

**Document of  
The World Bank**

Report No:

---

**A Qualitative Follow Up to the Impact Evaluation of the  
Philippines *Pantawid Pamilya Pilipino* Program**

---

Social Protection Unit  
Human Development Sector Unit  
East Asia and Pacific Region



The World Bank

## Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....  | II |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....   | V  |
| INTRODUCTION .....   | 1  |
| METHODS.....   | 2  |
| THE STUDY SAMPLE.....  | 3  |
| LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....  | 5  |
| KEY FINDINGS .....   | 7  |
| IMPACT AND PRIORITY TARGETED OUTCOMES .....  | 7  |
| COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS .....   | 11 |
| PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, INCLUDING REGISTRATION, PAYMENT, COMPLIANCE VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CVS)<br>AND THE GRIEVANCE REDRESS SYSTEM (GRS)..... | 14 |
| FAMILY DEVELOPMENT SESSIONS.....   | 15 |
| PROGRAM PERCEPTION IN THE GENERAL POPULATION.....  | 16 |
| CHANGES IN THE COMMUNITY.....  | 17 |
| DISCUSSION .....   | 18 |
| CONCLUSION.....  | 21 |
| REFERENCES .....   | 22 |
| ANNEXES: FIELD TOOLS AND INSTRUMENTS .....   | 23 |
| FIELDWORK GUIDE.....   | 23 |
| INSTRUMENTS FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS.....  | 27 |
| FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDES.....   | 60 |

*The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the task team, and should not be attributed in any manner to the World Bank, to its affiliated organizations, or to members of its Board of Executive Directors, or the countries they represent.*

## Executive Summary

Designed as a follow-up to the Quantitative Impact Evaluation of the *Pantawid Pamilya* Conditional Cash Transfer Program, the goals of this qualitative study are (1) to understand better the mechanisms behind the impact of the *Pantawid Pamilya* program, (2) to investigate any regional heterogeneity in implementation, and (3) to examine the community and implementer comprehension of the program and how this may be related to the effects of the program on the community.

The *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program* provides cash transfers to poor households, conditional upon investment in child education and health as well as use of maternal health services. The objective of the program is to promote investments in human capital to help break the intergenerational transmission of poverty, while providing immediate financial support to the household. Poor households are identified by the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR) based on a transparent household welfare assessment mechanism, using a statistical model<sup>1</sup> to predict income. Households with estimated income below the poverty line are classified as poor. From that database of poor households, *Pantawid Pamilya* identifies and selects eligible households who have children 0-14 years of age and/or a pregnant woman. These households then receive cash grants every two months ranging from PhP 500 to PhP 1,400 per household per month, depending on the number of eligible children.

### *Impact on Targeted Outcomes*

Overall, the study results highlight the success of the *Pantawid Pamilya* program. All groups that were interviewed for his study uniformly praised the program's impact on their lives (beneficiaries), and the community (program staff, elected officials and non-beneficiaries). Many emphasized the importance of the program's Family Development Sessions as the avenue for beneficiaries to gain knowledge and change behavior. Program staff attributed increased enrollment, lower infant mortality, reduced child malnutrition, and improved living conditions for the poor to the *Pantawid Pamilya* program.

Beneficiaries described in vivid and articulate terms how they have benefited from the program. They are hopeful that being able to send their children to school will prevent their children from facing the constraints that the parents have faced. In all provinces, beneficiaries reported that *Pantawid Pamilya* has enabled them to buy school supplies, milk and vitamins, in addition to allowing them to invest in their livelihood and save for the lean season.

The program appears to help most during times when income from income earning activities is low. For instance, the community visited in Mindoro is a coastal one, with most households relying on fishing for their livelihood. During the rainy season, however, it is often impossible to fish, and beneficiaries reported that receiving the cash grant helps the households have enough to eat and stay healthy, while also sending children to school. While not explicitly worded as such, these responses suggest that perhaps prior to

---

<sup>1</sup> Known as Proxy Means Testing (PMT).

participation in *Pantawid Pamilya*, the households had to make tradeoffs between food expenditure, health care and education. Program staff reported that beneficiaries could now save enough for the lean season instead of living on credit from stores as they had used to.

The study also found that in some localities additional conditions, such as mandatory participation in “voluntary” community service activities, were imposed on beneficiaries. Interestingly, even though program staff and elected officials were aware that such requirements were deviations from operational guidelines, the situation was not addressed beyond informing beneficiaries that any additional conditions are not linked to payments. Actually, most elected officials and a few program staff justified such additional conditions as being fair since beneficiaries have to pay their dues to society. Most non-beneficiaries, and some beneficiaries, also thought that such additional conditions were only to be expected in exchange for a “handout” from the government. However, some beneficiaries considered such expectations to be unfair.

#### *Program Perception in General Population*

In general, the program is perceived positively by non-beneficiaries, as well as elected officials. They commented that beneficiary children were more eager to go to school now that they have new uniforms and full stomachs. Although elected officials had very little understanding of the program other than its objectives, a small minority of them thought that the program should provide livelihood support to beneficiaries rather than cash transfers. Non-beneficiaries in every Focus Group Discussion reported being envious of beneficiaries. They all said that they wished they had been included in the program. The non-beneficiaries in Negros Oriental in particular reported that they were very poor and did not understand why they were not included.

In all provinces, respondents told about a “better-looking community” resulting from better-fed and better-clothed children of beneficiaries, as well as from the improvements to the beneficiaries’ houses. In two of the provinces that were visited for the study, schools and health centers reportedly improved in terms of infrastructure and service availability. However, these positive changes were not reported in other provinces, and some concerns were raised about quality of services, because in some cases teacher aides were hired to meet the increased demand for education.

#### *Spatial Heterogeneity*

One of the objectives of this study was to identify sources of regional heterogeneity in program impact, identified by the quantitative impact evaluation. The study was designed to identify the differences in the ways in which the program is operating and how it is perceived by the community. The study did not detect clear evidence of variations in either. However, some potential sources of variability with regards to the effectiveness of the family development sessions at a more micro level were identified. This result might have been influenced by the fact that the study could cover only one village per municipality, which was also the most populous in terms of the number of program beneficiaries, and was also the closest village to the municipality center. By covering a wider range of program areas, the study might have captured more variability in how the program

operates. Furthermore, due to time and logistics constraints (the typhoon season) the study did not look at the availability of health and education services and thus could not triangulate the reported surge in school participation and use of health services by the program beneficiaries. Finally, studying potential sources of heterogeneity in the program impact may also require a larger study, covering a wider range of communities and in conjunction with other sources of information.

## Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by a World Bank Group team lead by Eeshani Kandpal and Junko Onishi. The team included Homaira Hanif, Jed Friedman, Jorge Avalos, Jennylyn Villena, Christine Ajoc, Marie Girado, and King Francis Ocampo.

The Government of the Philippines, through the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), supported the study by facilitating data collection through DSWD regional offices. The team would like to express their deep gratitude to Secretary Corazon Juliano-Soliman, Undersecretaries Mateo Montaño, Parisya Taradji and Angelita Medel and their dedicated teams including those at the *Pantawid Pamilya* National Program Management Office (NPMO) and its Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

The team is grateful to the DSWD Regional Directors, the Municipal Mayors, DSWD field staff, Barangay Captains, and the *Pantawid Pamilya Program* beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries who spent time with the teams providing valuable information.

The team would also like to thank the members of the World Bank in the Philippines, including Aleksandra Posarac, Yuko Okamura, Rashiel Velarde, and Shanna Rogan for their feedback throughout the study implementation. Valuable administrative support was provided by Corinne Bernaldez and Gia Mendoza.

The study was financed through a grant from the Korea Trust Fund. It is a part of the World Bank impact evaluation program of the *Pantawid Pamilya Program* in the Philippines.

## Introduction

Designed as a followup to the Quantitative Impact Evaluation of the *Pantawid Pamilya* Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Program, the goals of this qualitative study are (1) to understand better the mechanisms behind the impact of the *Pantawid Pamilya* program, (2) to investigate any regional heterogeneity in its implementation, and (3) to examine the community and implementers comprehension of the program and how this may be related to the effects of the program on the community.

The *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program* provides cash transfers to poor households, conditional upon investments in child education and health, as well as use of maternal health services. The objective of the program is to promote investments in the education and health of children to help break the intergenerational transmission of poverty, while providing immediate financial support to poor households. Poor households are identified by the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR) – *Listahanan*, based on a transparent poverty targeting mechanism, using a statistical model<sup>2</sup> to estimate income. Households with estimated income below the poverty line are classified as poor. From that database of poor households, *Pantawid Pamilya* identifies and selects eligible households who have children 0-14 years of age and/or a pregnant woman. These households then receive cash grants every two months ranging from PhP 500 to PhP 1,400 per household per month, depending on the number of eligible children.

Since its launch in 2008, *Pantawid Pamilya* has been scaled up rapidly and has become the cornerstone of the Government's social protection system. It has been an important part of a renewed effort to address chronic poverty and meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, achieve universal primary education, promote gender equality, reduce child mortality, and improve maternal health (DSWD, 2009). By June 2013, the program covered approximately 3.8 million households with about 20.0 million members and more than 7.0 million children receiving education grants. The program spending reached 0.4 percent of GDP in 2013.

The specific objectives of the program are to: (i) keep children in school, (ii) keep children healthy, and (iii) invest in the future of children, reflecting the Government's commitment to promoting inclusive growth by investing in human capital so as to improve education and health outcomes for poor children and pregnant women. The program is based on the premise that poverty is not about income alone but is multi-dimensional, and factors such as access to basic social services and social environment matter.

---

<sup>2</sup> Known as a Proxy Means Test (PMT).

**A carefully designed, comprehensive, and rigorous impact evaluation of the CCT program applying the Randomized Control Trials (RCT) method was conducted in 2012/2011. The evaluation found that *Pantawid Pamilya* is reaching most of its key objectives, including:**

- **Helping to keep poor children in school**, by increasing enrollment among younger children (3-11 years old) and increasing attendance among 6-17 year olds.
- **Helping to keep poor children healthy** by improving the long-term nutritional status of younger children (6-36 months old) and encouraging poor women to use maternal and child health services such as antenatal care, postnatal care, regular growth monitoring, and taking Vitamin A and deworming pills. In addition, it has helped increase healthcare-seeking behavior among beneficiaries when their children become ill.
- **Enabling poor households to increase investment in health and education of their children.** *Pantawid Pamilya* is changing the spending patterns of poor households, with beneficiary households spending more on health and education than poor households who had not received the program. The study also found that beneficiary households spent less on adult goods such as alcohol and that the program may have contributed to increased savings among beneficiary households.

**The quantitative impact evaluation also found that the program impact differs by province.** The study found considerable differences in the program impact on household socioeconomic, child health, and education outcomes across the four provinces. Across most outcomes, Negros Oriental consistently showed the most positive and strongest program impact, while Lanao del Norte consistently showed weaker impact than other provinces.

**This report outlines the key findings from a qualitative study that aimed to supplement the quantitative impact evaluation of the *Pantawid Pamilya*,** and seeks to gain an in-depth understanding of the implementation and delivery mechanisms of the program, by probing how it was implemented and how it was perceived by both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

## **Methods**

This study is aimed to help shed some more light on key factors behind the findings of the Randomized Control Trials (RCT) Study; it does not strive to achieve representativeness. Data collection was conducted in all four provinces covered in the RCT sample. The data was collected between August 19 to September 6, 2013, involving 16 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and 28 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) in each province. Each of these efforts was designed to inform the study of the key issues surrounding the implementation of the *Pantawid Pamilya* in the province.

**The study employed focus group discussions with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries to solicit views and opinions from the community, in addition to key informant interviews with program implementers and local government officials. All**



discussions were recorded and transcribed, as well as notes taken during the discussion. Key informants were identified and divided into two categories: DSWD implementers and elected officials. Since implementation occurs at the regional, provincial, municipal and barangay level, the DSWD implementers interviewed include: (1) Regional Directors for each of the four regions; (2) Provincial Links for each province; (3) Municipal Links, who are DSWD focal points for each municipality and are responsible for grassroots implementation of the program, and (4) Two Parent Leaders from each barangay. Information collected through these discussions and interviews were coded and analyzed using computer assisted qualitative data analysis software, where appropriate.

Based on the RCT evaluation findings, the primary research areas were identified as follows:

**(1) The mechanisms of the impact of the *Pantawid Pamilya*. Specifically, how do the goals and conditions tie in to the success of the program, and what are the limitations?**

**(2) Spatial heterogeneity in program implementation: how was the program implemented in each of the four IE study provinces? Are there key differences in how program staff and elected officials view their roles and priorities? Do these differences correlate to the observed variation in outcomes?**

**(3) How is the program perceived in the general population? Does the social pressure or expectations affect the way the beneficiaries are treated? Is social stigma or envy often observed in communities where not all households are beneficiaries?**

## **The Study Sample**

**Field teams consisting of one interviewer and one note taker visited one barangay in each of four municipalities for all four provinces where the quantitative Randomized Control Study was conducted.** These barangays were selected based a few pre-identified criteria:

- Part of the treatment group in the RCT study, receiving the *Pantawid Pamilya* program since 2009.
- Close to the municipal center to ensure ease of access for the teams, and
- Containing a large number of *Pantawid Pamilya* program beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries to ensure that there were enough in the pool to invite for focus group discussions from.

The four provinces and the municipalities in the sample are listed below.

| <b>Province</b>    | <b>Municipality</b> |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Mountain Province  | Paracelis           |
| Occidental Mindoro | Paluan              |
| Negros Oriental    | Basay               |
| Lanao del Norte    | Salvador            |

Schedule and budgetary constraints determined the total number of focus groups discussions and interviews that were conducted for this study.

| <b>Informants</b>                             | <b>Total conducted</b> |
|---|------------------------|
| FGDs with beneficiaries                       | 8                      |
| FGDs with the non-beneficiaries               | 8                      |
| Interviews with Regional Directors            | 4                      |
| Interviews with Provincial Links              | 4                      |
| Interviews with Municipal Links               | 4                      |
| Interviews with Parent Leaders                | 8                      |
| Interviews with Municipal Mayors <sup>3</sup> | 4                      |
| Interviews with Barangay Captains             | 3 <sup>4</sup>         |

Using the NHTS dataset on all beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, randomized samples of up to 32 households per barangay for each FGD, for a total of four lists of 32 households were created. In keeping with the target of two FGD with beneficiaries and two with non-beneficiaries per barangay, two of these sample lists were of beneficiaries, and two of non-beneficiaries. Within each list, households were listed in random order. Field teams were told to invite ten individuals to each FGD, starting from the first individual listed on the sample and going down the list until ten individuals had agreed to attend the FGD. However, in Occidental Mindoro and Mountain Province, the exact randomized order was not followed because houses were scattered and some of the listed households were up to a

<sup>3</sup> In some instances, the municipal mayor was not available for an interview; the vice-mayor was interviewed in his/her place.

<sup>4</sup> Neither the Barangay Captain nor a deputy was available to speak with the field team during the visit to Negros Oriental.

two hours' walk away from the village center, which would have made it difficult for these individuals to attend the FGD. In Lanao del Norte, approximately half of the sampled non-beneficiaries were now beneficiaries, and thus were not invited to the FGD for non-beneficiaries, even if it meant breaking the order of the random sample. This enforced the nature of the study's sample as a convenience sample, with study participants drawn from villages and neighborhoods close to the municipality center.

The sampling of the KII was more straightforward. With DSWD's cooperation, the regional director, and provincial and Municipal Links for each barangay were identified and interviewed. However, since most study barangays had more than two Parent Leaders, two per barangay were randomly chosen ahead of time and interviewed. The guides for each FGD and KII were developed jointly by the team in Washington, DC, then revised with input from the local interviewers, and revised yet again after three days of field-testing in Pasay City, National Capital Region (NCR). The guides consisted of open-ended questions with suggested probes to obtain information from the participants' point of view. The questions and probes were developed with the intention of collecting in-depth, directed information on the areas of interest. Interviewers were instructed to use the probes only in cases where the natural flow of conversation did not bring up specific information

Two teams consisting of an interviewer and note taker collected the data in the local language, Tagalog or Cebuano. Informed oral consent was obtained before data collection. The interviews and focus group discussions ranged from 1 to 3 hours in length. The interviews were recorded and notes were also taken. After the focus group discussion or interview, the team would have a debriefing to address any questions and areas of clarification. The team would then review the recording and provide the expanded notes, which were used for the data analysis. Each interview was summarized, describing the data collection process and key points and emerging themes as well as record team observations and reflections while in the field.

The data analysis process consisted of the team reading and reviewing all the data collected. A coding list was developed *a priori* based on the topics covered and additional codes were added based on developing patterns and themes in the data. The expanded notes were imported into ATLAS.ti and coded accordingly. Coding sorts were created according to the key themes, across key groups and provinces. These outputs were used to organize the data, which facilitated the interpretation of the data collected.

### **Limitations of the study**

- The study does not strive to achieve representativeness and uses a small convenience sample instead.
- Logistic difficulties due to the typhoon season led to several changes in the schedule and problems with obtaining security clearance. As a result, all field visits had to be shortened, leading to all regional directors and provincial links being interviewed by phone from Manila. Most elected officials, and all Parent Leaders and Municipal Links were interviewed in person.

- Due to time constraints, the analysis presented here was conducted using field note takers, rather than relying on the transcripts.
- Most focus group participants and all program staff/elected officials knew that the World Bank—a financier of the *Pantawid Pamilya*, along with the Asian Development Bank and The Australian Aid— was conducting this study. Participants were also aware that many beneficiaries were scheduled to graduate in December, and both non-beneficiaries and beneficiaries were eager to (continue to) receive the program. Hence, the study may not have successfully captured all the negative aspects of program implementation and performance.
- In several contexts, focus group participants were shy and hesitant to speak openly. Field teams attempted to get these participants to speak more openly and saw at least some success; nonetheless, it is possible that not all subtleties were captured.

## Key Findings

**This section summarizes the main findings of the study. The presentation is organized by topic in the following order: Impact and Priority Targeted Outcomes; Conditionality Compliance; Systems, including Payment, Compliance Verification System (CVS), and Grievance Redress System (GRS); Family Development Sessions (FDS); Program Perceptions in General Population; and Changes in the Community.**

**First, a brief context is provided through a short summary of the key findings from the quantitative RCT-based Impact Evaluation of *Pantawid Pamilya*.** The quantitative impact evaluation identified positive program effects in most of the target program areas including school enrollment among the younger cohort (3 – 11 years old), regular school attendance (6 – 14 years old), child health (reduced stunting among 6 – 36 month olds), use of child health services (0 - 5 years old), and use of maternal health services. Although the RCT study found that households invest more on health and education per capita, it did not detect a positive impact on the overall per capita consumption.

**The RCT IE found that overall the CCT program impact was positive, corroborating findings from administrative and other assessments that that the program is reaching its key objectives. The evaluation also found that there was considerable regional heterogeneity in the program impact.** Although the RCT study was not designed to study the regional differences in program impact and the analysis was conducted for demonstrative purposes only, the study found a consistent pattern across the outcome indicators. The RCT study found strong and consistently positive impacts across the board in Negros Oriental and Occidental Mindoro, while in the Mountain Province the impacts were mixed, and in Lanao del Norte the program impacts were consistently weak or non-existent (DSWD and World Bank 2012).

As a follow up study to the RCT IE, this qualitative study was designed to help understand better the CCT program implementation in the RCT study areas. It also aimed to study people’s perceptions and awareness of the program and its impact, and to uncover the possible explanations for regional heterogeneity in program performance.

### *Impact and Priority Targeted Outcomes*

*Beneficiary in Negros Oriental: “The grant is a big help to us in buying school supplies for our children, for their check up and for household expenses”*

**Overall, the study results highlight the success of the *Pantawid Pamilya* program. All groups that were interviewed uniformly praised the program’s impact on their lives (beneficiaries), and the community (program staff, elected officials and non-beneficiaries). The study also found evidence of several additional conditions, such as mandatory participation in “voluntary” community service activities, being**

**imposed on the beneficiaries. Furthermore, even though program staff and elected officials are aware of such deviations from operational guidelines, these additional requirements were never rectified or even addressed beyond simply reminding beneficiaries that any additional conditions are not linked to payments. Indeed, most elected officials and a few program staff justified such additional conditions as being fair since beneficiaries have to pay their dues to society. Most non-beneficiaries, and some beneficiaries, also thought such additional conditions were only to be expected in exchange for a “handout” from the government. However, some beneficiaries considered such expectations to be unfair.**

**Familiarity with the program differed significantly between elected officials and DSWD staff. Elected officials had a limited grasp of the workings of the program, perhaps because many of them were new to the post,** instated in July 2013 after the last round of local elections. All elected officials were able to identify that the main goal of the program was to reduce poverty and that beneficiaries’ children faced a school attendance requirement. However, they knew little else about the program. They often explained their lack of knowledge about the program by saying that elected officials are not supposed to be involved in the program. Nonetheless, several of these officials also noted that they felt the program should have more onerous conditions and should not make these grants without more substantial requirements. However, only one local official openly voiced opposition to the program’s approach, citing the need to provide livelihood programs to the poor rather than cash transfers.

**DSWD program staff, on the other hand, was well versed with the specific goals and target outcomes,** and were able to connect the program goal of breaking the cycle of poverty to improvements to children’s educational and health outcomes. Many emphasized the importance of the Family Development Sessions as the avenue for beneficiaries to gain knowledge and change behavior.

**Program staff attributed increased enrollment, lower infant mortality, reduced child malnutrition, and improved living conditions for the poor to the *Pantawid Pamilya* program.** A DSWD staff member in Lanao del Norte pointed out that while the program has reached the poorest of the poor in Salvador municipality, the program coverage of interior areas could be improved. The staff member further noted that accessible areas, including the barangay that was visited for the study had already received many interventions from the government and were perhaps less in need of the program. Another staff member is actively seeking partnerships with local NGOs and other government agencies to complement *Pantawid Pamilya* and improve social protection coverage of the poorest households. This program staffer believes that linking other programs to *Pantawid Pamilya* beneficiaries is part of his/her duty in ensuring synergies in program impacts.

**Beneficiaries described in vivid and articulate terms how they have benefited from the program.** They are hopeful that being able to send their children to school will prevent their children from facing the constraints that the parents have faced. In all provinces, beneficiaries reported that *Pantawid Pamilya* has enabled them to buy school supplies, milk and vitamins, in addition to allowing them to invest in their livelihood and save for the

lean season. These findings are consistent with the quantitative estimates of significant increases in per capita education and health expenditures by beneficiary households. Further, the additional expenditures on milk and vitamins are also in keeping with the estimated improvements in child nutrition.

**The program appears to help the most during times when income from earned activities is low.** For instance, the community visited in Mindoro is a coastal one, with most households relying on fishing for their livelihood. During the rainy season, however, it is often impossible to fish, and beneficiaries reported that receiving the cash grant helps the households have enough to eat and stay healthy, while also sending children to school. While not explicitly worded as such, these responses suggest that perhaps prior to participation in *Pantawid Pamilya*, the households had to make tradeoffs between food expenditure, health care and education. Program staff reported that beneficiaries could now save enough for the lean season instead of living on credit from stores.

*Beneficiary in Negros Oriental: "It is a big help especially in times like this [rainy season] when earning [a] salary is hard."*

**As may be expected, beneficiaries were well aware of program goals and requirements.** Indeed, both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries from areas other than Lanao del Norte, identified poverty reduction and helping the indigent as the central goal of the *Pantawid Pamilya* program. A group of beneficiaries in Occidental Mindoro specifically mentioned reducing the number of hungry people as a priority outcome.

Education was the second most frequently mentioned target outcome. Beneficiaries told the study team that since the grant is tied to their children's schooling, they feel that the money is meant for school supplies, vitamins, and milk, and for fees for extracurricular activities at school.

Even non-beneficiaries who did not know much about the program, such as those from Lanao del Norte, knew that the program was related to education because they had observed an increase in school attendance by children and heightened monitoring of attendance by school teachers. Note that this finding is consistent with the significant impacts on school enrollment and attendance reported in the impact evaluation.

*Beneficiary in Lanao del Norte: "Our children are very willing to go to school because they know that if they do not meet the 85% attendance, we won't be able to receive the grant."*

**Beneficiaries consistently pointed out that their children were happier and more eager to go to school** because they now have new school uniforms and supplies, as well as *baon*, i.e. money for school snacks. They reported that even their children realize that the grant that is tied to their attendance pays for the new supplies, uniforms, and *baon*. We posit that this knowledge in turn provides the right incentive to attend school, which in

turn creates a virtuous and self-reinforcing pattern than may contribute to long run poverty reduction goals.

In Lanao del Norte, non-beneficiaries noted that beneficiaries' children look a lot better while going to school because now they have new uniforms, and are cleaner and better fed, which is again consistent with the significant and positive impact estimates on child education and health. While most children are more motivated to go to school, parents also noted that girls are more easily disciplined and younger children are more easily persuaded to go to school. Older children, particularly boys, are more difficult to send to school as they may leave the house in the morning but not actually attend school. Further, **parents themselves are more involved in the school activities**. In Mountain Province, an elected official noted increased participation in school activities by both beneficiary and non-beneficiary parents.

**The program also appears to be drawing more people under the official purview of the government, making them aware of key official documentation in order to help them access government services.** In Occidental Mindoro, for instance, non-beneficiaries report getting birth certificates and marriage licenses more frequently than before because they have observed how beneficiaries have benefited from participating in the program. Seeing how the registration process worked appears to have helped non-beneficiaries become aware of the utility of official documents as well as how to procure them, perhaps in the hope that in the next wave, having these documents will help them receive the grant. Such increases in registration give individuals easier access to social protection programs, which may in turn increase their human capital and decrease poverty levels. **A provincial link also noted that while government services have always been available, *Pantawid Pamilya* has paved the way for beneficiaries to access them.**

**However, there also appear to be some deviations from stated implementation policy and goals.** Beneficiaries, but not DSWD staff, mentioned that program implementation in the barangay studied in Negros Oriental reportedly has a strong moral component, with FDS meetings often relying on religious teachings. Beneficiaries from this region thus also identified morality and decreasing vices as a goal of the program. Furthermore, some potential beneficiaries in Occidental Mindoro did not attend the community assembly to enroll in the program because they had heard that the program was a cult.

**Few beneficiaries specifically mentioned health as one of the targeted areas, even though all focus groups were aware of the health conditions, albeit to varying degrees.** However, for instance in Mindoro, non-beneficiaries reported that their local health center has a larger number of trained personnel and more frequent doctor visits due to the *Pantawid Pamilya* program's emphasis on health. Non-beneficiaries also linked the increased PhilHealth coverage in their village to *Pantawid Pamilya* and were appreciative of this additional coverage.



### *Compliance with conditions*

**Conditions were viewed favorably by all groups of respondents as helping the program meet its objectives to improve human capital by investing in children’s health and education. In general, beneficiaries understand their responsibilities and do not find the conditions difficult to comply with. Beneficiaries are also aware of a multi-layered and complex enforcement system.**

**Reinforcements of compliance with conditions occur at several levels.** Parent Leaders stay in routine contact with beneficiaries, informing beneficiaries of the FDS schedule, helping with the information update in the beneficiary database, and making sure that there are no questions or difficulties that need to be addressed. The Municipal Link also checks in regularly and ensures that conditions are understood and that compliance is high.

**These roles are well known to the beneficiaries; in all the four study areas, beneficiaries were able to identify the appropriate point of contact for any questions they might have.** The effectiveness of the Municipal Links in reaching the beneficiaries seemed, at least from the view of the Parent Leaders, to be driven by the Municipal Link’s personalities. Many Parent Leaders referred to Municipal Links in terms of approachability (or lack thereof), particularly where there has been a high turnover of Municipal Links. In addition, beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries and DSWD staff mentioned that teachers now monitor attendance more carefully while health workers keep track of checkup visits and immunization records.

**The study found evidence of social pressure as a two-pronged reinforcing mechanism for compliance with conditions.** First program staff, teachers and health workers, and even the larger community, expect beneficiaries’ children to attend school and to go to health centers without lapse. We posit that this social pressure is an important correlate of the high compliance rates. Further, the study found evidence of social pressure or expectations on a variety of additional informal conditions, all pertaining to ostensibly voluntary community service activities that are open to the entire community.

However, because of the role of expectations/ social pressure, only beneficiaries ever participate in these activities, which may place a burden on their time, in turn leading to beneficiaries’ feeling that they are being treated unfairly. The ad-hoc scheduling of FDS can also add to the inconvenience faced by beneficiaries as signaled by remarks made by beneficiaries that they must choose between a lower entitlement due to a rescheduled FDS or foregone income from an employment opportunity.

*Beneficiary in Mountain Province: “We have obligations because we are receiving [the grant].”*

**Nonetheless, beneficiaries reported finding the official conditions straightforward to comply with, and did not explicitly report many issues.** In a few focus groups, beneficiaries even referred to non-compliers as “lazy”. The only issue explicitly raised in Focus Group Discussions in Mindoro and Lanao del Norte was that sometimes their children do not wish to go to school, which leads to issues with the 85% attendance condition.

*Non-beneficiary in Mountain Province: “There are children who are really lazy, if the child doesn’t want to go, the mothers [used to] just let them [skip school]. But now they persevere to study because if they don’t, they will lose the grant.”*

**Less explicit, however, were several other problems with the conditions. Distance to schools and health centers can be challenging.** One beneficiary reported an hour-long walk to and from the school; further, the health center in Lanao del Norte is in the municipality, and not the barangay.

**The unpredictability of the FDS schedule was also raised in every barangay visited.** Last minute changes often conflict with prior commitments, and sometimes the schedule is not advertised widely, so beneficiaries miss the FDS due to a lack of information. In Negros Oriental, a single parent mentioned that during special occasions, when their hands are already full, sometimes it is hard to keep track of the FDS schedule.

*Interviewer: “How far are the schools from your houses?”*

*Beneficiary in Mountain Province: “In [village name], it is far. It may take an hour for the children to go to school, but they are used to long walks and it is not a problem.”*

**During focus groups with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries as well as in-depth interviews with elected officials, the role of social pressure and expectations also became clear.** This pressure comes from non-beneficiaries as well as elected officials. The expectation is that since beneficiaries are receiving “a handout” from the government, they should be expected to “pay their dues” to the community. As a result, while all parents or residents are invited to volunteer for activities at the school or in the community, only beneficiaries attend these activities and are expected to do the work.

**The expectations are so deeply ingrained that some elected officials and non-beneficiaries even thought that these volunteer activities were part of the conditions imposed by the *Pantawid Pamilya*.** While in most focus groups, beneficiaries did not complain about these additional conditions, the group in Occidental Mindoro, as well as a Parent Leader, said they thought such distinctions were unfair. Although these additional conditions are against the rules of *Pantawid Pamilya*, the program’s staff seems to turn a

blind eye, often noting that these activities (such as school and community cleaning) are responsibilities as community members, anyway. These expectations notwithstanding, elected officials as well as program staff consistently pointed out that the program brought social cohesion among the beneficiaries. Staff also reported that beneficiaries are more organized and are more willing to participate in community activities. However, there was no mention of such cohesion spilling over to the non-beneficiaries.

These are not the only deviations from policy. For instance, in Mountain Province, beneficiaries reported giving Parent Leaders small cash gifts for snacks etc., while the

*Beneficiary in Occidental Mindoro: "The barangay officials asked all of the people in the barangay to clean. However, it was only the 4Ps beneficiaries who attended and did the cleaning."*

Parent Leaders travel because the travels result in information about the cash grant or school records. Similarly, in one of the study areas, the Municipal Link collects cash contributions to purchase snacks for the police officers protecting the beneficiaries during payout times.

Nonetheless, the CCT program staff described in fair detail how they attempt to facilitate compliance. In Lanao del Norte, where the health center is at some distance, monthly checkups are done on the same day as FDS sessions, or the staff makes itself available for consultations during payout time. **In all provinces, program staff as well as elected officials also mentioned supply-side constraints, including a shortage of teachers (Occidental Mindoro), drugs (Negros Oriental), poor educational or medical infrastructure, such as a lack of latrines in schools (Mountain Province) or of ambulances (Lanao del Norte).**

**This study had also sought to understand regional heterogeneity in the CCT program implementation through the eyes of the program staff and other stakeholders.** However, its ability to do so turned out to be limited, because the design assumption that implementers would be able to make informed comparisons about program implementation in one locality to another locality within their jurisdiction did not work on the ground. First, the grassroots-level staff was focused on the narrow municipality or barangay and was not able to observe and articulate the differences across localities even if they worked in these localities. At the same time, senior staff was unable to compare how municipalities or provinces under their management cross-compared. When asked how the program implementation fared in a specific municipality compared to other municipalities in the province or the region, program staff was unable to assess program performance in those terms.

*Program administration, including registration, payment, Compliance Verification System (CVS) and the Grievance Redress System (GRS)*

**In general, program staff reported that program systems, payment and beneficiary information update systems in particular, have improved over time with shorter processing time and less errors being reported. However, the GRS is little understood, especially among non-beneficiaries. Improving comprehension and usage of this system could improve program performance as well.**

Several payment systems were described in the study sites the team visited, with MLhuiller and Landbank being the most appreciated systems. In Occidental Mindoro, which has recently switched from Landbank to MLhuiller, beneficiaries said they preferred MLHuiller and that they no longer need to spend money on transportation to and from the payout site, and that the payment is faster than before. Another constraint with Landbank is that many beneficiaries are illiterate and do not know how to use the Bank Card—a constraint that was mentioned in both Lanao del Norte and Occidental Mindoro. Overall, beneficiaries in all study sites reported that the system has improved over time and that their current wait times are shorter than ever before.

Several barangays reported that their payment systems had changed over the past several years and that the latest system is the best they have used because it has evolved in response to local conditions, including the time to travel to payment site, costs incurred during such travel and security concerns.

Interestingly, there was not necessarily a consensus on which payment system is the best across barangays. Some groups reported liking LandBank best, while others preferred receiving cash payments from the ML. The salient feature behind the popularity of a system appears to be whether it has been adapted to local conditions.

Beneficiaries in all four of the study sites are aware of the beneficiary information update system and how it works. They know when and how they need to provide the information for updates and that there is a lag of a few weeks for the updates to be processed. Several beneficiaries reported that the update process had become faster and more accurate over time. At the same time, program staff across the study sites also noted the lags in the update system.

Several beneficiaries across all study sites complained about receiving “system error” messages that resulted in a lower-than-expected grant amount received. In a few of these cases, it was unclear whether the beneficiary failed to understand why the entitlement was low or whether there are in fact underlying errors. While the program staff was aware that these “system error” messages occurred due to problems at the central level, they felt frustrated as they could not explain to the beneficiaries why these errors were happening and what could be done about them.

Some non-beneficiaries in Mountain Province, Occidental Mindoro and Lanao del Norte complained about not having been interviewed under the NHTS because they were away from home the first time the survey team came and the team never made a repeat visit.

Elected officials and non-beneficiaries across all four provinces also reported knowing of poor people who were not enrolled. The Barangay Health Worker in one of our study site has apparently listed the names of people who were “left out” of the first round of the NHTS. All elected officials and several program staff also requested that the program be expanded to cover more people in their area. By allowing non-beneficiaries to officially lodge complaints such as these, the GRS seeks to address issues in registration. However, non-beneficiaries were not aware of any of the program systems, including GRS. Ideally, non-beneficiaries should know where and how to register any complaints about the program, but this was not the case in any of the locations visited by the study. Further, program staff reported that while the Compliance Verification System (CVS) is now largely accurate, it still occasionally fails to update. Interestingly, not even the beneficiaries had heard of the CVS.

### *Family Development Sessions*

*Beneficiary in Occidental Mindoro: “We learned a lot like in nutrition and business [during FDS]. We are happy and those are useful.”*

*Non-beneficiary in Mountain Province: “[FDS] is where they discuss responsibility of the parents, laws on women. Those who have vices like drinking and smoking are being reported, so it may not be removed but at least, it’s being minimized.”*

### **All interviewed groups had largely positive things to say about the content of the FDS.**

A Municipal Link described the FDS as the heart of the program, while a provincial link stated that FDS implementation has strengthened community partnerships, with the LGU taking ownership of its constituents by providing adequate health and education infrastructure. DSWD program staff also makes a concerted effort to improve the content covered by bringing resource people to conduct the FDS session. FDS topics that were singled out for praise by beneficiaries include: composting, family planning, female empowerment, disciplining children, and domestic violence.

Since the Municipal Link is the usual facilitator of the FDS, the sessions allow beneficiaries to raise any questions or concerns about the program. In Lanao del Norte, beneficiaries also reported getting information on the timing and location of the release of the grant during the FDS. However, Parent Leaders pointed out that crowded FDS with too many participants in one session sometimes led to participants not paying enough attention during the session and thus being unable to retain the information they had been provided. In Mountain Province, one FDS session is for over 140 beneficiaries, making it difficult both for the organizers and the participants.

### *Program perception in the general population*

Elected officials and non-beneficiaries have clearly defined perceptions about participants. Non-beneficiaries in every Focus Group Discussion reported being envious of beneficiaries. They all said that they wished they had been included in the program. The non-beneficiaries in Negros Oriental in particular reported that they were very poor and did not understand why they were not included.

*Non-beneficiary in Mountain Province: "We knew that [the amount] they get from 4Ps isn't that big. [...] If [the grant] is for the studies of their children, they should use it on that, [but] some are irresponsibly using the money in other things. That's our observation."*

A few instances of bias were also reported. Some non-beneficiaries and elected officials said that the grants make beneficiaries lazy since they no longer need to work to earn a living. Even in instances where beneficiaries were not explicitly called lazy, the implication was that they were. For instance, in a discussion in Mountain Province, non-beneficiaries said that while they don't receive the grant, they work on their own, and persevere. "[They] survive but not with the government's help." Beneficiaries in turn view the conditions—primary and additional—as ways in which they can prove to their community that they are deserving, productive members of the community.

Others reported hearing of beneficiaries who used the grant for alcohol or gambling. In contrast, beneficiaries made it a point to note that they do not spend the grant on vices since the grants are for their children's benefit and not to spend on alcohol or gambling. This finding, however, is in contrast to the quantitative evidence of a decrease in alcohol consumption expenditure. The discordance between the quantitative and qualitative findings may be because non-beneficiaries are envious at being left out. Alternatively, it could be that one or two individuals may have misused the grant, but these instances became widely known and talked about.

On the other hand, one Parent Leader in Occidental Mindoro thinks that beneficiaries have become less lazy with the knowledge gained from FDS and the grants received. According to this Parent Leader, in the past, rather than work as day laborers, poor families would settle for eating cassava during the lean season. Now, these people have learned to grow vegetables in their backyard by buying seeds with the grant, and are no longer willing to settle for just cassava. Another Parent Leader in Mountain Province also noted that families are now able to save, start small businesses such as selling vegetables or raising hogs.

Elected officials and non-beneficiaries in Mountain Province said that only those known by barangay officials were selected for the survey, and that many people who should have been included were not because of a quota. These officials also stated that many poorer households were not included as beneficiaries and were now hurt and jealous.

To assess whether there is social stigma against the program beneficiaries, questions were asked whether beneficiary parents and/or their children are treated differently in the communities. Although most beneficiaries suggested that neither themselves nor their

children were treated any differently in the community, at health facilities or schools, a Parent Leader in Occidental Mindoro noted that beneficiaries are treated well at the health center and don't have to buy medicines.

### *Changes in the community*

**In all provinces, respondents told about a “better-looking community” resulting from the better-fed and better-clothed children of beneficiaries, as well as from the improvements to the beneficiaries’ houses. In two of the visited provinces, schools and health centers reportedly improved in terms of infrastructure and even service availability. However, these positive changes were not reported in the other provinces, and some concerns were raised about quality of services given the hiring of teacher aides to provide the additional supply necessary to meet the increased demand for education from beneficiaries.**

In Lanao del Norte, non-beneficiaries said that the barangay school has received better infrastructure and more teachers due to the increase in enrollment, which has improved the overall quality of this school. As a result, non-beneficiaries are willing to send their children to this school instead of the municipality school, which is a greater distance away. Similarly in Negros Oriental, elected officials and non-beneficiaries said that general conditions have improved at both health centers and schools. However, there were also reports by elected officials in Negros Oriental and in Mountain Province of classroom shortages and increased teacher-student ratio as a result of *Pantawid Pamilya*.

Elected officials and non-beneficiaries everywhere reported that many more children now attend school, the overall community looked better, there were fewer “poor-looking” people, houses were cleaner and sturdier, and there was greater political participation at the barangay-level.

In all four provinces, beneficiaries reported being able to start up small enterprises as a result of the cash grant. In Occidental Mindoro, one beneficiary had used the grant plus small contributions from fellow beneficiaries to start a goat farm. Other had opened *halo-halo* stands, *sari-sari* stores, and grocery shops. In some cases, these enterprises did not last too long, but the losses were minimal and the beneficiaries were able to start new enterprises within short periods. The quantitative study was not able to pick up any of these effects likely because they were too small on average.

Program staff reported observing the effect of consumption smoothing among beneficiaries. Specifically, they reported that beneficiary households no longer have to go hungry during the lean season as they can now rely on regular income from the program. Beneficiary households are no longer meeting their daily needs on credit from stores during the lean season as they can now save. In the coastal village in Occidental Mindoro, a Parent Leader reported that beneficiary households have now all bought boats, which allows them to fish without having to rent a boat or fish for others.



While many of these changes were beyond the scope of the quantitative impact evaluation, the lack of impacts on overall consumption and ownership of assets mask any such—admittedly small, but nonetheless visible— effects on the community.

## Discussion

**Overall, the study found evidence that the *Pantawid Pamilya* program is working well. Beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries, program staff, and elected officials, all reported that the program helps improve school attendance, which echoes the impact found in the quantitative impact evaluation. Also consistent with the quantitative results, in many barangays, it was reported that utilization of the health centers increased and that parents were more likely to take their children for regular checkups. In addition, beneficiaries reported that they had a greater feeling of self-worth and social cohesion (with other beneficiaries) and for the first time, felt that the government cares about them and their children.**

### *The mechanisms of the impact of the Pantawid Pamilya*

**The CCT program is operated in a standardized manner across regions, with program administrative systems in place and operating in a consistent manner.** Program staff and different actors involved in implementation reported playing their specified roles as designed and delivering messages to beneficiaries as required by the implementation guidelines. This results in consistent program implementation. The only aspect of the CCT program where local variations were reported is the Family Development Sessions. The FDS received both praise and criticism from beneficiaries., The quality of the content covered in FDS and their logistics seem to vary considerably at the local level, thereby leading to significant differences in beneficiaries' experiences with them.

**While beneficiaries reported enjoying many FDS topics, and program staff identified the FDS as “the heart of the program”, the variable content and schedule may contribute to a divergent program impact across regions.** The quality of FDS and the topics covered seem to largely depend on the resourcefulness and initiatives of the Municipal Links in inviting resource persons and making the FDS an appropriate forum for learning. Encouraging collaborations with groups of CSOs and academia to further develop and standardize content and FDS schedules across regions may help the program become more efficient. In addition, opening up the substantive component of the FDS to the entire community may help abate the program's spillovers to community dynamics resulting from non-beneficiaries feeling left out.

### *The program perception in the general population*

In general, the program is perceived positively by non-beneficiaries, as well as elected officials who commented that beneficiary children were more eager to go to school now that they have new uniforms and full stomachs. A small minority of elected officials thought that the program should provide livelihood support to the beneficiaries rather than cash transfers. In every study area there was a clear manifestation of raised expectations for



program beneficiaries to “give back” to the communities in the form of additional conditions.

**The study team found that in every barangay visited, additional conditions were imposed on beneficiaries.** These conditions varied from not being allowed to drink or gamble to being required to clean the school or a health center. Elected officials and DSWD program staff were generally aware of these additional conditions; however, none of those that were spoken to saw the need to end such deviations from program policy; indeed, some implementers even suggested that such additional conditions were just and that the beneficiaries should be expected to do even more in return for the grant. Both primary and additional conditionality are enforced through social pressure and expectations. Non-beneficiaries feel envious and left out causing them to expect “more” of the beneficiaries—more in terms of parental responsibilities to their children as well as community service. Elected officials observe that several poor households in their area did not receive the program and consider the beneficiaries to be lucky. As a result, beneficiaries feel obliged to do more than just meet the conditionality to pay their dues to society. Perhaps surprisingly, elected officials simultaneously lack knowledge of the program and are strongly of the opinion that the program is too much of a handout. Better communicating the goals, strategies and implementation of the program to elected officials and communities may help counter some of the pressure on beneficiaries to do more than is required of them.

**Beneficiaries thus face a greater burden on their time than perhaps is intended or understood by program staff.** The issue of a disproportionate time burden, although to a large extent depends on the extent of the additional “conditions” and “tasks” beneficiaries are required to perform, may undermine the ability of the program to reduce poverty. Additional conditions that impose too much of a time burden on beneficiaries, may limit their ability to engage in income-generating activities, so that the cash transfer at best compensates for the additional time they spend meeting the informal requirements of the program. In this case, the program may fail to promote households out of poverty and simply protects them from fluctuations in income, instead. As a result, any gains to household stability may be short term and easily eroded in the absence of the program. It may perhaps be advisable for the program to track or at least be cognizant of the potential harm that these additional conditions can do to distract the program from achieving its full potential impact.

### ***Spatial heterogeneity of the program impact***

One of the objectives of this study was to identify sources of regional heterogeneity in program impact, identified by the quantitative impact evaluation. The study was thus designed to identify the differences in the ways in which the program is implemented and how it is perceived by the community. The study did not detect clear evidence of variations in either, although it identified potential sources of variability at a more micro level in the effectiveness of FDS. The possible reasons for this may be the fact that the study could only cover one village per municipality, which was also the most populous in terms of the number of program beneficiaries, and was also the closest village to the municipality center. By covering a wider range of program areas, the study may have captured more variability in how the program operates.

In addition, due to the time and logistics constraints, the study did not cover supply of health and education services, limiting its ability to triangulate the reported surge in school participation and use of health services by the program beneficiaries.

Studying the potential sources of heterogeneity in program impact may benefit from a larger study, covering a wider range of communities. Indeed, it may also require a more a program assessment approach that studies the program administrative data such the CVS, GRS, updates, and payments data, supplemented with a qualitative study, may be better able to analyze how to discuss how administrative issues affect the implementation of the program on the ground.

## Conclusion

Although this study could effectively provide answers to only two of the three research questions, it complements and corroborates the findings of the quantitative impact evaluation. However, there were findings that this qualitative study identified but were not found by the quantitative impact evaluation. The positive impact on consumption smoothing could not be statistically identified by the quantitative study, probably due to its small impact size or the season in which the data were collected. Other findings not identified by the quantitative evaluation include the program's effects on social cohesion among beneficiaries and social pressure they receive from the non-beneficiaries. These factors are direct effects of the program and invariably (albeit most probably indirectly) affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the program in which it achieves its program goals and therefore should also be studied and documented.

**This study complements the quantitative impact evaluation in several ways.** For instance, the quantitative impact evaluation did not capture the impact of the CCT on the beneficiaries' income seasonality, which the qualitative study did: the beneficiaries told that they find the grant most useful in meeting ends during the lean season. Further, through FGD, the study found that the grant enables beneficiaries to save enough to survive the lean season without having to rely on credits from stores. Several beneficiaries in each community are also able to save up enough to start small enterprises. The quantitative impact evaluation did not capture these protective effects on household livelihood, most probably because the impact size is too small to have been picked up by the quantitative IE. Interestingly a lot of these enterprises failed, but participants seemed relatively unconcerned and believed that they could open another similar enterprise in a few months due to the cash flow from the program, perhaps indicating scope for a livelihood intervention. These individuals were also highlighted as examples to be followed in the group discussions and by Parent Leaders.

Similarly, the quantitative impact evaluation did not capture the program's effects on the community, including the increased social cohesion among the beneficiaries as many Parent Leaders, elected officials and program staff pointed out. The mechanisms of how social pressure on beneficiary households work on their performance in the program, as well as in implementing additional conditions imposed were among other issues that were not highlighted by the quantitative evaluation. Non-beneficiaries repeatedly reported being jealous or envious of beneficiaries; such feelings may increase the instances of additional conditions, potentially placing an undue burden on beneficiaries' time.

The quantitative study also did not capture the roles and the responsibilities played by different stakeholders, in particular the lack of understanding of the program and its goals, conditions, and the targeting process by the elected officials who thought that the beneficiaries were lucky to be in the program and "knew" of many others who should have been in the program.

The *Pantawid Pamilya* program may benefit from taking into consideration some of these findings, and the second wave impact evaluation may also benefit from a mixed methods approach, by conducting a qualitative study larger in scope and in scale. In future qualitative

studies, including local health and education service providers in the study will add another dimension to the context in which the program operates. These qualitative findings help provide perspective to the quantitative findings and enrich our understanding of the program's true effect on the beneficiaries and their communities.

## References

DSWD and World Bank (2012). *Philippines Conditional Cash Transfer Program Impact Evaluation 2012*.

Department of Social Welfare and Development (2009), *Operations Manual for the Pantawid Familyang Pilipino Program*.

## Annexes: Field Tools and Instruments

### Fieldwork Guide

#### SAMPLING:

We have selected four central barangays in each of the four provinces in our study. Each barangay is in a municipality that participates in the *Pantawid Pamilya* program.

#### TEAM COMPOSITION:

- (1) Cebuano: Christine Ajoc and Marie Girado
- (2) Tagalog: Jennylyn Villena and King Francis Ocampo

#### OVERVIEW OF STEPS FOR FIELDWORK:

- (1) Field testing of focus group discussions will be conducted on Thursday, **August 15** in the barangay hall of Barangay 201 in **Pasay** in Metro Manila.
- (2) Field testing of key informant interviews will be conducted on Friday, **August 16** in Pasay in Metro Manila.
- (3) On Sunday, **August 18**, both teams, Jorge Avalos, Homaira Hanif and Eeshani Kandpal will travel to Occidental Mindoro.
- (4) On Monday, **August 19**, we will conduct the Key Informant Interviews with the provincial link, Municipal Link, the mayor, Barangay Captain and Parent Leaders. We will also set up the focus group discussions.
- (5) On Tuesday, **August 20** and Wednesday, **August 21**, we will conduct focus group discussions in Occidental Mindoro.
- (6) On Thursday, **August 22**, we will travel back to Manila.
- (7) On Friday, **August 23**, the **Cebuano team** will fly to Lanao del Norte and will make a courtesy visit to the mayor's office. If possible, the Key Informant Interview for the mayor will also be completed during this visit. The Cebuano team will then continue to complete the rest of the qualitative study for Lanao del Norte; the details of each step are as below. We anticipate that they can complete fieldwork in Lanao by **August 28**.
- (8) The **Tagalog team** will conduct the Key Informant Interviews with the regional directors for Lanao del Norte and Negros Oriental via phone, and in person with the regional director for Occidental Mindoro on Friday, **August 23**.
- (9) Between **August 23 and August 25**, the **Tagalog team** will also work with Homaira Hanif and Eeshani Kandpal to finalize the notes from Occidental Mindoro, and transcribe as much of the focus group discussions as possible.
- (10) On Monday, **August 26**, the **Tagalog team** will travel to Mountain Province. As necessary, Jorge and/or Homaira will accompany them. The Tagalog team will make a courtesy call to the mayor's office on Tuesday, **August 27**, and attempt to complete the interviews of the mayor, provincial link and Municipal Link on the 27<sup>th</sup>

itself. We anticipate that this team can complete fieldwork by **August 29**, following the steps detailed below. On the way back to Manila, on **August 30**, the team will interview the regional director.

- (11) On Tuesday, **September 3**, **Marie Girado** and **King Francis Ocampo** will travel to Negros Oriental for two days to complete the Key Informant Interviews with Implementers and the Parent Leader (there is only one in the barangay). They will return to Manila on **September 6**.

#### **KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS:**

- a. Before heading out to the field, the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) will communicate with the DSWD Regional offices relevant for the selected study sites. The regional offices will inform the provincial and Municipal Links in the respective study areas regarding the arrival of the study team.
- b. In the ideal scenario, the interview with the **regional directors (form “KII with regional directors”)** should take place face-to-face, but as the regional offices are often far from the study site, the interview could be conducted by phone. We will call all the regional directors to determine whether we can meet with them in person; if not, the interviews can be conducted via phone from the Bank office in Manila. We will complete all the phone interviews on August 23.
- c. At the municipality, the first point of contact is the contact person identified by DSWD, and whose contact information is listed in this guide. The team should ask these contact persons to help set up interviews with the **provincial links and the Municipal Links**. The team then should introduce themselves to the mayor for the selected municipality and introduce the study. Please explain that the team will be in the selected barangay and provide the exact dates. Request for interviews with all three of these interviews (provincial links, Municipal Links, and mayor) on the same day, or schedule one or two on a day with one FGD (described below). If the interviews are not conducted on that day, the team must return to the mayor’s office for the interview with the mayor.
- d. On the day(s) that they are available, the team will interview the **provincial link (“KII with provincial links”), Municipal Link (“KII with Municipal Links”)** and the **mayor “KII with mayor”**), following the same procedure as above.
- e. In addition, the team will interview the **Barangay Captain (“KII with Barangay Captains”)** Then, the team will interview two **Parent Leaders (“KII with Parent Leaders”)**. Ask the Municipal Link to give you a comprehensive list of all the Parent Leaders and their contact number (if any) in the village that you will be studying. List all the Parent Leaders alphabetically using their full names [First name Last name] (not nicknames), and then interview the following Parent Leaders:
  - a. Lanao Del Norte: 1<sup>st</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>
  - b. Mountain Province: 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>
  - c. Negros Oriental: 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>
  - d. Occidental Mindoro: 1<sup>st</sup>

- f. We estimate that the interviews of the Municipal Links, mayor, Barangay Captains, and two Parent Leaders will each last for about an hour and can be accomplished in 1.5-2 days including a preliminary cleaning up the interview notes.

A few general points to note for these key informant interviews:

- (1) Please stress that this is not an evaluation of the Pantawid Pamilya program, simply an exploratory study to better understand how the program works.
- (2) Please select a quiet place for the interview and conduct each of these interviews where there is some privacy (no on lookers or people listening into the conversation). At the end of the interviews, ensure that all the questions were asked and go back to the questions that may not be complete. After making sure that you have all the information, thank the interviewee for his/her time and the information.
- (3) After the interview, please carefully review your notes and clean them as necessary.
- (4) One team member should conduct the interview, while the other one operates the recorder and takes notes.

#### **FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS (FGD):**

- a. In addition to the key informant interviews, we will conduct two types of FGDs in Occidental Mindoro, Lanao del Norte, and Mountain Province. We will not conduct FGDs in Negros Oriental.
- b. In the first FGD (**FGD-1A and FGD-1B**), we will ask about program implementation, while in the second FGD (**FGD-2A and FGD-2B**), we will ask about program perception.
- c. Each FGD will be held for treated and untreated households, for a total of 4 FGDs per barangay.
- d. At the end of each FGD, we will spend 15 minutes asking participants about their understanding of certain subjective welfare questions. These questions were originally part of the quantitative impact evaluation of the Pantawid Pamilya program, and we are seeking to gauge how well and how consistently the questions were understood by the respondents.
- e. Each focus group should target to be completed in one hour.

Here is how the team will locate potential candidates for inclusion in the FGDs:

- a. We will give the teams a list of names of 32 households that are eligible for *Pantawid Pamilya* for each of the four FGDs in each of the three selected barangays.
- b. After interviewing the Barangay Captain and Parent Leaders, the team will identify where the households on the list are and invite the first eight to ten households available from each list to FGD-1A and FGD-1B, and the next eight to ten available for FGD-2A and FGD-2B. Usually the best way to find where the households are is by asking the Parent Leaders and/or the Barangay Captain. If the first eight cannot

be identified or are not in the barangay, go to the next household. Do not skip households and make sure that all the households are invited starting from the top of the list going down, until you find 8 grantees who are willing to participate.

- c. At the end of each FGD, please ensure that you have carefully reviewed your notes.
- d. After reviewing your notes, please make an outline of the transcription—this will help you transcribe with greater speed once you return from the field.
- e. We estimate that we will be able to do up to two FGDs each day. On days we do only one FGD, we should aim to also complete any remaining key informant interviews, and/or carefully review notes and work on transcription outlines.

**Field Worker Diary** – Each team should write a diary in English while you are in the field. Please write down anything that you found interesting, anything you heard people say about the village, about the municipality, about the Pantawid Pamilya program, outside of the focus groups and key informant interviews. Please do this together at the end of each day in the field.

**It is very important that the team introduces themselves as well as the study properly. Here are examples of how we suggest you introduce yourselves.**

Introduction: Good Morning. My name is [...]. My teammate, [...], and I are participating in a DSWD supported, World Bank implemented qualitative study that seeks to understand the Pantawid Pamilya program. We want to understand how the program works, how it was implemented, who participates in it, and how the program is perceived in your barangay.

FOR KIIs: We would like to have a brief conversation with you that should take no longer than one hour, in which we would like to ask you about your role in the implementation of the program, your thoughts on the program, and any areas where you think the program could be improved in your area [region/province/municipality/barangay].

For FGDs: We would like to have a brief group discussion with all of you that should take no longer than one hour, in which we would like to ask you about (your participation in) the Pantawid Pamilya program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program in this barangay. We ask that everyone participate and express themselves freely, but that you are respectful of each other's views as there are no correct or incorrect answers. At the end of the discussion, we will set aside about 10 minutes to go over some questions about your perceptions of your own life and well being. Please know that your participation in this discussion will in no way affect your benefits from the program, nor will we reveal your identities to anyone outside this room.



## Instruments for Key Informant Interviews

### Key Informant Interview with Regional Director

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour, in which we would like to ask you about the Pantawid Pamilya program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions? Do you give consent?

*[This interview with the Regional Director is to capture implementation from the highest level, especially how this province compares to other provinces. We want to know his/her experiences with the program. This entire questionnaire is asking about your province in particular in comparison to the rest of the region.]*

#### Background Information:

| Age | Highest Level Education | Where are they originally from? | Do they speak the local languages? Which ones? | Note the gender |
|-----|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|
|     |                         |                                 |  |                 |

#### General:

1. Can you tell me about when 4Ps entered this province?

*[We want to know what they think are the important goals of the program and how their job relates to the goals; how they prioritize their activities.]*

**2. What is the goal of 4Ps?**

**3. What do you consider to be your priority activities for 4Ps?**

*[We want to know about their trainings so far and if they consider it sufficient. They might have received many trainings and we want to know if overall they were good and whether it should be improved/changed.]*

**4. How do you feel about the training you have received for the program until now?**

- a. Was the training sufficient for you to perform your job?
  - i. Or did you have to consult with someone else on the aspects of your job?
- b. Do you have any suggestions for the training so that you can be more effective in your role in the 4Ps program?
- c. Who do you go to if you have problems?

*[We want to understand the supply-side constraints that may prevent the province from performing well.]*

**5. Does this province, in comparison to other provinces in the region, have enough health infrastructure and personnel to provide the health services required for 4Ps beneficiaries appropriately?**

- a. Probe for details. Are there supply-side constraints? Etc If so, what are the reasons of the constraints?
- b. In comparison to other provinces?

***Conditions:***

*[We're trying to understand what the Regional Director perceives are the barriers for beneficiaries in meeting conditionalities.]*

**6. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps health requirements, in this province compared to others in the region?**

- a. **If they mention difficulties, probe on reasons.**
  - b. **What would be more reasonable?**
7. **How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps education requirements, in this province compared to others in the region?**
- a. **If they mention difficulties, probe on reasons.**
  - b. **What would be more reasonable?**
8. **Based on your experiences, do you think the numbers and types of conditionalities are reasonable for beneficiaries to comply with?**
- a. **What difficulties do they encounter in complying with them?**

*[We want to know if the Regional Director is aware of any variations/divergence from the intended implementation of the program]*

9. **Are you aware of additional conditions, not from the program, beneficiaries have to meet in order to receive the payment?**

***Perception of Family Development Sessions:***

*[We want their general opinions about FDS and what their impression is regarding effect.]*

10. **What do you think about the Family Development Sessions?**
- a. **Probe specific responses: positive and negative. Tell me more about why you think it is good/bad.**
  - b. **How can they make FDSs more useful?**
  - c. **How are the FDS in this province, compared to other provinces.**

***Payments:***

*[We want their general impression of the payment process and if the Director knows of any issues or bottlenecks in the system. In addition, we're interested in the update system, and the Compliance Verification System]*

11. **How well has the payment process worked across the provinces in this region? And in this province in particular?**
- a. **Have payments been made in a timely fashion?**
  - b. **If not, what are the bottlenecks that cause delay? Ask for each payment method that is in this province.**

**12. Are you aware of any irregularities (breaking of 4Ps rules) regarding the payments to beneficiaries (such as officials demanding fees, fraud, etc)?**  
a. How were these addressed? What were the results?

**13. What are the main bottlenecks of the update system (BUS)?**  
a. What is the source of the issues?

**14. How well does the Compliance Verification system work?**  
a. How accurate is it?  
b. How about those who didn't comply? Are there issues with capturing them?  
c. If there are issues, where are the bottlenecks in the CVS system?  
d. What are some changes you would make to improve performance?

***Issues/Concerns:***

*[Be sure to probe answers, how they are in comparison to other provinces.]*

**15. How well has the implementation of the program gone overall?**  
a. In this province compared to others?  
b. What have been some key issues?

**16. What issues, concerns, or complaints do you frequently encounter from the beneficiaries and the service providers?**

**17. Who do you go to if you have questions or problems with the program?**  
a. What questions have been raised to them?  
b. How were they addressed?  
c. Did you feel they were appropriately addressed?

*[In the next 4 questions (18-21), we're first interested in general complaints. The last question is focused on the grievance resolution system specifically.]*

**18. What are the top three complaints you receive in this region?**  
a. Ask for comparison of your province to others in region. Similar?

**19. How many complaints do you receive in a typical month for this region?**

**20. What do you think about the complaints, are they reasonable?**

**21. What do you think about the grievance resolution system?**  
a. Is it effective? How can it be more effective?

### ***SERVICES***

**22. Have you noticed any changes in your region since the start of 4Ps?**  
a. Probe: Depending on their answers, you can continue with the questions below in the order they bring up the topics. If they don't bring up any of the topics, then continue with the guide.

**23. Have you noticed any changes in the schools in this province since the introduction of 4Ps?**  
a. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?  
b. Examples: Noticed changes in the number of children in classes; changes in quality of school.

**24. Have you noticed any changes in health services in this province since the introduction of 4Ps?**  
a. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Changes in quality of services provided or wait time.  
b. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?

**25. Overall, how does this province (name the one you're going to) compare to others in the region for school and health services?**

- a. Probe for specifics if they can tell you anything about bottlenecks, etc  
Probe for reasons why they might be different.**

**26. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the 4Ps program?**

**Thank them for their time.**

## Key Informant Interview with Provincial Link

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour, in which we would like to ask you about the Pantawid Pamilya program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. Everything discussed here will be kept confidential and we will not reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. We will mention the provinces and municipalities we visited, so it may be possible for someone to identify you, but we will not disclose your identity. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions? Do you give consent?

*[The provincial link is the main DSWD official on the provincial level who interacts with the municipalities. In this interview we're to **capture their experiences in the province and to compare the municipalities.**]*

### **Background Information:**

| Age | Highest Level of Education | Where are they originally from? | Do they speak the local languages? Which ones? | Note the gender |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|
|     |                            |                                 |  |                 |

### **General:**

**27. When did 4Ps enter this province?**

**a. When did it start in the municipality we are going to?**

- 28. How were you recruited for your position?**  
a. How long have you been in your position?

*[We want to know what they think are the important goals of the program. We want to know what they think are the important goals of the program and how their job relates to the goals; how they prioritize their activities.]*

- 29. What is the goal of 4Ps?**

- 30. What are your main activities for the 4Ps?**  
a. Which do you consider to be your priority activities?

*[We want to know about their trainings so far and if they consider it sufficient. They might have received many trainings and we want to know if overall they were good and whether it should be improved/changed.]*

- 31. How do you feel about the training you have received for the program until now?**  
a. Was the training sufficient for you to perform your job?  
i. Or did you have to consult with someone else on the aspects of your job?  
b. Do you have any suggestions for the training so that you can be more effective in your role in the 4Ps program?

**Registration:**

*[We want to understand their knowledge of the registration process and any variations in the implementation of registration across the provinces.]*

- 32. How were households selected for the program?**

- 33. Were community assemblies conducted in this province at the beginning of the program implementation?**  
a. For Set 1?  
b. How about for other sets?  
c. Probe on variations across the province.

- 34. In this province, are there poor households that you know of that are currently not identified as eligible for 4Ps, although in your opinion they should be?**  
a. If yes, do you know why they were not identified as eligible?

- 35. How well does the update system work (BUS)?**  
a. What are the main bottlenecks?



- b. Ask for details.

**Conditions:**

*[We're trying to understand what the Provincial Link perceives are the barriers for beneficiaries in meeting conditionalities. We want to understand the supply-side constraints that may prevent the province from performing well.]*

- 36. Does this province have enough health facilities and personnel to provide the health services required for 4Ps beneficiaries appropriately?**
  - a. Probe for details. Are there supply-side constraints? Etc If so, what are the reasons of the constraints?
  - b. Ask comparison of your municipality to others in the province.

*[We're trying to understand what the Provincial Link perceives are the barriers for beneficiaries in meeting conditionalities AND how that compares in your municipality versus others.]*

- 37. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps health requirements in this province?**
  - a. If they mention difficulties, probe on reasons.
  - b. Be sure to probe on variations across the municipalities.
  - c. What would be more reasonable?

- 38. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps education requirements, in this province?**
  - a. If they mention difficulties, probe on reasons.
  - b. Be sure to probe on variations across the municipalities.
  - c. What would be more reasonable?

- 39. Based on your experiences, do you think the numbers and types of conditionalities are reasonable for beneficiaries to comply with?**
  - a. What difficulties do you know about that they have in complying with them?

- 40. Are you aware of additional conditions not from the program [but imposed by local officials] beneficiaries have to meet in order to receive the payment?**

**Participation in Family Development Sessions:**

*[We want their general opinions about FDS and what their impression is regarding effectiveness/usefulness.]*

**41. What do you think about the Family Development Sessions?**

- a. Probe specific responses the group gives: positive and negative. What they think beneficiaries liked the most/least?
- b. What was helpful to the beneficiaries? How can they make FDSs more useful for the beneficiaries?

***Payments:***

*[We want their general impression of the payment process and if the Provincial Link knows of any issues or bottlenecks in the system. In addition, we're interested in the update system, and the Compliance Verification System]*

**42. How well has the payment process worked across the municipalities? And in this municipality in particular?**

- a. Have payments been made in a timely fashion?
- b. If not, what are the bottlenecks that cause delay? Ask for each payment method that are in this municipality.

**43. Have you heard of instances where beneficiaries have to pay something or make a contribution to receive payment?**

- a. How were these addressed? What were the results?

**44. How well does the Compliance Verification system work?**

- a. How accurate is it?
- b. How about those who didn't comply? Are there issues with capturing them?
- c. If there are issues, where are the bottlenecks in the CVS system?
- d. What are some changes you would make to improve performance?

***Issues/Concerns:***

*[Be sure to probe answers, how they are in comparison to other municipalities.]*

**45. What issues, concerns, or complaints do you frequently encounter from the beneficiaries and the service providers?**

- a. Probe: This municipality compared to others in the province

- 46. What are the top three complaints you receive in this municipality?**
- a. From beneficiaries:**
  - b. From providers:**

- 47. Which ones are you able to address at your level?**
- a. Explain details.**

- 48. Which ones do you need to forward to other or higher offices? Why?**
- a. Were these addressed? How were these addressed?**

**49. How many do you receive in a typical month?**

**50. What do you think about the complaints, are they reasonable?**

- 51. What do you think about the grievance resolution system (GRS)?**
- a. Is it effective? How can it be more effective?**

### *Services*

*[We want to know about overall changes in the province, as well as variations across the municipalities.]*

- 52. Have you noticed any changes in the schools, in this province, since the introduction of 4Ps? How about in this municipality**
- c. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
  - d. Examples: Noticed changes in the number of children in classes; changes in time teachers spend with their child; changes in quality of school.**

- 53. Have you noticed any changes in the health center, in this province, since the introduction of 4Ps? How about in this municipality?**
- c. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Changes in quality of services provided or wait time.**
  - d. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
  - e. Do you feel you have better, the same or worse healthcare now with 4Ps?**

**54. Overall, in regards to 4Ps implementation, how does this municipality compare to other municipalities in your province?**

- a. Probe for specifics if they can tell you anything about bottlenecks, etc  
Probe for reasons why they might be different.**

**55. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the 4Ps program?**

**Thank them for their time.**

## Key Informant Interview with Municipal Link

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour, in which we would like to ask you about the Pantawid Pamilya program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. Everything discussed here will be kept confidential and we will not reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. We will mention the provinces and municipalities we visited, so it may be possible for someone to identify you, but we will not disclose your identity. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions? Do you give consent?

[The Municipal Link is the main DSWD official on the municipal level who interacts with the barangays. In this interview we're to capture their experiences in the municipality and to compare the barangays.]

Background Information:

| Age | Highest Level of Education | Where are they originally from? | Do they speak the local languages? Which ones? | Note the gender |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|
|     |                            |                                 |  |                 |

**General:**

**56. When did 4Ps enter this municipality?**

**57. How were you recruited for your position?**

**a. How long have you been in your position?**

[We want to know what they think are the important goals of the program. We want to know what they think are the important goals of the program and how their job relates to the goals; how they prioritize their activities.]

**58. What is the goal of 4Ps?**

**59. What do you consider to be your priority activities?**

**60. How do you feel about the training you have received for the program?**

- a. Was the training session sufficient for you to perform your job?
  - i. Or did you have to consult with someone else on the aspects of your job?
- b. Do you have any suggestions for the training so that you can be more effective in your role in the 4Ps program??
- c. Who do you go to if you have questions or problems with the program?

***On Parent Leaders:***

*[We want to understand how much they know about the selection process of Parent Leaders and how Parent Leaders function and their perceptions of how successful they are in their position.]*

**61. How were Parent Leaders chosen?**

**62. What is the role of Parent Leaders in the program?**

- a. Is there a fixed term for Parent Leaders?

**63. How do you feel about the training Parent Leaders have received?**

- a. Do you feel it is enough to do the job? Explain.

**64. Do you think they are performing their role as expected? Explain.**

**65. How do you feel about your relationship with the Parent Leaders?**

***Registration:***

*[We want to understand their knowledge of the registration process and any variations in the implementation of registration across the barangays in that municipality.]*

**66. How do poor households register for the program in this barangay?**

a. How does that compare to other barangays in this municipality?

**67. Were community assemblies conducted in this municipality at the beginning of the program implementation?**

- a. For Set 1?
- b. How about for other sets?

**68. Are there poor households that you know of that are currently not identified as eligible for 4Ps, although in your opinion they should be?**

- a. If yes, do you know why they were not identified as eligible?

**69. What are the main bottlenecks of the update system (BUS)?**

- a. Ask for details.

***Participation in Family Development Sessions:***

*[We want their general opinions about FDS and what their impression is regarding effectiveness/usefulness.]*

**70. What do you think about the Family Development Sessions?**

- a. Probe specific responses the group gives: positive and negative. What they think beneficiaries liked the most/least?
- b. What was helpful to the beneficiaries? How can they make FDSs more useful for the beneficiaries?

***Conditions:***

*[We're trying to understand what the Municipal Link perceives are the barriers for beneficiaries in meeting conditionalities. We want to understand the supply-side constraints that may prevent the municipality from performing well.]*

**71. Does this municipality have enough health infrastructure and personnel to provide the health services required for 4Ps beneficiaries appropriately?**

- a. Probe for details. Are there supply-side constraints? Etc If so, what are the reasons of the constraints?

**72. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps health requirements in this province?**

- a. Probe on reasons given.**
- b. If yes, What would be more reasonable?**

**73. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps education requirements, in this province?**

- a. Probe on reasons given.**
- b. If yes, What would be more reasonable?**

**74. Based on your experiences, do you think the numbers and types of conditionalities are reasonable for beneficiaries to comply with?**

- a. What difficulties do they encounter in complying with them?**

**75. Do you know of additional conditions not from the program, but from other people, beneficiaries have to meet in order to receive the payment?**

***Payments:***

*[We want their general impression of the payment process and if the Provincial Link knows of any issues or bottlenecks in the system. In addition, we're interested in the update system, and the Compliance Verification System]*

**76. What do you think about the payment process?**

- a. How have people's experiences been with the payment process in this municipality?**

**77. Have payments been made in a timely fashion?**

- a. If not, what are the bottlenecks that cause delay? Ask for each payment method that is in this municipality or barangay.**
- b. Compared to other municipalities.**

**78. Have you heard of instances where beneficiaries have to pay something or make a contribution to receive payment?**

- a. How were these addressed? What were the results?**



- 79. How well does the Compliance Verification system work?**
- a. How accurate is it?**
  - b. How about those who didn't comply? Are there issues with capturing them?**
  - c. If there are issues, where are the bottlenecks in the CVS system?**
  - d. What are some changes you would make to improve performance?**

***Issues/Concerns:***

*[In the next 4 questions, we're first interested in general complaints. The last question is focused on the grievance resolution system specifically.]*

- 80. What are the top three complaints you receive in this municipality?**
- a. From beneficiaries:**
  - b. From providers:**

**81. How many do you receive in a typical month?**

**82. What do you think about the complaints, are they reasonable?**

- 83. Which ones are you able to address at your level?**
- a. Explain details.**

- 84. Which ones do you need to forward to other or higher offices? Why?**
- a. Were these addressed? How were these addressed?**

- 85. What do you think about the grievance resolution system (GRS)?**
- a. Is it effective? How can it be more effective?**

***COMMUNITY:***

**86. Have you noticed any changes in your municipality since the start of 4Ps?**

- b. **Probe:** Depending on their answers, you can continue with the questions below in the order they bring up the topics. If they don't bring up any of the topics, then continue with the guide.

**87. Are people the same, better or worse off in the community since the start of the 4Ps?**

- a. **Probe on specifics:** What are the changes, if any? Do they think it is related to 4Ps?
- b. **If they give an example of change, Probe:** is this common?

### ***SERVICES***

*[We want to know about overall changes in the municipality, as well as variations across the barangays.]*

**88. Have you noticed any changes in the schools since the introduction of 4Ps?**

- e. **If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
- f. **Examples:** Noticed changes in the number of children in classes; changes in time teachers spend with their child; changes in quality of school.

**89. Have you noticed any changes in the quality of health services since the introduction of 4Ps?**

- f. **If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Changes in quality of services provided or wait time.**
- g. **Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
- h. **Do you feel you have better, the same or worse healthcare now with 4Ps?**

**90. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the 4Ps program?**

**Thank them for their time.**

## Key Informant Interview with Parent Leader

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour, in which we would like to ask you about the Pantawid Pamilya program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. Everything discussed here will be kept confidential and we will not reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. We will mention the provinces and municipalities we visited, so it may be possible for someone to identify you, but we will not disclose your identity. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions? Do you give consent?

*[The interview with the Parent Leader is part of the implementation side of the 4Ps since they are closest to the issues with beneficiaries. They were appointed by DSWD to be a representative for beneficiaries. They provide information and support to beneficiaries.]*

### Background Information:

| Age | Highest Level of Education | Where are they originally from? | Do they speak the local languages? Which ones? | Note the gender |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|
|     |                            |                                 |  |                 |

### **INTRODUCTION**

91. How did you get involved with 4Ps?

**BEING PARENT LEADERS:**

*[We want to know their experiences as Parent Leaders and how it has affected their lives and time commitment. We want to understand if they know how to address grievances.]*

**92. How did you become a Parent Leader?**

- a. How long have you been a Parent Leader?
- b. What is your role in this program?

**93. How do you feel about being a Parent Leader?**

**94. What effect, if any, has being a Parent Leader had on your life?**

**95. How much of your time do you spend on Parent Leader activities?**

**96. Who do you go to if you have questions or problems with the program?**

- a. What questions have been raised to them?
- b. How were they addressed?
- c. Did you feel they were appropriately addressed?

**97. Have you have filed any grievances to the 4Ps program grievance redress system?  
If yes, then for what?**

- a. If you filed a grievance, has it been resolved? If yes, then by whom and how long did the resolution take? If no, what is the status of the grievance?

**98. Please tell me about your experiences working with the Municipal Link.**

- a. Probe on nature of meetings, how often they meet, what they discuss, etc

**UNDERSTANDING OF CONDITIONS**

*[We want to know their understanding of the program since they are the ones conveying information to others.]*

**99. What must you do to regularly receive the full grant amounts?**

**100. How did you learn about these conditions?**

- a. Probe: Who told them? What do you do if you have questions about the conditions?**

### ***PARTICIPATION IN FAMILY DEVELOPMENT SESSIONS***

**101. What do you think about the Family Development Sessions?**

- a. Probe specific responses the group gives: positive and negative. What is your role in the conduct of the FDS? What works and what doesn't work in conducting monthly FDS?**

### ***COMMUNITY***

*[We want to know how 4Ps are perceived in their communities; is there any stigma or envy attached to being in the 4Ps. We want to know if they feel 4Ps families are given preferential treatment and/or extra attention/resources OR the opposite.]*

**102. How do you feel the 4P families are treated in the barangay?**

- a. As far as you know: what do families who were not included in 4Ps feel towards the families that were included, such as yours?**
- b. What are the feelings/attitudes of people in the community, schools or health centers towards 4P families?**

*[Have them describe what they think has happened in their community since the start of 4Ps. Be sure to capture why they think these changes are connected to the program. Interesting areas to explore, depending on their answers, would be change in services, prices, employment opportunities...]*

**103. Have you noticed any changes in your barangay since the start of 4Ps?**

- c. Probe: Depending on their answers, you can continue with the questions below in the order they bring up the topics. If they don't bring up any of the topics, then continue with the guide.**

### ***PRICE***

*[We want to know specifically if they have noticed changes in price of **staple goods: rice, dried fish, eggs, corn**; list anything they mention as changes in price.]*

**104. Have you noticed any changes in prices of staple goods in the local market since the start of 4Ps?**

- a. If yes, probe for more detail on amount of change, timing, and which goods.
- b. Example of staple goods: rice, dried fish, eggs, corn

### ***EMPLOYMENT***

105. Since the start of 4Ps, are people the same, better or worse off?
  - a. Probe specifics and why they think it's connected to 4Ps.
  - b. Probe financial answers, what happens with the extra money?
106. Since the start of 4Ps, have you found it easier or harder to find jobs?
  - a. If yes, probe for details on type of jobs and amount of change in rates; differences for men and women.
107. How have the sources of earnings for your household changed, if at all, since the start of 4Ps?
  - a. Examples of economic activities: work, sources of earnings etc
  - b. If yes, probe what did you used to do, what do you do now? Ask same questions about spouse's economic activities as well.

### ***SERVICES***

108. How do you feel about the program's effect on your children's education (school environment)?
  - a. What signs encourage them to say positive or negative effects?
  - b. Probes: Feel their children will stay in school longer?
  - c. Examples: Noticed changes in the number of children in classes; changes in time teachers spend with their child; changes in quality of school.
  - d. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?
109. How has the 4Ps program affected your child's interest in going to school?
  - a. How would they explain the children's change in interest?
  - b. Has the attendance improved? Do they go to school prepared (i.e., assignments and projects)?

**110. Have you noticed any changes in the quality of services in the health center since the introduction of 4Ps?**

- i. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Changes in quality of services provided or wait time.**
- j. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
- k. Do you feel you have better, the same or worse healthcare now with 4Ps?**

**111. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the impact of the 4Ps program?**

**Thank them for their time.**

### Key Informant Interview with Mayor

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour, in which we would like to ask you about the Pantawid Pamilya program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions? Do you give consent?

Background information:

Province:

Municipality:

| Age | Highest Level of Education | Where are they originally from? | Do they speak the local languages? Which ones? | Note the gender |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|
|     |                            |                                 |  |                 |

#### **General:**

**112. How long have you been a mayor here?**

**113. When did 4Ps enter this area?**

**114. What is the goal of 4Ps?**

**115. What is your role with the 4Ps program?**

#### **Registration:**



*[We want to understand their knowledge of the registration process and if there were any issues in implementation. Try to discover any variations in the implementation that diverge from the original DSWD plan. Did the community assembly happen?]*

**116. How were households selected for the program?**

**117. Are there poor households that you know of that are currently not identified as eligible for 4Ps, although in your opinion they should be?**

**a. If yes, do you know why they were not identified as eligible?**

**Conditions:**

**118. Does this municipality have enough health facilities and personnel to provide the health services required for 4Ps beneficiaries appropriately?**

**a. Probe for details. Are there supply-side constraints? Etc If so, what are the reasons of the constraints?**

**119. Please explain the health conditions for 4Ps.**

**120. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps health requirements?**

**a. Probe on reasons given.**

**b. If yes, What would be more reasonable?**

**121. Please explain the education conditions for 4Ps.**

**122. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps education requirements?**

**a. Probe on reasons given.**

**b. If yes, What would be more reasonable?**

**123. Do you think the numbers and types of conditionalities are reasonable for beneficiaries to comply with?**

**a. What difficulties do they encounter in complying with them?**

**124. Do you know of additional conditions, not from the 4Ps program, beneficiaries have to meet in order to receive the payment?**

***Participation in Family Development Sessions:***

- 125. Do you know about the Family Development Sessions?**
- 126. What do you think about the Family Development Sessions?**
- a. Probe specific responses the group gives: positive and negative. What they think beneficiaries liked the most/least?**
  - b. What was helpful to the beneficiaries? How can they make FDSs more useful for the beneficiaries?**

***Payments:***

*[We want their general impression of the payment process and if the Barangay Captain knows of any issues or bottlenecks in the system. In addition, we're interested in the update system, and the Compliance Verification System]*

- 127. How well has the payment process worked in this municipality?**
- a. Have payments been made in a timely fashion?**
  - b. If not, what are the bottlenecks that cause delay? Ask for each payment method that are in this municipality.**
- 128. Are you aware of any irregularities (breaking of 4Ps rules) regarding the payments to beneficiaries?**
- a. How were these addressed? What were the results?**

***Issues/Concerns:***

*[Try to get specific information on issues so that we can compare the different levels in the analysis process. The questions are referring to issues specifically in relation to 4Ps, not general to the barangay.]*

- 129. How well has the implementation of the program gone overall?**
- a. What have been some key issues?**

*[In the next 4 questions, we're first interested in general complaints. The last question is focused on the grievance resolution system specifically.]*

130. What are the top three complaints you receive in this municipality?
- From beneficiaries:
  - From providers:
131. How many do you receive in a typical month?
132. What do you think about the complaints, are they reasonable?
133. Which ones are you able to address at your level?
- Explain details.
134. Which ones do you need to forward to other or higher offices? Why?
- Were these addressed? How were these addressed?
135. What do you think about the grievance resolution system (GRS)?
- Is it effective? How can it be more effective?

***COMMUNITY:***

136. Have you noticed any changes in the municipalities since the start of 4Ps?
- Probe: Depending on their answers, you can continue with the questions below in the order they bring up the topics. If they don't bring up any of the topics, then continue with the guide.
137. Since the start of 4Ps, are people the same, better or worse off?
- Probe specifics and why they think it's connected to 4Ps.
  - If yes what are the actions taken by the households in the community as a result of the change in the situation?

***SERVICES***

138. Have you noticed any changes in the schools since the introduction of 4Ps?
- If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?
  - Examples: Noticed changes in the number of children in classes; changes in time teachers spend with their child; changes in quality of school.

**139. Have you noticed any changes in the health center since the introduction of 4Ps?**

- l. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Changes in quality of services provided or wait time.**
- m. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
- n. Do you feel you have better, the same or worse healthcare now with 4Ps?**

**140. Overall, how does this barangay (name the one you're going to) compare to others in the municipality?**

- a. Probe for specifics if they can tell you anything about health and education services**
- b. Probe for reasons why they might be different.**

**141. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the 4Ps program?**

**Thank them for their time.**

## Key Informant Interview with Barangay Captain

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour, in which we would like to ask you about the Pantawid Pamilya program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions? Do you give consent?

[The Barangay Captain is an elected official. They may be new to the position and not have all the information regarding the implementation side. Still try to capture as much information as you can from them.]

Background Information:

| Age | Highest Level of Education | Where are they originally from? | Do they speak the local languages? Which ones? | Note the gender |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|
|     |                            |                                 |  |                 |

### ***General:***

**142. How long have you been a mayor here?**

**143. When did 4Ps enter this area?**

**144. What is the goal of 4Ps?**

**145. What is your involvement in 4Ps?**

### ***Registration:***

*[We want to understand their knowledge of the registration process and if there were any issues in implementation. Try to discover any variations in the implementation that diverge from the original DSWD plan. Did the community assembly happen?]*

146. How do poor households register for the program?
147. Were community assemblies conducted for this barangay at the beginning of the program implementation?
148. Are there poor households that you know of that are currently not identified as eligible for 4Ps although in your opinion they should be?
- a. If yes, do you know why they were not identified as eligible?

*Conditions:*

149. Does this barangay have enough health facilities and personnel to provide the health services required, given the demand?
- a. Probe for details. Are there supply-side constraints? Etc If so, what are the reasons of the constraints?
150. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps health requirements?
- a. If they mention difficulties, probe on reasons.
  - b. What would be more reasonable?
151. Does this barangay have enough education infrastructure and personnel to provide the education services required, given the demand?
- a. Probe for details. Are there supply-side constraints? Etc If so, what are the reasons of the constraints?
152. How do you feel about the beneficiaries' ability to meet the 4Ps education requirements?
- a. If they mention difficulties, probe on reasons.
  - b. What would be more reasonable?
153. Do you think the numbers and types of conditionalities are reasonable for beneficiaries to comply with?
- a. What difficulties do they encounter in complying with them?
154. Do you know of additional conditions not from the program beneficiaries have to meet in order to receive the payment?

***Participation in Family Development Sessions:***

*[We want their general opinions about FDS and what their impression is regarding effect.]*

- 155. What do you think about the Family Development Sessions?**
- a. Probe specific responses the group gives: positive and negative. What they think beneficiaries liked the most/least?**
  - b. What was helpful to the beneficiaries? How can they make FDSs more useful for the beneficiaries?**

***Payments:***

*[We want their general impression of the payment process and if the Barangay Captain knows of any issues or bottlenecks in the system. In addition, we're interested in the update system, and the Compliance Verification System]*

- 156. How well has the payment process worked?**
- a. Have payments been made in a timely fashion?**
  - b. If not, what are the bottlenecks that cause delay? Ask for each payment method that are in this barangay.**
- 157. Are you aware of any irregularities (breaking of 4Ps rules) regarding the payments to beneficiaries?**
- a. How were these addressed? What were the results?**

***Issues/Concerns:***

*[Try to get specific information on issues so that we can compare the different levels in the analysis process. The questions are referring to issues specifically in relation to 4Ps, not general to the barangay.]*

- 158. How well has the implementation of the program gone in this barangay?**
- a. What have been some key issues?**

*[In the next questions, we're first interested in general complaints. The last question is focused on the grievance resolution system specifically.]*

- 159. What are the top three complaints you receive in this barangay?**

- a. From beneficiaries:
- b. From providers:

160. Which ones are you able to address at your level?
- a. Explain details.
161. Which ones do you need to forward to other or higher offices? Why?
- a. Were these addressed? How were these addressed?
162. How many complaints do you receive in a typical month?
163. What do you think about the complaints, are they reasonable?
164. What do you think about the grievance resolution system, GRS?
- a. Is it effective? How can it be more effective?

***COMMUNITY:***

165. Have you noticed any changes in your barangay since the start of 4Ps?
- e. Probe: Depending on their answers, you can continue with the questions below in the order they bring up the topics. If they don't bring up any of the topics, then continue with the guide.
166. Since the start of 4Ps, are people the same, better or worse off?
- a. Probe specifics and why they think it's connected to 4Ps.

***SERVICES***

167. Have you noticed any changes in the schools since the introduction of 4Ps?
- i. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?
  - j. Examples: Noticed changes in the number of children in classes; changes in time teachers spend with their child; changes in quality of school.
168. Have you noticed any changes in the health center since the introduction of 4Ps?



- o. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Changes in quality of services provided or wait time.**
- p. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
- q. Do you feel you have better, the same or worse healthcare now with 4Ps?**

**169. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the 4Ps program?**

**Thank them for their time.**

## Focus Group Discussion Guides

### ***Focus Group Discussion with Beneficiaries (1A):***

#### ***Perceptions of Program Priorities and Rules***

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour or two, in which we would like to ask you about the 4Ps program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. Everything discussed here will be kept confidential and we will not reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. At the end of the discussion, we will set aside about 10 minutes to go over some questions about your perceptions of your own life and well being. Please know that your participation in this discussion will in no way affect your benefits from the program, nor will we reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions?

***Introduction:*** *[To get the group warmed up talking about 4Ps]*

- 170. Let's discuss the 4Ps program, how do you feel about being a beneficiary?**  
**a. How did you get involved?**

#### ***Understanding of the conditions:***

*[To understand what they list as conditions for them to receive full payment and to see if they know all the conditions they have to comply with. It isn't to test them. We just want to know what they consider requirements/conditions to receive payment. You should let the group discuss the requirements. Note if they seem to agree or if there are a lot of different answers.]*

- 171. What do you have to do to get the full grant amounts?**

*[We want to know about their sources of information and who they go to if they have any problems.]*

- 172. How did you learn about these conditions?**  
**a. Probe: Who told them? What do you do if you have questions about the conditions?**

*[Asking in general about any sort of conditions people in the community might impose: either attending meetings, additional fees, contributions etc to school or health center.]*

**173. Are there any additional conditions not from the program you need to meet in order to meet the requirements?**

- a. Probe: If yes, what are they? How did you learn about these conditions?**
- b. Probe: Imposed by school officials? Health center? Etc.**

***Experiences meeting the conditions:***

*[Starter question to see what the participants mention about compliance.]*

**174. Tell me about your experiences complying with the conditions.**

*[We want to understand issues, any difficulties in particular, in case it doesn't come up in the previous question.]*

**175. Were there any difficulties in complying with the conditions?**

- a. How did you address them?**
- b. Probe: What is the easiest condition? What is the most difficult?**
- c. Probes: education versus health conditions; younger children vs older children; boys vs girls**

*[We want to understand if the other people in the household help the beneficiaries with chores or other household activities so that they can comply with program. We want to know if anyone else is helping them with the extra time burden.]*

**176. What do your family members think about the program conditions?**

**177. How are your family members involved in meeting the conditions?**

***Participation in Family Development Sessions:***

*[We want to know their experiences with the FDS and if they are useful; conducted well etc Is it a burden to attend these sessions? If it's positive, what are the factors that they enjoyed?]*

**178. What do people think about the Family Development Sessions?**

- a. Probe specific responses the group gives: positive and negative.**
- b. What they liked the most/least? What was helpful?**

***Experiences receiving the cash grants:***

*[We want them to explain the process of receiving their grants, the mode of payment (debit card system, over the counter, mobile phones); We also want to know the difficulty and on average, how long it takes them to receive payment.]*

**179. How do you receive your grants?**

**180. How much time and effort was spent on receiving your grants?**

**a. Probe if there were any difficulties. Explore the process.**

*[We want to know about the timeliness of the update system, if there are any serious bottlenecks. As well as the accuracy, are they getting what they think should be.]*

**181. Your child was in daycare, now they are in elementary school. What would you need to do with the 4Ps to report changes like this?**

**a. Probe on any forms mentioned: What is \_\_ form? How does it work?**

**b. How do you update your information? (if they don't mention the update system)**

*[We want to know if they think the payment is greater than the effort and/or burden on their time.]*

**182. What do you think about the amount of the grant?**

**a. Probe on whether they think the amount is appropriate considering the conditions they have to meet.**

*[If this doesn't come up in the previous question, we want to know if others in the community, Parent Leaders or school officials or health centers, are asking for extra payments for services, products etc knowing that they are beneficiary of 4Ps.]*

**183. As a beneficiary, do you have to pay anything or make a contribution to receive payment?**

**a. Probe: by whom; how much; how often.**

***Interactions with the Parent Leaders and Municipal Links:***

*[We want to know if they go to Parent Leaders/Municipal Links when they have problems and if they are addressed to their satisfaction. We want to know if they were resolved and time. Ask about the grievance system and if they've used it, and if not, why they didn't file their grievance.]*

- 184. What do people do if they have questions or problems with the program?**
- a. What questions have been raised to them?**
  - b. How were they addressed?**
  - c. Did you feel they were appropriately addressed?**
  - d. If they filed a grievance, ask about process and if resolved.**

*[If they mention Parent Leaders/Municipal Links in the previous question, then be sure ask what their roles is in the program. If they don't, ask these questions separately, to understand how they interact with them.]*

- 185. What is the role of Parent Leaders in the program?**
- a. What have your experiences been with your Parent Leader?**

- 186. What is the role of the Municipal Links in the program?**
- a. What have your experiences been with your Municipal Link?**

- 187. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the 4Ps program?**

***Subjective Welfare Questions:***

*[This section will cover specific questions from the evaluation. We want to know their understanding of the questions, what does it make them think of when they hear this question. Be sure to probe key words and what they reference.]*

**Now I will read 3 questions to you and I want to know what each question means to you.**

**20. READ:** Pakiramdam ko ay malaya akong magdesisyon para sa aking sarili kung paano ako mamumuhay.

I feel like I am **free** to decide for myself how to live my life.

What does this mean to you?

Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?

What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

21. **READ:** Nakakaramdan ako ng kaigtingan o pressure sa aking buhay.  
I feel **pressured** in my life.

What does this mean to you?

Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?

What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

22. **READ:** Ang mga taong kakilala ko ay nagsasabi sa akin na ako ay mahusay sa aking ginagawa. People I know tell me I am good at what I do.

What does this mean to you?

Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?

What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

Thank them for their time.

## ***Focus Group Discussion with Non-Beneficiaries (1B):***

### ***Perceptions of Program Priorities and Rules***

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour or two, in which we would like to ask you about the 4Ps program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program in this barangay. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. At the end of the discussion, we will set aside about 10 minutes to go over some questions about your perceptions of your own life and well being. Everything discussed here will be kept confidential and we will not reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions?

*[What they understand to be the program. Explore how they think people were selected, and maybe why they were not selected. Probe on the conditions of the program. If they mention people just get money, ask what they have to do to receive the money.]*

- 1. Please tell me about the 4Ps program.**
  - a. Explore how they think people are selected to be in the program.**
  - b. Ask them to explain the conditions of the program.**

*[Connected to the first question. If you haven't already discussed this, be sure to ask them the goals.]*

- 2. What is the 4Ps for?**

### **Perceptions of 4Ps families:**

*[We want to know how 4Ps are perceived in their communities; is there any stigma or envy attached to being in the 4Ps. We want to know if they feel 4Ps families are given preferential treatment and/or extra attention/resources OR the opposite.]*

- 3. How do people feel about the families that were included in the 4Ps?**

4. **How do you feel people in the schools or health centers treat the 4Ps families?**
  - a. **If need to Probe: Are there differences in how 4Ps families are treated?**

*[We want to know even though they are not part of the 4Ps, what complaints they might have against the program (crowding out of services, increase prices etc). If they don't have any complaints, maybe they have heard complaints/grievances from others in the community. We want to know overall perceptions of the program]*

5. **Does any have complaints against 4Ps?**
  - a. **Explore reasons for complaints.**
  - b. **If mentioned Grievances, probe more on that and if they used GRS.**

*[Have them describe what they think has happened in their community since the start of 4Ps. Be sure to capture why they think these changes are connected to the program. Interesting areas to explore, depending on their answers, would be change in services, prices, employment opportunities...]*

6. **Have you noticed any changes in your community since the start of 4Ps?**
  - a. **Explore positive and negative changes and try to get details.**
  - b. **Probe: How does this affect your community?**
  - c. **How do any of these changes impact them?**
7. **Are people the same, better or worse off in the community since the start of the 4Ps?**
  - a. **Probe on specifics: What are the changes, if any? Do they think it is related to 4Ps?**
  - b. **If they give an example of change, Probe: is this common?**
8. **Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the 4Ps program?**

### ***Subjective Welfare Questions:***

*[This section will cover specific questions from the evaluation. We want to know their understanding of the questions, what does it make them think of when they hear this question. Be sure to probe key words and what they reference.]*

**Now I will read 3 questions to you and I want to know what each question means to you.**

9. **READ:** *May natutunan akong mga bagong kawili-wiling kakayahan kamakailan. I have been able to learn interesting new skills recently.*

What does this mean to you?



Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?

What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

10. **READ:** Sa aking pang-araw araw na buhay, madalas kong kailangang gawin kung ano ang sinabi sa akin.

*In my daily life, I frequently have **to do what I am told**.*

What does this mean to you?

Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?

What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

11. **READ:** Ang mga taong parte ng buhay ko ay nagmamalasakit sa akin.

*People in my life **care** about me.*

What does this mean to you?

Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?

What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

**Thank them for their time.**

## ***Focus Group Discussion with Beneficiaries (2A):***

### ***Fairness/Usefulness and Spillovers***

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour or two, in which we would like to ask you about the 4Ps program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. Everything discussed here will be kept confidential and we will not reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. At the end of the discussion, we will set aside about 10 minutes to go over some questions about your perceptions of your own life and well being. Please know that your participation in this discussion will in no way affect your benefits from the program, nor will we reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions?

*[See what they talk about concerning the program and probe on the overall goals of the program. How do they think the conditionalities relate to the goals? For example, the program wants to improve educational outcomes, so they require school attendance.]*

#### **2. Please tell me about the 4Ps program.**

- a. How do you feel about being a beneficiary?**
- b. Probe: What do you think is the goal of this program?**
- c. Probe on how they think the conditionalities relate to the goals.**

#### **ATTITUDE OF OTHERS:**

*[We want to know how 4Ps beneficiaries are perceived in their communities; by other members, in particular non-beneficiaries; secondly, by those who provide services, education or health. Is there any stigma or envy attached to being in the 4Ps? Do people treat them differently? We want to know if they feel 4Ps families are given preferential treatment and/or extra attention/resources at schools/health centers OR the opposite.]*

#### **3. How do you feel the 4P families are treated in the community?**

- a. As far as you know: what do families who were not included in 4Ps feel towards the families that were included, such as yours?**

- b. What are the feelings/attitudes of people in the community, schools or health centers towards 4P families?**

### **COMMUNITY**

*[Have them describe what they think has happened in their community since the start of 4Ps. Be sure to capture why they think these changes are connected to the program. Interesting areas to explore, depending on their answers, would be change in services, prices, wages, employment opportunities. In general, is the community better off as a result of households in the community participating in the program (ie: due to more money in the community)]*

- 4. Have you noticed any changes in your community since the start of 4Ps?**
  - a. Probe: Depending on their answers, you can continue with the questions below in the order they bring up the topics. If they don't bring up any of the topics, then continue with the guide.**

*[If it hasn't come up already, this question is trying to capture the financial changes in the community as a result of the extra money that households gets from participating. This is particularly relevant to poor areas with many households are beneficiaries in 4Ps]*

- 5. Are people the same, better or worse off in the community since the start of the 4Ps?**
  - a. Probe on specifics: What are the changes, if any? Do they think it is related to 4Ps?**
  - b. If they give an example of change, Probe: is this common?**

### **PRICE:**

*[We want to know specifically if they have noticed changes in price of staple goods: rice, galunggong fish, sweet potato (kamote), bread (pandesal); list anything they mention as changes in price.]*

- 6. Have you noticed any changes in prices of staple goods in the local market since the start of 4Ps?**
  - a. If yes, probe for more detail on amount of change, timing, and which goods.**

### **EMPLOYMENT**

*[This section wants to know if there have been any changes in job availability or in the daily wage rate. Potential areas of concern: some beneficiaries might choose to no longer work, therefore more jobs might be available. Or for some beneficiaries, their minimum wage requirements have increased and therefore the daily wage rate has changed in the community. Explore reasons for any changes they might have noticed.]*

**7. Since the start of 4Ps, have you found it easier or harder to find jobs?**

**8. Since the start of 4Ps, have you noticed any changes in the daily wage rate?**

- a. If yes, probe for details on type of jobs and amount of change in rates; differences for men and women.**

*[Has their expectations changed as a result of their participation in 4Ps? Do they now have savings when they didn't have it before? Do they think they can make longer term plans because you have more money (such as education for their children, investments)?]*

**9. Do you think the 4Ps has had an impact on your household's financial situation?**

- a. If yes to impact, explore why they think so.**  
**b. What are the actions taken by the household as a result of the change in the situation?**

*[We want to know more about what they do, the types of activities they engage in to earn money. Has the mix of sources of earnings changed?]*

**10. How have the sources of earnings for your household changed, if at all, since the start of 4Ps?**

- a. If changes, probe what did you used to do, what do you do now? Ask same questions about spouse's economic activities as well.**

## **SERVICES**

*[We want to know if their children will stay in school longer or the quality of education has decreased because there might be more children in the schools. Maybe topics will come up concerning parental involvement in their children's education. Be sure to understand the reasons they give for any effect of the 4Ps. Q11 is more focused on if their child is more engaged and if not, give reasons why. What are the barriers to children going to school?]*

**11. What do you think about the program's effect, if any, on your children's education?**

- a. What signs encourage them to say positive or negative effects?**  
**b. Probes: Feel their children will stay in school longer?**  
**c. Examples: Noticed changes in the number of children in classes; changes in time teachers spend with their child; changes in quality of school.**  
**d. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**

**12. How has the 4Ps program affected your child's interest, if at all, in going to school?**

- a. **How would they explain the change in interest?**
- b. **Has the attendance improved? Do they go to school prepared (i.e., assignments and projects)?**

*[We want to know their perceptions regarding the health center and if it has affected their healthcare. Are things better or worse since the start? Did they go to the health center before, if they didn't notice any changes?]*

**13. Have you noticed any changes in the quality of services at the health center since the introduction of 4Ps?**

- a. **If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Changes in quality of services provided or wait time.**
- b. **Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
- c. **Do you feel you have better, the same or worse healthcare now with 4Ps?**

**14. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the impact of the 4Ps program?**

***Subjective Welfare Questions:***

*[This section will cover specific questions from the evaluation. We want to know their understanding of the questions, what does it make them think of when they hear this question. Be sure to probe key words and what they reference.]*

**Now I will read 3 questions to you and I want to know what each question means to you.**

**15. READ:** Halos lahat ng araw nararamdaman ko ang sense of accomplishment o kabuluhan ng aking mga ginagawa.

*Most days I feel a **sense of accomplishment** from what I do.*

What does this mean to you?

- a. **Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, "not at all true"?**
- b. **What do you think it means if someone answers, "somewhat true"?**

**16.READ:** Sa aking buhay, hindi ako masyadong nagkaroon ng pagkakataon upang maipakita ang aking kakayahan.

*In my life, I do not get much of a chance to show how capable I am.*

What does this mean to you?

- a. Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?
- b. What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

**17.READ:** Karamihan sa mga tao ay palakaibigan sa akin.

*People are generally pretty friendly towards me.*

What does this mean to you?

- a. Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?
- b. What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

**Thank them for their time.**

## ***Focus Group Discussion with Non-Beneficiaries (2B):***

### ***Fairness/Usefulness and Spillovers***

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with us today. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and my colleague, \_\_\_\_\_, is here to help me. We are part of a research team from the World Bank working with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). We would like to have a conversation with you that should take about an hour or two, in which we would like to ask you about the 4Ps program, and your thoughts and experiences on the program in this barangay. We want you to be honest and tell us everything, the good and bad. At the end of the discussion, we will set aside about 10 minutes to go over some questions about your perceptions of your own life and well being. Everything discussed here will be kept confidential and we will not reveal your identities to anyone outside this room. We will record the interview only for ourselves so that we capture everything you say. It will not be shared with anyone else. My colleague will take notes during the interview. This participation is voluntary and you can choose to end the interview at any time you wish. Do you have any questions?

*[We want to know how nonbeneficiaries perceive the fairness of the program and if it's a useful program, even if they are not beneficiaries. We are also interested in whether the program has unintended consequences on nonbeneficiary households, whether positive or negative. Examples of unintended consequences include: crowded classrooms, longer wait times at health centers, higher immunization rates for children resulting in less sick children etc)]*

#### ***GENERAL***

*[What they understand to be the program. Explore how they think people were selected, and maybe why they were not selected. Probe on the conditions of the program. If they mention people just get money, ask what they have to do to receive the money.]*

#### **18. Please tell me about the 4Ps program.**

- a. Probe: What do you think is the goal of this program?**

#### ***ATTITUDE TOWARDS 4Ps FAMILIES:***

*[We want to know how 4Ps are perceived in their communities; is there any stigma or envy attached to being in the 4Ps. We want to know if they feel 4Ps families are given preferential treatment and/or extra attention/resources OR the opposite.]*

#### **19. How do people feel about the families that were included in the 4Ps?**

- a. **Probe: How do you feel the 4P families are treated in the community?**

**COMMUNITY**

*[Have them describe what they think has happened in their community since the start of 4Ps. Be sure to capture why they think these changes are connected to the program. Interesting areas to explore, depending on their answers, would be change in services, prices, employment opportunities, migration...]*

**20. Have you noticed any changes in your community since the start of 4Ps?**

- a. **Probe: Depending on their answers, you can continue with the questions below in the order they bring up the topics. If they don't bring up any of the topics, then continue with the guide.**

*[If it hasn't come up already, this question is trying to capture the financial changes in the community as a result of the extra money that households get from participating. This is particularly relevant to poor areas with many households are beneficiaries in 4Ps]*

**21. Are people the same, better or worse off in the community since the start of the 4Ps?**

- a. **Probe on specifics: What are the changes, if any? Do they think it is related to 4Ps?**  
b. **If they give an example of change, Probe: Is this common?**

**PRICE**

*[We want to know specifically if they have noticed changes in price of **staple goods** rice, galunggong fish, sweet potato (kamote), bread (pandesal); list anything they mention as changes in price.]*

**22. Have you noticed any changes in prices of staple goods, the main foods you consume on a daily basis, in the local market since the start of 4Ps?**

- a. **If yes, probe for more detail on amount of change, timing, and which goods.**

**EMPLOYMENT**

*[This section wants to know if there have been any changes in job availability or in the daily wage rate. Potential areas of concern: some beneficiaries might choose to no longer work, therefore more jobs might be available. Or for some beneficiaries, their minimum wage requirements have increased and therefore the daily wage rate has changed in the community. Explore reasons for any changes they might have noticed.]*

**23. Since the start of 4Ps, have you found it easier or harder to find jobs?**



- 24. Since the start of 4Ps, have you noticed any changes in the daily wage rate?**
- a. If yes, probe for details on type of jobs and amount of change in rates; differences for men and women.**

*[We want to know more about what they do, the types of activities they engage in to earn money. Has the mix of sources of earnings changes?]*

- 25. How have the sources of earnings for your household changed, if at all, since the start of 4Ps?**
- a. Examples of economic activities: work, sources of earnings etc**
  - b. If yes, probe what did you used to do, what do you do now? Ask same questions about spouse's economic activities as well.**

### **SERVICES**

*[We want to understand any changes in the schools: Noticed changes in the number of children in classes; changes in time teachers spend with their child; changes in quality of school]*

- 26. What do you think about the program's effect, if any, on your children's education?**
- a. What signs encourage them to say positive or negative effects?**
  - b. Probes: Feel their children will stay in school longer?**

*[We want to know their perceptions regarding the health center and if it has affected their healthcare. Are things better or worse since the start? Did they go to the health center before, if they didn't notice any changes?]*

- 27. Have you noticed any changes in the quality of services in the health center since the introduction of 4Ps?**
- a. If yes, probe for specific information positive/negative. Do they think it's because of the 4Ps program? Why?**
  - b. Do you feel you have better, the same or worse healthcare now with 4Ps?**

*[We want to know how 4Ps beneficiaries are perceived in their communities; is there any stigma or envy attached to being in the 4Ps. We want to know if they feel 4Ps families are given preferential treatment and/or extra attention/resources OR the opposite.]*

- 28. Do you think 4P families receive different quality of services from schools or health centers that are different from the rest of the population?**
- a. If they give examples of different lines or schedule times for 4Ps, probe on how that makes them feel. Do they think it is fair?**

**29. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the impact of the 4Ps program?**

***Subjective Welfare Questions:***

*[This section will cover specific questions from the evaluation. We want to know their understanding of the questions, what does it make them think of when they hear this question. Be sure to probe key words and what they reference.]*

**Now I will read 3 questions to you and I want to know what each question means to you.**

**30. READ:** Nakakasundo ko ang mga taong nakakasama ko.

I get along with people I come into contact with.

What does this mean to you?

- a. Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?
- b. What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

**31. READ:** Ako ay palaging nag-iisa at wala gaanong maraming nakakasalamuha.

I pretty much keep to myself and don't have a lot of social contacts.

What does this mean to you?

- a. Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?
- b. What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?

**32. READ:** Sa pangkalahatan, nararamdaman kong malaya kong naipapahayag ang aking mga ideya at opinion.

I generally feel free to express my ideas and opinions.

What does this mean to you?

- a. Probe: What do you think it means if someone answers, “**not at all** true”?
- b. What do you think it means if someone answers, “**somewhat** true”?