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ABSTRACT

The recent global financial and economic crisis which started in the United States and expanded to other developed countries has, to some extent, affected developing countries as well. Given the vulnerability of most developing countries, it is important to monitor the impact of this global crisis on poverty. This study, therefore, aims to assess the impact of the crisis on poverty in the Philippines. The result of this study would serve as inputs to policymakers in prioritizing mitigating measures that would address the impact of the crisis.

In this study, monitoring is done primarily through the conduct of CBMS surveys in selected sentinel sites. Household- and community-level data were collected to capture the different dimensions of poverty. In addition to the CBMS core indicators, specific indicators (including the outcome and impact indicators) were monitored to determine the impact of the global crisis. These indicators were identified based on the relevant key transmission channels for the Philippines including overseas employment and remittances, and local employment. The study also looked at the different coping mechanisms adopted by the households in response to the crisis. The study also attempted to identify who are able to access the programs which were being implemented in the community.

Ten (10) barangays all over the Philippines were selected to serve as poverty observatories or sentinel sites for monitoring the impact of the global crisis. Selection of these sites was also based on the relevant transmission channels for the Philippines. Results reveal that although the impact of the crisis is generally minimal, the crisis has affected some specific sectors in the economy. The degree of impact also varies among different groups of households. Hence, policies should be designed to mitigate the impact of the crisis on these affected sectors and groups of households.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The recent global financial and economic crisis which started in 2007 in the United States and expanded to other developed countries has, to some extent, affected developing countries as well. In particular, developing countries could be affected by the financial crisis in two possible ways: 1) financial contagion and spillovers for stock and bond markets in emerging markets; and 2) economic downturn in developed countries. Economic downturn in developed countries may have significant impact on developing countries through the following channels: a) trade and trade prices; b) remittances, c) foreign direct investment and equity investment; d) commercial lending; e) aid; and f) other official flows. Although the economic impact of the global financial crisis would vary across different countries, it is expected that, in general, there would be further pressures on current accounts and balance of payment. The crisis could also result in weaker export revenues, lower investment and GDP growth rates and loss of employment. In terms of social impact, the lower growth would translate into higher poverty and even slower progress toward the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Velde, 2008).

The Philippines was not able to escape the adverse consequences of the crisis. This can be clearly shown by Philippine data for the period 2004-2009. In terms of economic growth, the Philippines posted an annual rate of 3.8 percent in 2008 which is down from 2007’s 31-year high of 7.1 percent (Figure 1). In 2009, the country posted a relatively lower GDP growth at 0.6 percent, 1.5 percent and 0.76 percent during the first three quarters of the year, respectively. Note that the first and the third quarter figures are still lower than the revised official government target of 0.8 to 1.8 percent for the year. Growth projections for the Philippines have been trimmed down due to potentially lower exports and foreign direct investments, among others. In fact, data on these key economic indicators showed that the global economic slowdown has also affected the Philippine economy.

In terms of exports, the country’s earnings for September 2009 have declined by at least 18.3 percent (from US$4.446 million in September 2008 to US$3.634 million) year-on-year, which is primarily due to lower demand from advanced economies (Figure 2). Negative growth in total exports is observed since October 2008. Note that the United States and Europe account for about 17.8 percent and 20.0 percent, respectively of the Philippines’ export income for the period January-September 2009. It is also important to highlight that electronics, which is the country’s major export product accounting for about 57.6 percent of the total export revenues from January-September 2009, is the most affected. There is an increasing trend in the volume of exports starting March 2009 but year-on-year growth is still in negative territory.

1 Revised version of the paper presented during the 6th CBMS National conference on December 8-10, 2009 at Manila Diamond Hotel, Manila.
2 PIDS Senior Research Fellow and Director, Research Associate and Research Assistant, respectively, of the CBMS Philippines Team. The authors are grateful to Steffie Joi Calubayan for her excellent research assistance. The authors acknowledge the support provided by IDRC and CIDA thru the PEP-CBMS Network.
In terms of employment, at least 41,000 people in the Philippines have lost their jobs as of 24 March 2009 amid the global crisis. The total number includes job losses from the crisis since October 2008 and includes overseas-based contract workers from recession-hit economies (about 5,700 persons) and employees in domestic factories (35,300 persons) which are also suffering from the fall in global demand. Hence, the unemployment rate as of April 2009 stood at 7.5 percent (Figure 3). During this period, the manufacturing sector reported a negative year-on-year growth (i.e., about -1.5%) in the number of employed persons. However, based on the report on employment as of July 2009, unemployment rate stood at 2.9 million compared to 2.7 million in the same month in 2008. This translates to unemployment rate of 7.6 percent in July 2009, an increase of 0.2 percentage points compared to previous year’s figure.

Furthermore, employment growth, measured in terms of labor turnover rates started to decline significantly during the second quarter of 2008 (Figure 4). However, it improved considerably to 2.2 percent in 2009 as compared to the 2008 figure of nearly zero growth rate (0.27%). It is also important to highlight that the manufacturing sector recorded a negative labor turnover rate during the first quarter of 2009 (Figure 5). This means that in the manufacturing sector, the separation rate (or terminations of employment or quits that occurred during the period) was higher than the accession rate (or the additions to employment).
Another negative impact of the global financial crisis is in terms of slower growth in remittances from overseas Filipino workers (Figure 5). According to the reports of BSP, remittances coursed through banks grew by 8.6 percent in September 2009 year-on-year notwithstanding the global financial crisis. Remittances during the period reached US$1.447 billion. It is important to highlight, however, that the September growth is lower compared to the 16.9% growth a year ago. BSP expects that remittances will grow by about 4% this year to $17.1 billion, “noting that the impact of the global economic crunch on the amount of money sent by Filipinos overseas was less severe than expected.” The BSP had earlier projected that remittances this year would only be the same as last year’s level of $16.4 billion. BSP pointed to more favorable trends in recent months for the revision of forecast figures. Note that based on the data from the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA), a total of 1,236,013 workers were deployed in 2008 which is 14.7 percent higher compared to the 1,077,622 in 2007. The growth (year-on-year) in the number of deployed workers, however, declined during the third and fourth quarters of 2008 (Figure 6).

Given the vulnerability of the Philippines, it is important to determine the potential impact of this global crisis on poverty. This study, therefore, aims to assess the impact of the crisis on poverty in the Philippines. In particular, the study aims to determine which sectors of the economy are affected by the crisis. The study also looks at the different coping mechanisms adopted by the households, as well as the programs implemented by the government, in response to the crisis. The result of this study would serve as inputs to policymakers in prioritizing mitigating measures that would address the impact of the crisis on poverty. In particular, the results of this study would help in identifying and designing the necessary social protection programs, as well as in refining program targeting, and in addressing the incidence as well as stimulus of the taxes and expenditures. The need for improved social protection programs had already become clear in the course of the food and energy price rises just preceding the financial crisis and global slowdown.
2. METHODOLOGY

Given the objectives of the study, the impact at the household and community level will be analyzed using the data on the different dimensions of poverty obtained from community-based monitoring systems being implemented in the Philippines. This study demonstrates how CBMS can be used as a tool for monitoring the impact of shocks (such as the global financial and economic crisis) on poverty.

2.1 Transmission Channels

Based on the review of the literature and further discussions, the relevant channels by which the impact of the global crisis could affect households were identified. In the case of the Philippines, these channels include overseas employment and remittances, and local employment. Under local employment, there were two categories as follows: 1) entrepreneurial activities; 2) wage earners and salaried workers. This study, therefore, focuses only on these channels. These key transmission channels helped in the identification of the poverty observatories or sentinel sites for monitoring the impact of the crisis, as well as the additional indicators that were monitored at the household- and community levels.

2.2 Data and Indicators

In addition to the existing CBMS core indicators (which are being considered as the impact indicators), specific outcome indicators were monitored to determine how households are affected by the global crisis. As mentioned earlier, the outcome indicators were identified based on the relevant transmission channels for the Philippines. Indicators of coping mechanisms were also monitored to determine how households were adopting in response to the crisis.

2.3 Project Coverage

In this paper, results are presented for 10 selected sites distributed all over the Philippines. These include 4 sites in rural areas, 5 sites in urban areas outside NCR and 1 site in urban NCR. The sites would serve as poverty observatories or sentinel sites for monitoring the impact of the crisis (Table 1). These selected barangays under this study consist of about 3,499 households. As mentioned earlier, identification of these sites was based on the relevant transmission channels for the country. Note that for this round of data collection, the reference period used is 6 months (i.e., from November 2008 to April 2009).

2.4 Data Collection Instruments and Conduct of Necessary Training

Aside from the CBMS Core questionnaires (Household Profile Questionnaire and Barangay Profile Questionnaire), rider questionnaires were prepared and were administered to selected sentinel sites in order to collect the additional information required for monitoring the indicators. The two new rider questionnaires that were developed are as follows: 1) HPQ Global Crisis Rider (CBMS Form 5); and 2) BPQ Global Crisis Rider (CBMS Form 6). These rider questionnaires were designed particularly to collect information on the indicators of outcome and impact of the crisis, as well as the different coping mechanisms adopted by the households in response to the crisis.

---

3 The CBMS Network initiative covers 13 sentinel sites for the GFC Impact study. Data encoding for the remaining sites is still ongoing.
Table 1. Total no. of households and total population per barangay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Municipality/City</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Households No.</th>
<th>Households %</th>
<th>Population No.</th>
<th>Population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban NCR</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Pasay City NCR</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UrbanOutside NCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>7,729</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumamela</td>
<td>Labo</td>
<td>Camarines Norte</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Angeles</td>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>Bataan</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poblacion III</td>
<td>Santo Tomas</td>
<td>Batangas</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magbangon</td>
<td>Cabucgayan</td>
<td>Biliran</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masikap</td>
<td>Puerto Princesa C</td>
<td>Palawan</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>905</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>4,491</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ando</td>
<td>Borongan</td>
<td>Eastern Samar</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>Llorente</td>
<td>Eastern Samar</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvacion</td>
<td>Puerto Princesa C</td>
<td>Palawan</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Vicente</td>
<td>Santa Elena</td>
<td>Camarines Norte</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15,161</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To help the enumerators, manuals were also prepared containing the guidelines on how to administer the questionnaires. The *CBMS Manual 5* presents the details on how to accomplish the *HPQ Global Crisis Rider Questionnaire* while the *CBMS Manual 6* is provides the details on filling-up the *BPQ Global Crisis Rider Questionnaire*. The enumerators and supervisors were provided training by the CBMS-Philippines Team, particularly on the key concepts and on how to administer the questionnaires. The training also involved hands-on exercises on the conduct of the survey. Furthermore, the CBMS encoding system was also revised to incorporate the questions contained in the rider questionnaires. The assigned data encoders were also given a short training on the revised encoding system.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Impact on Households Through Overseas Employment and Remittances

##### 3.1.1 Returning OFWs Due to Retrenchment

As mentioned earlier, data on deployment from the POEA revealed positive year-on-year growth in the total number of deployed during the period 2007 to 2009. However, the CBMS data reveals that there were some OFWs who were retrenched during the period November 2008 to April 2009. In particular, about 450 of the 3,499 surveyed households have at least one previous member who was working abroad which translates to about 12.9 percent of all households interviewed. Although 44.7 percent of respondents with OFW reported that they had an OFW who returned during the period, only 25 households or about 12.4 percent of households with returning OFW were affected through OFW retrenchment. This translates to a total of 28 OFWs who pointed to retrenchment or lay-off as the reason for the homecoming.
A large proportion of retrenched OFWs used to work in Saudi Arabia. Data for the ten (10) sentinel sites revealed that about 25.0 percent of OFWs who were retrenched came from Saudi Arabia, followed by the United States (14.3%). Data disaggregation also revealed that most of the retrenched OFWs are male (71.4%). (Table 2 and Figure 7)

Table 2. Distribution of retrenched OFWs, by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of Retrenched OFWs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

Most of the retrenched OFWs used to work in private households with employed persons. In fact, these workers represent about 21.4% of the retrenched OFWs (Table 3 and Figure 8). A relatively large proportion of retrenched OFWs came from health and social work (17.9%) and manufacturing sector (14.3%).

Table 3. Retrenched OFW, by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Private households with employed person</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Health and social work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Financial intermediation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Transport, storage and communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Real estate, renting and business activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Hotel and restaurants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Wholesale &amp; retail trade, repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles, and personal household goods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Other community, social and personal service activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

Figure 7. Distribution of retrenched OFWs, by country

Figure 8. Retrenched OFW, by sector
3.1.2 Wage Reduction among OFWs

Rather than going back home to the Philippines, some OFWs agreed to wage cuts during the reference period. About 9.3 percent of the households with OFW reported that their OFW experienced wage reduction during the period November 2008-April 2009. This represents 42 OFWs who experienced a reduction in wage. Some of the major reasons mentioned by the OFWs for the decrease in wage are the following: 1) reduced working hours (33.3%); 2) the firm where the OFW works is cutting costs (26.2%); and 3) the firm where the OFW works is incurring losses (11.9%). About 71.4 percent of the OFWs who experienced wage reduction are working in Asian countries. A significant proportion of OFWs are, in fact, working in the Middle East. In particular, about 37.2 percent of the affected OFWs are working in Saudi Arabia, followed by USA (9.3%) and Hong Kong SAR (9.3%). Disaggregation by sex reveals that male workers dominate the group of OFWs who experienced a reduction in wage or salary. (Table 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong SAR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

Most of the OFWs who experienced wage reduction are service workers and shop and market sales worker. About 30.2 percent of affected OFWs work in this type of job. This is followed by those who work in trades and related work (14.0%), technicians and associates (14.0%), and laborers and skilled workers (14.0%). The rest works in other types of occupation. Still, male workers dominate the group of affected workers. (Table 5)

3.1.3 Decline in the Amount and Frequency of Remittances Received

As mentioned earlier, data from the BSP indicate that remittances continue to increase, although the pace slackened. Based on the CBMS data, however, not all of the households with OFW actually received remittances during the 6-month period covered by the study. In fact, about 21.6 percent of them reported that they did not receive remittance. In addition, about 8.9 percent of the households with OFW experienced reduction in amount of remittances received during the period. An estimated 7.1 percent of all households experienced a decline in the frequency of receipt of remittances.
Table 5. OFW who experienced wage reduction, by occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Job</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Occupations</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers and shop and market sales worker</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades and related workers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians and associate professionals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and skilled workers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and machine operators and assemblers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials of government and special interest organization, corporate executives, managers, managing proprietors and supervisors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, forestry workers and fisherfolk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

The largest proportion of households which experienced decline in the amount and frequency of receipt of remittance is reported in urban NCR. About 18.3 percent of households with OFW in urban NCR experienced a decline in the amount of remittance they received during the period which is higher compared to the reported figures for households in rural and urban outside NCR amounting to 8.9 percent and 6.7 percent, respectively. (Table 6)

Table 6. Households affected by the crisis through remittances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban NCR</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Outside NCR</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH with OFW</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH who received remittances during the past 6 months</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH who experienced a decline in the amount of remittances received</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH who experienced a decline in the frequency of receipt of remittances</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

3.2 Impact on Households through Local Employment

The study also tried to determine how households were affected through local employment by looking at those who are involved in entrepreneurial activities and those who are wage earners and salaried workers. Based on the CBMS data, there are 5,701 members of the labor force, 88.5 percent of which are employed during the reference period. This translates to unemployment rate of 11.5 percent. About 62.5 percent of employed individuals are male while the rest are female (Table 7).
### Table 7. Labor force statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Male No.</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female No.</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 15 years and over</td>
<td>10,394</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>5,123</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>5,271</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

### Entrepreneurial Activities

#### 3.2.1 Opening of New Business and Closing of Existing Business

*Only a few households engaged in a new business during the period (Table 8).* Results showed that a meager 2.1 percent of the households surveyed actually engaged in new entrepreneurial activity during the 6-month period covered by the study. This translates to 75 new businesses set up in all the barangays covered by the study. A majority (i.e., about 57.3%) of these new businesses are related to wholesale and retail trade and repair of motor vehicles. However, most of the households which engaged in a new business are those living in urban areas. *A few households also closed their existing business during the period.* In fact, only 19 households (or 1.0%) reported that they closed their business during the period. These results confirm the minimal effect of the crisis in the selected sites in terms of households’ engagement in a business or entrepreneurial activity.

#### Table 8. Outcome indicators: Entrepreneurial Activities, 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHs engaged in new entrepreneurial activity</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs engaged in an entrepreneurial activity</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs which closed a business</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with significant change in the monthly income from the business</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with significant change in the no. of employed persons in the business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

#### 3.2.2 Change in the Number of Employed Persons and Amount of Monthly Income from the Business

*About 8.7 percent (or 158) of households engaged in entrepreneurial activity experienced a significant change in their monthly income from their business (Table 8).* A majority of these households reported a decline in their monthly income from the business. In particular, 79.1 percent
of these households reported that they suffered a decrease in income while the remaining 20.9 percent experienced an increase in income from their business. The proportion of households which suffer a decline in the monthly income from a business is lower in rural areas (i.e., 69.2%) as compared to those households living in urban areas. Furthermore, a meager 0.3 percent of households engaged in at least one entrepreneurial activity reported a significant change in the number of employed persons in their business, 50.0 percent of which said that they decreased the number of their employees during the period covered by the study.

Wage Earners and Salaried Workers

3.2.3 Loss of Job

The global crisis could have potentially affected local employment given the reduction in exports, including exports of electronics. Unemployment rate, using the data from NSO, went up and employment in the manufacturing sector declined. Labor turnover rate for the first quarter of 2009 in the Philippines is posted at 0.27 percent indicating that the separation rate (layoffs) is just slightly lower than accession rate (hirings).

During the period November 2008 to April 2009, 92 households reported job loss of at least one of their members representing 2.2 percent of all households surveyed (Table 9). This translates to a total of 109 persons who lost their job during the period. Most of the affected individuals used to work as service workers and shop and market sales workers accounting for 23.9 percent of all affected members (Table 10). In addition, many of the affected individuals used to work in the manufacturing industry which account for about 20.2 percent of the total number of persons who lost their job (Table 11). Hence, this sector could potentially be affected by the crisis through the employment channel. Note that no individual from the agriculture sector has lost his/her job due to layoffs.

3.2.4 Reduction in Wage, Number of Working Hours and Employment Benefits

Some of the employed individuals also experienced a reduction in wage, number of working hours and employment benefits (Table 12). These employed persons would prefer working in the same job despite these reductions rather than moving to another job or being unemployed. Based on the responses given during the survey, about 1.6 percent (or 83 persons) suffered a decline in wage. In addition, 73 persons experienced a reduction in working hours while 8 persons suffered from a reduction in benefits. Although there are more employed men than women, the reported proportion of employed women affected through reduced wage (1.9%) and working hours (1.9%) is slightly higher as compared to men.
Table 9. Outcome indicators, Wage Earners and Salaried Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH with member who lost job</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members who lost job</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH with member who experienced wage reduction</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH with member who experienced a reduction in number of working hours</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH with member who experienced reduction in employment benefits</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

Table 10. Members who lost job, by Type of job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of job</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service workers and shop and market sales workers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and skilled workers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and machine operators and assemblers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians and associate professionals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

Table 11. Members who lost job, by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private households with employed person</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other community, social and personal service activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale &amp; retail trade, repair of motor vehicles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage, and communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defense; compulsory social security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial intermediation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas and water supply</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate, renting and business activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-territorial organizations and bodies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

Table 12. Members who experienced reduction in wage, working hours or employment benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Employed Persons</th>
<th>With Wage Reduction</th>
<th>With Reduced Working Hours</th>
<th>With Reduced Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

3.3 Impact on the Agriculture Sector

Looking at the group of households involved in agriculture, data shows that the sector was not affected very much. As mentioned earlier, based on the responses given during the conduct of the survey, no individual from the agriculture sector has lost his/her job due to the crisis. Furthermore, out of the 3,499 households included in the survey, only 775 (23.7%) were involved in the agriculture sector with Barangay Salvacion (Puerto Princesa City, Palawan) recording the highest proportion of households engaged in an agricultural activity at 87.8 percent (Table 13). Among all those households which reported a decline in income from existing business, 61 (48.8%) were
involved in the agricultural business while 64 (51.2%) were not engaged in an agricultural activity. Note that, in general, the average income of households working in the agriculture sector is significantly lower as compared to the non-agriculture households. Only 27 (of the 927 households involved in agriculture) or 2.9 percent reported a decline in their income from their agricultural business (Table 14). The decrease is mainly due to damages caused by natural calamities or inclement weather and not necessarily related to the global crisis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13. Households involved in the agriculture sector, by site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvacion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Vicente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magbangon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumamela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masikap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poblacion III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brgy. 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

It is also important to highlight that among all sites included in the study, Villa Angeles (Orion, Bataan) recorded the highest proportion of households affected by the global financial crisis (Table 15). In particular, about 22.3 percent of the households living in Villa Angeles were affected by the crisis which channels through overseas employment and remittance or through local employment. About a fifth of the affected workers in the barangay work or used to work in the manufacturing sector as accountant, autocad, comptroller, factory worker, laborer, and welder. The other major sectors affected by the crisis include the education sector (16.7%), comprising of teachers and clinical instructors who lost their their jobs, and private households with employed persons (16.7%). Bookkeeper, draftsman, house maid, laundrywoman, janitor, instrument technician, and electrician comprise the latter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14. Distribution of households by type of involvement in the agriculture sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of HHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of HHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average income (Php)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with a decrease in income from agricultural business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Agri HHs refer to those which are involved in the agriculture sector while Non-Agri HHs refer to those which are NOT involved in the agricultural sector

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

Note that most of the barangays with high proportion of households engaged in any agriculture activity were not affected by the crisis. For instance, in Ando (Borongan, Eastern Samar) where about 71.8 percent of the households are involved in an agriculture activity, only 1.1 percent were affected through the local employment channel and 2.3 percent through overseas employment and remittance channel.
Table 15. Households affected by the global financial crisis through overseas employment and remittance and local employment, by site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barangay</th>
<th>Affected by GFC</th>
<th>Affected through Overseas Employment and Remittance</th>
<th>Affected through local employment</th>
<th>HHs Engaged in any Agriculture Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban NCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay 192</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Outside NCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumamela, Labo, Camarines Norte</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Angeles, Orion, Bataan</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poblacion III, Sto. Tomas, Batangas</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magbangon, Cabucayan, Biliran</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masikap, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ando, Borongan, Eastern Samar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel, Llorente, Eastern Samar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvacion, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Vicente, Sta. Elena, Camarines Norte</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 CBMS Core Indicators: Changes over Time

3.4.1 Panel Data for Barangay 192, Pasay City

A panel dataset was prepared for Barangay 192 (Pasay City, NCR) by defining the same household as one with at least one member present in both rounds (i.e., in 2005 and in 2009). Matching of households reveals that only 324 households (out of the 836 households during the 2005 survey) matched in both survey rounds. Results from the panel data created showed that the proportion of poor households in the area slightly increased from 8.3 percent in 2005 to 9.9 percent in 2009 (or a 1.6 percentage point increase) (Table 16). This is despite the fact that unemployment rate decreased slightly in 2009. In particular, unemployment rate decreased by 4.9 percentage points from 17.5 percent in 2005 to 12.6 percent in 2009. These results may imply that the decrease in the proportion of unemployed 4 does not necessarily increase the per capita income of the households living in the area. While the total number of unemployed persons decreased by 44, the number of employed individuals declined by 57 (Table 17). The total members of the labor force also decreased by 101

4 The difference in the employment definition (based on NSO’s official definition) used in the 2005 and 2009 surveys may have also contributed to the decrease in unemployment rate. The definitions used in the surveys differ terms of the adoption of the “availability criterion” and the imposition of a “cut-off period for the job search” of the discouraged workers in the 2009 survey.
from 634 persons in 2005 to 533 persons in 2009. One of the possible reasons for the decrease in
the number of the labor force is splitting of households in 2005. Note that only one of the split
households was included in the panel dataset.

Table 16. CBMS core indicators for panel households in Barangay 192, Pasay City, 2005 and 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBMS Core Indicators</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Nutrition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children aged 0-4 years old who died</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of women who died due to pregnancy related causes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children aged 0-5 years old who are malnourished</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households living in makeshift housing</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households that are squatters*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water and Sanitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households without access to safe water supply</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households without access to sanitary toilet facilities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children aged 6-12 years old who are not attending elementary school</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children aged 13-16 years old who are not attending secondary school</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households with income below the poverty threshold</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households with income below the food (subsistence) threshold</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households that experienced food shortage</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of persons who are unemployed</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peace and Order</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of persons who were victims of crimes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*for validation

Based on job status, about 85.5 percent of all employed persons are working in a permanent job
while the rest are either working in a non-permanent job (i.e., whose status is short-term,
seasonal/casual work or work on different jobs) (Table 16). The number of members who have a
permanent job remained almost unchanged while the number of persons who are considered
working in a non-permanent job declined from a total of 76 in 2005 to 19 in 2009 translating to a
decrease of 75.0 percent. These results may imply that the members who lost their job within the
reference period are those who are working in a non-permanent job.
Another possible explanation for the increase in poverty incidence during the period is the potential decrease in the mean income of employed persons. Note that there was a significant increase in the number of laborer and unskilled workers by 112 (or 86.2%). In addition, the number of professionals, associate professionals, service workers, trades and related workers all dropped significantly for the period 2005-2009 (Table 17). Given the decline in the number of employed persons in 2009 (some of whom are professionals, service workers, or trades workers), there had also been a shift in the type of occupation for those members who are still working. It is also possible that the new entrants into the labor market work as laborers and unskilled workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>2005 No.</th>
<th>2005 %</th>
<th>2009 No.</th>
<th>2009 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials of government and special-interest organization, corporate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executives, managers, managing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proprietors and supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician and Associate Professionals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers and shop and market sales workers</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>42.94</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, forestry workers and fisherfolk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades and related workers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and machine operators and assemblers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and unskilled workers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special occupations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>524</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>468</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18. Distribution of employed workers by type of occupation, 2005 and 2009

3.4.2 CBMS Core Indicators for the Ten Selected Sites (All Households)

Annex A shows the CBMS core indicators reflecting the potential impact of the global crisis (and possibly, of other shocks) on poverty in the ten (10) selected GFC sites. Results show that poverty incidences in most of the sites have increased in 2009 as compared to their previous CBMS round. For instance, an increase in the proportion of income poor households was observed in Magbanganon (Cabugcayan, Biliran) from 42.2 percent in 2005 to 56.8 percent in 2009, translating to 14.6
percentage point increase. There was also an increase in income poverty in 2009 in San Vicente (5.6 percentage points) and in Ando (2.6 percentage points) when compared to the baseline period.

In terms of employment, three of the sites (i.e., San Miguel, San Vicente and Ando) recorded an increase in unemployment rate, which may be partly due to the impact of the crisis on local employment. The difference in the employment definition used in the 2005 and 2009 surveys may have also contributed to the decline in the estimate of unemployment rate in these sites.

Results also show worsening of poverty situation in terms of other dimensions, including health and nutrition, shelter, water and sanitation, among others.

Although the change in the poverty indicators could not be attributed solely to the global crisis, the interactions of different shocks which the households faced in between periods have definitely contributed to the worsening condition, and hence, increasing poverty. Note, however, that these estimates do not necessarily include the same set of households, primarily because of attrition.

4. Coping Mechanisms Adopted by the Households

Households usually cope with shocks (e.g., the global crisis) by increasing receipts, reducing consumption or shifting to cheaper substitutes. During the period covered by the study, a majority of the households (i.e., 86.0%) reported that they modify their consumption of food (Table 19). In particular, most of the households tried to reduce consumption of relatively expensive food items. Another common strategy adopted by the households is by buying food in retail and smaller portions/packages. Next to food, clothing is another major expense affected when households try to cope with the shocks.

It should also be noted that some of the coping strategies adopted by households may have negative long-term consequences, especially on women and children. For instance, about 57.0 percent of the surveyed households reported that they modified their expenses related to health while a quarter of the surveyed households said that they modified some of their expenses related to education. In terms of health, households usually cope by shifting to generic drugs/cheaper medicines which is reported by 33.8 percent of the respondents. In addition, about 28.4 percent of all the respondents mentioned that they shifted to using medicinal plants or herbal medicines in case one of their household members got sick. The other most common coping strategy in terms of health expenses include shifting to government health centers/hospitals and resorting to self-medication. It is also worth noting that 172 (or 4.9%) of all the surveyed households reported that they did not buy medicines although they are necessary. In terms of education, about 1.4% of students who were studying were withdrawn from school during the period November 2008-April 2009 and in the coming school year (i.e., SY 2009-10). In addition, about 0.8% of students who were studying in a private school in the past school year moved to a public school during the period November 2008-April 2009 and in the coming school year. Although these strategies are not damaging in the short-run, they can be counter-productive in the medium- and long-run.

Another major coping strategy adopted by households is in terms of tapping various fund sources. In fact, about 40.0 percent of the households reported that they borrowed money from various fund sources while 13.0 percent used their existing savings. Another 6.6 percent of the households either pawned or sold their assets. Furthermore, another major strategy of households is to seek additional
source of income. About 6.3 percent of households said that at least one member of their household looked for work in addition to their existing job. However, not all of them were able to find and do the additional job. In fact, only 4.6 percent of the households reported that at least one of their members actually did additional work during the period. A few households also reported that at least one member of their household not previously working got a job in order to cope with the crisis. Some also tried to look for a work abroad. However, comparing the results, the impact of the global crisis is not as severe as was seen due to impact of food and fuel price shocks. Annex B presents some details of the different coping strategies adopted by the households by location. Note that some of the coping strategies adopted by the households may differ by location. For instance, in terms of health, a majority of households in the rural area and urban areas outside NCR adapted by using medicinal plants or herbal medicines while more households in urban NCR shifted to generic brands or cheaper drug brands. In terms of education, more households in the rural area and urban areas outside NCR reduced allowance for members who are studying while a large share of households in urban NCR used second-hand uniforms or shoes.

Given the recent global crisis, the government put in place programs to mitigate the impact of the shocks. These programs included CLEEP, 4Ps and NFA rice program, among others. The succeeding sections present a brief description of some of the relevant programs and provide some updates on the status of implementation.
5. Mitigating the Impact of the Global Crisis

General Description of Programs

Table 19. Coping strategies adopted by households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping strategy</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Modified the ff: Type of Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>3,008</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping strategy</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Tapped various fund sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed money</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used savings</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawned assets</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold assets</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping strategy</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Sought additional source of income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked for additional work</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did additional work</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed members not previously working</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked for work abroad</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

5.1 Comprehensive Livelihood and Emergency Employment Programs (CLEEP)
This program aims to provide emergency employment and income-generating services for the poor, returning expatriates, workers in the export industry, and out-of-school youth. It aims to protect these vulnerable sectors from threats and consequences of reduced or lost income as a consequence of the global economic crisis. President Arroyo has made it clear that CLEEP is to be implemented nationwide as long as the world is in recession. Government department heads have been instructed specifically to 1) hire for emergency employment; and 2) fund and supervise livelihood projects.

The total budget allocated for this program is Ph13.69 billion to ensure jobs and employment opportunities are available for poor and underprivileged Filipinos during the crisis. Based on a report on October 2009, the programs/activities/projects (PAPs) under CLEEP intend to employ 466,644 individuals nationwide. It is estimated that 333,088 Filipino workers have been given jobs (or 71.4% accomplished as of October 2009) under the CLEEP program since its implementation in January this year. So far, about PhP8.37 billion has already been obligated for the implementation of CLEEP from the total budget allocation committed by the agencies for the various programs/activities/projects.

5.2 Philhealth Sponsored Programs
This program aims to provide medical privileges to the marginalized sector of the Philippine society. This program is open to qualified indigents belonging to the lowest 25% of the Philippine population. Under this program, the government shoulders the monthly contribution of the qualified beneficiaries. The goal of this program is to achieve universal health insurance coverage by enrolling 4.7 million indigent families or 23.5 million poor beneficiaries. As of March 2009, there are about 3.4 million indigent families enrolled or about 17 million beneficiaries.

5.3 Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps)
This is one of the poverty alleviation programs of the government (through the Department of Social Welfare and Development –DSWD) that were launched to shield the people from the effects
of the world problem on high prices of oil and commodities. The local government units will comply with the conditions of the program to provide basic facilities and supplies for health, like vaccines and family planning services, and education. Under the program, a family beneficiary with maximum of three children will receive a monthly allowance of P1,400, a P500 monthly allowance for nutrition and health expenses, and P3,000 for one school year or P300 per month for educational expenses per child. The beneficiaries have to comply with certain conditions to continue receiving the cash grants. These conditions include parents ensuring that their children attend school at least 85 percent of the time and receive vaccinations and health care. This is formerly called the Ahon Pamilyang Pinoy Program.

As of June 2009, 4Ps is benefiting 695,746 poor households nationwide. The program targets to provide a total of 700,000 households starting June 2009. The expansion was approved by President Arroyo last December 2008 with corresponding additional budget of P5.0 billion. The areas included in the 2nd set of implementation were selected from the 100 poorest municipalities from the poorest provinces based on 2003 Small Area Estimates (SAE) of the National Statistical and Coordination Board (NSCB).

5.4 NFA Rice access program
This program offers NFA rice at subsidized prices which can be bought through NFA rolling stores, Tindahan Natin outlets and other government-run stores. In 2008, 14 million families have availed the subsidized NFA rice. During the year, NFA has distributed 13,108,343 bags to Tindahan Natin Outlets (TNOs) and 953,972 bags of rice to the Bigasan sa Parokya outlets (BPOs) with a total of 14,062,315 bags at P16.75 per kg or P837.50 per bag of 50 kg. The worldwide crisis of the rice supply in 2008 resulted in high acquisition cost of imported rice by NFA at P34.00 per kg or P1,700 per bag. Given this, the agency has incurred total losses of P12.1 billion exclusive of the cost of Iron Coated Rice Premix.

From January to November 16, 2009, NFA has already distributed a total of 32,217,942 bags of 50 kg rice with daily average sales of 146,445 bags nationwide. The average acquisition cost of NFA rice if P31.80 per kg or P1,590 per bag for 2009 rice importation. These stocks were sold to accredited retailers at a highly subsidized price.

5.5 Self-Employment Assistance-Kaunlaran (SEA-K)
This is a capability-building program in coordination with the Local Government Units (LGUs) which is designed to enhance the socio-economic skills of poor families to establish and self-manage a sustainable community-based micro-credit organization for entrepreneurial development. The target beneficiaries of this program are unemployed and under-employed families. As of press release last 27 August 2009, 1172 individuals were employed under the SEA-K program. The regions covered, so far, were the following: CAR, ARMM and Region XII.

General Findings
In response to the global crisis, several programs were identified and were implemented by the Philippine government. Some of these programs (such as NFA and 4Ps), however, were already existing even before the crisis. For instance, the conditional cash transfer program was stepped up in response to the crisis.

Based on preliminary findings, many of these programs suffer from weak targeting. For instance, the long-running NFA program, despite the issuance of family access cards to address mistargeting
still suffers from significant leakage and exclusion. Among all households belonging to the first income quintile, 68.9 percent were able to access the NFA rice program (Table 20). Note that even the households in highest income quintile were also able to access the NFA rice program reflecting poor targeting of the program.

It is also important to highlight that there are relatively high leakage and exclusion rates for all sites covered in the study. In fact, about 48.9 percent of all households who access the program are considered non-poor (leakage rate) (Table 21). In addition, 35.6 percent of all poor households were not able to access the program (exclusion rate). The highest leakage rate is reported for urban NCR while the largest exclusion rate is observed in urban areas outside NCR. This also reflects poor targeting of the program.

It is important to mention that there are two key questions that need to be considered in implementing a targeted program. First, whether the poor are reached and second, are there any benefits that are leaking to non-poor or non-eligible persons or households. Hence, identification of poor households is critical. Poor households can be identified based on income or based on a Proxy Means Testing (PMT) Model. Based on income, leakage rate for NFA rice program is 48.9 percent for all sites while exclusion rate is 35.6 percent (Table 22). Note, however, that leakage rate is relatively higher when poor are identified based on PMT. Under the PhilHealth program, about 65.8 percent of the income poor were not able to access the PhilHealth program. However, about 65.4 percent of the PMT poor households were able to access the program.

### Table 20. Households who were able to access the NFA rice program (10 GFC sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Quintile</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>% of HHs in the Income Quintile who were able to access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2009

### Table 21. NFA Rice Program: Leakage and Exclusion Rates (10 GFC sites)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>LEAKAGE RATE</th>
<th>EXCLUSION RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SITES</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban NCR</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area Outside NCR</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Source:** CBMS Survey 2009

### Table 22. Leakage and Exclusion Rates for NFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on Income</th>
<th>NFA</th>
<th>PhilHealth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leakage Rate</td>
<td>Exclusion Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Sites</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban NCR</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Outside NCR</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on PMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Sites</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban NCR</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Outside NCR</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aims to monitor the economic and social impact of the global financial and economic crisis in the Philippines. Although the impact was not as large as initially expected, modest increase in poverty is found. Moreover, coupled with the impact of price shock in 2008 and the recent natural calamities, poverty incidence is expected to go up significantly in the future. This is more worrisome given the recent reversal in poverty incidence observed in 2006, when poverty incidence went up for the first time since 1985.

Results of this study showed that the potential impact of the crisis on poverty varies across different groups of households. In fact, certain groups of households or individuals were affected more as compared to the other groups. The crisis has affected the households in terms of OFW remittances and local employment. For instance, households which are highly dependent on remittances as a source of income would be adversely affected through reduced remittance receipts. In addition, households with members who are working in the affected sectors (e.g., manufacturing) could be negatively affected through reduced income. This may, therefore, result in an increase in poverty incidence, albeit modestly. In response to the crisis, households adopted various coping strategies, some of which may be damaging and counter-productive in the medium- and long-run. For instance, one of the coping mechanisms adopted by the households is in terms of withdrawal of their children from school which may have negative long-term consequences. The health status of the affected households could also be adversely affected in the long-run if they do not seek medical attention.

Although the government has identified and implemented some programs that could mitigate the impact of the crisis, more efficient targeting is necessary. The recurring problem of targeting in social protection programs highlights the need for a good targeting mechanism in order to minimize leakages and exclusion. Household-level data, such as those being generated by the community-based monitoring system, are very useful in identifying eligible beneficiaries. Hence, evaluation of current programs is needed so that we could identify those which are ineffective and need not be implemented anymore, and improvements in others that should be kept.
## ANNEX A. CBMS Core indicators for the ten (10) selected sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBMS Core Indicators</th>
<th>URBAN NCR</th>
<th>URBAN OUTSIDE NCR</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRGY. 192 (Pasay City)</td>
<td>Gumamela (Labo, Camarines Norte)</td>
<td>Villa Angeles (Orion, Bataan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children aged 0-4 years old who died</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of women who died due to pregnancy related causes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children aged 0-5 years old who are malnourished</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shelter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households living in makeshift housing</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households that are squatters</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water and Sanitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households without access to safe water supply</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households without access to sanitary toilet facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children aged 6-12 years old who are not attending elementary school</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children aged 13-16 years old who are not attending secondary school</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households with income below the poverty threshold</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households with income below the food (subsistence) threshold</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of households that experienced food shortage</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of persons who are unemployed</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of persons who were victims of crimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBMS Survey 2005, 2006 and 2009
## ANNEX B. Coping Strategies Adopted by Households in the 9 Selected Sites, by Location, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategies</th>
<th>Urban NCR</th>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Outside NCR</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tapped various fund sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used savings</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold assets</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawned assets</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed money</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought additional source of income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked for additional work</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did additional work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed members not previously working</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked for work abroad</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping strategies in terms of health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not buy medicine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued intake of prescribed medicine</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifted to government health centers and hospitals</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifted to alternative medicine</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorted to self medication</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced prescribed drug intake</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessened the availment of medical treatment for any illness</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not seek medical treatment for any illness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used medicinal plants/herbal medicines</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifted to generic drugs/cheaper drug brands</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping strategies in terms of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred children from private school to public school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn children from school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred children from daycare to homecare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members who are studying skipped classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced allowance for members who are studying</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members who are studying used second-hand books</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members who are studying used second-hand uniform/shoes</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifted from private vehicle/school bus to commuting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>