ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

PERCEPTIONS OF WEALTH-BASED BIAS AND FAIRNESS IN THE PHILIPPINE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: THE ROLE OF SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

Dr. Rhem Rick N Corpuz, Rosemarie A. Dizon, Rosmar M. Evangelista, Gabriella Villanueva
Angeles University Foundation College of Criminal Justice Education

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra25520
DOI No: 10.36713/epra25520

ABSTRACT

This research investigated perceptions of wealth-based bias and fairness within the Philippine criminal justice system and examined how these perceptions were shaped by socio-demographic factors. The study analyzed public attitudes toward the equitable treatment of individuals, regardless of socio-economic status, within the legal framework. Employing quantitative methods, the research analyzed survey data to assess the extent to which wealth influenced perceptions of fairness, access to justice, and overall confidence in the system. Key socio-demographic variables such as education, income level, geographical location, and age were examined to determine their impact on shaping these perceptions. Statistical analyses, including regression models, were utilized to identify significant correlations between socio-demographic factors and perceptions of bias. The findings revealed significant disparities in perceptions of fairness based on socio-economic status, highlighting the need for targeted interventions to address systemic biases and promote equitable justice. The study provided valuable insights for policymakers, legal practitioners, and civil society organizations seeking to enhance transparency, accountability, and inclusivity within the Philippine criminal justice system. Ultimately, this research contributed to the ongoing discourse on social justice and equality by offering recommendations for reforms aimed at fostering a more equitable and impartial legal environment for all citizens.

KEYWORDS: *Wealth-Based Bias, Fairness Perceptions, Criminal Justice System, Socio-Demographic Factors, Philippines.*

INTRODUCTION

While fairness in the administration of criminal justice has been recognized as a basic tenet of democratic life, its practice has often remained problematic due to systemic disparities that made this ideal difficult or impossible to attain (Robinson, 2012). Wealth has frequently served as a significant determinant of access to justice and decisions related to equity, thereby creating biases that have called the broader legitimacy of the justice system into question (Daly & Davis, 2021). This research explored perceptions of wealth-based bias and fairness in the Philippine criminal justice system, recognizing that these perceptions were shaped not only by economic conditions but also by other socio-demographic factors.

Opposition to economic inequality, as discussed in existing literature, has been identified as a deeply ingrained normative belief about fairness and justice rather than merely a reaction to unequal outcomes or social instability. Such beliefs have been shown to strongly motivate attitudes and behaviors related to wealth and justice. Moreover, material resources were found to protect individuals from fear and criticism of societal changes, suggesting that economic stability functioned as an important moderator of attitudes toward social systems and institutions.

Cross-national research has increasingly demonstrated that judgments of fairness were culturally and institutionally contingent (Lu, 2025). For example, studies indicated that Americans exhibited a stronger aversion to inequality arising from intergenerational wealth transfers than to self-earned wealth, reflecting merit-based conceptions of fairness. These findings underscore the importance of considering cultural contexts and policy regimes when examining perceptions of justice and redistribution.

Within the Philippine criminal justice system, where pronounced socio-economic disparities have persisted, understanding how wealth-framed perceptions of bias and fairness were imperative. Poverty was found to exacerbate the negative consequences of legal problems, while wealth acted as a buffer that enabled risk-mitigation strategies, often resulting in more favorable outcomes (Gramatikov et al., 2021). Such dynamics likely undermined confidence in the justice system among marginalized groups and fostered experiences of systemic injustice. This study investigated perceptions of bias and fairness in the Philippine criminal justice system by drawing on insights from various socio-demographic factors. By examining these perceptions, the research aimed to contribute to a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities involved in advancing a more equitable and just legal system in the Philippines. Ultimately, addressing wealth-based inequalities and ensuring nondiscriminatory access to justice were identified as essential to nurturing public trust in the justice system and upholding fundamental human rights principles.

Study Purpose/ Objectives

General Research Objective

To assess how socio-economic status, specifically poverty and wealth shapes criminal justice dynamics in the Philippines by examining (1) the influence of poverty on patterns of

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

criminalization and law enforcement interactions, and (2) the perceived prevalence of informal or extralegal mechanisms employed by wealthier individuals to affect justice system outcomes.

Specific Research Objectives

To quantify the extent to which poverty (measured by income level, employment status, and household resources) predicts patterns of criminalization and the frequency and nature of interactions with law enforcement.

To measure the perceived prevalence of informal or extralegal mechanisms (e.g., bribery, favoritism) used by wealthier individuals to influence justice outcomes, relative to their socio-economic status.

Methodology Research Method

Data will be collected through structured questionnaires distributed both online and in person. Participants, including individuals from low-income and high-income backgrounds, legal practitioners, Barangay Officials, and the Community, will be selected using non-probability sampling techniques based on accessibility and willingness to participate. This approach is time-efficient, cost-effective, and appropriate for capturing trends.

Research Instruments/ Study Design

The survey will be deployed online across the country, allowing respondents from different regions, both urban and rural areas, to participate. A quota sampling technique will be used to ensure that participants represent key groups such as region, type of residency, and income bracket. Unlike random stratification, this non-probability approach relies on accessible respondents while still aiming to capture diversity across important subgroups. This method enhances representativeness compared to simple convenience sampling and provides broader insights beyond equal splits from specific cities.

Study Participants & Sample Size

The sample consists of 390 respondents in total, in the Philippines. The Philippine Statistics Authority officially reported a national population of 117,002,874.. Based on this population size, a sample size of 390 respondents with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error is sufficiently powered for a nationwide online survey.

Population and Sampling

The researchers used the Raosoft Sample Size Calculator, which is widely used in academic research. By inputting population size, margin of error, and confidence level, it computes the needed sample size. The Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) announced today that, based on the 2025 Census of Population (2025 POPCEN), the total population of the Philippines as of 01 September 2025 is 117,002,874.

Data Analysis

Microsoft Excel was used to code, organize, and analyze the survey data collected in this study. Descriptive statistical tools such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were utilized to summarize respondents' socio-demographic profiles and to present their perceptions of wealth-based bias and fairness in the Philippine criminal justice system. Inferential statistical analyses, including Spearman's rho correlation and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), were employed to determine the relationships and significant differences between wealth and justice perceptions and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of the justice system across different education levels, household income groups, and occupations. The findings provided empirical evidence on how socio-demographic factors shape public perceptions of equity, bias, and effectiveness within the Philippine criminal justice system.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria Inclusion Criteria

Participants included in this study were individuals who are residents of the Republic of the Philippines and are at least eighteen (18) years of age. Respondents were required to belong to any income group, ranging from low- to high-income earners, to ensure representation across different socioeconomic backgrounds. In addition, participants had to fall under at least one of the following categories: legal practitioners, barangay officials, or community members. Lastly, only individuals who were willing and able to provide informed consent were included in the study to ensure ethical participation and voluntary involvement.

Exclusion Criteria

Individuals were excluded from participation in this study if they were not residents of the Republic of the Philippines or were below eighteen (18) years of age. Participants who were unwilling or unable to provide informed consent were also excluded. In addition, individuals who were under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of data collection were not included to ensure the reliability and validity of responses. Lastly, participants who were unable to understand or complete the survey due to cognitive limitations or language barriers were excluded from the study.

Ethical Considerations

This study adheres to established ethical standards to ensure that all participants are protected, respected, and treated fairly throughout the research process. Informed consent was obtained by providing participants with clear and comprehensive information about the study, after which they voluntarily agreed to participate. Participation was entirely optional, and participants retained the right to withdraw at any point without consequence. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained by safeguarding all identifying information; participants' names were excluded from reports and findings, and survey responses were anonymized to prevent traceability. Data protection measures were implemented to secure all collected information, which was stored on password-protected devices and encoded using identification codes instead of personal identifiers. Special care was taken when engaging vulnerable populations to minimize the risk of coercion or harm, and potentially distressing questions were avoided to prevent emotional discomfort. The study was designed to avoid harm by carefully formulating research questions and ensuring that appropriate support measures were available if needed. Prior to data collection, ethical clearance was obtained from a recognized review board to ensure compliance with institutional and ethical guidelines. Throughout the research

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

process, transparency and integrity were upheld by reporting findings honestly and without misrepresentation. The study aims to contribute meaningfully to the promotion of fairness in access to justice while minimizing bias and advancing efforts to address socioeconomic inequalities.

Significance or Importance

This study is important because it helps us understand how wealth and poverty affect how people are treated in the Philippine justice system. It shows that poor people may face more arrests, longer jail time, and less access to good lawyers, while rich and well-connected people may get lighter punishments or avoid jail.

The results of this study can help government leaders, police officers, and lawyers see the unfair treatment happening in the justice system. It can also guide them in making better rules and policies to make the system fairer for everyone.

For students and researchers, this study adds new information and helps fill the gap in research about justice and inequality in the Philippines. It also gives a voice to those who feel the justice system is unfair to them because of their background.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1
Education Attainment of the Respondents

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Elementary Graduate	5	1.3
High School Level	8	2.1
High School Graduate	26	6.7
Seinor High School Graduate	58	14.9
College Level (Undergraduate)	167	42.8
College Graduate (Bachelor's Degree)	116	29.7
With Postgraduate Units	8	2.1
Master's Degree Holder	2	0.5
Total	390	100

Table 1 presents the Educational Attainment of the respondents, it can be gleaned from the table that there are total of 390 respondents from which majority or 42.8% or 167 are college level (undergraduate, followed by those college graduate with 29.7% or 116 respondents, there are also 14.9% or 58 respondents who are senior high school graduates, high school graduates with 6.7% or 26 respondents, there also a Tie percentage on both High School Level and with Postgraduate Units with the percentage of 2.1 and eight respondents, following with Elementary graduate with 1.3% or five respondents, lastly, Masters Degree Holder two respondents, or 0.5%.

According to Tampubolon (2025), childhood poverty has a profound and lasting impact on healthy aging, significantly reducing cognitive function, muscle strength, mental health, and increasing frailty in later life. This educational distribution reflects varied levels of access to academic opportunities, which may influence social mobility and health outcomes over time.

Collectively, these findings emphasize that addressing childhood poverty and educational disparities is essential to advancing health equity and justice. Both Tampubolon (2025) and Doing Justice Collective et al. (2023) highlight the moral and policy imperative to implement early, systemic interventions that disrupt cycles of inequality and promote sustainable justice across generations.

Table 2
Monthly Household Income

Monthly Household Income	Frequency	Percent
Prefer not to say	120	30.8
Less than ₱10,000	57	14.6
₱10,001-₱20,000	69	17.7
₱20,001-₱30,000	44	11.3
₱30,001-₱40,000	42	10.8
₱40,001-₱50,000	31	7.9
₱50,001-₱75,000	17	4.4
₱75,001-₱100,000	6	1.5
More than ₱100,000	4	1
Total	390	100

Table 2 presents the Monthly Income of the respondents. It can be gleaned from the table that there are a total of 390 respondents, of which the majority, or 30.8% or 120 of the respondents answered prefer not to say, followed by 17.7% or 69 respondents, on the ₱10,001-₱20,000. There are also 14.6% or 57 who answered Less than ₱10,000, and from the ₱20,001-₱30,000

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

respondents show 11.3% or 44 respondents, following with the salary of ₱30,001-₱40,000 with 10.8% or 42 respondents, ₱40,001-₱50,000 with the respondents of 31 or 7.9%, also the ₱50,001-₱75,000 with the respondents of 17 or 4.4%, ₱75,001-₱100,000 with 1.5% or Six respondents, Lastly, the More than ₱100,000 with the four respondents and a percentage of One.

According to Robison (2025), Wealth disparities confer disproportionate political power. Robison emphasizes that these inequalities create systemic barriers to fair policymaking and justice, where economic power translates into political privilege, perpetuating unjust outcomes across generations. This distribution reflects varied economic realities, with a substantial portion hesitant to reveal income, possibly indicating stigma or privacy concerns related to economic status.

These findings highlight that economic inequality is not simply a matter of income disparity but a deeper justice issue that impacts political representation and social outcomes. Both Robison (2025) and Flora (2024) advocate systemic interventions that address wealth-related power imbalances to promote more equitable and effective justice systems.

Table 3. Primary Occupation of the Respondents

Primary Occupation of the Respondents	Frequency	Percent
Unemployed	21	5.4
Student	125	32.1
Homemaker	5	1.3
Daily Wage Earner / Laborer	28	7.2
Skilled Worker / Technician	7	1.8
Clerical / Office Staff	6	1.5
Public-Sector Employee	45	11.5
Private-Sector Employee	43	11
Self-employed / Entrepreneur	24	6.2
Professional	25	6.4
Retired / Pensioner	3	0.8
Overseas Filipino Worker (OFW)	7	1.8
Others	51	13.1
Total	390	100

Table 3 presents the Primary Occupation of the respondents. It can be gleaned from the table that there are a total of 390 respondents, of which the majority, or 32.1% or 125 of the respondents are students, followed by 13.1% or 51 respondents who prefer to answer others. There are also 11.5% or 45 respondents who answered Public-Sector Employee, and Private-Sector Employee, with 43 respondents or 11%. Following the Daily Wage Earner / Laborer, with 7.2% or 28 respondents, also Professional with the percentage of 6.4% or 25 respondents, followed by Self-employed / Entrepreneur with 24 respondents or 6.2%. and then the Unemployed with 5.4% or 21 respondents. There is also a Tie percentage on Skilled Worker/ Technician and Overseas Filipino Worker (OFW) with the percentage of 1.8% or seven respondents, also Clerical / Office Staff with 1.5% or six respondents, and 1.3% or Five respondents who answered Homemaker. Lastly, the respondents from the Retired / Pensioner with 0.8% or three respondents.

According to Scholtens, Holterman, Mangubhai, and Mills (2021), perceptions of fairness in the distribution of benefits within environmental governance are deeply influenced by local socio-demographic factors such as wealth and education. Wealthier and more educated individuals tend to hold differing views on what constitutes just distribution, emphasizing the pluralistic and context-dependent nature of fairness. Smaller percentages include unemployed individuals, skilled workers, overseas Filipino workers, clerical staff, homemakers, and retirees. This occupational diversity reflects varied socio-economic backgrounds, which likely influence respondents' perceptions of fairness and justice within their communities. These findings suggest that understanding justice and fairness requires attention to the socio-economic and cultural contexts shaping individuals' experiences and views. Both Scholtens et al. (2021) and Robinson (2012) highlight that legitimacy and fairness are not one-dimensional but deeply intertwined with local realities, social identities, and institutional trust, reinforcing the importance of culturally sensitive and participatory approaches to justice.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 4. Wealth and Justice Perception

	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Median	Std. Deviation	Variance
Rich suspects often bribe police officers.	3.58	Strongly Agree	4.00	0.67	0.45
Rich people can delay or stop investigations by using their political connections.	3.29	Strongly Agree	3.00	0.72	0.53
Police officers are more likely to arrest and prosecute poor suspects than rich ones.	3.13	Agree	3.00	0.78	0.61
Judges are kinder or more forgiving to rich people accused of crimes.	3.16	Agree	4.00	0.98	0.96
Court decisions are often influenced by secret deals that benefit the rich.	3.04	Agree	3.00	0.77	0.59
Prosecutors are less strict in filing cases against rich or famous people.	3.25	Strongly Agree	4.00	0.88	0.77
Wealthy individuals often use their money or influence to avoid criminal charges.	3.45	Strongly Agree	4.00	0.84	0.71
Having private lawyers gives rich people an unfair advantage in courts.	3.26	Strongly Agree	4.00	0.91	0.82
The use of backchannel “backer” or "palakasan" often happens in cases involving rich suspects.	3.28	Strongly Agree	3.00	0.77	0.59
In my community, people generally believe that justice favors the rich.	3.13	Agree	3.00	0.81	0.65
Average	3.26	Strongly Agree	3.50	0.81	0.67

Table 4 represents the Wealth and Justice Perception. It can be seen that the Final average from this table has a mean of 3.26, a median of 3.50, a standard deviation of 0.81, and a variance of 0.67, and it comes to an end that the verbal interpretation shows Strongly Agree. In this case, the people have strongly agreed to the wealth and justice perception that Justice can be bought. There’s a lot of influence when people have money than in achieving justice. On the other hand, the highest average acquired in the table raises the question of whether Rich is suspected of often bribing police officers. The average of the mean, median, standard deviation, and variance is 3.58, 4.00, 0.67, and 0.45, and finally the verbal interpretation for this is Strongly Agree, which, in this case, is the perception of most people who answered it Strongly Agree that the rich people often bribe police officers to avoid being imprisoned. While the lowest average acquired in the table raises the question about how Court decisions are often influenced by secret deals that benefit the rich. The averages in the mean, median, standard deviation, and variance are 3.04, 3.00, 0.77, and 0.59, and finally the verbal interpretation for this is Agree, even though it has the least average, people still believe that Court decisions are often influenced by secret deals that benefit the rich. Therefore, there are some who still believe that the court decision is still based on the justice system.

According to Daly and Davis (2021), financial power significantly shapes access to justice and the protection of human rights, with economic inequality acting as both an enabler and barrier within legal systems. Their research highlights how wealth facilitates better legal representation and participation in justice processes, while also emphasizing that the commodification of justice through fees, fines, and other financial barriers excludes marginalized groups. This creates systemic disparities, positioning justice as a commodity rather than a universal right. Daly and Davis argue that neoliberal policies exacerbate this divide and call for stronger safeguards to ensure justice is accessible to all, independent of financial means.

These findings underscore Daly and Davis’s (2021) assertion that perceptions of justice are closely linked to economic inequalities, which erode public trust in legal institutions. Addressing wealth-based disparities is thus essential to restoring confidence in justice systems and ensuring that rights are upheld equitably for all members of society.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 5. Justice and Fairness Effectiveness Scale

	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Median	Std. Deviation	Variance
The Philippine justice system treats everyone equally, whether rich or poor.	2.30	Disagree	2.00	1.02	1.03
Justice is given fairly in most criminal cases.	2.49	Disagree	2.00	1.16	1.35
Poor individuals are more likely to receive unjust outcomes in the courts.	2.97	Agree	3.00	0.85	0.73
Rich people are punished properly when they are found guilty.	2.30	Disagree	2.00	0.92	0.85
In my experience or observation, all cases are given equal attention no matter who the accused is.	2.63	Agree	3.00	0.88	0.78
I trust that criminal courts decide cases based on facts and evidence.	2.57	Agree	3.00	0.87	0.76
Police investigations are conducted professionally and without bias.	2.42	Disagree	2.00	0.84	0.71
Prosecutors act independently and without political or financial influence.	2.43	Disagree	2.00	0.85	0.72
I trust the honesty of the Philippine justice system.	2.37	Disagree	2.00	0.94	0.88
Law and rules are applied equally by the police and the courts.	2.33	Disagree	2.00	0.81	0.66
The criminal justice process is too slow to be considered effective.	3.14	Agree	3.00	0.80	0.64
Courts are effective in resolving cases in a timely and consistent manner.	2.41	Disagree	2.00	0.88	0.78
Criminal cases often take too long to be decided.	3.14	Agree	3.00	0.80	0.65
Law enforcement agencies respond efficiently to crime and ensure case follow-up.	2.49	Disagree	2.50	0.83	0.69
The justice system has the capacity to handle cases without undue delay or backlog.	2.25	Disagree	2.00	0.90	0.80
Average	2.55	Agree	2.37	0.89	0.80

Table 5 represents the Justice and Fairness Effectiveness scale. It can be seen that the Final average from this table has a mean average of 2.55, a median of 2.37, a standard deviation of 0.89, and a variance of 0.80, and it comes to an end that the verbal interpretation shows that Agree. In this case, the people have agreed that the Justice and Fairness Effectiveness perception is not effective, is not fair, and with due delayed in declaring justice.

On the other hand, the highest average acquired in this table is the question about Criminal cases often take too long to be decided. The average in the mean, median, standard deviation, and variance are 3.14, 3.00, 0.80, and 0.65, and finally the verbal interpretation for this is Agree, which in this case the perception of most people who answered it agrees that Criminal cases often take too long to be decided, where people are experiencing the slow process which may be considered to be un-effective sometimes.

While, the least average acquired in this table is the question about the justice system has the capacity to handle cases without undue delay or backlog. The average in the mean, median, standard deviation and variance are, 2.25, 2.00, 0.90 and 0.80, and finally the verbal interpretation for this is Disagree, meaning in this question the people are not agreeing that the justice system has no delay or backlog meaning that the perception of the respondent in the justice system in handling cases is with a delay and backlog.

According to Petkanopoulou et al. (2025), people's objections to economic inequality are primarily motivated by justice-based concerns, particularly distributive justice, rather than merely by fears of social instability. The lowest-rated item, whether the justice system has the capacity to handle cases without undue

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

delay received a mean score of 2.25, corresponding to a "Disagree" interpretation. This reveals a significant perception of backlog and inefficiency within the justice system.

These findings corroborate Petkanopoulou et al.'s (2025) argument that perceptions of justice effectiveness are closely tied to moral concerns about fairness and distributive justice. The public's experience of delays and inefficiencies not only affects their trust in judicial institutions but also strengthens calls for systemic reforms framed around principles of equity and timely justice. Relationship between wealth justice perception and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of the justice system.

A Spearman's rho correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between wealth perception and the justice and fairness effectiveness scale. The analysis revealed a statistically significant and extremely strong positive correlation between the two variables, $r_s=.989$,$p<.001$, $N=391$. This finding indicates that respondents who reported higher perceptions of wealth also tended to evaluate justice and fairness effectiveness more positively.

Table 6
A significant relationship between wealth, justice perception and the perceived fairness and effectiveness of the justice system

Correlations				
			Wealth and Justice Perception	**Justice and Fairness effectiveness scale**
Spearman's rho	Wealth and Justice Perception	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.989**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	391	391
	Justice and Fairness Effectiveness Scale	Correlation Coefficient	.989**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	391	391
Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Significant Difference in Wealth Justice Perception and Justice Fairness Effectiveness of Education groups the respondents. A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether respondents' education level significantly influenced their perceptions of wealth and justice, as well as their evaluations of justice and fairness effectiveness. The analysis revealed a statistically significant effect of education on wealth and justice perception, $F(7, 382) = 600.987$, $p < .001$, and on the justice and fairness effectiveness scale, $F(7, 382) = 535.865$, $p < .001$. These findings suggest that respondents with different educational backgrounds varied considerably in how they perceived the relationship between wealth and justice, as well as the effectiveness of fairness within the justice system. Given the magnitude of the F-values and the significance levels, education appears to be a strong determinant of justice-related perceptions. Post hoc analyses are recommended to identify the specific educational groups that differ significantly from one another. Significant Difference in Wealth, Justice Perceptio,n and Justice Fairness Effectiveness of Education groups the respondents

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Wealth and Justice Perception	Between Groups	207.025	7	29.575	600.987	.000
	Within Groups	18.798	382	.049		
	Total	225.824	389			
Justice and Fairness Effectiveness Scale	Between Groups	228.060	7	32.580	535.865	.000
	Within Groups	23.225	382	.061		
	Total	251.285	389			

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Significant Difference on Wealth Justice Perception and Justice Fairness Effectiveness if the respondents are grouped as to Household Income

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to assess whether respondents' household income significantly influenced their perceptions of wealth and justice, as well as their evaluations of justice and fairness effectiveness. The results showed that household income had a statistically significant effect on wealth and justice perception, $F(8, 381) = 235.081$, $p < .001$, and on the justice and fairness effectiveness scale, $F(8, 381) = 320.923$, $p < .001$.

These findings suggest that perceptions of justice are not uniform across income levels; rather, household income strongly shapes how individuals evaluate the relationship between wealth and justice and the overall fairness of justice processes. Post hoc comparisons are necessary to determine which specific income categories differ significantly from one another.

Significant Difference on Wealth Justice Perception and Justice Fairness Effectiveness if the respondents are grouped as to Household Income

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Wealth and Justice Perception	Between Groups	187.781	8	23.473	235.081	.000
	Within Groups	38.043	381	.100		
	Total	225.824	389			
Justice and Fairness effectiveness scale	Between Groups	218.813	8	27.352	320.923	.000
	Within Groups	32.472	381	.085		
	Total	251.285	389			

Significant Difference on Wealth Justice Perception and Justice Fairness Effectiveness if the respondents are grouped as to Occupation.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether respondents' occupation significantly influenced their perceptions of wealth and justice, as well as their evaluations of justice and fairness effectiveness. The results revealed a statistically significant effect of occupation on wealth and justice perception, $F(12, 377) = 285.990$, $p < .001$, and on the justice and fairness effectiveness scale, $F(12, 377) = 303.074$, $p < .001$.

These findings demonstrate that occupational background is an important factor in shaping justice-related perceptions. Respondents employed in different types of work reported varying evaluations of how wealth interacts with justice and how fair and effective the justice system is perceived to be. This suggests that occupational experiences, which often mirror broader socioeconomic conditions, strongly influence levels of trust and confidence in justice institutions. Post hoc analyses are recommended to identify the specific occupational groups that differ significantly.

Significant Difference on Wealth Justice Perception and Justice Fairness Effectiveness if the respondents are grouped as to Occupation.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Wealth and Justice Perception	Between Groups	203.472	12	16.956	285.990	.000
	Within Groups	22.352	377	.059		
	Total	225.824	389			
Justice and Fairness Effectiveness Scale	Between Groups	227.683	12	18.974	303.074	.000
	Within Groups	23.602	377	.063		
	Total	251.285	389			

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

The findings collectively demonstrate that socioeconomic position operationalized through education, household income, and occupation exerts a significant influence on justice-related perceptions. Higher social status, whether measured through academic attainment, income, or occupational prestige, is consistently associated with more favorable evaluations of the justice system's fairness and effectiveness.

The near-perfect correlation between wealth perception and justice fairness effectiveness highlights the centrality of wealth in shaping views of justice. This finding may reflect a broader societal perception that economic resources and social privilege translate into greater access to fair treatment and positive legal outcomes. Such results are consistent with conflict theory, which argues that institutions, including the justice system, often reflect and reinforce class structures (Marx, 1971; Chambliss & Seidman, 1982). They also resonate with legitimacy theory (Tyler, 1990), which posits that citizens' trust in justice institutions is strongly influenced by their perceptions of fairness, equality, and impartiality.

Differences by education, income, and occupation further reinforce the stratified nature of justice perceptions. Respondents from privileged backgrounds may have greater access to legal resources, procedural knowledge, and institutional protections, which fosters more favorable perceptions of justice effectiveness. In contrast, those from lower socioeconomic brackets may experience barriers to justice, procedural disadvantages, or discriminatory treatment, leading to skepticism or distrust toward justice institutions. These patterns are also consistent with relative deprivation theory (Runciman, 1966), which suggests that disparities in wealth and opportunity shape perceptions of fairness.

The policy implications of these findings are significant. First, they suggest that justice institutions must prioritize procedural fairness and equitable access across socioeconomic strata in order to foster legitimacy and public trust. Second, the justice system must adopt inclusive reforms that address barriers faced by disadvantaged groups, such as access to legal representation, protection from discrimination, and transparent decision-making processes. Finally, these results underscore the need for public education and community-based programs aimed at bridging perceptions of inequality in justice delivery.

CONCLUSION

The strength of the correlation suggests that as perceptions of wealth increase, perceptions of justice and fairness effectiveness increase almost perfectly in tandem. While the result underscores a powerful association, it also warrants careful interpretation given the unusually high magnitude of the coefficient. This may indicate conceptual overlap between the two constructs or potential measurement redundancy in the instruments employed. Nevertheless, the statistical evidence confirms a robust monotonic relationship, demonstrating that perceptions of socioeconomic status are closely linked to evaluations of justice and fairness.

Recommendation

Based on the findings of this study, which demonstrate that perceptions of fairness in the Philippine criminal justice system are strongly influenced by wealth and socio-demographic factors, it is recommended that policymakers and justice institutions implement concrete measures to address perceived inequities. Mandatory ethics and anti-corruption training should be institutionalized for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and court personnel to reduce wealth-based bias in decision-making. In addition, transparency mechanisms such as the public posting of official procedures, timelines, and fees in police stations, barangay halls, and courts should be strengthened to minimize opportunities for bribery and favoritism. Expanding access to free and quality legal assistance, particularly through the enhancement of the Public Attorney's Office and the establishment of legal aid desks in underserved communities, may further promote equal treatment regardless of socioeconomic status.

Local government units and barangays are encouraged to conduct regular community-based legal education programs to improve public awareness of legal rights and available remedies, especially among marginalized sectors. Collaboration with civil society organizations, law schools, and human rights groups in providing legal clinics and paralegal services is also recommended. Future research may build on the results of this study by employing advanced statistical methods such as chi-square tests and logistic regression, as well as incorporating actual case outcome data, to further identify predictors of perceived injustice and support evidence-based reforms toward a more equitable and trustworthy criminal justice system.

REFERENCES

1. *Beijersbergen, K. A., Bottoms, A., Sparks, R., & Tankebe, J. (2020). Do perceptions of legitimacy and fairness matter in prison? Examining how procedural and distributive justice relate to misconduct. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 47(9), 1095–1114. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820916901*
2. *Bhuiyan, M. R. I., Milon, M. N. U., Hossain, R., Poli, T. A., & Salam, M. A. (2024). Examining the relationship between poverty and juvenile delinquency trends in a developing country. Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 13(6), 255–272. https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2024-0193*
3. *Bowers, J., & Robinson, P. H. (2012). Perceptions of fairness and justice: The shared aims and occasional conflicts of legitimacy and moral credibility. Wake Forest Law Review, 47, 211–284. http://www.antoniocasella.eu/restorative/Bowers_2012.pdf*
4. *Daly, K., & Davis, J. (2021). Money justice. Journal of Criminology, 54(1), 60–75.DOI:10.1177/00048658211007912*
5. *David Leong & Koh Hock Kiat (2023). A conception of Yi (義): Harmony, fairness, and justice in management – A prospective inquiry framework. Qeios. DOI: 10.32388/6W1A65*
6. *Dongli Ma and Mengyang Wu (2024). The establishment of criminal emotional justice based on data mining algorithms. International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems, 32(Suppl.2),405–422. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129156425407727*
7. *Dongli Ma and Mengyang Wu (2024). The establishment of*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 12| December 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

criminal emotional justice based on data mining algorithms. International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems, 32(Suppl.2),405–422. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129156425407727

8. *Fahrudin Fahrudin (2024). Application of the principles of justice in the distribution of wealth: A literature review of contemporary Islamic economics. International Journal of Islamic Economics and Law, 2(3), 1–15. DOI: 10.62976/ijijel.v2i3.684*
9. *Featherstone, R., & Deflem, M. (2003). Anomie and Strain Theory: Context and Consequences of Robert Merton's Two Theories. Sociological Inquiry, 73(4), 471–489. Anomie and Strain: Context and Consequences of Merton's Two Theories - Featherstone - 2003 - Sociological Inquiry - Wiley Online Library*
10. *Gonzales, R. M. (2020). Criminal justice and inequality: A socio-legal perspective on poverty in Philippine courts. Ateneo Law Review, 64(2), 102–123.*
11. *Gramatikov, M., Kaur, R., Banks, I., & Heijstek-Ziemann, K. (2021). Poverty and access to justice. The Hague Institute for Innovation of Law (HiiL). https://www.hiil.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/HiiL-report-Poverty-and-Access-to-Justice-web.pdf*
12. *Henny Saida Flora (2024). Effectiveness of the implementation of restorative justice in the juvenile criminal justice system. Restorative Justice Law Journal, 3(1), 45–60. DOI: 10.70177/rjl.v3i1.2068*
13. *Jonathan, O. E., Olusola, A. J., Bernadin, T. C. A., & Inoussa, T. M. (2021). Impacts of crime on socio-economic development. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 12(5), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.36941/mjss-2021-0045*
14. *Kvasha Oksana (2024). Justice & fairness: the relationship and the corruption factor. State and Law, 35, 588–596. DOI: 10.33663/0869-2491-2024-35-588-596*
15. *Loi, M., & Heitz, C. (2024). What's distributive justice got to do with it? Rethinking algorithmic fairness from the perspective of approximate justice. arXiv. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2407.12488*
16. *Lu, K. (2025). Silver spoons and scales of justice: The fairness preference over unequal intergenerational wealth transfers between Americans and Chinese. Journal of Economic Behavior &Organization, 223, 107093. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2025.107093*
17. *Matthews, R. (2014). From cultural criminology to cultural realism. In Realist Criminology (pp. 94-116). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.*
18. *Narveson, J. (2005). Welfare and wealth, poverty and justice in today's world. The Journal of Ethics, 8(4), 305–348. DOI:10.1007/s10892-004-4895-1*
19. *Nirmalasary, T. N., Rejo, A., Windusari, Y., & Azhar. (2024). Analysis model of socio-cultural environment on criminality rate: A rural case study. Journal of Law and Sustainable Development, 12(5), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v12i5.3670*
20. *Olevska-Kairisa, I., & Kairiss, A. (2023). Victims of heritage crimes: Aspects of legal and socio-economic justice. Open Archaeology, 9, Article 20220293. https://doi.org/10.1515/opar-2022-0293*
21. *Onyeneke, C. C., & Karam, A. H. (2022). An exploratory study of crime: Examining lived experiences of crime through socioeconomic, demographic, and physical characteristics. Urban Science, 6(3), 43 https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci6030043*
22. *Papagianneas, S., & Junius, N. (2023). Fairness and justice through automation in China's smart courts. Computer Law & Security Review, 51, 105897. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105897*
23. *Petkanopoulou, K., Griva, A.-M., García-Sánchez, E., Vlastou-Dimopoulou, F., Daoultzis, K.-C., Willis, G. B., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2025). Why do people object to economic inequality? The role of distributive justice and social harmony concerns as predictors of support for redistribution and collective action. British Journal of Social Psychology, 64(2), e12877. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12877*
24. *PSA2025 https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/philippines-population/ Raosoft Sample Size Calculator http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html*
25. *Rajnish, H. (2018). Effects of unemployment and its relationship with crime. International Journal of Law, 4(2), 92–97.*
26. *Resmini, F., & Rojas, D. (2025). Government ideology and support for redistribution among the wealthy. Political Science Research and Methods, 1–17. DOI: 10.1017/psrm.2025.10029.sm001*
27. *Robinson, P. H. (2012). Perceptions of fairness and justice: The shared aims & occasional conflicts of legitimacy and moral credibility. Wake Forest Law Review, 47(2), 211–284. University of Pennsylvania Law School, Public Law Research Paper No. 11-13. https://ssrn.com/abstract=1814006*
28. *Robison, W. L. (2025). The injustice of inequalities in wealth and income. In Contemporary facets of injustice (pp. 25–42). Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-93783-5_2*
29. *Salim, Y. (2015). Poverty, inequality and the social causes of crime: A study between United States and Europe. International Journal of Science and Research, 4(8), 1385–1390.*
30. *Scholtens, J., Holterman, D. A., Mangubhai, S., & Mills, D. J. (2021). Equity in environmental governance: Perceived fairness of distributional justice principles in marine co-management. Environmental Science & Policy, 124, 160–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.05.022*
31. *Senejko, A., Łoś, Z., & Oleszkowicz, A. (2019). Perception of money resources and psychological attitudes toward globalised world. Research in Globalization, 1, 100007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resglo.2019.100007*
32. *Tampubolon, G. (2025). Parental socioeconomic position, childhood poverty and healthy ageing: Retrospective and prospective study of six cohort surveys across 32 wealthy and developing nations. medRxiv. DOI: 10.1101/2025.08.22.25334234*
33. *Walklate, S. (2006). Imagining the victim of crime. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).*
34. *Yigzaw, Y., Mekuriaw, A., & Amsalu, T. (2023). Analyzing physical and socio-economic factors for property crime incident in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Heliyon, 9(1), e13282. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13282*