



EXTENT OF IDENTIFICATION OF POOR HOUSEHOLDS AND LEVEL OF ASSURANCE OF LISTAHANAN IN MAUBAN, QUEZON

Jhohanna A. Acebes

Laguna State Polytechnic University

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to measure the extent of identification of poor households by Listahanan, a targeting system used to identify low-income households in Mauban, Quezon. The research measured the relationships between the extent of identification of poor households in terms of assessment, program management and validation, and the level of assurance in the data collected by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), as perceived by 150 randomly sampled respondents. It also measured the relationship between the extent of identification and the level of Listahanan being used by the Local Government Unit (LGU).

Quantitative questionnaires and in-person interviews were the main data gathering methods employed in this study. Personal interviews and an online survey were used to acquire the data in Mauban, Quezon. To address every question in this research, the researcher employed questionnaires that were created based on the statement of the problem.

The researcher acquired the required information and data using the appropriate questionnaire to the study's goals. The researcher made sure that the respondents could understand the queries. A Tagalog version of the questionnaire was developed for the respondents who opted to answer the questions in Tagalog. In order to generate responses to the study questions, the researcher organized and examined the findings. Additionally, the researcher computed the mean and standard deviation using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for the gathered data.

The results suggested that Listahanan provided a high level of assurance in the credibility. The Proxy Means Test (PMT) used by Listahanan was deemed an effective tool in identifying interviewed poor households, with no inclusion errors observed. Furthermore, Listahanan data is very useful in selecting beneficiaries for social protection programs and services as baseline data. It is very easy and fast to access, hence, through Listahanan, disadvantaged households were given priority in the government's programs and services for the poor.

Likewise, the use of Listahanan data used a systematic process in identifying list of poor households and averted the claims that the list was politically influenced and that only their relatives and friends were often selected during selection process.

KEYWORDS - *Assessment, Validation, Poor Households, Targeting System, Social Protection Database*

INTRODUCTION

The Listahanan is a nationwide system of poverty targeting used by the Philippine government to identify poor households in the country. The system was developed by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and is used to target beneficiaries of national programs and services, such as the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps).

The system uses a combination of socio-economic indicators to identify households that are most in need, allowing the government to prioritize their resource and better target their poverty-reduction efforts.

The Listahanan is an important tool for the government to identify and prioritize households that are in need of social protection programs. It helps the government to make more efficient and effective use of the resources allocated for social protection programs. It also provides valuable data that assists in the planning, design and implementation of social protection programs.

The purpose why DSWD conducts a Listahanan assessment and validation in a locality is to identify the poorest households in the area and to provide them with access to social protection programs and other government assistance. Listahanan helps the government to accurately determine the number of poor families in an area so that it can direct resources to them. This also helps to ensure that resources are properly allocated, during planning and budgeting process, to the most vulnerable households and that government assistance is reaching those who need it most [1].

The National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR), later on rebranded as Listahanan, was established in 2009 identify poor households and determine their eligibility for social protection programs. It uses Proxy Means



Test (PMT) to estimate the income of households based on the socio-economic characteristics. This can help local officials, head of agencies and program implementers to identify vulnerable populations, target resources towards them, and better understand the needs of their communities. It can also help local officials to create more effective policies and programs, as they will have more data-driven information to guide their decisions [2].

The pandemic had created big impact on the economy that highlights the critical need for government assistance for afflicted families, particularly the most vulnerable groups. Ramos (2020) stated that COVID-19's effects policy to urgent solutions in keeping the economy abrupt making the people continue their work and income. However, selection of beneficiaries became a great deal to most of the affected areas.

In the Philippines, many issues have been raised during the distribution of ayuda (financial assistance), including the Social Amelioration Program (SAP). Some government officials have been tagged as corrupt or being selective in identifying beneficiaries [3].

A study made by Reference [4], suggests that there should be a program for the identification of the least advantaged during times of crisis like the COVID-19 pandemic. It is implied that the distribution of financial support as brought by lockdown should acquire a system that is in great priority as ayuda is distributed.

The DSWD used a rostered system that reduced poverty as a process identification of beneficiaries of programs for social protection and services, that is the Listahanan. It identifies poor households and the lists are readily available to agencies of the government in the national and local level and also, to other social agency stakeholders' relative in identifying needy families.

As the leader in social protection and the implementer of key government social assistance programs, it is the DSWD's duty to implement policies and programs in the most effective and efficient manner. Having a targeting system which is derived from a scientific, objective, and standard set of criteria to identify the poor is important to achieve the Department's goal and mandate.

As DSWD cannot be considered as a data collection agency, the credibility and reliability of its data is assisted by the (PSA) through development of its data collection tool and enhancement of its enumerators' manual. The variables being used by Listahanan to identify the poor are generated from surveys, censuses of the family income and expenditure, labor force and population which are conducted by PSA. Prior to its operations, Listahanan also implements an accountability structure to ensure that information collected and stored in its database are correct and fraud-free. Stringent data collection and supervision, random interviews, spot checks at various phases of the implementation, and citizen's feedback are just some of the mechanisms that have been put in place to ensure that the information in the database are valid and of high quality.

In 2022, Listahanan (Version) 3 database identified 5,599,091 poor households from the assessed family of 15,487,655 (DSWD, 2022). There are LGUs who have faith in the Listahanan's accuracy and credibility in the selection of programs and services for the poor. The DSWD has been continuously advocating the utilization of the database to all internal and external stakeholders hoping most of them will enter into an agreement and make use of the data [5].

In Mauban, 3,046 was identified poor during the Listahanan's 2nd round of assessment conducted in 2014. Meanwhile in the latest version of Listahanan, 4,508 households were identified as poor. This study was conducted in Mauban, because they are one of the two LGUs who uses Listahanan data in the selection of program beneficiaries. This study concludes the usefulness and assurance of the data collected as perceived by the respondents.

This research reviews the processes and mechanisms of Listahanan to determine if it produces reliable and credible data, as well as how the data is shared and how useful it has been for local government units.

Targeting system used for program assessment, management and validation as "The most commonly used targeting system is socio-economic targeting, which includes individual and/or household-level variables such as asset ownership, age, and type of household to identify the poor. Other targeting approaches used are geographic targeting, labor market targeting, and computer-generated targeting. Targeting criteria vary across countries and may include a combination of approaches." [6].

Targeting the poor is a necessary tool to ensure that government resources are efficiently used and that the benefits of government policies reach those who need them the most. He argued that targeting is an efficient way to reduce poverty and to use resources efficiently. He concluded that with careful design and implementation, targeting the poor can be an effective way to reduce poverty [7].

Better coordination between barangays and LGUs is also advised in order to enhance the targeted system. This makes it possible for barangays and LGUs to react to changes on the list more rapidly. The information can be used to identify regions that were missed by the first tranche and provide guidance on how to give them priority in the second phase. [8].

Reference [9] argues that targeting systems for poor households should prioritize households that are in greatest need and ensure that resources are allocated equitably by using transparent and objective criteria. He also suggests that targeting should be done in a way that is cost-effective and relatively easy to administer. Finally, Reference [9] emphasizes the importance of designing and implementing targeting systems that are sensitive to changes in household circumstances and that can be updated regularly to ensure that those in need of assistance are accurately identified.

The LGUs perform a vital role in ensuring the success of Listahanan's operations for all of the activities of the program, from preparatory to



reports generation phase, are coordinated with them. Coordination and orientations were done to ensure that the LGUs know and understand the ins and outs of the project [1].

The targeting system of poor households should be improved to include using better data, such as income, assets, and other indicators of poverty, to identify who is in need of assistance and how much assistance is needed. It was recommended increasing the use of information and communication technologies, such as mobile phones, to ensure that government programs are reaching those who are in need [10].

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to determine if the data collected by the DSWD are credible and useful, particularly in Mauban, Quezon. The results of this study help the DSWD in advocating the use of Listahanan data in the selection of program beneficiaries at the national and local level.

This study seeks to explore the credibility and effectiveness of the Listahanan in identifying potential beneficiaries such as 4Ps and those who should exit the program. It will provide great benefits to a number of organizations such as the National Household Targeting Office (NHTO), who can use the results as reference to retain Listahanan as the sole DSWD targeting system; the DSWD, who will receive evidence-based results to clarify issues on the data and improve systems and policies; City/Municipal Social Welfare and Development Officers (C/MSWDOs), who can use the results to justify accessing the Listahanan database; and Local Government Units, who can attest to the reliability and accuracy of Listahanan data. It will also inform and influence other stakeholders, such as academe, and civil society organizations, to use the Listahanan database.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study used quantitative approach to examine the usefulness and credibility of Listahanan, as well as to determine ways to further enhance its implementation. A sample of 150 respondents was chosen from the municipality of Mauban, Quezon, which included local implementers, LGU beneficiaries, and random community members. A descriptive correlation design was used to measure the awareness and usefulness of Listahanan data and the relationship between research variables.

Research Instrument

Questionnaires that were created based on the statement of the problem were used to collect the responses and gain information from the identified respondents. Included in the survey were participants age 18 and older and are involved in the program implementation. The questionnaires comprised 13 questions which were distributed to three sections, namely demographic profile, level of awareness and general proposal on the community involvement. The process for data collection was carried out in a four-week schedule.

The questionnaire, which took about 30 minutes to complete, contains a variety of items dealing with Listahanan. Permission from participants was obtained prior to the administration of the questionnaire regarding their willingness to complete the questionnaires. The participants were ensured of their right to anonymity and confidentiality.

In-person interviews were the main data gathering methods employed in this study. Personal interviews and an online survey were used to acquire the data in Mauban, Quezon.

The researcher made sure that the respondents could understand the queries. A Tagalog version of the questionnaire was developed for the respondents who opted to answer the questions in Tagalog.

In order to generate responses to the study questions, the researcher organized and examined the findings. Additionally, the researcher computed the mean and standard deviation using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for the gathered data.

Population and Sampling Technique

Community sampling is an important method for obtaining a representative sample of the population in order to gain meaningful insights into community-level dynamics and health outcomes [11].

Female respondents make up the largest percentage followed by the male respondents. While the lowest number of respondents belongs to those who preferred not to reveal their gender.

According to Social Role Theory, men and women have different social roles. Women are more likely to engage in social behaviors, including responding to surveys, than men because they are more likely to identify with their community and have greater sense of social responsibility ([12].

Statistical Treatment

To determine the extent of identification of poor households and the level of assurance as perceived by the respondents, Likert scale was used to measure responses to a question or statement. The responses are categorized into 5 levels, ranging from very good effect to no effect. The numerical intervals for each level are 4.50-5.00 for very good effect, 3.50-4.49 for good effect, 2.50-3.49 for moderate effect, 1.50-2.49 for low effect, and 1.00-1.49 for no effect.



Table 1: The following scale was used to measure the responses

Scale	Interval	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.50 – 5.00	Very Good Effect
4	3.50 – 4.49	Good Effect
3	2.50 – 3.49	Moderate Effect
2	1.50 – 2.49	Low Effect
1	1.00 – 1.49	No Effect

To determine the level of assurance between the level of knowledge as to Listahanan, the following Likert Scale was used:

Table 2: Interpretation of the Likert Scale was Used to Measure the Responses

Scale	Interval	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.50 – 5.00	Very High
4	3.50 – 4.49	High
3	2.50 – 3.49	Moderate
2	1.50 – 2.49	Low
1	1.00 – 1.49	Very Low

For the purpose of this study, MS Excel was used to enter data and perform statistical computations with ease. The results from the questionnaires were analyzed to determine respondents' views in relation to the study objectives and research questions. The analysis assisted the researcher to interpret results by comparing it with existing literature. The purpose of conducting qualitative study is to produce findings. Data collected through an interview was transcribed and analyzed to establish relationships of variables and what should be improved on the system.

A narrative report was written to provide an account of the findings which was compared with the results of the questionnaires.

The data collected from the respondents were classified and tabulated for further analysis using Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Weighted Mean, Ranking and Pearson Correlation "R" test.

To determine the demographic characteristics of the respondents, *Frequency Mean* and *Percentage Distribution*. To determine the extent of role in identification of poor households and knowing the level of assurance on the collected data by the DSWD, *Frequency Mean* and *Standard Deviation* were used. These tools were also used to determine the extent of Listahanan being used by the LGU and other known service providers in their programs and service.

To test for the relationship between the extent of the role in identification of poor households and the level of assurance on the collected by the DSWD, Pearson r was used. The "r" value refers to the Pearson correlation coefficient, which is a measure of the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables. The table indicates that the lower the "r" value, the weaker the relationship between the two variables, and the higher the "r" value, the stronger the relationship between the two variables.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study provides an analysis and interpretation of data collected in this research. The data has been collected and analyzed using a variety of scientific methods and tools, and this presentation will help to demonstrate some of the findings from this research. The data presentation, analysis, and interpretation used a variety of software tools and statistical methods in order to provide an accurate and comprehensive understanding of the research data. The implications of the data were discussed and provided recommendations for further research work.

The descriptive statistics used to describe the basic features of the data in this study were *Frequency Mean*, and *Standard Deviation*. It was used to simply describe what the data indicates in a more general sense and in a more manageable form. The Mean is used to describe the central tendency of the collected data. As the questionnaire scale ranged from 1 (low) to 5 (high), a higher mean score reflects responses that indicate higher attributions of the leadership characteristics, and vice versa. The Standard Deviation used to show the relation that a set of responses has to be mean of the sample and serves as a statistical measure of variation in this data distribution.

The *frequency means* and verbal interpretation in relation to the respondents' ability to identify poor families as shown in Table 3 demonstrates that Listahanan is a useful evaluation technique for locating poor households.



Table 3: Summary of the Extent of Identification of Poor Households as Perceived by the Respondents

Role in identification of poor households as perceived by the respondents	Overall Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. As to Assessment of households	4.44	4.96	Good Effect
2. As to Program Management	4.48	5.55	Good Effect
3. As to validation of poor households.	4.47	8.32	Good Effect
Overall Mean	4.46		Good Effect

Legend:

4.50 – 5.00 (Very Good Effect)

3.50 – 4.49 (Good Effect)

2.50 – 3.49 (Moderate Effect)

1.50 – 2.49 (Low Effect)

1.00 – 1.49 (No Effect)

Results showed that the extent of identification of poor households as perceived by the respondents with overall *mean* of 4.46 that indicates a verbal interpretation of good effect. Among the three sub-variables, the Program Management has the highest score ($M=4.48$), Validation ranks second ($M=4.47$) and Assessment ranks third ($M=4.44$). The respondents agree that Program Management, Assessment and Validation have a big role in the process of selection of poor households.

The standard deviation scores of 4.96, 5.55, and 8.32, respectively, for the variables Assessment of households, Program Management, and Validation of poor households indicated that there is a broad range in the data set for each of these variables. This suggests that different people may have different opinions on the procedures for assessment, program management, and the validation of poor households. The larger standard deviations of 8.32 for validation and 5.55 for program management indicates that there may be significant discrepancies in the opinions held about each of these topics.

Effective program management is essential for the successful implementation of projects. It emphasizes the importance of having a clear vision and a well-defined set of objectives for the project, as well as the need for good communication and collaboration between all stakeholders.

Additionally, it suggests that program managers should be well-versed in project methodology and have the ability to effectively manage risks and resources. Finally, it emphasizes the importance of monitoring the project's progress and making any necessary adjustments along the way [13].

As to the level of assurance on the collected data by the DSWD as perceived by the respondents in terms of credibility, the findings demonstrated that the homes classified as poor are, in fact, poor and that inclusion errors had not occurred. When choosing beneficiaries for social protection programs and services, the baseline data should be the recognized poor. With an overall mean of 4.47, it was discovered



Table 4: Level of Assurance on the Collected Data as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of Credibility

Indicative Statement	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>I agree that</i>			
1. systematic procedures and properly execution of Listahanan in assessing and generating the list of poor households was strictly followed a systematic procedure.	4.47	0.80554	High
2. assessment of households handled by skilled and knowledgeable Listahanan personnel.	4.40	0.97297	High
3. shows the result of the Listahanan that the households who have been identified as poor are actually poor and no inclusion error has been made.	4.43	0.92676	High
4. released the results of Listahanan based on reliable data.	4.45	0.88383	High
5. identified poor should be the baseline data in selecting beneficiaries for social protection programs and services.	4.49	0.80612	High
Weighted Frequency Mean	4.47		High

Table 4 shows that the Listahanan employed a methodological process to identify and generate a list of low-income households with weighted mean of 4.47. The assessment was handled by knowledgeable and skilled staff (M=4.40). High weighted mean was also achieved on the questions whether the Listahanan data has actually identified the real poor and no inclusion error has been made (M=4.43); has released the results with reliable data (M=4.45); and believed that poor household should be the baseline data in selecting beneficiaries for programs and services (M=4.49).

With the limited government resources, it is important that the identified and real poor should be given priority in the provision of programs and services. Inclusions errors sometimes occur in the targeting system of government programs and services; however, inclusion errors are very minimal or most unlikely to happen in Listahanan. Most of the grievances received in the validation phase were exclusion errors where households claimed that they are actually poor but not included in the list of poor households.



Table 5: Level of Assurance on the Collected Data as Perceived by the Respondents in terms of Usefulness of the Data

Indicative Statement <i>I agree that.....</i>	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. the list of poor households was accepted and utilized by the LGUs.	4.49	0.83854	High
2. relevance of the data in selecting the list of beneficiaries.	4.42	0.95408	High
3. shortened the process in selecting beneficiaries through the Listahanan data.	4.49	0.7894	High
4. no bias in selecting beneficiaries nor involvement of politics.	4.42	0.95408	High
5. prioritized the poor households in the programs and projects of the government.	4.44	0.95219	High
Weighted Frequency Mean	4.44		High

Legend:

- 4.50 – 5.00 (Very High)
- 3.50 – 4.49 (High)
- 2.50 – 3.49 (Moderate)
- 1.50 – 2.49 (Low)
- 1.00 – 1.49 (Very Low)

Table 5 shows that the LGUs accepted and used the Listahanan data in choosing beneficiaries with weighted mean of 4.49. The data is relevant in selecting the list of beneficiaries (M=4.42), no bias or political influence in selecting beneficiaries (M=4.42) and the process in selecting beneficiaries became fast with Listahanan (M=4.49). In government projects and programs, the disadvantaged households were given priority (M=4.44). A general weighted frequency mean of 4.44 was revealed.

Table 6: Level of Assurance on the Collected Data by the DSWD

Level of assurance in the collected data as to....	Overall Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Credibility of Data	4.44	9.94	High
2. Usefulness of Data	4.48	12.3	High
Overall Mean	4.45		High

Legend:

- 4.50 – 5.00 (Very High)
- 3.50 – 4.49 (High)
- 2.50 – 3.49 (Moderate)
- 1.50 – 2.49 (Low)
- 1.00 – 1.49 (Very Low)

The frequency mean and verbal interpretation of the level of assurance on the DSWD-collected with 4.44 weighted mean and the level of assurance that the data is useful with overall mean of 4.48 which both indicate data is High. It demonstrates that in government programs, low-income households were given priority given that the Listahanan data is credible and being used to provide social protection programs and services.



Table 7: The Extent of Knowledge that Listahanan is being used by the LGU and other known Service Providers in their Programs and Services

Indicative Statement <i>I am aware that</i>	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Listahanan is all about and how it is being used.	4.53	0.80578	Very High
2. understanding the processes of identifying the poor households under Listahanan.	4.52	0.83841	Very High
3. identifying the list of poor households are known by the LGU and other organizations	4.50	0.9	Very High
4. familiarity on the system that DSWD Listahanan is the lead in identifying the poor households and not the local officials.	4.47	0.94302	High
5. sharing of Listahanan data with DSWD is fast and easy.	4.49	0.8999	High
Weighted Frequency Mean	4.52		Very High

Legend:

4.50 – 5.00 (Very High)

3.50 – 4.49 (High)

2.50 – 3.49 (Moderate)

1.50 – 2.49 (Low)

1.00 – 1.49 (Very Low)

Table 7 shows that the respondents had a very high level of knowledge in terms of Listahanan being used by the LGU and other known service providers in their programs and services, with a weighted frequency *mean* of 4.52. This indicates that the respondents were aware of what Listahanan is all about, understood the processes of identifying the poor households, were familiar with the system that DSWD Listahanan is the lead in identifying the poor households, and had knowledge that the sharing of Listahanan data with DSWD was fast and easy (Weighted Frequency *Mean* = 4.52, Very High).

Table 8: Relationships Between the Extent of Identification of Poor Households and the Credibility and Usefulness of the Data

Variables	P-Value	R-Value	Analysis	Importance	Decision
Extent of Assessment, Program Management and Validation	p < 0.05	0.3788	Moderate	Significant	Reject H0
VS					
Level of assurance					
<i>At 0.05 Level of Significance</i>					

Table 8 shows that the relationships between the extent of roles in identification of poor households and the credibility and usefulness of the data as perceived by the respondents were found to be moderate ($r=0.3788, 0.5357$) and high ($r=-0.9572, 0.9481$), level of roles in identification of poor households and the credibility of the data as perceived by the respondents was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

The results also indicates that the Listahanan program's coordination and advocacy efforts with the LGU were successful and had a positive impact on the usefulness of the data.



Table 9: Relationship Between the Extent of Identification of Poor Households and the Knowledge on the Use of Listahanan

Variables	P-Value	R-Value	Analysis	Importance	Decision
Extent of Assessment, Program Management and Validation	p < 0.05	+0.7644	High	Significant	Reject HO
VS Knowledge on the use of Listahanan					

At 0.05 Level of Significance

Overall, the statistical interpretation of these variables is that there is a high to very high correlation between the extent in identification of poor households and the knowledge on the use of Listahanan by program implementers, as indicated by the correlation coefficients as shown in Table 18. This indicates that the higher the role of the program implementers in identification of poor households, the more knowledge they have about the use of Listahanan. This correlation is statistically significant, as indicated by the p-value being lower than 0.05.

Reference [14] found that the Validation of the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (Listahanan) in the Philippines was successful in identifying the poorest households in the country. The study found that Listahanan was able to accurately differentiate between households in poverty and those that were not, and this was largely due to the fact that the survey incorporated the use of a variety of data sources. The authors concluded that Listahanan was a reliable and effective tool for targeting poverty reduction efforts in the Philippines.

In summary, the Listahanan program from the DSWD has been successful in collecting data, managing resources, and validating lists of poor households. The data collected is used to effectively target those households in need of support and those households believe it is accurate. Additionally, the program is well coordinated with local authorities and is seen to prevent claims of political intervention as well as establishing a baseline of data for other social protection programs and services.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were made:

1. The Listahanan is a DSWD effort that aims to locate and identify the impoverished or poor households in the Philippines, particularly in Mauban, Quezon. It accomplishes this by collecting information from the households through interviews and surveys. Based on a set of criteria, a list of households that are deemed to be poor is subsequently generated using this data. The Listahanan is crucial because it enables more focused and effective social welfare initiatives by assisting the DSWD and other government agencies in determining which societal segments and places require the most support. Additionally, it facilitates the agency's access to its target industries and provides details on how to use these services
2. The results of the survey conducted in Mauban Quezon indicate that the respondents identify themselves as part of the poorest members of the community. The survey was conducted by the DSWD and the results provide an indication of how effective the DSWD's data collection, program management, and validation of Listahanan was perceived to be by the respondents. The mean value for each characteristic was more than 4.00, which indicates that the answers to the characteristics were generally perceived to be "very effective". This suggests that the DSWD's efforts to collect, manage, and validate data about the poorest members of the community were seen in a positive light by the respondents.
3. A systematic approach was used by Listahanan to find and generate a list of low-income households. The results demonstrated that the residences identified as poor were actually poor and that there had not been any inclusion errors. The PMT being used by Listahanan has been an effective tool in identifying the interviewed poor households. Likewise, the field staff who were hired to conduct the assessment phase were trained and well-equipped in their duties to find and interview the potential poor households. It is therefore concluded that the selection of poor households was not influenced by any political affiliations and that selection was not made by any local official, employees or organization. The list of poor households was generated by a credible targeting system.
4. DSWD-Listahanan engaged LGUs and barangays in the usage of data by distributing a list of poor households which is a good indication that the Listahanan program management is efficient in coordinating with the local authorities before and after the conduct of household assessment. This also popularizes the use of Listahanan data with other LGUs and stakeholders.



5. The Listahanan data is very useful in selecting beneficiaries for social protection programs and services as baseline data. It is very easy and fast to access, hence, through Listahanan, disadvantaged households were given priority in the government's programs and services for the poor. Likewise, the use of Listahanan data prevents the claims that there were political interventions in the selection of beneficiaries and that only their relatives and friends were often selected during selection process.
6. The alternative hypothesis was accepted that "There is a significant relationship between the role in identification of poor households and assurance in the data collected by the DSWD as perceived by the respondents".

The following are the recommendations based on the findings and conclusions:

1. The DSWD to continue using Listahanan as an assessment tool to identify who will be the potential beneficiaries of social protection and projects. Listahanan is the only reliable targeting system that can identify poor households. It is quick, simple to use, and completely free for those who want to use the data. The DSWD to establish a grievance mechanism to address the complaints on the "possible" exclusion errors

From the Focused-Group Discussions made with the program implementers and local authorities, it is also highly recommended for DSWD to share the latest Listahanan data with other LGUs, national and regional government agencies and other partners to utilize the data.

The National Household Targeting Office and its regional counterparts should strengthen the marketing and communication strategies in advocating the utilization of Listahanan data to all LGUs and other stakeholders.

Philippine Statistics Authority and DSWD, through its The National Household Targeting Office, should continuously improve the targeting system by ensuring that all data collected is 100 percent accurate and that all poor households will be included in the lists and no one will be left

APPENDIX

A – Copy of the questionnaire (English and Tagalog Version)

B – Demographic profile of respondents

REFERENCES

1. DSWD (January 2015). *Listahanan – Talaan ng Pamilyang Nangagailangan Operations Manual*.
2. DSWD (July 2012). *National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction Operations Manual*.
3. Marquez, P. (2020). A critical analysis of the Philippine social amelioration program: Inequitable coverage and incomplete implementation. *Revista Economía & Finanzas*, 14(2), 110-117.
4. Gozum, A.A., West, S., Wolff, S., Hastings, M. and Ferguson, J., 2021. Allocation strategies to identify the least advantaged during Covid-19 crisis. *International Social Security Review*, 74(1), pp.97-117.
5. Philippine Information Agency (2022) press release on DSWD opens Listahanan 3
6. Rubio-Codina, M., Imperial, A. F., Romero-Romero, M., & Battistini, O. (2016). Poverty targeting methods for program assessment, management, and validation: a systematic review. *PLoS ONE*, 11(8), e0159077.
7. Khera, R. (2006). Targeting special populations in health programs: Challenges and strategies for success. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 31(1), 93-97.
8. Apostol, M. (2020). Database System for Social Welfare Programs: Streamlining Services and Ensuring Fairness. *Journal of Social Security*, 44(6), 1061-1077.
9. Ballesteros, M. (2017). Assessment of Livelihood Success and Implementation Issues on the Sustainable Livelihood Program of the DSWD.
10. Dadap-Cantal, A., Carlota, M.C., Jones, K., & Bénabou, R. (2018). Improving Targeting of Social Protection: An Overview of Experiences in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhy024>
11. Düvell, F., & Schomaker, M. (2020). Sampling in community-based research: A systematic review. *Social Science & Medicine*, 255, 113253.
12. Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2012). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In J. Cantor & M. Koehler (Eds.), *The Psychology of Gender, Third Edition*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press
13. Akuffo, Y. (2017). The Role of Program Management in Implementing Projects. *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research*
14. Magno, A., & Pizarro, C. (2015). Validation of the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (Listahanan) in the Philippines. *Asian Development Review*.



APPENDIX A
Survey Questionnaire

TAGALOG VERSION

LAWAK NG PAGKILALA SA MGA MAHIHIRAP NA SAMBAHAY AT ANTAS NG PAGSIGURO NG LISTAHANAN

Maaari lamang po pakisagutan ang mga susunod na mga katanungan.

Part I. Impormasyon ng Respondent

TANONG	Response (Piliin ang sagot)
Pangalan ng LGU/Opisina	
Panagalan ng respondent:	
Edad:	
Kasarian:	<input type="radio"/> Lalake <input type="radio"/> Babae <input type="radio"/> Mas gusto na huwag sabihin
Pinakamataas na Paaralan na pinasukan	<input type="radio"/> Elementarya <input type="radio"/> High school <input type="radio"/> College <input type="radio"/> Vocational <input type="radio"/> Post graduate <input type="radio"/> Walang natapos
Posisyon sa Trabaho/Katayuan sa komunidad:	<input type="radio"/> MSWDO/Staff <input type="radio"/> Local Official <input type="radio"/> Barangay Official <input type="radio"/> DSWD personnel <input type="radio"/> Benepisyaryo ng isang programa <input type="radio"/> Simpleng mamamayan <input type="radio"/> Others: _____

Part II. Ang lawak ng pagkakakilanlan ng mga mahihirap na sambahayan ayon sa pananaw ng mga respondente

Direksyon: Lagyan ng tsek (✓) ang hanay na pinakamahasay na naglalarawan sa iyong tugon, alinsunod sa sumusunod na sukat ng rating.

- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 5 – Lubos na Sumasaangayon | 2 – Hindi Sumasang-ayon |
| 4 – Sumasang-ayon | 1 – Lubos na Hindi Sumasang-ayon |
| 3 – Katamtaman | |

MGA PAHAYAG	5	4	3	2	1
A. ASSESSMENT					
1. Ako ay nainterview noong 2019-2021 ng Listahanan					
2. Ang aming sambahayan ay itinuturing na mahirap					
3. Ang aming sambahayan ay natukoy ng Listahanan na mahirap					
4. Naitala ang aming sambahayan sa listahan ng mahihirap ng Listahanan					
5. Naendorso ang listahan ng mga mahihirap sa mga nagpapatupad ng programa					
B. PAMAMAHALA NG PROGRAM					
1. Ang impormasyon tungkol sa Listahanan ay ibinabahagi sa LGU at sa pangkalahatang publiko					
2. Ang pagpapakalat ng listahan ng mahihirap ay ginawa ng DSWD-Listahanan sa mga barangay at LGU					
3. Tinanggap ng mga lokal na opisyal ang listahan ng mahihirap na sambahayan					



4. Ang listahan ng mahihirap ay katanggap tanggap sa pagitan ng DSWD at ng LGU/Barangay					
5. Nakilahok sa paggamit ng Listahanan data para sa mga programa at serbisyo.					
C. VALIDATION/PAGPAPATUNAY					
1. Nakapanayam ang mga kabahayan na hindi nakalista na mahirap sa Listahanan					
2. Nasuri ang kita ng mga potensyal na mahihirap na sambahayan					
3. Naging parte sa pagpapatunay ng mahihirap na sambahayan					
4. Napatunayan na ang mahihirap na sambahayan ay tunay na mahirap					
5. Alinsunod sa validation ng mahihirap na sambahayan					

Part III. Antas ng katiyakan sa mga nakalap na datos ng DSWD ayon sa pananaw ng mga respondent.

Direksyon: Lagyan ng tsek (✓) ang hanay na pinakamahasay na naglalarawan sa iyong tugon, alinsunod sa sumusunod na sukat ng rating.

- 5 – Lubos na Sumasaangayon
- 4 – Sumasang-ayon
- 3 – Katamtaman
- 2 – Hindi Sumasang-ayon
- 1 – Lubos na Hindi Sumasang-ayon

MGA PAHAYAG	5	4	3	2	1
A. KREDIBILIDAD NG MGA DATOS					
1. Ang pamamaraan at maayos na pagpapatupad ng Listahanan sa pagtatasa at pagbuo ng listahan ng mga mahihirap ay mahigpit na sinusunod sa isang sistematikong pamamaraan.					
2. Ang pagsusuri sa mga sambahayan ay ginagawa ng mga may kasanayan at may kaalamang tauhan ng Listahanan					
3. Ang mga sambahayan na natukoy na mahirap sa Listahanan ay talagang mahirap at walang pagkakamali sa pagpili nito.					
4. Inilabas ang mga resulta ng Listahanan batay sa maaasahang datos.					
5. Ang natukoy na mahihirap ay dapat na maging basehan sa pagpili ng mga benepisyaryo para sa mga programa at serbisyo ng gobyerno.					
B. MAGAGAMIT ANG LISTAHAN NG MAHIHIRAP					
1. Ang listahan ng mga mahihirap ay tinanggap at ginagamit ng gobyerno					
2. Ang listahan ng mahirap ay may kaugnayan sa pagpili ng mga benepisyaryo ng programang pangmahirap					
3. Pinaikli ang proseso sa pagpili ng mga benepisyaryo sa pamamagitan ng Listahanan data					
4. Walang pagkiling sa pagpili ng mga benepisyaryo o pakikisangkot sa pulitika					
5. Inuna ang mga mahihirap na sambahayan sa mga programa at proyekto ng pamahalaan					

Part IV. Antas ng lawak ng Listahanan na ginagamit ito ng LGU at iba pang kilalang service provider sa kanilang mga programa, proyekto at serbisyo.

Direksyon: Lagyan ng tsek (✓) ang hanay na pinakamahasay na naglalarawan sa iyong tugon, alinsunod sa sumusunod na sukat ng rating.

- 5 – Lubos na Sumasaangayon
- 4 – Sumasang-ayon
- 3 – Katamtaman
- 2 – Hindi Sumasang-ayon
- 1 – Lubos na Hindi Sumasang-ayon



MGA PAHAYAG	5	4	3	2	1
A. KAALAMAN					
1. Alam kung ano ang Listahanan at kung paano ito ginagamit					
2. Naunawaan ang mga proseso ng pagtukoy sa mga sambahayang mahihirap sa ilalim ng Listahanan					
3. Ang listahan ng mahihirap ay kinikilala ng LGU at iba pang organisasyon					
4. Pamilyar sa sistema na Listahanan na ito ay pinangungunahan ng DSWD at hindi ang local government					
5. Mabilis at madali ang pagbabahagi ng Listahanan data sa DSWD					

PART V. Mga Rekomendasyon

Ano ang maaari kong imungkahi upang mapabuti ang Listahanan data at ang sistema ng pagtukoy sa sambahayang mahihirap?

**APPENDIX B
Profile of the Respondents**

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Age Group

Age Range	n	%
30 - 34	43	28.67
35 - 39	48	32
40 - 44	33	22
45 - 49	23	15.33
50 & above	3	2

N=150

Table 1 shows that the respondents make up the largest percentage of the population, with 32% belonging to age range of 35–39, followed by the ages of 30–34 with 28.67%, the ages of 40–44 with 22%, and the ages of 45–49 with a total percentage of 15.33%. While the lowest number of respondents, with 2% belonging to age ranges 50 and above.

Age has consistently been one of the strongest predictors of survey response. Older adults are more likely to respond to surveys than younger adults. This may be because older adults have more free time, are more likely to be at home during the day, or have a greater sense of civic duty. Alternatively, younger adults may be more difficult to reach because they are more likely to be working or more active social lives.

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	N	%
Female	78	52
Male	61	40.67
Preferred not to say	11	7.33

N=150

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents as to their revealed gender. A total of 78 female participants (52%), 61 male participants (40.67%), and 11 other participants (7.33%) participated in the survey. Female respondents make up the largest percentage followed by the male respondents. While the lowest number of respondents belongs to those who preferred not to reveal their gender.



According to Social Role Theory, men and women have different social roles. Women are more likely to engage in social behaviors, including responding to surveys, than men because they are more likely to identify with their community and have greater sense of social responsibility (Wood and Eagly, 2012).

Table 3: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Highest School Attended

Highest School Attended	<i>n</i>	Percentage
Elementary	13	8.67
High School	38	25.33
College	20	13.33
Vocational	27	18
Post Graduate	21	14
None	31	20.67

N=150

Table 3 shows the profile of the respondents as to their highest school attended based on the six categories under the participant’s educational attainment. Respondents make up the largest percentage of the population, with 25.33% having gone to high school, followed by respondents with no educational attainment, respondents who took vocational training, post-graduates and respondents who have been to college. While the lowest number of percentages, 8.67%, belongs to the respondents who have been to elementary school.

Educational attainment is a key predictor of responses to surveys, as it is associated with differences in life experiences and public opinions (Brody, 2013). Those with higher educational attainment levels are more likely to express opinions that are informed by personal experience, knowledge, or research. Therefore, educational attainment is a significant factor in making sure surveys accurately capture the perspectives of a population.

Table 4: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents Profile According to Employment Positions / Status in the Community

Employment Position	<i>n</i>	%
MSDWO / Staff	10	6.67
Local Officials	0	0
Barangay Officials	11	7.33
DSWD Personnel	0	0
Program Beneficiary	99	66
Local Citizen	0	0
Others	30	20

N=150

Table 4 shows the employment status or status in the community of the respondents from Mauban, Quezon. It shows that 66% of the respondents are Program Beneficiaries, and 20% of the respondents are Others or randomly selected respondents, the MSDWO/Staff has a percentage of 6.67%, and Barangay Officials has 7.33%. While the Local Officials, and Local Citizen has 0% of the respondents.