

PANTAWID PAMILYANG PILIPINO PROGRAM (4Ps) AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE INDICATOR

Analy M. Dumay¹, Husna T. Lumapenet², Meilrose B. Peralta³

¹ Department of Education, Sumayahon Elementary School, Barangay Perez, Kidapawan City, Philippines

² Assistant Professor, Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, Doroluman, Arakan, North Cotabato, Philippines

³ Assistant Schools Division Superintendent, Kidapawan City Division, Kidapawan City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the socio-economic characteristics of the learner-beneficiaries, the extent of implementation of 4Ps and the level of school performance indicators in Kidapawan City Division for School Year 2020-2021. The study also ascertained the significant relationship and influence of socio-economic characteristics and 4Ps implementation on the level of improvement of school performance indicators. This study made use of the quantitative method design, particularly the descriptive-correlational. A total of 143 respondents participated in the study and responded on the self-made and validated survey questionnaire. In terms of socio-economic characteristics, there were 4 – 6 children in the family who are living within two kilometres from school, with parents who are elementary graduates and low-income earners. Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in the areas of economic stability, health and education was implemented in Kidapawan City. The school performance indicators showed the very high enrolment rate and graduation rate and very low dropout rate. The relationship of socio-economic characteristics and school performance indicators revealed that distance of residence to school had significant relationship to dropout rate and graduation rate. The parents' income was correlated with dropout rate.

Keyword: *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), school performance indicator.*

1. INTRODUCTION

For many years now, a major part of the Philippines has been suffering from poverty. Thus, the government has implemented numerous social programs and policies with the objective of minimizing poverty prevalence. However, given that most solutions are one-stop, they have been unsustainable and ineffective [1]. One of the most popular social measures was just adopted in 2008 [2] through the Department for Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), the Pantawid Pamilyang Program (4Ps) in the Philippines was implemented.

Philippine Government, through 4Ps, offers the marginalized or "poorest of the poor" conditional cash subsidies to enhance health, food and education for children from 0 to 18 years old [3]. It is based on the Conditional Cash Transfer programs, which lifts million people from poor nations around the world [4].

Many families have benefited since the program was launched [5]. In breaking the cycle of poverty in various regions of the nation, the 4Ps program's objective to encourage social development to solve the pressing needs of severely poor families was effective [2]. According to statistics, the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) was implemented in all 79 provinces, 143 cities, and 1,484 municipalities in the Philippines. There are 4, 353, 597 active beneficiaries as of 26 August 2015, 570,056 of them are the homes of the indigenous people, and 217 and 359 have at least one individual who has become a disabled individual (PWD). School children between 0 and 18 years of age, 10, 235, 658 of the total population of the area are major beneficiaries of the program with average of 2 to 3 children, each family [6].

The Government committed billions in supporting the program and in providing monetary aid to the worthy students, including those in the contemporary research community, who are members of the underprivileged households. Despite government assistance, there are a handful of 4Ps with poor grades and class attendance. This scenario aroused the students' interest in looking at the relationship and effect of the execution of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino (4Ps) program, which are the primary recipients of the grant in all primary schools in Kidapawan City. In the field of education, school performance is influenced by many factors [7-9]. Development in the academe could be effective through the implementation of different mechanism [10-11].

2. METHODOLOGY

The study utilized the quantitative method design particularly the descriptive-correlational. Descriptive design was used in describing the level of socio-economic characteristics, extent of implementation of 4Ps and level of school performance indicators. Correlation was used in examining the significant relationship and influence of socio-economic characteristics and Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implementation on the school performance indicators. The respondents in this study were the 4Ps learner-beneficiaries and their school heads from selected IP-dominated elementary schools in District II, Kidapawan City Division with a total of 143 respondents. This study utilized a revised survey questionnaire that underwent validation using the Cronbach Alpha test. It resulted to 0.770 which means that the indicators/items in the survey instrument were valid and reliable. The survey instrument had three (3) parts where Part I gathered data and information about the socio-economic characteristics of the learners in terms of number of siblings, distance of home from school, parents' educational attainment and parents' monthly income. Part II extracted information regarding the extent of implementation of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in the aspects of economic stability, health and education; while Part III generated data as to the school's performance indicators in terms of enrolment rate, dropout rate and graduation rate. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data in the study.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Relationship of the Socio – Economic Characteristics and the Schools' Performance Indicators

The correlation matrix in Table 1 reveals the relationship of socio-economic characteristics and school performance indicators. The result shows that socio-economic characteristics in terms of distance of residence to school had significant relationship with drop out rate ($r=-0.393^*$ and $p=0.045$) and graduation rate ($r=-0.390^*$ and $p=0.045$). Parents' income was also associated with dropout rate ($r=-0.378^*$ and $p=0.047$).

The presented r -values and probability values which are lesser than the set 5% level of significance means that the stated hypothesis is rejected.

It is implied from the result of the study that socio-economic characteristics and school performance indicators had significant relationship. Among the socio-economic variables, distance of residence to school was related to dropout rate and graduation rate, while parents' income was correlated with drop out rate.

Further, this implies that the nearer the residence of 4Ps beneficiaries to the school, the lower is the dropout out rate and higher is the graduation rate. This is because it would be easy for the learners to reach the school and have more time to focus on their studies. However, those residing far and need to walk by kilometers before reaching the school have a greater chance to stop schooling and unable to graduate from elementary. In the same vein, parents' income is associated to dropout rate. If learners' parents have the capacity to provide the material needs of their children, they will not give up schooling and drop out from school. However, less income means that the dropout rate will likely increase.

The researchers have discovered that the location of the student home influenced student performance, even when variables were carefully controlled within the student and school [12].

Table 3 Influence of the socio – economic characteristics on the school performance indicators in terms of dropout rate.

Characteristics	Coef. B	Std. Error	t - value	Probability
(Constants)	6.056	7.060	0.858	0.413
Number of Sibling	-0.494	0.598	-0.826	0.430
Distance of res. to sch.	1.662	1.258	1.321	0.039*
Educational quali.	0.152	1.180	0.129	0.900
Parents' monthly income	-0.012	0.011	-1.091	0.048*

Multiple R = 0.288

F – Value = 1.910

Probability = 0.048*

* = Significant at 5% level.

Socio – Economic Characteristics on Graduation Rate

Table 4 presents the data on the combined influence of the socio-economic characteristics on graduation rate (F-value=0.718 and p-value=0.601^{ns}). Having a probability value that is greater than the set 5% level of significance, the stated hypothesis is accepted. This implies that the socio-economic characteristics of the 4Ps beneficiaries has no significant influence on graduation rate.

Table 4 Influence of the socio – economic characteristics on the school performance indicators in terms of graduation rate.

Characteristics	Coef. B	Std. Error	t – value	Probability
(Constants)	99.988	0.607	164.721	0.000
Number of Sibling	-0.043	0.051	-0.832	0.427
Distance of res. to sch.	-0.103	0.108	-0.955	0.364
Educational quali.	-0.001	0.101	-0.006	0.996
Parents' monthly income	-2.389E-005	0.000	-0.221	0.830

Multiple R = 0.142

F – Value = 0.718

Probability = 0.601^{ns}^{ns} = Not Significant**Relationship between the Implementation of 4Ps and the School Performance Indicators**

The correlation matrix in Table 5 reveals that the relationship of the level of implementation of 4Ps showed a significant relationship on school performance indicators in terms of health ($r=-0.365^*$ and $p=0.049$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

The result implies that the implementation of 4Ps in terms of health is significantly correlated with drop out rate. This further implies that the learners who are physically healthy and strong have the greater chance to stay in school and complete their education, compared to those who have health issues like being sickly or malnourished.

Velarde and Fernandez [13] stated that the 4Ps beneficiaries would attain higher and better living standards as long as they comply all the requirements. The 4Ps are also designed to address inequalities in children's education and health outcomes, like the lessons gained from other CCT programmes, and provide them with immediate poverty reduction.

Table 5 Correlation matrix showing the relationship of the level of implementation of 4Ps and th school performance indicators.

Implementation		Enrolment rate	Dropout rate	Graduation rate
Economic stability	Pearson r	-0.166	-0.171	0.171
	Probability	0.571	0.559	0.559
Health	Pearson r	0.222	0.365*	-0.272
	Probability	0.446	0.049	0.346
Education	Pearson r	-0.052	0.006	0.226
	Probability	0.859	0.984	0.437

Influence of the Implementation of 4Ps on the School Performance Indicators

Implementation of 4Ps on Enrolment Rate

Table 6 presents the data on the combined influence of the level of 4Ps implementation on school performance indicator in terms of enrolment rate (F-value=0.570 and p-value=0.648^{ns}). Having a probability value that is greater than the set 5% level of significance, the stated hypothesis is accepted. This implies that the level of 4Ps implementation had no significant influence on enrolment rate.

Table 6 Influence of the implementation of 4Ps on the school performance indicators in terms of enrolment rate.

4Ps Implementation	Coef. B	Std. Error	t - value	Probability
(Constants)	95.227	3.600	26.454	0.000
Economic stability	-0.846	0.797	-1.062	0.313
Health	0.737	0.628	1.174	0.048*
Education	0.193	0.477	0.404	0.694

Multiple R = 0.146
Probability = 0.648^{ns}

F – Value = 0.570
^{ns} = Not Significant
* = Significant at 5% level.

Implementation of 4Ps on Dropout Rate

Table 7 presents the data on the combined influence of the level of 4Ps implementation on school performance indicator in terms of drop out rate (F-value=1.647 and p-value=0.044*). Having a probability value that is lesser than the set 5% level of significance, the stated hypothesis is rejected.

In fact, 33.1% of the variation of school performance indicators in terms of dropout rate was accounted by the 4Ps implementation. The remaining 66.9% was accounted by some factors not captured in the study.

Among the indicators for 4Ps implementation, health was found to have the significant influence on school performance indicators, particularly on dropout rate.

The result implies that health predicts the dropping out from school of 4Ps beneficiaries. The more the learners are physically fit and strong due to the provision of healthy foods, the bigger the likelihood that they remain in school and complete their schooling.

In a research by Babbie [14] on 4P's health on recipient compliance in Negros Oriental. It was determined that they are very good at using the health services. The Government has to concentrate its efforts on teaching recipients about preventative child health, providing comprehensive child vaccination coverage and providing appropriate health facilities, including clinics and health care centers.

Table 7 Influence of the implementation of 4Ps on the school performance indicators in terms of **dropout rate**.

4Ps Implementation	Coef. B	Std. Error	t - value	Probability
(Constants)	-3.639	10.883	-0.334	0.745
Economic stability	-3.956	2.409	-1.642	0.132
Health	4.022	1.898	2.119	0.046*
Education	1.442	1.441	1.001	0.341

Multiple R = 0.331

F - Value = 1.647

Probability = 0.044*

* = Significant at 5% level.

Implementation of 4 Ps on Graduation Rate

Table 8 presents the data on the combined influence of the level of 4Ps implementation on school performance indicator in terms of graduation rate (F-value=0.716 and p-value=0.565^{ns}). Having a probability value that is greater than the set 5% level of significance, the stated hypothesis is accepted. This implies that the level of 4Ps implementation had no significant influence on graduation rate.

Table 8 Influence of the implementation of 4Ps on the school performance indicators in terms of **graduation rate**.

4Ps Implementation	Coef. B	Std. Error	t - value	Probability
(Constants)	99.279	1.006	98.714	0.000
Economic stability	0.221	0.223	0.993	0.344
Health	-0.199	0.175	-1.134	0.283
Education	0.022	0.133	0.166	0.871

Multiple R = 0.107

F - Value = 0.716

Probability = 0.565^{ns}^{ns} = Not Significant**3. CONCLUSIONS**

Socio-economic characteristics revealed that there were 4 – 6 children in the family who are living within two kilometres from school, with parents who are elementary graduates and low-income earners. Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in the areas of economic stability, health and education is implemented in Kidapawan City. The school performance indicators showed the very high enrolment rate and graduation rate and very low dropout rate. Socio-economic characteristics and school performance indicators were related. Socio-economic characteristics had significant influence on school performance indicators. The level of implementation of 4Ps and school performance indicators had significant relationship. The level of implementation of 4Ps had significant influence on school performance indicators.

4. REFERENCES (Font-11, Bold)

- [1]. Son, H. & Florentino, J. (2013). Ex-ante impact evaluation of conditional cash transfer program on school attendance and poverty: The case of the Philippines. Mandaluyong City, Manila: Asian Development Bank
- [2]. Dungog-Cuizon, A., & Cuizon, C. (2016). The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps): A Philippine Open Government Partnership (OGP) Initiative. CNU Journal of Higher Education, 10, 46-58
- [3]. Reyes, C., Tabuga, A., Mina, C., & Asis, R. (2015). Promoting Inclusive Growth Through the 4Ps. Discussion Paper Series No. 2015-01

- [4]. Raquiza, M. (2018). The conditional cash transfer program. Routledge Handbook of the Contemporary Philippines.
- [5]. Villano, R., & Dollery, B. (2015). Payment Schemes in Conditional Cash Transfer Programs: The Case of 4Ps in the Davao Region, Philippines. *Administrative Sciences*, 5(4), 240-259.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci5040240>
- [6]. Fernandez, F., & Olfindo, R. (2011). Overview of the Philippines' Conditional Cash Transfer Program: The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (Pantawid Pamilya). *Philippine Social Protection Note*.
- [7]. Lumapenet, H. (2017). Influence of the Family on the Pupils' Reading Performance. *Lumapenet, H. & Andoy*, (2017), 21-22.
- [8]. Kudto, N. M., Lumapenet, H. T., & Guiamalon, T. S. (2022). Students' Learning Experiences in The New Normal Education. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCES*, 3(5), 221-233.
- [9]. Pagocag, H. K., & Lumapenet, H. T. TEACHERS'WORK STRESSORS TOWARDS ACHIEVEMENT AND LEARNERS'PERFORMANCE.
- [10]. Otto, L. & Lumapenet, H. (2022). Technological Leadership and Crisis Management Skills of the School Administrators Towards School Development in the Special Geographical Area of MBHTE-BARMM. [International Journal Of Advance Research And Innovative Ideas In Education](#) 8(3):3934-3937.
- [11]. Guiamalon, T. S. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES(SUC's) CONTRIBUTION CREATIVITY SKILLS OF THE STUDENTS IN RECYCLING.
- [12]. *Catsambis, S., Beveridge, A. (2011)*. Does neighborhood matter? Family, neighborhood and school influences on eighth-grade mathematics achievement.
- [13]. Velarde, R. & Fernandez, L. (2011). Philippines - welfare and distributional impacts of the pantawid pamilyangpilipino program. Available:
http://www.wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServlet/WDSP/IB/2012/06/11/000426104/Rendered/PDF/69423_0BRI0P1180ang0Pilipino0Program.pdf Retrieved: August 25, 2014.
- [14]. Babbie, E. (2010) *The practice of social research*. 12th Edition, Wadsworth, Belmont.