

5/21/79

Analytical Description of the Poor

- by C.S. CALLISON

Philippine Concepts of Equity and Development Goals

The highly skewed distribution of income in the Philippines is widely recognized in both government and academic circles and is much discussed in professional publications and the popular press. Preliminary income data indicate that the poorest 40% of families received only 15% of total income in 1975, while the wealthiest 20% received 53%. Although these figures represent a slight improvement over previous decade, when the poorest 40% received only 12% of the income, it still represents a highly undesirable situation. (See Table 1.)

The "promotion of social development and social justice" through "the creation of productive employment opportunities, the reduction of income disparities, and the improvement of the living standards of the poor" is listed prominently as the first development goal of the Five-Year Philippine Development Plan, 1978-82 (See Annex C of CDSS). The GOP Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) launched a Social Indicators Project in 1973 to design a system of quantifying the national well-being and measuring it over time, including indicators for health, nutrition, education, economic well-being and poverty thresholds, environmental concerns, public safety and justice, political opportunity and social mobility.^{1/}

The basic definitions of poverty and the predominant concepts of equity adopted by the DAP and apparent in the GOP Five Year Plan have clearly been derived from a basic human needs approach to development, and the Philippines must be given the credit for adopting this approach in 1973, about the time the "Congressional Mandate" specifying a similar focus was first handed to A.I.D.

Out of the DAP project grew the realization that more reliable data relevant to the basic human needs and equity concerns were needed, and this has led to a NEDA-sponsored and USAID-supported Economic and Social Impact Analysis/Women in Development Project, currently underway, to improve the collection and distribution of such data. The family income and other data currently available are sufficiently descriptive to tell us generally who and where are most of the poor people in the country, however, and to identify some of their salient characteristics.

Incidence and Composition of Poverty

Adopting a 1971 average poverty threshold of ₱3867 annual income per family, or about \$100 per capita for an average family of 6 (₱6.44 = \$1.00), 70% of all Philippine families earned less. In 1971, the proportion of all families falling below the poverty threshold, the "incidence" of poverty, was 79%

^{1/} The results of this project were published in Mahar Mangahas, ed., Measuring Philippine Development, Development Academy of the Philippines, 1976, 574 pages.

in rural areas and 49% in urban. The rural poor families comprised 79% of the total poor in the country, while the urban poor comprised only 21%, despite the fact that 30% of all families resided in urban areas.

When families are classified by main source of income, the largest identifiable group of the poor is clearly composed of those dependent on agriculture, farmers and farm laborers, who comprise 55% of all families below the poverty threshold. Another 11% of the poor is represented by non-agricultural workers in rural areas. The highest incidences of poverty among source of income groups are found in the farming (86%), fishing, forestry and hunting (87%), and agricultural wages and salaries (83%) categories. (See Tables 2 and 3.)

Among major occupational groups, the "farmers, farm laborers, fishermen, hunters, loggers and related workers" group (of which 88% are farmers and farm workers) suffers the highest incidence of poverty with 81% living below the poverty threshold, while "manual workers and laborers not elsewhere classified (N.E.C.)" record the second highest incidence of 78%. Poor families in the former occupational category comprise 61% of all poor families in the country, while those in the latter comprise 11%. Family heads who are "unemployed without work experience and those not in labor force" comprise another 9% of the poor. The remaining 19% are scattered among the other 8 major occupational groups. (See Tables 4 and 5.)

Correlation with Family Size

Alcestis S. Abrera has calculated separate poverty thresholds for each family size from 1 through 10. Her calculations place 69% of all Philippine families below the threshold in 1971. When translated into number of persons, however, the percentage of the total Philippine population falling below this threshold is 73, since the incidence of poverty is higher among larger families than among smaller ones. While poor families with 6 or more members comprise 57% of all poor families, the persons in those families comprise 74% of the total number of people in poor families. (See Table 6.)

Reverse Correlation with Education

The incidence of poverty is clearly correlated with the education level of the household head, and declines markedly with each additional year of education completed. Among families for which the household head was listed as having completed no grade, 86% were below the poverty threshold; where his highest level completed was within the elementary grades 80% were poor; among former high school students 58% were poor; and where at least one year of college had been completed only 27% were poor. (It is remarkable that the incidence of poverty is so high even among those with high school and college education. This is a sad commentary on the lack of employment opportunities in an underdeveloped economy.) Of all families below the poverty threshold, 15% of their household heads reported no formal education and 65% had completed one or more grades at the elementary level only. (See Table 7.)

The Regional Dimension

On one hand, the regional dimension of poverty appears significant. The average family income of Manila is about triple, and that of Southern and Central Luzon is about double, the average income of the poorest region. The incidence of poverty varies from 36% in Manila and 61 to 63% in Southern and Central Luzon to 80 to 86% in the poorest three regions. (See Table 8.) There are also significantly higher proportions of families in the three wealthier regions who (in 1973) had electricity and safer sources of water, and lower proportions who used wood or charcoal as cooking fuel. (See Tables 8 and 9.)

The regional breakouts are not much help in locating discreet sub-groups of poor families, however, since the poor are spread fairly evenly throughout the country, outside of Metro-Manila. Even Manila and Southern and Central Luzon have sufficiently dense populations that, even with a lower incidence of poverty, they include 28% of all poor families. The three poorest regions, Bicol, Eastern Visayas and Cagayan Valley, include some 39% of all poor families; and the remaining 32% are found in the four middle-income regions.

The Urban/Rural Dimension and Other Economic Indicators

The urban-rural comparison appears to provide a more consistent distinction between rich and poor, both in the income statistics discussed above and in other economic indicators. In 1973, for example, only 10% of rural households had electric lights in their homes, compared with 72% of the urban households. Some 88% of rural households used wood or charcoal as cooking fuel, while only 37% of urbanites did. The percentage of households having flush or antipolo toilets was 70 in urban areas, only 33 in rural areas. Of urban households, 89% lived in houses made of concrete blocks and/or wood and 86% had access to waterworks, pumps or artesian wells, while the corresponding rural percentages were 52 and 55, respectively. (See Table 9.)

Health and Nutritional Status

Not many of the health data series currently available permit correlation with household income data. Recent surveys on nutritional status indicate a marked relationship between poverty and malnourishment, however, and a similar correlation would be expected in morbidity and mortality data. While the average caloric intake deficiency of all households in Metro-Manila was 17% in 1976, for example, the average deficiency of the lowest 39% of households, ranked according to income, is 25%. In comparison, the 28% of households in the highest income bracket reported a caloric deficiency of only 5%.

Protein intake deficiency is similarly correlated with income. While the deficiency is only 5.4% overall, the poorest 39% of households consumed only 81% of the daily protein standard, suffering an average deficiency of 19%. (See Table 10.)

These data are for the Greater Manila area, where the incidence of poverty, as reported above, is the lowest at only 37%. Nutritional status survey data do not yet permit such correlations for the rest of the country, where the overall (1971) incidence of poverty was 79% in rural areas and where most of the people live.

The data also indicate a clear correlation between the number of small children in a family and the incidence of malnutrition. (See Table 11.) A family planning program that emphasized longer spacing between children should help alleviate this problem.

Other health data, while undifferentiated by income group, indicates a fairly typical low-income situation. About one-third of all deaths are caused by pneumonia (16.2%), tuberculosis (10.9%), gastro-enteritis and colitis (5.3%), contagious diseases associated with poverty, over-crowded and unsanitary living conditions and complicated by poor nutritional status. (See Table 12.) The four leading causes of reported morbidity are influenza, gastro-enteritis and colitis, tuberculosis, and pneumonias. (See Table 13.) Other surveys indicate the percentage of people hosting a parasite ranges from 73% in Manila to 87% in a rural region like the Bicol. The proportion of Bicolanos carrying two or more parasites in 1976 was found to be 59%. (See Table 14.)

Profile of a "typical" poor household in the Philippines

The vast majority of low-income families reside in rural areas, and the majority of these are rice and corn farmers. A "typical" poor farmer lives with his wife and five children three or more kilometers from the semi-urban poblacion (municipal center) on an unpaved road passable by motor vehicles only during dry weather. He tends one hectare of land from which he obtains very low yields, due to poor drainage and a lack of dry season irrigation water, coupled with the high costs of transporting fertilizer and other farm inputs in, and any marketable produce out, over unpaved dirt (mud) paths. He works about 150 days a year, and between the hard-working periods of planting and harvesting he looks for manual labor jobs to supplement his income.

His wife shares the hard struggle for life. She also works in the fields and sometimes makes mosquito netting or other handicraft products for sale. Some of her time everyday is spent gathering food, since she has no way to preserve it. She and her children must also porter about 30 gallons of water each day from a shallow well one kilometer away, and the water is usually contaminated. A brother-in-law who works for a local merchant lives with the family and contributes to its income. With three working members, the household has a combined annual income of about ₱4,000, or around \$540.

The family lives in a two-room house made of bamboo and nipa palm. It is furnished with four chairs, an improvised wood-burning stove, a table, a stool, a cupboard and two kerosene lamps. The village gets dark about six o'clock, and, since there are no electric lights, it is difficult to read a newspaper or to sew a seam. It is not possible to watch television or listen to a phonograph. It is difficult to study by the flickering light

of a flame. It is possible to gather at neighbor's house and socialize after dark, but the unlighted paths are more difficult to traverse by night than by day. Poverty, the constant drudgery of physical labor required by both farm and household chores, bad or non-existent roads, and a lack of electricity impose an isolation, monotony and dullness on rural families that mark their lives.

Causes of Poverty

Considerable analytical effort has gone into determining the causes of poverty in the Philippines, with poverty defined as 1) insufficient income to provide the basic essentials of life (food, clothing and shelter), 2) poor health and nutritional status, 3) low levels of educational attainment and socio-political participation, and 4) including other aspects of the quality of life. The most obvious "cause" of poverty from the household point of view (but actually part of the economic definition of poverty) is the lack of productive employment opportunities and the resultant low levels of wage earnings and net farm income. In rural areas this is the result of low labor productivity due to inefficient agricultural production and marketing technology, in conjunction with limited and poorly distributed productive assets of all kinds--including 1) arable land and other natural resources, 2) public infrastructure such as roads, water control facilities, electrification and communications facilities, 3) privately-owned physical capital such as productive equipment and the facilities to house it, and 4) "embodied" human capital acquired through education, training and experience.

Attempts to increase productive assets on a per capita basis are seriously hampered by the high rate of population growth, which averaged 3.1% annually in the 1960's and 2.8% in the early 1970's and is considered to be the largest single impediment to eradicating poverty in the Philippines.

Other important causes of poverty, as defined above, include 1) the deterioration of environmental conditions such as deforestation, pollution, congested and poor housing conditions, lack of potable water and sanitation facilities, again exacerbated by rapid population growth, and 2) a notable ignorance among the bulk of the population about preventive health and nutrition technology, coupled with limited supplies of and access to basic social services.

Some of the more important constraints to overcoming these causes of poverty include 1) capital scarcity and limited financial resources available to national and local governments, 2) poor mobilization of domestic resources for development purposes, 3) limited supply of and access to effective credit, applied research, extension and marketing services, 4) the capital-intensive and urban bias of many government policies, 5) a serious foreign exchange constraint, 6) restrictive foreign trade policies of major trading partners, especially for labor-intensive manufactured goods and important agricultural exports like sugar and copra, and 7) an historical lack of local-level and especially of rural participation in political decision-making regarding resource allocation, development priorities, and other economic choices, contributing to the urban bias and neglect of rural requirements. (For a more detailed discussion of the causes of poverty and the constraints to their removal, see Annex B of the CDSS.)

Table 1

Distribution of Income in the Philippines, 1961-1975:
Percent of Total Income Received by Family Income Quintile

<u>Family Income Quintile</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1975^P</u>
Highest 20%	56.5	55.5	54.0	53.3
Second 20%	19.3	20.1	21.0	19.1
Third 20%	12.1	12.8	13.3	12.9
Fourth 20%	7.9	8.1	8.1	9.2
Lowest 20%	4.2	3.5	3.6	5.5

P = Preliminary

Source: "An Analytical Description of the Poor Majority," Social Research Associates (SRA), May 1977 (Second Draft), contracted by USAID/Philippines, Table 1.

Table 2

Families by Main Source of Income, Philippines, Urban and Rural: 1971

<u>Main Source of Income</u>	<u>Philippines</u>		<u>Urban</u>			<u>Rural</u>		
	<u>Families</u> <u>(1000)</u>	<u>% of</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Families</u> <u>(1000)</u>	<u>% of Total</u>		<u>Families</u> <u>(1000)</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	
				<u>Urban</u>	<u>Phil.</u>		<u>Rural</u>	<u>Phil.</u>
<u>Wages & Salaries</u>	<u>2727</u>	<u>43.0</u>	<u>1261</u>	<u>65.9</u>	<u>19.9</u>	<u>1468</u>	<u>33.1</u>	<u>23.1</u>
Agricultural	679	10.7	55	2.9	0.9	621	14.0	9.8
Non-agricultural	2050	32.3	1203	62.9	19.0	842	19.0	13.3
<u>Entrepreneurial Activities</u>	<u>3235</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>499</u>	<u>26.1</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>2736</u>	<u>61.7</u>	<u>43.1</u>
Trading	392	6.2	203	10.6	3.2	191	4.3	3.0
Manufacturing	199	3.1	82	4.3	1.3	120	2.7	1.9
Transport	83	1.3	25	1.3	0.4	58	1.3	0.9
Other Enterprises	64	1.0	42	2.2	0.7	22	0.5	0.3
Profession or Trade	42	0.7	27	1.4	0.4	18	0.4	0.3
Farming (incl. livestock & poultry)	2183	34.4	86	4.5	1.4	2097	47.3	33.0
Fishing, forestry & hunting	273	4.3	36	1.9	0.6	235	5.3	3.7
<u>Other Sources</u>	<u>384</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>8.1</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>231</u>	<u>5.2</u>	<u>3.6</u>
TOTAL	6347	100.0	1913	100.0	30.1	4434	100.0	69.9

Source: Family Income and Expenditures: 1971, The BCS Survey of Households Bulletin, Bureau of the Census and Statistics, Manila, Tables 8 and 60. Urban and rural family numbers and percentages of Philippine total have been estimated from column percentage figures in source.

Table 3

Incidence and Percentage Composition of Poverty by Main Source of Family Income,
Philippines, Urban and Rural: 1971

<u>Main Source of Income</u>	<u>% Incidence of Poverty</u>			<u>Number of Impoverished Families (1000's)</u>			<u>% Composition of Column Totals</u>		<u>% Composition of Philippines Total</u>		
	<u>Phil.</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>Phil.</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>Phil.</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Rural</u>
<u>Wages & Salaries</u>	<u>57.9</u>	<u>45.4</u>	<u>68.7</u>	<u>1580</u>	<u>572</u>	<u>1008</u>	<u>61.7</u>	<u>28.7</u>	<u>35.6</u>	<u>12.9</u>	<u>22.7</u>
Agriculture	82.6	63.6	84.6	561	35	525	3.8	15.0	12.7	0.8	11.8
Non-agriculture	49.7	44.6	57.3	1019	537	483	57.9	13.8	23.0	12.1	10.9
<u>Entrepreneurial Activities</u>	<u>80.7</u>	<u>54.1</u>	<u>84.8</u>	<u>2612</u>	<u>270</u>	<u>2320</u>	<u>29.1</u>	<u>66.1</u>	<u>58.9</u>	<u>6.1</u>	<u>52.3</u>
Trading	61.2	46.8	70.2	240	95	134	10.2	3.8	5.4	2.1	3.0
Manufacturing	72.6	54.9	83.5	144	45	100	4.9	2.8	3.2	1.0	2.3
Transport	65.1	51.0	68.6	54	13	40	1.4	1.1	1.2	0.3	0.9
Other Enterprises	61.9	47.6	77.0	40	20	17	2.2	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.4
Profession or Trade	34.1	20.7	35.6	14	6	6	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1
Farming (incl. livestock & poultry)	86.3	77.0	86.7	1884	65	1819	7.0	51.8	42.5	1.5	41.0
Fishing, forestry & hunting	86.5	72.2	86.8	236	26	204	2.8	5.8	5.3	0.6	4.6
<u>Other Sources</u>	<u>63.5</u>	<u>47.1</u>	<u>74.0</u>	<u>244</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>3.9</u>
TOTAL	69.9	48.5	79.1	4434	927	3509	98.7	99.7	99.8	20.9	79.1

Source: Incidence of poverty percentages have been revised somewhat from "An Analytical Description of the Poor Majority, Project Report I-B," Social Research Associates (SRA), May 1977 (Second Draft) (Contracted by USAID/Philippines), Tables 6 & 7, using the basic source data contained in Family Income and Expenditures: 1971, The BCS Survey of Households Bulletin No. 34, Bureau of the Census and Statistics, Manila, Tables 8 & 9. Rounding error prevents some items from adding exactly to their respective totals or subtotals.

ORD: CScallison,vbp, 5/7/79

Table 4

Families by Major Occupation Group of Household Head, Philippines, Urban and Rural: 1971

Major Occupation Group of Household Head	Philippines		Manila & Suburbs			Other Urban Areas			Rural Areas		
	Families (1000)	% of Total	Families (1000)	% of Total		Families (1000)	% of Total		Families (1000)	% of Total	
				Manila	Phil.		O.Urban	Phil.		Rural	Phil.
Professional, technical & related workers	228	3.6	48	9.1	0.8	92	6.6	1.4	87	2.0	1.4
Admin., executive & managerial	125	2.0	24	4.6	0.4	58	4.2	0.9	43	1.0	0.7
Clerical	201	3.2	46	8.8	0.7	100	7.2	1.6	54	1.2	0.9
Sales	469	7.4	75	14.3	1.2	207	14.9	3.3	187	4.2	2.9
Farmers, farm laborers, fishermen, hunters, loggers & related ^{1/}	3161	49.8	5	1.0	0.1	197	14.2	3.1	2959	66.7	46.6
Miners, quarrymen & related	15	0.2	1	0.2	0.02	7	0.5	0.1	7	0.2	0.1
Transportation & communication	360	5.7	68	13.0	1.1	126	9.1	2.0	166	3.7	2.6
Craftsmen, production-process	753	11.9	128	24.4	2.0	269	19.4	4.2	356	8.0	5.6
Manual workers & laborers N.E.C.	154	2.4	15	2.9	0.2	51	3.7	0.8	88	2.0	1.4
Service, sports & related	293	4.6	55	10.5	0.9	104	7.5	1.6	134	3.0	2.1
Unemployed w/o work experience & those not in labor force	582	9.2	61	11.6	1.0	174	12.5	2.7	346	7.8	5.5
Occupation not reported	8	0.1	—	—	—	2	0.1	0.03	5	0.1	0.1
TOTAL	6347	100.1	525	100.4	8.3	1388	99.9	21.9	4434	99.9	69.9

^{1/} The total composition of this category is:

Occupation	No. of Families (1000)	% of Category
Farmer owners	1036	32.8
Farmer part-owners	187	5.9
Farmer tenants	986	31.2
Farmers not specified & tuba gatherers (self-employed)	286	9.0
Farmer managers, administrators & overseers	10	0.3
Farm laborers, incl. foremen, copra workers, tuba gatherers, farm equipment operators, etc.	287	9.1
Fishermen, fishpond laborers & related workers	323	10.2
Hunters, trappers & related workers	1	0.03
Loggers & other forestry workers	45	1.4
TOTAL	3161	99.93

Source: Family Income and Expenditures: 1971, The BCS Survey of Households Bulletin, Bureau of the Census and Statistics, Manila, Tables 37 and 43.

Table 5

Incidence and Percentage Composition of Poverty by Major Occupational Group of Household Head, Philippines, Urban and Rural: 1971

Major Occupation Group of Household Head	% Incidence of Poverty			Number of Impoverished Families (1000s)			% Composition of Column Totals		% Composition of Philippines Total		
	Phil.	Urban	Rural	Phil.	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Phil.	Urban	Rural
Professional, technical & related workers	17.4	14.4	19.3	40	20	17	2.3	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.4
Admin., executive and managerial	15.9	7.4	17.9	20	6	8	0.7	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.2
Clerical	25.1	24.3	25.7	50	36	14	4.2	0.4	1.2	0.9	0.3
Sales	45.6	39.2	49.5	214	110	93	12.9	2.8	5.1	2.6	2.2
Farmers, farm laborers, fishermen, hunters, loggers, and related	81.2	65.8	82.2	2567	133	2432	15.6	73.6	60.8	3.2	57.6
Miners, quarrymen & related	29.0	-	46.0	4	-	3	-	0.1	0.1	-	0.1
Transportation & communication	56.0	52.6	57.8	202	102	96	12.0	2.9	4.8	2.4	2.3
Craftsmen, production-process	62.1	51.4	64.5	468	204	230	23.9	7.0	11.1	4.8	5.4
Manual workers & laborers N.E.C.	77.7	78.8	77.3	120	52	68	6.1	2.1	2.8	1.2	1.6
Service, sports & related	52.4	49.1	54.2	154	78	73	9.1	2.2	3.6	1.8	1.7
Unemployed w/o work experience & those not in labor force	65.9	47.5	78.7	383	112	272	13.1	8.2	9.1	2.7	6.4
TOTAL	66.6	44.7	74.7	4221	853	3305	99.9	100.0	100.0	20.2	78.3

Source: Incidence of Poverty estimates are taken from "An Analytical Description of the Poor Majority, Project Report I-B," Social Research Associates (SRA), May 1977 (Second Draft) (contracted by USAID/Philippines), Table 8, and applied to number of families in each occupation group as reported in Family Income and Expenditures: 1971, The BCS Survey of Households Bulletin No. 34, Bureau of the Census and Statistics, Manila, Table 37. The "Unemployed without work experience & those not in labor force" estimates were calculated from the latter source, using a poverty threshold of ₱3867. The fact that the sum of the urban and rural totals falls short of the Philippine total by 1.5% is apparently due to errors contained in the SRA draft.

ORD: CSCallison, vbp, 5/7/79

Table 6

Numbers of Families and Persons whose Expenditures are Below the Total Poverty Threshold, Proportions of Poor Families to All Families, and Composition of Poor Families and Population, By Family Size, Philippines: 1965 and 1971.

Family Size	Total Families (1000's)		Total Persons (1000's)		Families Below Total Threshold						Population Below Total Threshold			
					1965			1971			1965		1971	
	1965	1971	1965	1971	Number (1000's)	% of size Category	% of total poor	Number (1000's)	% of size Category	% of total poor	Number (1000's)	% of Total poor persons	Number (1000's)	% of Total poor persons
1	192	115	192	115	65.1	33.9	1.8	58.1	50.5	1.3	65	0.3	58	0.2
2	296	439	592	878	136.8	46.2	3.8	185.3	42.2	4.3	274	1.2	371	1.4
3	531	737	1593	2211	282.5	53.2	7.9	408.1	55.4	9.4	848	3.8	1224	4.6
4	717	945	2868	3780	474.8	66.1	13.2	568.8	60.2	13.0	1899	8.4	2275	8.5
5	666	929	3330	4645	476.4	71.5	13.3	635.1	68.4	14.6	2382	10.5	3176	11.8
6	723	855	4338	5130	541.0	74.8	15.1	642.7	75.2	14.7	3246	14.4	3856	14.4
7	625	735	4375	5145	494.9	79.3	13.8	561.6	76.4	12.9	3464	15.3	3931	14.7
8	501	699	4008	5592	425.5	85.0	11.8	576.3	82.4	13.2	3404	15.1	4610	17.2
9	397	353	3573	3177	328.9	82.9	9.2	290.3	82.2	6.7	2960	13.1	2613	9.7
10+	477	539	5247 ^{1/}	5929 ^{1/}	367.6	76.9	10.2	427.6	79.3	9.8	4044 ^{1/}	17.9	4704 ^{1/}	17.5
TOTAL	5126	6347	30116	36602	3594.2	70.4	100.1	4358.9	68.7	99.9	22586	100.0	26818	100.0
											(75.0%)		(73.3%)	

^{1/} An average family size of 11 was assumed for this category.

Sources: Calculated from Alcestis S. Abrera, "Philippine Poverty Thresholds," Appendix 5/4, contained in Mahar Mangahas, ed., Measuring Philippine Development, Development Academy of the Philippines, 1976, p. 268, and Family Income and Expenditures: 1971, The BCS Survey of Households Bulletin No. 34, Bureau of the Census and Statistics, Manila, Table 68.

ORD: CSCallison, vbp, 5/7/79

Table 7

Incidence and Composition of Poverty by Education of Household Head, 1971

<u>Highest Grade Completed by Household Head</u>	<u>No. of Families (1000's)</u>	<u>% of Total Families</u>	<u>% of Families w/Income below ₱3867</u>	<u>No. of Impoverished Families (1000's)</u>	<u>% Composition of Poor Families</u>
<u>No Grade Completed or Reported</u>	<u>767</u>	<u>12.1</u>	<u>85.8</u>	<u>658</u>	<u>14.8</u>
<u>Elementary</u>	<u>3631</u>	<u>57.2</u>	<u>79.6</u>	<u>2890</u>	<u>65.2</u>
Grades 1-3	1083	17.1	82.7	896	20.2
Grades 4-5	1316	20.7	80.3	1057	23.8
Grades 6-7	1231	19.4	75.7	932	21.0
<u>High School</u>	<u>1179</u>	<u>18.6</u>	<u>57.9</u>	<u>683</u>	<u>15.4</u>
Year 1	195	3.1	72.3	141	3.2
Year 2	269	4.2	63.6	171	3.9
Year 3	158	2.5	60.8	96	2.2
Year 4	557	8.8	49.4	275	6.2
<u>College</u>	<u>771</u>	<u>12.1</u>	<u>26.8</u>	<u>207</u>	<u>4.7</u>
Year 1	59	0.9	55.9	33	0.7
Year 2	165	2.6	40.0	66	1.5
Year 3	73	1.2	34.3	25	0.6
Year 4	367	5.8	20.4	75	1.7
Year 5	41	0.6	14.6	6	0.1
Year 6 or higher	65	1.0	11.0	7	0.2
TOTAL	6347	100.0	69.9	4434	100.1

Source: Calculated from Family Income and Expenditures: 1971, The BCS Survey of Households Bulletin No. 34 Bureau of the Census and Statistics, Manila, Table 48, and "An Analytical Description of the Poor Majority," Social Research Associates (SRA), May 1977 (Second Draft), contracted by USAID/Philippines, Table 13.

Table 8

Incidence of Poverty and Composition by Region: Philippines, 1971

<u>Region</u>	<u>Total No. of Families (1000's)</u>	<u>% of Total Families</u>	<u>% of Families with Income below ₱3867</u>	<u>No. of Families in Poverty (1000's)</u>	<u>Regional Composition of Poverty (%)</u>
I Manila & Suburbs	525	8.3	35.6	187	4.2
II Ilocos - Mt. Province	346	5.5	75.1	260	5.9
III Cagayan Valley - Batanes	260	4.1	85.8	223	5.0
IV Central Luzon	855	13.5	61.2	523	11.8
V S. Luzon & Islands	869	13.7	63.3	550	12.4
VI Bicol	496	7.8	80.3	398	9.0
VII W. Visayas	670	10.6	76.3	511	11.5
VIII E. Visayas	980	15.4	81.9	803	18.1
IX N. Mindanao	522	8.2	76.8	401	9.0
X S. Mindanao	<u>825</u>	<u>13.0</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>578</u>	<u>13.0</u>
TOTAL	6347	100.1	69.9	4434	99.9

Source: Calculated from Family Income and Expenditures: 1971, The BCS Survey of Households Bulletin No. 34, Bureau of the Census and Statistics, Manila, Table 4.

Table 9

Comparative Economic and Social Indicators by Regions and Urban/Rural Sectors, 1971 and 1973

<u>Region or Sector</u>	<u>Ave. Family Income 1971 (Pesos)</u>	<u>Median Family Income 1971 (Pesos)</u>	<u>1971 Incidence of Poverty (%)</u>	<u>1971 % of Families</u>		<u>1973 % Households w/ electric lights</u>	<u>1973 % Households using wood or charcoal to cook</u>	<u>1973 % Households flush or anti-polo toilets</u>	<u>1973 % Households w/ houses of blocks or wood</u>	<u>1973 % Households w/ waterworks, pump or artesian well</u>
				<u>Farm</u>	<u>Rural</u>					
<u>Philippines</u>	<u>3736</u>	<u>2454</u>	<u>69.9</u>	<u>44.7</u>	<u>69.9</u>	<u>28.3</u>	<u>72.6</u>	<u>44.3</u>	<u>62.9</u>	<u>63.8</u>
Urban	5867	3972	48.5		0.0	71.7	37.0	70.1	88.8	85.8
Rural	2818	1954	79.1		100.0	9.6	87.9	33.2	51.8	54.7
I. Manila	7785	5202	35.6	1.5	0.0	95.8	5.4	86.7	99.1	97.8
V. S. Luzon	4332	2960	63.3	33.5	60.8	40.5	59.5	44.6	68.7	81.1
IV. Central Luzon	4127	3119	61.2	39.3	71.7	37.6	63.8	39.0	66.1	82.4
X. S. Mindanao	3577	2549	70.0	55.5	81.2	16.4	89.8	38.1	59.9	39.5
II. Ilocos	3299	1803	75.1	63.9	83.2	11.5	82.1	44.4	57.1	60.1
VII. W. Visayas	3206	2332	76.3	39.6	75.7	11.0	84.1	22.2	32.0	43.7
IX. N. Mindanao	3062	2186	76.8	59.2	81.2	14.1	91.0	32.1	76.6	43.8
VI. Bicol	2784	1874	80.3	56.3	82.3	16.6	83.9	32.4	56.9	56.0
VIII. E. Visayas	2548	1651	81.9	50.1	79.0	15.3	86.5	61.3 - ?	58.4	60.7
III. Cagayan Valley	2390	1652	85.8	67.7	85.8	8.1	89.2	28.8	47.2	59.4

Source: Family Income and Expenditures: 1971, The BCS Survey of Households Bulletin No. 34, Bureau of the Census and Statistics, Manila, Tables 4, 7, 16 and 17; and "An Analytical Description of the Poor Majority, Project Report I-B," Social Research Associates (SRA), May 1977 (Second Draft) (contracted by USAID/Philippines), Table 19.

ORD: CSCallison, vbp, 5/7/79

Table 10.

Mean Daily Per Capita Calorie and Protein Intake
by Per Capita Annual Income in Greater Manila Area
Feb.-March 1976

<u>Per Capita Annual Income^{1/} (Pesos)</u>	<u>% of Total Households</u>	<u>Calories (KCAL)</u>	<u>Protein (Gm)</u>	<u>% of Ave. Caloric Standard^{2/}</u>	<u>% of Ave. Protein^{3/} Standard^{3/}</u>
0-500	15.3	1457	38.3	72.9	76.6
500-999	23.5	1527	42.3	76.4	84.6
1000-1499	19.8	1643	45.2	82.2	90.4
1500-1999	13.3	1810	52.4	90.5	104.8
2000+	<u>28.1</u>	<u>1902</u>	<u>58.9</u>	<u>95.1</u>	<u>117.8</u>
All Households	100.0	1660	47.3	83.0	94.6

1/ ₱1632 for all households.

2/ 2000 calories per capita per day.

3/ 50 grams per capita per day.

Source: Food and Nutrition Research Institute, Manila

Table 11.

Impact of Number of Pre-Schoolers per Family
on their Nutritional Health

<u>No. of Pre-Schoolers Per Family</u>	<u>Percent Mal- nourished</u>
1	36
2	39
3	49

Source: Report of the Bulacan Province Nutrition and Family Planning Program. Ma. Minda Caldo, Victoria Santiago and R. W. Engel, Dec. 1972, Nutrition Resource Paper, USAID Resource Library, Manila.

TABLE 12
Mortality: Ten Leading Causes and Crude Death Rates, CY 1969-1973 and 1974
(Number and Rate per 100,000 population)

	5-Year Average 1969 — 1973			1974		
	Number	Rate	% Total Deaths	Number	Rate	% Total Deaths
Pneumonias	45,135	118.0	17.1	45,910	110.7	16.2
Tuberculosis (all forms)	28,500	74.5	10.8	31,031	74.9	10.9
Diseases of the Heart	15,335	40.1	5.8	23,542	56.8	8.3
Gastro-Enteritis and Colitis	15,119	39.5	5.7	15,182	36.6	5.3
Diseases of the Vascular System	12,757	33.4	4.8	14,478	34.9	5.1
Avitaminosis and other Nutritional Deficiency	9,147	23.9	3.5	12,517	30.2	4.4
Malignant Neoplasms	9,995	26.1	3.8	12,469	30.1	4.4
Accidents	11,239	29.4	4.2	8,657	20.9	3.0
Bronchitis, Emphysema and Asthma	9,715	25.4	3.7	7,064	17.0	2.5
Tetanus	3,587	9.4	1.4	3,794	9.2	1.3

TABLE 13
Morbidity: Incidence (Cases Per Year) of Ten Leading Diseases Reported
CY 1969-1973 and 1974

Cause	5-Year Average 1969-1973		1974	
	Number	Rate Per 100,000 Population	Number	Rate Per 100,000 Population
Influenza	302,354	790.6	297,474	717.5
Gastro-Enteritis and Colitis	225,362	589.3	245,813	592.9
Tuberculosis (all forms)	141,914	371.1	142,250	343.1
Pneumonias	88,677	231.9	93,050	224.4
Malaria	28,955	75.7	27,420	66.1
Dysentery (all forms)	18,424	48.2	23,552	56.8
Measles	23,251	60.8	22,999	55.5
Whooping Cough	23,255	60.8	22,042	53.2
Malignant Neoplasms	10,124	26.5	12,757	30.8
Infectious Hepatitis	4,653	12.2	5,977	14.4

TABLE 14
Prevalence of Intestinal Parasitism

Type of Parasite	Percentage of Subjects Found Positive		
	Visayas (1975)	Greater Manila Area (1976)	Bicol (1976)
Any parasite	75.5	73.1	87.4
Ascaris lumbricoides	60.4	57.3	76.2
Trichiuris trichiura	34.3	54.5	60.1
Hookworm	12.5	2.5	23.4
Entamoeba histolytica	0.9	0	0
Giardia Lamblia	0.4	0	0.3
Enterobius vermicularis	0.1	*	0.3
Two or more parasites	30.4	39.7	59.4
Number of subjects examined	7892	2342	2529

*Less than 0.1%

Source: Food and Nutrition Research Institute, NSDB. Unpublished data:

Parasitism and Anemia in Visayas, 1975.

Parasitism and Anemia in Greater Manila Area and Bicol, 1976.