugby 3% shabu, marijuana & rugby 59% did not know any sellers | 22% shabu 78% did not know any sellers |
| Effects of drugs (does not total 100%) | 29% say increased energy 29% say paranoia/faulty sensory perception 24% say it compromises the child's future 15% say insomnia 15% say mental deterioration 12% say physical deterioration 12% say involvement in criminal activity 12% say violent behavior 6% say lethargy 6% say increased appetite 6% say academic delinquency 3% say decreased appetite 38% other undesirable effects of drugs | 38% say physical deterioration 36% say involvement in criminal activity 33% say paranoia/faulty sensory perception 33% say mental deterioration 22% say violent behavior 17% mention other undesirable effects of drugs 14% say insomnia 11% say increased stamina/energy 8% say it compromises future 6% say decreased appetite 6% say sex trips 3% say academic delinquency |
| Primary drug used by respondent | 47% use shabu 18% use rugby 9% use shabu and rugby 3% use marijuana and rugby 3% use shabu, marijuana and solvent 20% did not reply | 42% use shabu 25% use rugby 17% used rugby and solvent 3% used solvent 13% did not reply |
| Amount spent on drugs (per month) | Mean - P1243 per month Median - P400 per month | Mean - P958 per month Median - P1200 per month |

Table 5. Selected Findings: Youth in Drugs, 2000 (cont.)

| Information | Tatalon | Paco |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Presence of abuse in the family | 35% drug abuse 65% alcohol abuse 24% physical abuse No sexual abuse 38% gambling 15% other vices | 50% drug abuse 64% alcohol abuse 28% physical abuse 6% sexual abuse 58% gambling |

Table 6. Selected Findings on Working Children/Youth in Drugs, 2003

| Information | Paco | Pasay | Tatalon |
|------------------------|--|--|---|
| Family Situation | <p>Average Household Size: 7 members</p> <p>63.4% living with both parents 18.3% living with mother only 10% living with father only 8.3% living with others</p> <p>88.3% both parents alive 1.7% mother dead 6.7% father dead</p> | <p>Average Household Size: 6 members</p> <p>40% living with both parents 28% living with mother only 7% living with father only 25% living with others</p> <p>68% both parents alive 3% mother dead 22% father dead 2% both parents dead</p> | <p>Average Household Size: 6 members</p> <p>76.7% living with both parents 13.3% living with mother only 10% living with others</p> <p>90% both parents alive 10% father dead</p> |
| Age | <p>Mean Age: 13.98 years old Modal Age: 16 years old</p> | <p>Mean Age: 13.24 years old Modal Age: 16 years old</p> | <p>Mean Age: 14.97 years old Modal Age: 17 years old</p> |
| Gender/ Sex | <p>62% male 38% female</p> | <p>70% male 30% female</p> | <p>63.3% male 36.7% female</p> |
| Education | <p>45% in school 50% not in school 5% no answer</p> <p>Mean - 6.27 years in school</p> | <p>50% in school 50% not in school</p> <p>Mean - 4.51 years in school</p> | <p>56.7% in school 43.3% not in school</p> <p>Mean - 8.14 years in school</p> |
| Employment | <p>30% working 35% not working 35% no answer</p> | <p>80% working 20% not working</p> | <p>19% working 81% not working</p> |
| Work with Drugs | <p>12.5% courier 16.7% look-out/ watcher 16.7% posting 20.8% runner 33.3% user N = 24</p> | <p>41.2% look-out/ watcher 5.9% posting 41.2% runner N = 17</p> | <p>12.5% posting 75% runner 12.5% user N = 8</p> |
| Exposure to Drug Users | <p>Know of drug user/s: 98.30% yes 1.70% no N = 60</p> <p>Drug user identified as: 68.3% family member 21.7% peer 10% other/s N = 60</p> | <p>Know of drug user/s: 89.47% yes 10.53% no N = 76</p> <p>Drug user identified as: 66.2% family member 30.8% peer 3% other/s N = 65</p> | <p>Know of drug user/s: 95.7% yes 4.3% no N = 70</p> <p>Drug user identified as: 51.43% family member 34.29% peer 14.30% other/s N = 70</p> |

Table 6. Selected Findings on Working Children/Youth in Drugs, 2003 (cont.)

| Information | Paco | Pasay | Tatalon |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| Type of Drug Used | 76.7% shabu 1.7% marijuana 1.7% shabu and marijuana 5% shabu and rugby 1.7% shabu, marijuana & rugby N = 60 | 61.7% shabu 3.3% marijuana 3.3% rugby 1.7% shabu and cough syrup 1.7% shabu and ecstasy 25% shabu and marijuana 3.3% shabu and rugby 1.7% shabu, marijuana & cough syrup N = 65 | 40% shabu 1.4% marijuana 2.9% rugby 24.3% shabu and marijuana 4.3% shabu and rugby 1.4% shabu, marijuana & cough syrup 18.6% shabu, marijuana & rugby 2.9% marijuana and rugby N = 70 |
| Age at First Drug Use | Mean: 13.76 years old Mode: 14 years old | Mean: 12.2 years old Mode: 14 years old | Mean: 15.08 years old Mode: 16 years old |
| Reasons for Drug Use | 31.7% curiosity 18.2% escape problems 45.5% peer pressure N = 22 | 13% curiosity 30.4% escape problems 43.5% peer pressure 13% other reasons N = 23 | 23.08% curiosity 7.69% escape problems 69.23% peer pressure N = 13 |
| Involvement in Drug Trade | 45% friends 26.7% parents 13.3% siblings 14% respondent | 29% friends 26% parents 6% siblings 15% respondent | 18% friends 11.4% parents 5.7% siblings 1.4% respondent |

Table 7. Selected Findings on Working Children/Youth in Drugs, 2004

| Information | Paco | Pasay | Tatalon |
|------------------------|---|--|--|
| Family Situation | Average Household Size: 7 members 70.4% living with both parents 25.9% living with mother only 0.0% living with father only 3.7% living with others 85.2% both parents alive 14.8% father dead | Average Household Size: 6 members 43.3% living with both parents 26.7% living with mother only 3.3% living with father only 26.7% living with others 70.0% both parents alive 16.7% father dead 13.3% both parents dead | Average Household Size: 6 members 76.7% living with both parents 13.3% living with mother only 0.0% living with father only 10.0% living with others 90.0% both parents alive 10.0% father dead |
| Age | Mean Age: 15.78 years old Modal Age: 17 years old | Mean Age: 15 years old Modal Age: 17 years old | Mean Age: 15 years old Modal Age: 17 years old |
| Gender/ Sex | 81.5% male 18.5% female N=27 | 80.0% male 20.0% female | 63.3% male 36.7% female |
| Education | 25.9% in school 74.1% not in school Mean – 7.16 years in school | 26.7% in school 73.3% not in school Mean – 5.8 years in school | 56.7% in school 43.3% not in school Mean – 8.38 years in school |
| Employment | 9.5% working 90.5% not working | 50% working 50% not working | 27.6% working 72.4% not working |
| Work with Drugs | 66.7% posting 33.3% runner N = 6 | 20.0% posting 80.0% runner N = 10 | 66.7% runner 33.3% look-out N = 3 |
| Exposure to Drug Users | Know of drug user/s: 100% yes N = 27 Drug user identified as: 26.5% family member 32.7% peer 40.8% other/s N = 49 | Know of drug user/s: 100% yes N = 30 Drug user identified as: 39.3% family member 53.6% peer 4.1% other/s N = 56 | Know of drug user/s: 93.3% yes 6.7% no N = 30 Drug user identified as: 32.6% family member 27.9% peer 39.5% other/s N = 43 |
| Type of Drug Used | 46.2% Shabu only 1.9% Marijuana only 1.9% Rugby only 19.3% Shabu, Marijuana 17.3% Shabu, Marijuana, Rugby 11.5% Shabu, Rugby 1.93% Shabu, Marijuana, Xtasy N=52 | 16.4% Shabu only 3.6% Marijuana only 14.5% Rugby only 49.2% Shabu, Marijuana 3.6% Shabu, Marijuana, Rugby 5.5% Shabu, Rugby 1.8% Shabu, Marijuana, Rugby, Cough syrup 1.8% Shabu, Marijuana, Xtasy 1.8% Shabu, Rugby, Cough Syrup 1.8% Marijuana, Rugby N=55 | 47.6% Shabu only 11.4% Marijuana only 2.3% Rugby only 15.9% Shabu, Marijuana 11.4% Shabu, Marijuana, Rugby 9.1% Shabu, Rugby 2.3% Shabu, Marijuana, Rugby, Cough syrup N=44 |

Table 7. Selected Findings on Working Children/Youth in Drugs, 2004 (cont.)

| Information | Paco | Pasay | Tatalon |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| Age at First Drug Use | Mean: 14.08 years old Mode: 13 & 16 years old | Mean: 12.36 years old Mode: 12 years old | Mean: 14.66 years old Mode: 14 years old |
| Reasons for Drug Use | 30.0% family problems 70.0% peer influence N = 10 | 4.3% family problems 69.7% peer influence 21.7% problems & peer influence 4.3% other reasons N = 23 | 11.1% escape problems 77.8% peer influence 11.1% problems & peer influence N = 9 |
| Involvement in Drug Trade | 48.0% friends 12.0% parents 20.0% siblings 5.0% respondent N=25 | 47.2% friends 27.8% parents 5.6% siblings 19.4% respondent N=36 | 60.0% friends 6.7% parents 20.0% siblings 13.3% respondent N=15 |

Table 8. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004

| Information | Tatalon | Paco | Pasay |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Family Size | Mean – 6 members Median – 5.5 members | Mean – 7.4 members Median – 6.5 members | Mean – 5.6 members Median – 5.5 members |
| Length of Residence in Current Area | Mean – 17.4 years Median – 19 years | Mean – 33 years Median – 36.5 years | Mean – 21.8 years Median – 18 years |
| Ethnicity | 40% Tagalog only 30% Tagalog, Bicol 20% Tagalog, Visayan 10% Tagalog, Waray | 80% Tagalog only 10% Tagalog, Pangalatok 10% Tagalog, Visayan | 90% Tagalog only 10% Tagalog, Visayan |
| Place of Origin | 30% Metro Manila 30% Bicol 10% Aklan 30% No answer N=10 | 60% Current 10% Pangasinan 10% Misamis Oriental 10% Anakbayan 10% No answer N=10 | 20% Metro Manila 10% Bicol 70% No answer N=10 |
| Sufficiency of Income | 20% Yes 80% No | 10% Yes 90% No | 100% No |
| Occupation: Respondent | 10% Avon dealer 20% teacher 20% laundry woman 10% manicurist 20% vendor 20% not working N=10 | 10% parent aid 30% laundry woman 10% sales lady 10% vendor 10% street sweeper 20% not working N=10 | 10% laundry woman 10% pusher 60% vendor 20% not working N=10 |
| Family Member 1 | 25.0% auto services 12.5% garbageman 50.0% construction related services 12.5% not working N=8 | 30% construction related services 10% garbageman 10% vendor 10% delivery 10% printing 20% not working N=10 | 16.7% Barangay watchman 16.7% floor manager 16.7% helper 33.2% porter 16.7% vendor N=6 |
| Family Member 2 | | 20% food vendor 10% factory worker 10% helper 10% printing 50% not working N=10 | 33.3% helper 66.7% porter N=3 |
| Family Member 3 | | 10% painter 10% promo girl 80% not working N=10 | 50% helper 50% vendor N=2 |
| Family Member 4 | | 11.1% delivery boy 99.9% not working | garbage collector (N=1) |
| Family Member 5 | | 12.5% delivery boy 12.5% helper 75.0% not working N=8 | |

Table 8. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004 (cont.)

| Information | Tatalon | Paco | Pasay |
|---|---|---|---|
| Monthly Income Respondent Family Member 1 Family Member 2 Family Member 3 Family Member 4 Family Member 5 Total Monthly HH Income | Mean: P 2768.75 2068.60 4070.00 | Mean: P 2343.75 1750.00 4420.00 2640.00 2400.00 7798.00 | Mean: P 3037.50 2975.00 2500.00 1850.00 300.00 5365.00 |
| Sources of Debt Reasons for Debt | Friends – 20% Relatives – 10% Store/Market – 40% Usurer – 10% Organization/ Cooperative – 10% Others – 0% Basic needs – 40% Lack of income – 20% Payment of utilities – 10% For business/livelihood – 20% Pay other loans – 10% Education – 10% Others – 0% | Friends – 15.7% Relatives – 21.1% Store/Market – 21.1% Usurer – 21.1% Organization/ Cooperative – 5.3% Others – 15.7% Basic needs – 26.2% Lack of income – 5.3% Payment of utilities – 18.5% For business/livelihood – 5.3% Pay other loans – 15.8% Medical care – 15.8% Others – 15.8% | Usurer – 80% Loan – 50% Basic needs – 38.5% Lack of income – 15.4% For business/livelihood – 38.5% Others – 7.6% |
| Spouses Relations Quality of Relations Frequency of Quarrels Exposure to Quarrels Causes of Quarrels Violence During Fights Effects of Quarrels | 10% Excellent 30% Good 30% Not good, not bad 30% No answer 10% Often 60% Sometimes 30% No answer 30% See parents fight 20% Hear parents fight 30% See and hear parents fight 20% No answer Finances – 60% Vices – 40% Misunderstandings – 20% 20% Sometimes 60% Never 20% No answer Emotional pain – 30% Anger – 10% Other effects – 20% N=27 | 20% Excellent 40% Good 20% Not good, not bad 20% Bad 10% Always 20% Sometimes 50% Seldom 10% Never 10% No answer 40% See parents fight 30% See and hear parents fight 30% No answer Children – 20% Finances – 50% Vices – 50% Misunderstandings – 30% 10% Always 20% Sometimes 10% Seldom 50% Never 10% No answer Emotional pain – 20% Physical pain – 10% Anger – 10% Rebellion – 20% Separation of parents – 10% N=30 | 40% Good 20% Not good, not bad 20% Bad 20% No answer 40% Sometimes 20% Seldom 40% No answer 30% See parents fight 20% Hear parents fight 10% See and hear parents fight 40% No answer Children – 30% Finances – 60% Vices – 30% 10% Often 20% Sometimes 10% Seldom 20% Never 40% No answer Emotional pain – 50% Anger – 10% Rebellion – 10% Other effects – 20% N=27 |

Table 8. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004 (cont.)

| Information | Tatalon | Paco | Pasay |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Vices | | | |
| Respondent's Vices | Smoking – 10% Drugs – 10% | Gambling – 10% Drinking – 10% Others – 10% | Gambling – 30% Drinking – 30% Drugs – 30% |
| Effects of Vices | Quarrels with spouse – 10% Upsets children – 10% | No answer | Fear – 30% Increased expense – 60% Quarrels with spouse – 10% |
| Spouse's Vices | Gambling – 30% Drinking – 60% Infidelity – 10% Smoking - 20% Drugs – 30% | Gambling – 40% Drinking – 70% Infidelity – 20% | Gambling – 30% Drinking – 40% Drugs – 30% |
| Effects of Vices | Increased expense – 40% Quarrels with spouse – 20% Upsets children – 10% | Increased expense – 30% Quarrels with spouse – 30% Distrust – 20% Separation – 20% Infrequent drinking – 10% | Fear – 20% Increased expense – 50% Quarrels with spouse – 40% Unstable family – 10% Misunderstanding – 10% |
| Discipline | | | |
| Respondent's Disciplinary Methods | Spank – 30% Shout – 10% Curse – 10% | Spank – 40% Hit – 10% Slap – 10% Shout – 60% Curse – 30% | Spank – 50% Shout – 50% Curse – 30% |
| Spouse's Disciplinary Methods | Spank – 30% Shout – 10% Curse – 10% | Spank – 20% Hit – 30% Slap – 0% Shout – 40% Curse – 20% | Spank – 40% Shout – 30% Curse – 20% |
| Other Disciplinary Methods | 70% Discuss/ Scold | 20% Discuss/ Scold 10% Pinch | 40% Discuss/ Scold |
| Reason for Type of Discipline Used | Spank 66.7% Hard headed children 33.3% Excessive anger N=3 | Spank 50% Excessive anger/ irritation 25% Constant misbehavior 25% Make child take it seriously N=4 Hit 50% constant misbehavior 50% excessive temper N=2 Shout 50.0% hard headed children 33.3% excessive temper 16.7% only older children N=6 Curse 66.7% hard headed children 33.3% caught off guard N=3 | Spank 50% Make children afraid 50% teach child a lesson N=4 Shout 100% Make children afraid N=5 Curse 66.7% Shock children 33.3% Excessive temper N=3 |

Table 8. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004 (cont.)

| Information | Tatalon | Paco | Pasay |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| School Expenses per Year | Mean: P 320.00 | Mean: P1030.00 | Mean: P 670.00 |
| Uniform | 115.00 | 227.00 | 416.00 |
| Tuition | 140.00 | 575.00 | 150.00 |
| Miscellaneous | 0.00 | 320.00 | 500.00 |
| Books | 325.00 | 560.00 | 518.00 |
| Supplies | 7714.00 | 4020.00 | 5031.00 |
| Allowance | 2650.00 | 1200.00 | 0.00 |
| Transportation | 175.00 | 4407.00 | 317.00 |
| Projects | 250.00 | 228.00 | 0.00 |
| Contributions | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Others | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1625.00 |
| Opportunity Cost of Work | 9936.00 | 12332.00 | 6768.00 |
| Total School Expense | | | |
| School Related Risks | Troublemakers/ fighting – 22.2% Bad peer influence – 11.1% Child lacks interest – 33.4% Cannot afford expenses – 22.2% Problems with teacher – 11.1% | Troublemakers/ fighting – 7.1% Bad peer influence – 7.1% Child lacks interest – 21.4% Cannot afford expenses – 57.1% Problems with teacher – 7.1% | Cannot afford expenses – 41.7% Difficulty w/ academic req. – 41.7% Other problems – 16.6% |
| Solutions to School Related Risks | Talk to child – 44.5% Save/borrow money – 22.2% Talk to teacher – 22.2% Transfer school – 11.1% | Talk to child – 28.6% Save/borrow money – 35.7% Talk to teacher – 14.3% Stop education – 21.4% | Talk to child – 30% Save/borrow money – 60% Other solutions – 10% |
| Involvement in Community Activities | 60% Yes 20% No 20% No Answer N=10 | 70% Yes 10% No 20% No Answer N=10 | 20% Yes 70% No 10% No Answer N=10 |
| Types of Activities | SWMI-AIB – 37.5% Health work – 25.0% Clean-up drive – 25.0% Training – 12.5% | Parent advocates – 10.5% Women's group – 10.5% Livelihood – 15.8% Clean-up drive – 15.8% Training/ Meeting – 10.5% Barangay activities – 21.1% Other activities – 15.8% | Barangay activity – 10% Fiesta – 10% |
| Level of Involvement | Participant – 50.0% Officer – 25.0% Leader – 12.5% Member – 12.5% | Officer – 6.3% Leader – 31.3% Member – 62.5% | Participant – 20.0% |
| Reason for Non-involvement | 50% Caring for children 50% Too much work N=2 | Caring for children (N=1) | 66.7% No activities to join 33.3% No time to join N=6 |
| Awareness of Child's Occupation | 60.0% Yes 20.0% No 20.0% No Answer N=10 | 30.0% Yes 10.0% Child not working 60.0% No Answer N=10 | 70.0% Yes 10.0% No 20.0% No Answer N=10 |
| Child's Economic Activites | Collecting garbage – 10% Car washing – 10% | Factory work – 10% Helper – 10% Vendor – 10% Construction – 10% Porter – 10% Delivery boy – 10% | Helper – 42.8% Garbage collector – 28.6% Floor manager – 14.3% Porter – 14.3% N=7 |

Table 8. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004 (cont.)

| Information | Tatalon | Paco | Pasay |
|---|---|--|--|
| Work Risks | Body pains (N=1) | 40% Wounds 20% Heavy work 20% Falling objects 20% Vehicular accidents N=5 | 50.0% Vehicular accident 33.3% Fights 16.7% Accidents |
| Economic Contribution | No answer | Mean: P833.00 | Mean: P1200.00 |
| Reason Child has to Work | 50% Additional income 50% Help family N=2 | 33.3% Additional income 66.7% Help family N=3 | 57.1% Additional income 42.9% Help family N=7 |
| Recruitment Process | 50% Family 50% Friends | 50% Family 50% Child N=2 | 42.8% Employer 32.9% Child 14.3% Friend |
| Decision to Work | 50% Own decision 50% Family N=2 | 33.3% Own decision 66.7% Family N=3 | 100% Own decision N=7 |
| Hours of Work | Mean: 3.25 hours per day | Mean: 3.25 hours per day | Mean: 4.86 hours per day |
| Work Schedule | 100% Morning only | 33.3% Morning only 33.3% Evening only 33.3% Whole day | 28.6% Morning only 42.9% Evening only 14.3% Whole evening 14.3% Morning and Evening |
| Involvement of Work-Related Accidents/ Illnesses | 100% No | 33.3% Yes 66.7% No | 14.3% Yes 85.7% No |
| Perception of Child's Work | 100% Good N=2 | 100% Good N=3 | 85.7% Bad 14.3% Acceptable N=7 |
| Type of Drug Work | | Wrapper/ Repacker (N=1) | 20% Wrapper/ Repacker 80% Pusher N=5 |
| Changes in Drug Work | | Yes (N=1) | 50% Yes 50% No N=4 |
| Other Drug Work Children are Involved In | Running (N=1) | Look-out – 14.5 Repacking – 14.5 Selling – 28.5% Posting – 14.5 Running – 14.5 Pushing – 14.5 | Selling – 40% Look-out – 10% |
| Exposure to Drug Users Knowledge of Drug Users | 80% Yes 20% No answer N=10 | 80% Yes 20% No answer N=10 | 90% Yes 10% No answer N=10 |

Table 8. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004 (cont.)

| Information | Tatalon | Paco | Pasay |
|---|---|---|--|
| Identity of Drug Users and Types of Drugs Used by Known Users | Parent – 20% 50% Shabu only 50% Drugs N=2 Sibling – 10% 100% Shabu, Marijuana N=1 Friend – 0% Child – 10% 100% Shabu N=1 Neighbor – 42.8% Relative – 28.6% Spouse – 14.3% Acquaintance – 14.3% 85.7% Shabu only 14.3% Shabu, Marijuana N=8 | Parent – 20% 100% Shabu only N=2 Sibling – 20% 50% Shabu 50% Shabu, Marijuana N=2 Friend – 40% 66.7% Shabu 33.3% Shabu, Marijuana N=4 Child – 40% 75% Shabu 25% Shabu, Marijuana, Rugby N=4 Neighbor – 60% Spouse – 20% Acquaintance – 20% 80% Shabu 20% Shabu, Marijuana N=5 | Parent – 20% 100% Shabu only N=2 Sibling – 40% 75% Shabu 25% Shabu, Marijuana N=4 Friend – 0% Child – 70% 29.6% Rugby 14.3% Rugby, Marijuana 42.8% Shabu, Marijuana 14.3% Shabu, Marijuana, Rugby N=7 Neighbor – 66.7% Spouse – 33.3% 33.3% Shabu only 33.3% Shabu, Marijuana 33.3% Shabu, Marijuana, Rugby N=3 |
| Changes in Use of Known Users | 25% Yes 75% No N=8 | 44.4% Yes 55.6% No N=9 | 77.8% Yes 22.2% No N=7 |
| Parent's Drug Profile | 10.0% Yes 30.0% No 60.0% No Answer N=10 | 10.0% Yes 90.0% No N=10 | 20.0% Yes 80.0% No N=10 |
| Ever Tried Drugs | 10.0% Yes 30.0% No 60.0% No Answer N=10 | 10.0% Yes 90.0% No N=10 | 20.0% Yes 80.0% No N=10 |
| Type of Drug Used and Frequency of Use | Shabu When available (money/drugs) | Shabu Seldom | Shabu Often (N=1) Marijuana (N=1) |
| First Type Tried | Shabu | Shabu | Shabu |
| Age of First Use | Mean – 21.00 years | Mean – 30.00 years | Mean – 31.00 years |
| Reason for Use | Spouse influence | Peer influence | Problems |
| Current Status of Drug Use | Still using | No longer using | Still using |
| Changes in Use | No N=1 | No N=1 | Yes N=2 |
| Involvement of Close Friends in Drug Trade | 10.0% Yes 20.0% No 70.0% No answer N=10 | 80.0% Yes 20.0% No N=10 | 60.0% Yes 40.0% No answer N=10 |

Table 7. Comparative Table of Parents' Responses, 2004 (cont.)

| Information | Tatalon | Paco | Pasay |
|--|--|--|--|
| Type of Involvement | No answer | 14.3% Running 57.1% Selling 14.3% Stealing 14.3% Wrapping | 25% Running 50% Selling 25% Wrapping |
| Changes in Involvement | No answer | 100% Yes N=4 | 50% Yes 50% No N=6 |
| Involvement of Child/ren | 10.0% Yes 20.0% No 70.0% No answer N=10 | 30.0% Yes 60.0% No 10.0% No answer N=10 | 10.0% Yes 20.0% No 70.0% No answer N=10 |
| Type of Involvement | User (N=1) | 50% Posting 50% Running N=2 | Courier (N=1) |
| Involvement of Siblings | 20.0% No 80.0% No answer N=10 | 10% Yes 80.0% No 10.0% No answer N=10 | 10% Yes 90% No answer N=10 |
| Type of Involvement | None | None | Pushing (N=1) |
| Changes in Family Involvement | No answer | No answer | No (N=1) |
| Respondent's Involvement | No answer | No answer | Yes |
| Reason for Involvement | No answer | No answer | Augment income |
| Means of Involvement | No answer | No answer | Personal decision |
| Changes in Involvement | No answer | No answer | Yes N=1 |
| Anti-Drug Related Activities of Organization Assessment of Activities | | | |