RESEARCH PAPER

The Socio-economic conditions of the Household-Beneficiaries of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps)

Genaro O. Basas III *

Bagacay National High School, DepEd Samar Division, Catbalogan City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) of the Philippine government was implemented by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). It was designed to aid poor households with short-term consumption needs while promoting investment in the education and health of their children to help break the inter-generational transmission of poverty in the country. This study employed a descriptive research design to determine the present socio-economic conditions of the household-beneficiaries of 4Ps in Bagacay, Daram, Samar, Philippines. The household-beneficiaries belonged to low-income families whose highest educational attainment of the majority of their members was elementary level only, and fishing was a main source of their income. More household-beneficiaries had two children each covered by the program. They still experienced deficiency with their daily basic needs such as foods, water, clothing, and other family expenditures. Many of them procured only those affordable televisions, electric fans, bulbs or fluorescents, and cell phones. They had no ownership and assurance in their housing and land used. Most of their houses were not concrete, since they could not afford to purchase materials for house construction. Not all household-beneficiaries constructed toilets, and some of those with toilets were not ideal. Other household-beneficiaries were cultivating agricultural lands which were not their own. More parents constantly monitored their children's attendance, and progresses in school. They actively participated in the school activities.

Keywords: *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program, Conditional Cash Transfer Program, Socio-Economic Condition, Poverty, Social Welfare and Development*

1. INTRODUCTION

Socio-economic status has commonly defined by education, occupation, and income. Each component displays different associations to different health outcomes, and would be catered by certain policies [1]. Socio-economic status remains a fundamental social cause of problems in the academic aspect of the children and their well-being. Access to social resources can be used to reduce the effects of problems once they occur. There must be a policy or program that should invest in children's human capital by

providing children social resources like in education and health aspects. Ensuring them to grow healthy and educated citizens is teaching them how to fish [2].

Children coming from the poor socio-economic conditions improve their academic standing slower than those coming from households with good socio-economic conditions [3]. The socio-economic barriers generally hinder individuals' vocational development [4]. They have less career related self-efficacy when it comes to vocational aspirations. The individuals from a higher social class are likely to become more prepared for the world of work and more successful in developing their career aspirations [5].

The socio-economic status plays an incidence and severity of health problems including cardiovascular disease, hypertension, and cancer. Socio-economic status is clearly associated to morbidity. Such remedies must be taken into consideration to reduce health disparities if cannot be eliminated totally. The most fundamental causes of health disparities are socio-economic inconsistencies.

Socio-economic disparities are prevalent in many countries in the world. Some of the countries are implementing policies to solve or reduce the problems. At early 2000s, Southeast Asian countries have tried to establish social protection schemes to cope with socio-economic problems of millions of households in the region. Those member countries of Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) announced that they would undertake collaborative efforts to introduce national as well as regional social protection policies, especially eradicating poverty [6]. In the Philippines, after the launch of comprehensive social protection strategies under President Gloria Arroyo (2001–2010), poverty reduction programs were incorporated with the elements of human development and community empowerment. Of those countries under ASEAN, the Philippines, surprisingly, was the first to implement the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Program or the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) nationwide after 2007. The Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) was chosen as the leading agency of the government in implementing the program which focused on human capital investment through provision of health and education cash grants to eligible households with poor socio-economic conditions and with children 0-14 years old.

The beneficiaries are provided with cash grants through cash cards issued by the Land Bank of the Philippines if they meet certain education and health conditions. The health grant is Php. 500.00 or 10.36485 USD per household per month which is equivalent to Php. 6,000 or 124.35 USD a year conditioned on obtainment of health services including vaccination and preventive check-ups for all children 0-5 years old, attendance of pregnant women to health centers. According to the protocol of Department of Health (DOH), completion with deworming protocol at schools for all school-aged children (6-14 years old), and attendance to family development sessions at least once a month by mother or spouse. The education grant is Php. 300 or 6.2175 USD per child per month which is equivalent to Php. 3000 or 62.17500 USD in a year (10 months only, up to maximum of 3 children). It is conditioned on

school attendance at least 85% of school days every month [7].

Former President Benigno Aquino III (2010–2016) has carried on the preceding president's poverty reduction policies, the 4Ps. President Aquino has emphasized 'inclusive growth' as the main policy goal in his medium-term development plan, and promoted the 4Ps and governance reform as the main policy tool for poverty reduction. Under this term, his cabinet allotted about 90 percent of welfare department budget into 4Ps as of 2012 [7]. He continued previous poverty reduction programs and then rapidly expanded them to cover all eligible poor household with children 0-18 years old.

The 4Ps is changing the spending patterns of poor households, with beneficiary households spending more on health and education and less on adult goods [8]. Meanwhile, the researcher believed that the 4Ps has a definite impact to the living conditions of its household-beneficiaries in the country. These beneficiaries are living in the social and economic system that doesn't give them equal opportunities. The 4Ps provides them this needed equality by making education as accessible to them and providing them much needed health services. It was on the belief that the healthy and educated children are able to become productive members of their family and the country in general.

The program provides cash transfers to supplement the income of poor households in selected municipalities in the country. Although, there were many research studies conducted to assess the outcomes of 4Ps to beneficiaries, this study also assessed the outcomes of this program but limited to household-beneficiaries in Bagacay, Daram, Samar, Philippines. The study intended to evaluate the present socio-economic conditions of the household-beneficiaries of 4Ps in this community.

2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1. Research Design

The purpose of this study was to determine the socio-economic conditions of the household beneficiaries of the 4Ps. To achieve its purpose, a descriptive research design was used to describe the background characteristics of the household-beneficiaries and their socio-economic conditions. This research design was appropriate to describe the conditions or characteristics of the population being studied [9]. This study was conducted at Brgy. Bagacay, Daram, Samar, Philippines in 2020. The place was located in the island municipality of Daram, a part of the second congressional district of the Province of Samar, and five kilometers away from the town proper of Daram.

2.2. Samples

The respondents of this study were only the household-beneficiaries of 4Ps under the Philippine Government CCT Program in Bagacay, Daram, Samar, Philippines. Samples were taken from the total of 198 household beneficiaries. Using the Slovin's formula with the margin of error of 5%, the sample size was computed accounting for 132 [10]. Then, the simple random sampling technique was used to choose the 132 households who filled out the survey-questionnaires.

2.3. Instrumentation

A survey-questionnaire served as a main tool of gathering the data. The questionnaire contained two major parts. The first part was about the household characteristics of the household-beneficiaries in terms of age, sex, and marital status of household head, total number of household members (family size), type of family, occupations and highest educational attainment of household members, years in living as household, and the number of children covered by the program. The second part consisted of the socio-economic conditions of the household-beneficiaries of 4Ps in terms of income; food and water; clothing and other expenditures; health; housing and land use; and education.

In order to establish the content validity of the research instrument, the drafted instrument was given to the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), and to some research experts for their assessment, corrections, comments and suggestions. The corrected instrument was used for pilot testing in Brgy. Cabac, Daram, Samar, Philippines, being a nearby barangay with household-beneficiaries of 4Ps. It was to ascertain the reliability of the instrument for this study. The reliability of the questionnaire was tested by employing the test-retest method.

2.4. Data collection

The researcher personally visited each of the houses of beneficiaries. Before the household heads answered the questionnaire, the researcher explained first the objective of the study. It was made sure that the respondents are comfortable before and during the administration. It was ascertained that all items in the survey-questionnaire are filled out and in the event that there are items that seem missed out, he resorted probing by re-asking the questions or by asking parallel questions that enabled them to get the exact answers to the questions. The study secured the confidentiality of all the information divulged by the respondents based on the survey-questionnaires given to them.

2.5. Statistical Analysis of Data

Data gathered were tabulated, organized and presented in statistical manner. The study employed descriptive statistical tools like frequency count, simple percentage, arithmetic mean, weighted mean, and standard deviation to answer the specific questions indicated in this study. In the data processing and analysis, the researcher used the computer applications such as the SPSS and the analysis tool pack add-ins of Microsoft Excel 2010.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Household Characteristics

This section shows the household information of 4Ps beneficiaries with regard to age, sex, and marital status of household head, total number of household members, occupations and highest educational attainments of the household members, years in living as households, and total number of children covered by the program.

Table 1. Age and Sex of the Household Head

Age Bracket	Sex		Total	
	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage
81-90	1	0	1	0.76
71-80	0	1	1	0.76
61-70	5	3	8	6.06
51-60	30	8	38	28.79
41-50	46	3	49	37.12
31-40	21	6	27	20.45
23-30	8	0	8	6.06
Total	**111**	**21**	**132**	**100**
Percentage	84.09		15.91	
Mean Age	47.14 years old			
Standard Deviation	10.71 years old			

Table 2. Marital Status of Household Head

Marital Status	Sex		Total	
	Male	Female	Frequency	Percentage
With live-in partner (not yet wedded)	29	1	30	22.73
Separated	2	0	2	1.52
Widowed	3	7	10	7.58
Married	73	13	86	65.15
Single	4	0	4	3.03
Total	**111**	**21**	**132**	**100**

Table 3. Number of Household Members

Family Size	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
13	1	0.76
11	5	3.79
10	3	2.27
9	9	6.82
8	17	12.88
7	17	12.88
6	25	18.94
5	26	19.7
4	19	14.39
3	9	6.82
2	1	0.76
Total	**132**	**100**

Table 1 shows that 37.12% of the household heads fell under the age bracket of 41-50 years old. Most of household heads were male, accounting to 111 or 84.09%. Their mean age was pegged at 47.14 years old with standard deviation of 10.71 years old which meant that their ages were concentrated at 36-60 years old. The youngest household heads were under the age bracket of 23-30 years old, accounting to 8 of them or 6.06% of sample size, and the oldest household heads were under the age bracket of 81-90 years old, accounting to 1 or 0.76% of the sample size. This only implies that the household heads were in the right ages to

Table 4. Occupation of Household Head

Occupation	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
Cook	1	0.8
Vendor	2	1.5
Housewife	7	5.3
Brgy. Councilor	1	0.8
Carpenter	6	4.5
Teacher	1	0.8
Construction worker	2	1.5
Farmer	16	12.1
Fisherman	77	58.3
self-employed	3	2.3
None	16	12.1
Total	**132**	**100**

Table 5. Occupation of All Household Members

Occupation	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
Cook	3	0.34
Vendor	2	0.23
Housewife	117	13.27
Brgy. Councilor	4	0.45
carpenter	15	1.7
teacher	10	1.13
Construction worker	5	0.57
Farmer	115	13.04
Fisherman	258	29.25
self-employed	6	0.68
Soldier	6	0.68
None	341	38.66
Total	**882**	**100**

manage and provide guidance to their family members. They were expected to engage into responsible parenthood that could help the program to succeed [11].

Table 2 presents that majority or 86 (65.15%) of the household heads were already married. 2 or 1.52% of them were separated and 4 or 3.03% were still single. There was also a significant number of household heads, accounting to 30 or 22.73%, who are living with their partners without submitting yet their selves to matrimony. The marital status of the household heads might affect the legitimacy of their children [12]. This would lead to problems in the future especially if conditions in choosing the children-beneficiaries under the 4Ps will be updated considering the legitimacy of the children.

Table 3 presents that most or 26 (19.70%) of household 4P's beneficiaries had 5 family members. There was only 1 family being considered to be the smallest containing 2 members only and the largest family had 13 members, accounting to 1 or 0.76% of household sample size. There were also considerable numbers of households having family members of 4 to 8. It was found out that there were household-beneficiaries with more members. According to the study of Ebo, Akpata, and Owoseni (2017), family size has significant

Table 6. Highest Educational Attainment of Household Head

Educational Attainment	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
College graduate	3	2.3
College level	2	1.5
High school graduate	10	7.6
High school level	13	9.8
Elementary graduate	37	28
Elementary level	67	50.8
Total	**132**	**100**

Table 7. Highest Educational Attainment of All Household Members

Educational Attainment	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
College graduate	32	3.63
College level	27	3.06
Still in College	14	1.59
High school graduate	90	10.2
High school level	79	8.96
Still in High School	120	13.61
Elementary graduate	175	19.84
Elementary level	213	24.15
Still in Elementary	76	8.62
Still in Pre-school(Kindergarten)	32	3.63
Not going to school yet (Out-of-school age)-still very young	24	2.72
Total	**882**	**100**

effect on the socio-economic conditions of the households [13]. This only implies under this study that although cash grants of 4Ps were intended for education and health of their children still other households might use these for their basic needs.

Table 4 reveals that majority (58.30%) of the household heads were fishermen and only one (0.80%) for each of the occupations such as cook, brgy. councillor, and teacher. There were 16 (12.10%) farmers, 2 (1.50%) vendors, 2(1.50%) construction workers, and 16 (12.10%) unemployed or disclosed to have no occupation. According to Philippine Statistical Authority or PSA (2017), the typical fishermen in the Philippines belong to families with income below the official poverty threshold [14]. Thus, this implies that the household-beneficiaries in Bagacay, Daram, Samar, Philippines were really deserving to be included in the program. However, they need to work hard in order to uplift their economic status in the future by attending the education and health of their children covered by the program.

Table 8. Years in Living as Household

Years of Residency	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
81-90	1	0.76
71-80	3	2.27
61-70	2	1.52
51-60	12	9.09
41-50	11	8.33
31-40	16	12.12
21-30	21	15.91
11-20	38	28.79
1-10	28	21.21
Total	**132**	**100**

Table 9. Number of Children Covered by the Program

Number of Children	Total	
	Number of Household	Percentage
3	36	27.27
2	51	38.64
1	45	34.09
Total	**132**	**100**

Table 10. Average Monthly Income of Household Beneficiaries

Income	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
Php.16,001-Php.20,000	2	1.52
Php.12,001-Php.16,000	1	0.76
Php.8,001-Php.12,000	6	4.55
Php.4,001-Php.8,000	28	21.21
Php.500-Php.4,000	95	71.97
Total	**132**	100
Mean Income	Php. 3752.50	
Standard Deviation	Php. 2950.26	

It was revealed in the table 5 that majority (38.66%) of the household members were no occupation and only few or 2 (0.23%) were vendors. It was then determined that 258 or 29.25% of the household members were fishermen, and 115 or 13.04% were farmers. Most of the unemployed household members were still children whose obligations are to enjoy their childhood and to go to school. It was evident in the results that more members of the household-beneficiaries had no occupations with stable income. Thus, the main sources of income of majority of them were fishing. Then, it was perceived that those members who were working professionals are already products of the program implementation.

The data in table 6 unveiled that the highest educational attainment of the majority or 50.8% of household heads was elementary level only. 28% or 37 household heads were elementary graduates and the smallest percentage was 1.5% equivalent to 2 household heads that were college level. In relation, Gundlach *et al.*, (2001) studied the relationship of the education and income qualities [15]. Education helps individuals to have more financial opportunities.

Table 11. Main Source of Income

Source	Total	
	Frequency	Percent
Governmental aids/assistance(i.e. 4P's cash grants, unemployment wage)	19	14.4
Assistance of relatives	15	11.4
Pension	1	0.8
Rental income	2	1.5
Trading	3	2.3
Fishing	77	58.3
Farming	14	10.6
Wage/salary	1	0.8
Total	**132**	**100**

Table 12. Food and Water

Statement	Weighted mean	Interpretation
We have a supply of water at home	3.52	A(MA)
We drink water at home	4.51	SA(Ab)
We can afford amount of water	3.92	A(MA)
We eat rice	4.77	SA(Ab)
We eat processed foods	2.52	NAD(A)
We take our snacks	1.59	D(LA)
We eat vegetables and fruits	2.52	NAD(A)
We eat meat, egg, etc.	2.51	NAD(A)
We eat fish.	4.53	SA(Ab)
We eat root crops such as cassava, potato, etc.	4.53	SA(Ab)
Grand Weighted Mean	**3.49**	**Neutral or adequate**

Legend:

4.51 – 5.00	Strongly agree (SA)	Abundant (Ab)
3.51 – 4.50	Agree (A)	More Adequate (MA)
2.51 – 3.50	Neither agree or disagree (NAD)	Adequate (A)
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree (D)	Less Adequate (LA)
1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree (SD)	Empty (E)

Table 13. Main Source of Water Supply at Home

Source	Total	
	Frequency	Percent
Water pump	1	0.76
Deep well	72	54.55
Spring	58	43.94
Rain	1	0.76
Total	**132**	**100**

Therefore, the higher education the household heads obtain, the lower the risk of poverty they have [16].

Table 7 divulged that 213 household members (24.15%) have the highest figure. It was found out to be elementary level only as their highest educational attainment. Only few (3.06%) of them entered college but were not able to graduate. The education level of the household members is a significant factor of the poverty rate and should be considered when assessing the struggle with poverty [17]. This implies that the household-beneficiaries were really struggling with poverty, since most of the household members were only elementary level.

Table 14. Type of Drinking Water at Home

Drinking Water	Total	
	Responses	% of Cases
Pump water	1	0.76
Well water	18	13.64
Spring water	90	68.18
Distilled or purified water i.e., mineral water	27	20.45

Table 15. Means of Getting water

Drinking Water	Total	
	Responses	% of Cases
By buying	50	37.88
By barangay water supply(free)	84	63.64
By being given by others	16	12.12

Table 16. Clothing and Other Expenditures

Statement	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Family members are provided with cloths	2.51	NAD (A)
Used cloths of elders are given to & used by younger members of the family	3.51	A (MA)
There are bed sheets, curtain, pillow, & blanket at home	2.52	NAD (A)
Provision of personal necessities of family members (i.e. cosmetics, napkins, tooth brushing kits like toothpaste, etc., soap, shampoo)	2.51	NAD (A)
We use electricity in our house	2.51	NAD (A)
We use fuel for heating and cooking	4.41	A (MA)
There are appliances/devices at home	3.59	A (MA)
We have our cellphones	4.42	A (MA)
We buy load for cellphone consumptions	4.41	A (MA)
We buy sugar, coffee, milk, & the like	4.48	A (MA)
Grand Weighted Mean	**3.49**	**Neutral or Adequate**

Legend:

4.51 – 5.00	Strongly agree (SA)	Abundant (Ab)
3.51 – 4.50	Agree (A)	More Adequate (MA)
2.51 – 3.50	Neither agree or disagree (NAD)	Adequate (A)
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree (D)	Less Adequate (LA)
1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree (SD)	Empty (E)

That is why they could not find jobs with decent salaries.

It was reflected in the table 8 that most of the household respondents or 28.79% of them assessed themselves living as household in 11 to 20 years. The shortest time of them living as household was in 1 to 10 years, corresponding to 28 (21.21%) of the households. However, the longest time of some of them living as household was in 81 to 90 years, accounting to 1 (0.76%) household. Based on findings, this only suggests that more household-beneficiaries were just new as households.

Table 9 reveals that each of the 51 (38.64%) households had only 2 children covered by the 4P's. There was only 1 child for each of the 45 (34.09%) of the households. However, for each of the 36 (27.27%) households had 3 children covered by the program. The program actually designed to cover only a maximum of 3 children in the household. That is why, giving of cash

Table 17. Fuel Used in Heating and Cooking

Fuel	Total	
	Responses	% of Cases
Firewood	91	68.94
Gas	67	50.76
Electricity	10	7.58

Table 18. Available Appliances or Devices at Home

Fuel	Total	
	Responses	% of Cases
Television	116	87.88
Electric fan	76	57.58
Refrigerator	20	15.15
Electronic iron	6	4.55
Refrigerator	5	3.79
Water dispenser	3	2.27
Computer	1	0.76
Laptop	4	3.03
Speaker or sound system	57	43.18
Bulb or fluorescent	125	94.7

Table 19. Number of Bulbs or Fluorescents Used at Home

No. of Bulbs or Fluorescents	Total	
	No. of Households	Percentage
1	28	22.4
2	44	35.2
3	26	20.8
4	18	14.4
5	4	3.2
6	2	1.6
7	2	1.6
15	1	0.8
Total	**125**	**100**

grants is limited only to three children in the household [7].

3.2. Socio-Economic Conditions of the Househould Beneficiaries by Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4ps)

Table 10 shows that 95 or 71.97% of the household beneficiaries revealed that their monthly income was within the range of Php. 500-Php. 4,000. It only meant that majority of the households were below poverty threshold. They belonged to low-income family class in the society. It was then noticeable, despite of the income divulged by many household beneficiaries, still there were 1 (0.76%) and 2 (1.52%) household beneficiaries had monthly income within the ranges of Php.12,001-Php.16,000 and Php.16,001-Php.20,000, respectively. The income is a significant determinant of family economic success [18]. In this study, the household beneficiaries belonged to poor families as to their average monthly income.

Table 22. Housing and Land Used

Statement	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
We have our own house and lot	2.37	D
We dont have our own house and lot	3.62	A
We live in a good quality type of house.	2.49	D
We can afford purchasing materials for house repair like cement, wood, nail, galvanized iron sheet(yero), etc.	1.51	D
The house where we are living is built on stable and strong soil (land)	1.53	D
There is/are comfortable living room/s at home	2.48	D
There is a comfort room or toilet at home	3.49	NAD
Any of our household member has land to cultivate	2.50	D
There is a solid waste management system at home	2.33	D
We have our own house and lot	2.37	D
Grand Weighted Mean	**2.47**	**Disagree**

Legend:

4.51 – 5.00	Strongly agree	(SA)
3.51 – 4.50	Agree	(A)
2.51 – 3.50	Neither agree or disagree	(NAD)
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree	(D)
1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree	(SD)

Table 23. Health

Living Status	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
Renter	3	2.27
Dweller only (Free of living with the consent of friend, relative, or whoever the owner is	117	88.64
Provided by employer or boss	2	1.52
Owner	10	7.57
Total	**132**	**100.00**

		Attended

Legend:

4.51 – 5.00	Strongly agree (SA)	Always Attended (AA)
3.51 – 4.50	Agree (A)	Frequently Attended (MA)
2.51 – 3.50	Neither agree or disagree (NAD)	Attended
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree (D)	Less Attended (LA)
1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree (SD)	Not Attended (NA)

Table 11 reveals that fishing was the main source of income of many household beneficiaries, accounting to 77 or 58.30% and only 1 (0.80%) household beneficiary for each of the sources; pension and salary. It was observed that 19 or 14.40% of them depended greatly on government assistance such as 4Ps cash grants and 15 or 11.40% of them relied on the help of their relatives. For this, the household-beneficiaries in the barangay were expected to have the low income. The household income has been said to have an influence in the education of the children. Since, children from high income earning households are expected to have more access to education than those children from low earning households [19].

Table 12 reveals that the household beneficiaries strongly agreed with the following statements considering their weighted means: "We eat rice" 4.77, "We eat fish" 4.53, "We eat

Table 24. Type of House the Household Beneficiaries Living

Type of House	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
Concrete house (brick, cement, stone, tiles, etc.	12	9.09
Concrete but not yet finished	38	28.79
Bahay kubo (bamboo, sawali, cogon, nipa)	65	49.24
Bahay kubo but not well-constructed	5	3.79
Tinabing-tabing na balay	12	9.09
Total	**132**	**100.00**

Table 25. Structure or Texture of the Soil Where Their Houses Found

Texture of the Soil	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
Clay or loam	88	66.67
Sand texture	44	33.33
Total	**132**	**100.00**

Table 26. Number of Comfort Rooms

Number of Comfort Rooms	Total	
	Number of Households	Percentage
0	42	31.82
1	88	66.67
2	2	1.52
Total	**132**	**100.00**

Table 27. Number of Comfort Rooms 90 households with CR

Status	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage (Based on 90 households)
With septic tank	53	58.89
Without septic tank	37	41.11
Total	**90**	**100.00**

root crops such as cassava, potato, etc." 4.53, and "We drink water at home" 4.51. They also expressed their disagreement of the statement "We take our snacks" with weighted mean of 1.59. Taken as a whole, they assessed the supply of their food and water at home as "Adequate" which meant that they have only enough number of foods and amount of water consumed at home. Although, the household-beneficiaries assessed themselves of having adequate foods and water still they experienced difficulty for the provision of foods and water considering the big number of household members.

As reflected in table 13, more or 72 household beneficiaries fetched their water supply at deep well. Other 58 households depended mostly on getting water supply from spring and only 1 household for each water pump and rain as main sources. The household-beneficiaries were still be lucky enough, since they had the source of potable water for their consumption.

Table 14 reveals that the household beneficiaries, 90 or 68.18% of them, reported that most of their potable water supply was taken from spring. 27 or 20.45% of them preferred to drink distilled or purified water, 18

Table 28. Ownership Status of Cultivated Land

Status	Total	
	Frequency	Percentage
No land to cultivate	113	85.61
Cultivated land doesn't belong to us (we rent or permitted to cultivate this land)	11	8.33
We own and cultivate this land	5	3.79
We own but don't cultivate this land	3	2.27
Total	**132**	**100.00**

Table 29. Ways of Disposing Solid Wastes

Solid Waste Management	Total	
	Responses	% of Cases
Barangay collects regularly	3	2.27
Disposed to predefined landfill	94	71.21
Disposed irregularly	122	92.42
Disposed to a river or lake	29	21.97
Disposed to a seashore or sea floor	99	75.00
Burning	54	40.91

or 13.64% of them drunk well water and only 1 had pump water to drink. The results of 2017 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey (APIS) posted by PSA (2019) [20] indicated that out of 24 million Filipinos, 94 percent have improved source of potable water such as water refilling stations, tube well, pipe into dwelling, rain water, protected spring or well, etc. This only indicates that the household-beneficiaries in the barangay had a good source of drinking water.

Table 15 reflects that many or 84 household beneficiaries provided themselves with drinking water by means of barangay water supply which is free of charge. 50 households preferred to buy potable water. 16 of them were given supply of drinking water by other households. This only means that the responsibility of the Barangay Local Government Unit (BLGU) was being attended. This is really the obligation of the BLGU to provide households with supply of potable water [11].

Table 16 reveals that the household beneficiaries agreed with the following statements having corresponding weighted means: "We buy sugar, coffee, milk, & the like" 4.48, "We have our cell phones" 4.42, "We eat root crops such as cassava, potato, etc." 4.53, "We use fuel for heating and cooking" 4.41, "There are appliances/devices at home" 3.59 and "Used cloths of elders are given to & used by younger members of the family" 3.51. However, they were neutral with the statements: "There are bed sheets, curtain, pillow, & blanket at home" 2.52 weighted mean, "Provision of personal necessities of family members (i.e. cosmetics, napkins, tooth brushing kits like toothpaste, etc., soap, shampoo)" pegged at 2.51 weighted mean and "We use electricity in our house" at 2.51 weighted mean also.

In general, they assessed their clothing and other expenditures as "Adequate" which signified that they have only enough provision of their necessities with regard to their garments and daily expenses. However, considering that most of them acquired clothing from their elders, their expenditures were just for their basics needs, and they were low-income earners, still they could not provide all their

Table 30. Education

Statement	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
All school-aged children are sent to school	4.38	A
Children are attending their classes regularly	3.49	NAD
Children are provided with their school needs (projects, uniforms, notebooks, etc.)	3.50	NAD
Parents attend the activities like Pintakasi, GPTA meeting, etc. called by the school	4.53	SA
Children work their school assignment at home	3.47	NAD
The progress of children in school is constantly monitored	4.50	A
Children perform better in school	2.55	NAD
Children are helped with their school assignments at home	3.10	NAD
Contributions and other financial obligations in school are attended	4.45	A
Children are motivated to finish their schooling	3.40	NAD
Grand Weighted Mean	**3.72**	**Agree or Frequently Attended**

Legend:

4.51 – 5.00	Strongly agree (SA)	Always Attended (AA)
3.51 – 4.50	Agree (A)	Frequently Attended (MA)
2.51 – 3.50	Neither agree or disagree (NAD)	Attended
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree (D)	Less Attended (LA)
1.00 – 1.50	Strongly disagree (SD)	Not Attended (NA)

needs. This is supported by the POPCOM (n.d.) that the average Filipino household spends nearly half of their income per month for foods. They have only less spending for clothing and other basic needs such as electricity, appliances, etc.

Table 17 reveals that in heating and cooking, fire wood was used having 91 responses, 67 responses in using gas, while 10 responses about the use of electricity. So, most of the household-beneficiaries relied on the use of firewood in cooking and heating. This result supports the findings of 2011 Household Energy Consumption Survey (HECS) [21] that firewood was most commonly used for cooking and heating water by more Filipino households.

As shown in table 18, most or 94.70% of the household beneficiaries installed electrical bulbs or fluorescents at home just to provide them light during night time. 87.88% of them owned televisions, 57.58% owned electric fans, 43.18% owned speakers, and 4.55% had refrigerators at home. It was registered that there were 1 household and 4 households having computers, and laptops used at home or any of their members. Most of the household-beneficiaries were expected to have bulbs or fluorescents at home to light up them during night time. Some of these television, and mini-speakers for entertainment were low in price affordable for household-beneficiaries.

Table 19 shows that each of the 44 (35.20%) household-beneficiaries had 2 bulbs or fluorescents installed at home. 28 or 22.40% of them had only 1 bulb or fluorescent for each. Each of the 26 or 20.80% of them installed 3 fluorescents, while 18 or 14.40% had 5 bulbs or fluorescents for each. Only few household beneficiaries utilized 5 to 7 bulbs or fluorescents at home. In addition, 1 household was identified to have 15 fluorescents used. Based on the results, more household-beneficiaries had 1 to 4

Table 31. Number of School-Aged Children at Home

No. of School- Aged Children	Total	
	No. of Households	Percentage
1	25	18.94
2	18	13.64
3	31	23.48
4	22	16.67
5	23	17.42
6	4	3.03
7	6	4.55
9	3	2.27
Total	**132**	**100.00**

Table 32. Number of School-Aged Children Who are going to School

No. of School- Aged Children	Total	
	No. of Households	Percentage
1	27	20.45
2	30	22.73
3	34	25.76
4	23	17.42
5	13	9.85
6	3	2.27
7	2	1.52
Total	**132**	**100.00**

bulbs or fluorescents at home. This implies that most of their houses were built in a small area. This is true since most of them had no land owned.

As shown in table 20, 48 household-beneficiaries agreed that there are 2 cell phones owned by any of their family members. 41 households said only 1 cell phone belonged to each of them. 17 households identified 3 cell phones for each. Moreover, 1 household beneficiary said that there were 9 cell phones belonged to their family. Despite of easy provision of cell phone, still there were household beneficiaries having no any cell phone in their families, accounting to 12 of them. This only suggests that mobile communication matters even for low-income families like the 4Ps household-beneficiaries [22].

Table 21 shows that the household beneficiaries agreed with the following statements having corresponding weighted means: “We are making sure to get enough physical activity” 3.55, “We receive health services like vaccination, prenatal, etc. in the LGU or barangay health center 3.53, “Members of the household are healthy” 3.51. But they expressed their strong disagreement with the statement “We use nutrition information to decide what to have when eating at home” having 1.15 as its weighted mean. However, they stated their convection of disagreement with the majority of the statements. The assessment of their health condition resulted to 2.23, general weighted mean. In overall glimpse, they less attended the health conditions of their household members. They also tried to express that they received less supports when comes to health services. In the study by Braganza (2018), he stated the impact

Table 33. Number of School-Aged Children Who are Not Going to School

No. of School- Aged Children	Total	
	No. of Households	Percentage
0	68	51.52
1	36	27.27
2	13	9.85
3	9	6.82
4	2	1.52
5	1	0.76
8	2	1.52
9	1	0.76
Total	**132**	**100.00**

Table 34. Main Reasons of Not Going to School

No. of School- Aged Children	Total	
	Responses	% of Cases
Getting marriage	17	26.56
Getting pregnant	12	18.75
Already working for a living	45	70.31
Poverty/financial problem	46	71.88
No longer interested	19	29.69
Sickly or unhealthy	8	12.50

of 4Ps as it expanded the healthcare services provided to beneficiaries such as weight monitoring of children, deworming at school, receiving suitable health care, and access to postnatal care [23]. The impact was only limited to the children and parents who were beneficiaries of the program. However, in this study, the household-respondents assessed their health condition including the other household members who were non-4Ps beneficiary.

As revealed in Table 22, the household beneficiaries agreed with the statement "We don't have our own house and lot" in the weighted mean of 3.62. They were neutral with the statement "There is a comfort room or toilet at home" with 3.49 weighted mean. Moreover, they articulated disagreement with the remaining 8 statements. In general view, they disclosed that they did not own house and lot, and have no any land owned to cultivate for a living.

Table 23 reveals that 76 (88.64%) households said that their status of living was free with the consent of the owners. 10 or 7.57% of them owned house and lot. 3 or 2.27% were renting, and only 2 or 1.52% of them were provided house and lot by their bosses or employers. Thus, it only means that majority of them had no ownership of their houses and lands where they were living.

Table 24 shows that majority or 49.24% of the household beneficiaries considered their houses as bahay kubo made on bamboo, sawali, cogon and nipa. 28.79% of them said that they had concrete houses but not yet finished. Others or 9.09% of them said that they were living in fully concrete houses. Also 9.09% of them living in houses made by light materials and 3.75% said that their houses were bahay kubo but not well-constructed. This only shows that the houses of the household-beneficiaries were not typhoon resilient.

Table 25 represents that more houses, (66.67%), were built in the land with clay or loam as its soil structure or texture. Others, 44 or 33.33%, were built in sandy type of lands. Thus, the results divulge that more household-beneficiaries were living apart from the seashore.

As shown in table 26, 88 or 66.67% of the households said they had 1 comfort room at home. Only 2 or 1.52% of them stated of having 2 comfort rooms. The alarming was still there were 42 or 31.82% of households with no comfort rooms being utilized. According to Department of Health (DOH), at least 26 percent of the population in the country still do not have clean and safe toilet facilities [24]. This only implies that the problems in sanitation continue to pervade in the barangay. The BLGU must initiate a project to address problems on the toilet construction of some households in the barangay.

The table 27 reveals that 53 out of 90 households were having comfort rooms with septic tanks at home, while the remaining 37 households were having comfort rooms without septic tanks. According to the DOH, more Filipino households have no standard and functional toilets [25]. This was evident in the barangay that not all the toilets of household-beneficiaries were built according to standard.

Table 28 shows that majority or 85.61% of the households had no land to cultivate. 8.33% of them said that they were cultivating lands which were not their own, and 3.79% of them were cultivating their own lands. The results imply that most of the household-beneficiaries were landless. That is why, those farmers produced agricultural products for the landlords of their cultivated land and they could not earn enough to provide their basic necessities [26].

As reflected in table 29, 122 (92.42%) households disposed their solid wastes irregularly, and 99 or 75% of them disposed their wastes to the seashore or sea floor. 94 or 71.21% of them disposed their garbage at predefined landfill. Only 3 or 2.27% of them said that their wastes were collected by barangay in regular basis. The data showed that the household beneficiaries had no proper waste management. The BLGU in this part of the world must therefore, assume the responsibility to raise the environmental consciousness of their constituents, especially 4Ps household-beneficiaries. Thus, they will change their attitudes if and only if, they are given the opportunity to understand the issues, to be part of decision-making and to effectively participate in concrete action [27].

Table 30 reveals that the household beneficiaries strongly agreed the statement "Parents attend the activities like pintakasi or school clean-up drive, General Parents and Teachers' Association (GPTA) meeting, etc. called by the school" with 4.53 weighted mean. They agreed with the following statements according to the weighted means of their responses: "The progress of children in school is constantly monitored" 4.50, "Contributions and other financial obligations in school are attended" 4.45, and "All school-aged children are sent to school" 4.38. It was found out that they were neutral in the rest of the statements. In general view, education of household members especially those of the school-aged children was frequently attended. This is true in the study of Braganza (2018) that 4Ps had significant effect to the increase of children's access to education.

This is one of the main objectives of the program to provide children an access to education [23].

As shown in table 31, each of the 31 household beneficiaries had 3 school-aged children at home. 25 households had only 1 school-aged child for each. 23 households had 5 school-aged children for each, and 22 households had 4 school-aged children for each. Then 6, 4, and 3 households had 7, 6, 9 school-aged children for each, respectively. The results suggest that there were more children that must be sent to school. The 4Ps if possible, must include more than the maximum of three children per household so that education would be more accessible to many children in the place.

Table 32 shows that each of 34 household beneficiaries had 3 school-aged children and were going to school. 30 households had 2 children each going to school. 27 households had only 1 child attending the school for each. 23 households said that they had 4 children enrolled in school for each. 13, 3, and 2 households had 5, 6, and 7 children attending the school for each, respectively. Mostly, these school-aged children who are going to school were only those beneficiaries of the program. Still, there were more children in the barangay that their education must be attended.

Table 33 shows that 68 or 51.52% said that all of their school-aged children were enrolled in the school. Each of 36 (27.27%) households had a child who is not going to school. It was noticeable that there was a household having 9 school-aged children who were not attending the school. This household was considered as a big family. As expected, only children-beneficiaries were going to school. The findings imply that the household-beneficiaries could not afford sending all their children to school.

Although there were other factors of having out-of-school youth, still poverty and child labour were pointed out by majority of the households as the main reasons why their school-aged children were not attending the school. In Bagacay, Daram, Samar, Philippines, child labour was still evident. Probably, these children who engaged into child labour were non-4Ps beneficiaries. Children covered by the 4Ps were going to school. Since, the original aim of the program is to decrease the case of child labour [23].

4. CONCLUSION

In Bagacay, Daram, Samar, Philippines more household-beneficiaries were in a family of five and predominated by married male household heads identified to be in the middle age. Most of their household heads and members were only elementary level. Fishing became an easier and more practical job that they got into, so it turned out to be a main source of their monthly income.

The household-beneficiaries were low-income families with unstable socio-economic conditions with regards to their purchasing power including their health, education, and other expenditures with respect to foods, water, clothing, gadgets, and home appliances. They had inadequate clothing provision and expenditures, and supplies of food and water at home. The provisions of their appliances and gadgets were somewhat affordable depending on the units or brands.

The 4Ps was very particular only with the health of mothers and children beneficiaries, and the

rest of the family members were not attended. They could not afford to purchase materials for house construction, and the toilet provision was still a problem for many of them. They also signified to have no ownership and assurance in their housing and land used. Apparently, they also exercised poor solid waste management system visible on their ways of disposing wastes. Most of the children were going to school with constant monitoring of their attendance and progresses by their parents and the DSWD through 4Ps. These parents answered the call of the school if necessary, and actively participated in the school activities such as general meeting and "pintakasi" or school clean-up drive. Some school-aged children were determined of not attending the school due to marriage, lack of interest, and poverty.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The subsidies even to a very single amount must be utilized to their real purpose. The household-beneficiaries must also work for a living. Their earnings must be spent wisely. They must work not just for their needs at the present time but also for their sustainable future. The government must find ways to subsidize all school-aged children, involve all members to work for their socio-economic well-being, and eradicate dependency on the program among household beneficiaries. The household beneficiaries must be provided with more opportunities and program initiatives such as complete health services, financial literacy trainings, students' scholarship program, and sustainable livelihood programs that can help them to go into viable livelihood ventures. The government through the DSWD must do a careful assessment of socio-economic conditions of the households without any political interference to ensure that the benefits of the program will reach the "poorest of the poor" households.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is thankful to the Department of Social and Welfare Development (DSWD) and the Barangay Local Government Unit (BLGU) of Bagacay, Daram, Samar through Hon. Maila F. Yazar, brgy. chairwoman. The author is also thankful to the 4Ps Beneficiaries for accepting the opportunity to become the respondents of this study. Finally, the author is thankful to his family for the support and love..

7. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author has declared that there is no conflict of interest.

8. SOURCE/S OF FUNDING

No source of funding

9. REFERENCES

1. Hermeto, A.M., & Caetano, A.J. (2009). Socioeconomic status, family structure and child outcomes in Brazil: health in the childhood. International Journal of Social Economics, Emerald Group Publishing, **36(*10*)**, 979-995.
2. Bloom, K. (2008, May 17). CCT in Philippines is "Teaching People how to fish." Philippine Daily Inquiry. Retrieved from http://opinion.inquirer.net/inquireropinion/columns/view/20080517-137087/CCT-in-Philippines-is-teaching-people-how-to-fish

3. Morgan, P.L., Farkas, G., Hillemeier, M.M., & Maczuga, S. (2009). Risk factors for learning related behavior problems at 24 months of age: Population-based estimates. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, **37**, 401-413.
4. Diemer, M.A., & Blustein, D.L. (2007). Vocational hope and vocational identity; Urban adolescents' career Assessment, **15**, 98-118.
5. Diemer, M.A., & Ali, S.R. (2009). Integrating social class into vocational psychology: Theory and practice implications. Journal of Career Assessment, **17**, 247-265.
6. ASEAN (2012, November 12). Chairman's Statement of 21st ASEAN Summit. Phnom Penh.
7. Department of Social Welfare and Development (2012) FY 2012 DSWD Budget. Development DoSWa, Manila.
8. Onishi, J., Friedman, J., & Chaudhury, N. (2013). Philippines Conditional Cash Transfer Program Impact Evaluation 2012. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.
9. Siedlecki, S.L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. Clinical Nurse Specialist CNS, **34(*1*)**, 8-12.
10. Isip, F. B. T. WHAT IS THE SLOVIN'S FORMULA?.
11. World Bank. (2017, July 10). FAQs about the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps). Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/philippines/brief
12. Philippine Statistics Authority (2020, May 21). Legitimation. Philippine Statistics Authority. Retrieved from https://www.psa.gov.ph/civilregistration/legitimation
13. Eboh, A., Akpata, G.O., & Owoseni, J.S. (2017). Socio-economic impact of family size preference on married couples in Kogi State University Community, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria. American Journal of Sociological Research, **7(*4*)**, 99-108.
14. Philippine Statistics Authority (2017, June 30). Farmers, Fisherman and Children consistently posted the highest poverty incidence among basic sectors-PSA. Philippine Statistics Authority. Retrieved from https://www.psa.gov.ph/content/farmer-fishermen-children-consistently-posted-highest-poverty-incidince-among-basic
15. Gundlach, E., de Pablo, J.N., & Weisert, N. (2001). Education is goal for the poor: A not in Dollar and Kraay (Discussion paper, No. 2001/137). Helsinki, Finland: United Nations University, World Institute for Development Economics.
16. Okojie, C. E. (2002). Gender and education as determinants of household poverty in Nigeria (No. 2002/37). Wider discussion paper.
17. Qureshi, S. K., & Arif, G. M. (2001). Profile of poverty in Pakistan, 1998-99 (MIMAP Technical Paper Series No. 5). Islamabad, Pakistan: Pakistan Institute of Development Economics.
18. Mayer, S.E. (2002). The influence of parental income on children's outcomes. Wellington, New Zealand: Knowledge Management Group, Ministry of Social Development
19. Dinah Ani-Asamoah Marbuah: Influence of Parental Income and Educational Attainment on Children's Years of

Schooling: Case of Ghana. Master's Thesis in Sociology of Education.

20. Philippine Statistics Authority (2019, March 29). Most Filipino Families have Access to Improved Source of Drinking Water (Results from the 2017 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey (APIS) and Water Quality Testing Modules. Philippine Statistics Authority. Retrieved from https://www.psa.gov.ph/most-filipino-families-have-access-improved-source-drinking-water-results-2017-annual.
21. Philippine Statistics Authority (2013, December 27). Electricity is the most common source of energy used by households. Retrieved from https://psa.gov.ph/content/electricity-most-common-source-energy-used-households.
22. APPTEGY. (2018, January 08). Equity and Technology: Why Mobile Communication Matters for Low Income Families. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.apptegy.com/guides/the-importance-of-mobile-for-low-income-families/am/
23. Braganza, C. (2018, September 12). The healthcare and education impact of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Programme. Social Protection. http://socialprotection.org./discover/blog/healthcare-and-education-impact-of-the-pantawid-pamilyang-pilipino-programme
24. Uy, J.R. (2016). More Filipinos have water, but many still lack toilets. Retrieved from https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/759824/-more-filipinos-have-water-but-many-still-lack-toilets/amp
25. Department of Health (2017, November 27). DOH: Filipinos Should have Access to Toilets more than Cellphones. Retrieved from https://doh.gov.ph/node/11787.
26. Pasquini, E.L. (2020, June 4). The Struggle for Land and Food in the Locked-down Philippines. Retrieved from https://www.ipsnews.net/2020/06/struggle-land-food-locked-philippines/
27. Bel, G., Fageda, X., 2009. "Empirical Analysis of Solid Management Waste Costs: some Evidence from Galicia, Spain" Research Institute of Applied Economics, University of Barcelona, Spain.