

6 ICLEHI 2017-011 Eriberto R. Astorga

**The Implementation of Republic Acts 8972 Known as “Solo Parent Act 2000”: Basis for Proposed Enhancement Program**

Eriberto R. Astorga, Jr., Herbert D. Vertucio  
De La Salle University/Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology/  
St. Jude College  
2401 Taft Avenue, Manila/Nagtahan, Sampaloc, Manila, Philippines  
ertagfa@yahoo.com

**ABSTRACT**

The Solo Parents’ Welfare Act of 2000 under Republic Act No. 8972 was embodied to implement in the Philippines for giving benefits and privileges to all solo parents and children for their social development and welfare services supported by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). In fact, various organizations both government and non-government reinforced this act for sustainable participation and consideration of the Philippine law. Through this study, the researchers assessed and evaluated the level of implementation of R.A. 8972 as well as the degree of problems encountered by the respondents using random sampling techniques particularly to the selected solo parent under District 6 of Manila. A descriptive design was used in order to give better description of the assessment and evaluation of the respondents regarding their benefits accumulated to the said act thru Likert Scale. With this, the study revealed that the work opportunities was implemented ranging 4.14 as the mean value, educational benefits was moderately implemented obtaining a computed mean value of 2.65, housing benefits was poorly implemented with 2.00 mean value, medical assistance was moderately implemented garnering 2.94 mean value, and the government support was poorly implemented garnering 2.24 mean value. As such, there are more problems encountered by the respondents on the implementation of the RA 8972 such as failed to be hired in the companies, cannot avail the scholarship programs for their children, influence peddling (palakasan system), Long processes of medical assistance due to hospital’s protocol or policies, and too much requirements processes. This result enacted by the group of researchers to formulate the Proposed Promotion and Enhancement Program of R.A. 8972 in order to observe and address a fully implementation of the Solo Parent Welfare Act of 2000.

*Keyword:* Solo parent, gender, work opportunities, Republic Act 8972, social development

**Introduction**

The family is the basic unit of human organization. It defined functionality, the family is essentially universal, and however, families’ structural form and strength vary greatly across cultures and time. The term family is use here in the broadest possible sense; it is defined as whatever system is a society uses to support and control reproduction in human sexual interactions. This broad definition solved many apparent conflicts over the meaning of changes presently taking place in family functions and structures. It composes of parents and their children. The parent should nurture their children with love at home. The family should mold its member first before exposing them to the bigger and more complicated world. The primary concern of the parents is to the teacher’s because there is no substitute for parents care. Parents and teacher should work hand to hand to develop the

young minds of children. All parents have many things in common like, the responsibilities that come with their role and satisfaction they may gain from it. However, in some situations parents also face unique concern and challenges. The perfect example for this is solo parenting. Solo parents include divorced, widowed, and single people with children. Nowadays the number of solo parent has increase dramatically. There have always been some people who are solo parents because of the death of their spouse.

Family is the best thing that you could ever wish for. They are there for you on the ups and downs of your life and will love you no matter what happens. They are always there. It is difficult for a person specifically to a child live without a family especially without his or her parents. Our father and mother cannot be replaced by anyone. Family has a great influence in our life. Even though family is considered the smallest unit in a community, but they are the one who molds us to be a better person. Our personality reflects on what is the status of our family and on what has been the teaching of our parents to us. They are also the one who is making us feel that we are loved. But as time passed by, there are many changes occurring in families. There are many broken families nowadays that cause the increasing of numbers of family consisting only of a single parent. Solo parents are faced with many trials. Along are the problems on financial, emotional, and social aspects. But even though it is hard to be a solo parent. It also has a good result when it comes to the relationship between the parent and child.

Moreover, the significant increase of single parenthood raises an important issue of educational disadvantages among children growing up with a single parent, given the overall low level of public provisions for children and family in Korea. Korea has a conservative social welfare system with very low levels of spending by the government on social programs. For instance, public expenditure on family (including both cash and other kinds of benefits) as a percentage of GDP (Growth Domestic Product) was only 0.1 percent in Korea in 2000 showing the lowest level among OECD countries, whereas the corresponding percentage in Denmark, Finland, and Norway was over 3 percent (OECD, 2004). An indicator of public support for children’s education tells a similar story. In Korea, private funds that came from individuals or households accounted for 77 percent of total expenditures on tertiary education in 2000, the highest among the OECD countries providing expenditure data. Indeed, except for Korea, only two countries, Japan (55 percent) and the U.S. (66 percent) had more than half of the expenditure on tertiary education funded by the private sector, while in other OECD countries most of the expenditure on tertiary education was from public sources (OECD, 2003). In addition to the overall low levels of social welfare provision, substantial social policies particularly geared toward single-parent families have not been implemented in Korea.

The vulnerable conditions of children living with a single parent, associated with the low level of public support, are expected to be particularly severe among those with a single mother. Although the rate of Korean women’s labor participation has steadily increased over time, still only a half of women in working age are in labor force (48.9% in 2003; KNSO, 2005). Moreover, the Korean economy is distinct with a comparably high proportion of women engaged in unpaid family work or self-employment, which indicates the overall unstable and informal features of women’s employment (Brinton, 2001). Even within the formal sector of employment, women are more likely to be in positions with much lower incomes than their male counterparts (Monk-Turner & Turner, 2000). In sum, the employment structure in Korea is characterized by the marginalization of women in the labor market and a wage system based on the male-breadwinner model. These characteristics of the employment environment in Korea imply that children with a single mother are at particularly high risk of economic deprivation.

In addition to severe economic deprivation that children in single-parent families

## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

may face, a strong negative stigma attached to the children of single parents is apparent in Korea. Despite recent changing views on single parenthood in Korea along with the growing prevalence (Yoo, 2006), young children growing up with a single parent, particularly a divorced parent, still suffer from various psychological difficulties caused by negative attitudes from school and peer groups. Even young adults often encounter a barrier to marriage due merely to the fact that they were reared in single-parent families (Chang & Min, 2002). These economic and cultural conditions of children growing up with a single-parent in Korea lead to an expectation of the evident educational gap between students from single-parent and two-parent families.

On the other hand, research studies on Asian parenting have increased immensely in the past two decades. Rapid changes in the last century raised interest in examining the impacts of urbanization and industrialization on family structures and family values within Asian families (Chao, 2002). Early research on parental control among Asians demonstrated that parents used harsh and strict parenting practices with their children that are not in alignment with Western child-rearing philosophies. Yet recent research shows that the negative descriptions of Asian parenting may have resulted from cultural differences or misunderstandings based on limited Western perspectives on these collectivist cultures (Chao, 2002). Researchers posited that existing studies and typology originate mostly from Caucasian cultural contexts that emphasize individualism and independence for children. As such, existing research cannot fully capture the prevailing parenting styles in Taiwan, which do not share the same social values and beliefs with individualistic Western societies (Fung, 2003). Many researchers have thus become aware of the impact of indigenous cultural notions on parenting, and take into consideration the similarity and distinctions in parenting practices among diverse cultural groups when analyzing these studies (Chen, 2010).

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study was based on the ‘family systems theory’ that introduced by Dr. Murray Bowen that suggest that individuals cannot be understood in isolation from one another, but rather as a part of their family, as the family is an emotional unit. Families are system of interconnected and interdependent individuals, none of whom can be understood in isolation from the system. According to Bowen, a family is a system in which each member had a role to play and rules to respect. Members of the system are expected to respond to each other in a certain way according to their role, which is determined by relationship agreements. Within the boundaries of the system, patterns develop as certain family member’s behavior is caused by and causes other people other family member’s behaviors in predictable system ways. Maintaining the same pattern of behaviors within the system may lead to balance in the family system, but also to dysfunction. For example if a husband is depressive and cannot pull himself together, the wife may need to take up more responsibilities to pick up the slack. The change in roles may maintain the stability in the relationship, but it may also push the family towards a different equilibrium. This new equilibrium may lead to dysfunction, as the wife not is able to maintain this overachieving role over a long period of time. But the point is that if the parents become parent. One of the parents didn’t last long in life.

### **Research Question**

This study aimed to assess the implementation of Republic Act 8972 known as Solo Parent Act in the City of Manila. In the light of the foregoing study, it sought to answer the following questions:

## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

1. What are the profile of solo parents in terms of the following:
  - 1.1 Age;
  - 1.2 Gender;
  - 1.3 Educational Attainment;
  - 1.4 Occupation;
  - 1.5 Monthly Net Income; and
  - 1.6 No. of Children?
  
2. What is the level of implementation of R.A 8972 in the City of Manila as assess by the group of respondents in terms of:
  - 2.1 Work Oppurtunities;
  - 2.2 Educational Benefits;
  - 2.3 Housing Benefits;
  - 2.4 Medical Assistance; and
  - 2.5 Government Support?
  
3. Is there any significant difference on the assessment of the group of respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of the above cited variables when group according to gender?
  
4. What are the degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of the aforementioned variables?

### Research Method

The study utilized a descriptive survey method in order to obtain accurate and meaningful description about the effect of the Solo Parent Welfare Act of 2000 in helping parent to upgrade their responsibility to their children, by means of collecting reliable and factual information. It also described the background of the situation for the researchers had been able to meet the deepest causes of these matters.

According to Manuel and Medel the descriptive method using the survey is a more logical type of investigation because this is concerned with the conditions or relations that are going on and effect on developing trends. At time, descriptive research is related to some preceding events that has influenced or affected a present.

This study also rely quantitatively with respect to the use of statistic manner such as (1) Percentage was used to show the percentage of frequency distribution of the respondent's profile. It sought to answer the sub- problem number 1 which is the profile of the respondents. The number of responses obtained was divided by the total number of respondents and then multiplied by 100. (2) Ranking. This is a descriptive measure to describe numerical data in addition to percentage ranking was used in the study for comparative purpose and for sharing the importance of items analyzed. (3) Weighted mean, this was used to get the average of frequency of the responses in each weighted item. (4) Likert Scale. This treatment, which was invented by Rensis Likert, sums up the responses on the five-level Likert item was designated by a numerical value of 5 to 1. The total designated value will be determined by the computation of the weighted mean. As the scoring system for each Likert item, the higher the score, the favorable response it reflects while the lower the score, the unfavorable response it do reflect. It sought to answer the sub- problem No.2 that is the level of implementation of R.A 8972 and sub-problem No.4 the degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972. The value of each item and its interpretations are as follows: 5 (4.20 – 5.00) Fully Implemented; 4 (3.40 – 4.19) Implemented; 3 (2.60 – 3.39)

## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

Moderately Implemented; 2 (1.80 – 2.59) Poorly Implemented; 1 (1.00 – 1.49) Not Implemented. 5 (4.20 – 5.00) Fully Encountered; 4 (3.40 – 4.19) Encountered; 3 (2.60 – 3.39) Moderately Encountered; 2 (1.50 – 2.59) Poorly Encountered; and 1 (1.00 – 1.49) Not Encountered. (5) T-Test is often called Student’s T-test in the name of its founder “Student”. T-test is used to compare two different sets of values. It is generally performed on a small set of data. T-test is generally applied to normal distribution, which has a small set of values. This T-test compares the mean of two samples. T-test uses means and standard deviation of two samples to make a comparison.

### Results and Discussion

The following are the findings of the specific problems raised in the study:

1. What are the profile of solo parents in terms of the following:
  - 1.1 Age;
  - 1.2 Gender;
  - 1.3 Educational Attainment;
  - 1.4 Occupation;
  - 1.5 Monthly Net Income; and
  - 1.6 No. of Children?

Table 1  
*The Distribution of Respondents as to Age*

| Age   | f  | %   |
|-------|----|-----|
| 18-27 | 10 | 20  |
| 28-37 | 18 | 36  |
| 38-47 | 9  | 18  |
| 48-57 | 6  | 12  |
| 58-67 | 3  | 6   |
| 68-77 | 4  | 8   |
| Total | 50 | 100 |

Table 1 shows the profile of the respondents as to age of 50 respondents; 18 or 36% were aged 28-37; 10 or 20% were aged 18-27; 9 or 18% were aged 38-47; 6 or 12% were aged 48-57; 4 or 8% were aged 68-77; and 3 or 6% were aged 58-67.

Table 2  
*The Distribution of the Respondents as to Gender*

| Gender | f  | %   |
|--------|----|-----|
| Male   | 11 | 22  |
| Female | 39 | 78  |
| Total  | 50 | 100 |

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents as to gender of 50 respondents; 39 or 78% were female while 11 or 22% were male.

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO**

Table 3  
*The Distribution of the Respondents as to Educational Attainment*

| Educational Attainment | f  | %   |
|------------------------|----|-----|
| Elementary Level       | 2  | 4   |
| Elementary Graduate    | 4  | 8   |
| High School Level      | 4  | 8   |
| High School Graduate   | 6  | 12  |
| Vocational Level       | 1  | 2   |
| Vocational Graduate    | 5  | 10  |
| College Level          | 14 | 28  |
| College Graduate       | 11 | 22  |
| Master’s Degree        | 2  | 4   |
| Doctoral Degree        | 1  | 2   |
| Total                  | 50 | 100 |

Table 3 shows the profile of the respondents as to educational attainment of 50 respondents; 14 or 28% were College level; 11 or 22% were College Level; 6 or 12% were High school Graduate; 5 or 10% were Vocational Graduate Level; 4 or 8% were Elementary Graduate and High School Level; 2 or 4% were Elementary Level and Master’s Degree; and 1 or 2% were Vocational Level and Doctoral Degree.

Table 4  
*The Distribution of the Respondents as to Occupation*

| Occupation    | f  | %   |
|---------------|----|-----|
| Employed      | 35 | 70  |
| Self-Employed | 15 | 30  |
| Total         | 50 | 100 |

Table 4 shows the profile of the respondents as to Occupation of 50 respondents; 35 or 70% were Employed while 15 or 30% were Self- Employed.

Table 5  
*The Distribution of the Respondents as to Monthly Net Income*

| Monthly Net Income | f  | %   |
|--------------------|----|-----|
| P41,000-Above      | 0  | 0   |
| P36,000-40,000     | 1  | 2   |
| P31,000-35,000     | 1  | 2   |
| P26,000-30,000     | 2  | 4   |
| P21,000-25,000     | 9  | 18  |
| P16,000-20,000     | 9  | 18  |
| P10,000-15,000     | 13 | 26  |
| Less than 10,000   | 15 | 30  |
| Total              | 50 | 100 |

Table 5 shows the profile of the respondents as to Monthly Net Income of 50 respondents; 15 or 30% were Less than 10,000; 13 or 26% were 10,001-15,000; 9 or 18%

## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

were 16,000-20,000 and 21,001-25,000; 2 or 4% were 26,001-30,000 and 2; 1 or 2% were 31,000-35,000 and 36,000-40,000 while 0 or 0% were 41,000- Above.

Table 6  
*The Distribution of the Respondents as to No. of Children*

| No. of Children | f  | %   |
|-----------------|----|-----|
| 5 and up        | 4  | 8   |
| 4               | 6  | 12  |
| 3               | 8  | 16  |
| 2               | 20 | 40  |
| 1               | 12 | 24  |
| Total           | 50 | 100 |

Table 6 shows the profile of the respondents as to No. Of Children of 50 respondents; 20 or 40% were 2; 12 or 24% were 1; 8 or 16% were 3; 4 or 12% were 4 and 4 or 8% were 5 and Up.

### 2. What is the level of implementation of R.A 8972 in City of Manila as assess by the group of respondents in terms of:

- 2.1 Work Opportunities;
- 2.2 Educational Benefits;
- 2.3 Housing Benefits;
- 2.4 Medical Assistance; and
- 2.5 Government Support?

The summary on the assessment of the respondents on the level of implementation of R.A 8972 are presented in Table 7.

Table 7  
*Summary of level of implementation of R.A 8972*

| Criteria                         | Male |     | Female |     | Composite Weighted Mean |     | Rank |
|----------------------------------|------|-----|--------|-----|-------------------------|-----|------|
|                                  | WM   | VI  | WM     | VI  | WM                      | VI  |      |
| In terms of Work Opportunities   | 4.47 | F.I | 3.79   | I   | 4.14                    | I   | 1    |
| In terms of Educational Benefits | 2.88 | M.I | 2.41   | N.I | 2.65                    | M.I | 3    |
| In terms of Housing Benefits     | 2.22 | P.I | 1.76   | N.I | 2.00                    | P.I | 5    |
| In terms of Medical Assistance   | 3.25 | M.I | 2.62   | M.I | 2.94                    | M.I | 2    |
| In terms of Government Support   | 2.47 | P.I | 2.00   | P.I | 2.24                    | P.I | 4    |
| Composite Weighted Mean          | 3.06 | M.I | 2.52   | P.I | 2.79                    | M.I |      |

Looking at the summary table, it could be observed that the male respondents rated work opportunities as **Fully Implemented** with the respective obtained mean value of 4.47. The educational benefits and medical assistance were rated **Moderately Implemented** with their respective obtained mean values of 2.88 and 3.25. The housing benefits and government support were rated **Poorly Implemented** with their respective obtained mean values of 2.22 and 2.47. The overall impressions of the male respondents

on the five variables presented were **Moderately Implemented** with the **grand mean of 3.06**.

On the part of female respondents they rated work opportunities as **Implemented** with the respective obtained mean value of 3.79. The medical assistance were rated **Moderately Implemented** with the respective obtained mean value of 2.62 they rated educational benefits and government support as **Poorly Implemented** with their respective obtained mean values of 2 and 2.41 while, on the housing benefits were rated **Not Implemented** with the respective obtained mean value of 1.76. The female respondents perception on the five variables presented were **Poorly Implemented** as evidenced by the obtained **grand mean of 2.52**.

Summarily, work opportunities with a total mean of 4.14 rank 1; medical assistance with a total mean of 2.94 rank 2; educational benefits with a total mean of 2.65 rank 3; government support with a total mean of 2.24 rank 4; and housing benefits with a total mean of 2 rank 5.

Generally, the obtained grand mean of 2.79 is verbally interpreted as **Moderately Implemented**. This implies that the level of implementation of R.A 8972 was **Moderately Implemented** to the two (2) groups of respondents.

**3. Is there any significant difference on the assessment of the group of respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of the above cited variables when group according to gender?**

The differences on the assessment of the respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 are presented in Table 8.

Table 8  
*Test on significant difference on the assessment of the respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972*

| Male Respondents |        |     | Female Respondents |        |     | COMP<br>T | LoS | TAB<br>T | DECISION  | VI          |
|------------------|--------|-----|--------------------|--------|-----|-----------|-----|----------|-----------|-------------|
| WM               | VAR    | VI  | WM                 | VAR    | VI  |           |     |          |           |             |
| 3.06             | 0.7776 | M.I | 2.52               | 0.6207 | P.I | 1.02      | 5%  | 2.306    | Accept Ho | There is no |

Looking at the test on significant difference on the assessment of the respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972. It shows that the male respondents computed weighted mean value of 3.06 while, the variance of 0.7776 verbally interpreted as moderately implemented. However, the female respondents computed weighted mean value of 2.52 while, the variance of 0.6207 verbally interpreted as **Poorly Implemented**. Using t-test the tabular t- value of 2.306 at 5% level of significance. Moreover, the computed t-value of 1.02 is less than the tabulat t-value therefore, accept the null hypothesis. This implies that there is no significant difference.

**4. What are the degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of the aforementioned variables?**

The degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 as to work opportunities are presented in Table 9.



THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

Table 9

*Degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of Work Opportunities*

| Variables   | Male |     | Female |     | Composite Weighted Mean |     | Rank |
|---|------|-----|--------|-----|-------------------------|-----|------|
|   | WM   | VI  | WM     | VI  | WM                      | VI  |      |
| 1. Some of the solo parents failed to be hired in the companies because of having a child.                        | 3.35 | M.E | 3.20   | M.E | 3.28                    | M.E | 1    |
| 2. Some of the solo parents encountered discriminations by their employers.                                       | 2.5  | P.E | 2.31   | P.E | 2.41                    | P.E | 4    |
| 3. There are companies, which are biased to their employees.  | 3.20 | M.E | 2.90   | M.E | 3.05                    | M.E | 2    |
| 4. Any solo parent employee who has not rendered service of at least one (1) year can't avail the parental leave. | 2.85 | M.E | 2.88   | M.E | 2.87                    | M.E | 3    |
| Composite Weighted Mean   | 2.98 | M.E | 2.82   | M.E | 2.9                     | M.E |      |

| Scale Value | Range       | Verbal Interpretations |
|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| 5           | 4.20 – 5.00 | Fully Encountered      |
| 4           | 3.40 – 4.19 | Encountered            |
| 3           | 2.60 – 3.39 | Moderately Encountered |
| 2           | 1.80 – 2.59 | Poorly Encountered     |
| 1           | 1.00 – 1.79 | Not Encountered        |

As shown from the data presented in Table 9, the male respondents rated components 1, 3 and 4 which are “Some of the solo parents failed to be hired in the companies because of having a child.”, “There are companies which are biased to their employees.”, and “Any solo parent employee who has not rendered service of at least one (1) year can't avail the parental leave.” **Moderately Encountered** as shown by their respective computed weighted mean values of 3.35, 3.20 and 2.85. The rest of the components states that “Some of the solo parents encountered discriminations by their employers.” **Poorly Encountered** as evidenced by the respective computed weighted mean value of 2.5 yielded a composite weighted mean value of 2.98 verbally interpreted as **Moderately Encountered**.

As to the female respondents, they rated components 1, 3 and 4 which are “Some of the solo parents failed to be hired in the companies because of having a child.”, “There are companies which are biased to their employees.” and “Some of the solo parents encountered discriminations by their employers.” **Moderately Encountered** as evidenced by their respective computed weighted mean values of 3.20, 2.90 and 2.88 except to the components 2 which is “Some of the solo parent's encountered discriminations by their employers.” **Poorly Encountered** as evidenced by the respective computed weighted mean value of 2.31 yielded a composite weighted mean value of 2.82 verbally interpreted as **Moderately Encountered**.

Generally, component 1 with a total mean of 3.28 rank 1; component 3 with a total mean of 3.05 rank 2; and component 4 with a total mean of 2.87 rank 3.

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO**

Moreover, the overall assessment of the male and female respondents on the four components presented under the degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 as to work opportunities was **Moderately Encountered** as supported by the respective obtained **grand mean of 2.9**.

The degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 as to educational benefits is presented in Table 10.

Table 10  
*Degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of Educational Benefits*

| Variables  | Male |     | Female |     | Composite Weighted Mean |     | Rank |
|--|------|-----|--------|-----|-------------------------|-----|------|
|  | WM   | VI  | WM     | VI  | WM                      | VI  |      |
| 1. Not all the solo parents can avail the educational benefit for their children because a lot of requirements such as solo parent I.D, Baptismal certificate and NSO Birth certificate. | 1.78 | N.E | 2.15   | P.E | 1.97                    | P.E | 3    |
| 2. The disqualified solo parent cannot avail the scholarship programs for their children.  | 1.88 | P.E | 2.20   | P.E | 2.04                    | P.E | 1    |
| 3. The parent/child applicant must pass the pre-screening process by TESDA regional, provincial, district office.  | 1.85 | P.E | 1.85   | P.E | 1.85                    | P.E | 4    |
| 4. The child applicant must pass the qualifying examination to avail the educational benefits.   | 2    | P.E | 1.95   | P.E | 1.98                    | P.E | 2    |
| Composite Weighted Mean  | 1.88 | P.E | 2.04   | P.E | 1.96                    | P.E |      |

As presented from the data in Table 10, It can be observed that the male respondents rated components 2, 3 and 4 which are “The disqualified solo parent cannot avail the scholarship programs for their children.” “The parent/child applicant must pass the pre-screening process by TESDA regional, provincial, district office.”, and “The disqualified solo parent cannot avail the scholarship programs for their children.” **Poorly Encountered** as shown by their respective computed weighted mean values of 1.88, 1.85 and 2. Only component 1 states “Not all the solo parents can avail the educational benefit for their children because a lot of requirements such as solo parent I.D, Baptismal certificate and NSO Birth certificate,” not encountered as evidenced by the respective computed weighted mean value of 1.78 yielded a composite weighted mean value of 1.88 verbally interpreted as **Poorly Encountered**.

As to the female respondents, they rated all components which are “Not all the solo parents can avail the educational benefit for their children because a lot of requirements such as solo parent I.D, Baptismal certificate and NSO Birth certificate.”, “The disqualified solo parent cannot avail the scholarship programs for their children.”, “The parent/child applicant must pass the pre-screening process by TESDA regional, provincial, district office.” and “The child applicant must pass the qualifying examination to avail the educational benefits.” Poorly encountered as evidenced by their respective

## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

computed weighted mean values of 2.15, 2.20, 1.85 and 1.95 yielded a composite mean value of 2.04 verbally interpreted as **Poorly Implemented**.

Summarily, component 2 with a total mean of 2.04 rank 1; component 4 with a total mean of 1.98 rank 2; component 1 with a total mean of 1.97 rank 3; and component 3 with a total mean of 1.85 rank 4.

Moreover, the overall assessment of the male and female respondents on the four components presented under the degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 as to housing benefits was **Poorly Encountered** as supported by obtained **grand mean of 1.96**.

The degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 as to housing benefits is presented in Table 11.

Table 11

*Problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of Housing Benefits*

| Variables  | Male |     | Female |     | Composite Weighted Mean |     | Rank |
|--|------|-----|--------|-----|-------------------------|-----|------|
|  | WM   | VI  | WM     | VI  | WM                      | VI  |      |
| 1. Some of the solo parents cannot be prioritized to the benefits because of “influence peddling” (palakasan system) | 1.65 | N.E | 2.45   | P.E | 2.05                    | P.E | 1    |
| 2. There are solo parents who cannot avail housing benefits because of absence of permanent income.                  | 1.78 | N.E | 2.07   | P.E | 1.93                    | P.E | 3    |
| 3. No acquisition of housing program from NEDA shall be given such benefit if they fail in the requirements.         | 1.78 | N.E | 1.89   | P.E | 1.84                    | P.E | 4    |
| 4. Some of the solo parent cannot avail housing benefits because of “No Permanent Address” (NPA).                    | 1.78 | N.E | 2.20   | P.E | 1.99                    | P.E | 2    |
| Composite Weighted Mean  | 1.75 | N.E | 2.15   | P.E | 1.95                    | P.E |      |

As presented from the data in Table 11, the male respondents rated all items which are some of the solo parents cannot be prioritized to the said benefits because of the “influence peddling” (palakasan system), There are solo parents who cannot avail housing benefits because of absence of permanent income, No acquisition of housing program from NEDA shall be given such benefit if they fail in the requirements, and some of the solo parent cannot avail housing benefits because of “No Permanent Address” (NPA). **Not Encountered** as observed by their respective computed weighted mean values of 1.65, 1.78, 1.78 and 1.78 yielded a composite weighted mean value of 1.75 verbally interpreted as **Not Encountered**.

The female respondents rated all the components which are some of the solo parents cannot be prioritized to the said benefits because of the “influence peddling” (palakasan system), There are solo parents who cannot avail housing benefits because of absence of permanent income, No acquisition of housing program from NEDA shall be

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO**

given such benefit if they fail in the requirements, and some of the solo parent cannot avail housing benefits because of “No Permanent Address” (NPA). **Poorly Encountered** as evidenced by their respective computed weighted mean values of 2.45, 2.07, 1.89 and 2.20 yielded a composite weighted mean value of 2.15 verbally interpreted as **Poorly Encountered**.

Summarily, component 1 with a total mean of 2.05 rank 1; component 4 with a total mean of 1.99 rank 2; component 2 with a total mean of 1.93 rank 3; and component 3 with a total mean of 1.84 rank 4.

Generally, the overall assessment of the two groups of respondents on the four components presented under housing benefits was **Poorly Encountered** supported by the obtained **grand mean of 1.95**.

The degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 as to medical assistance is presented in Table 12.

Table 12  
*Degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of Medical Assistance*

| Variables   | Male |     | Female |     | Composite Weighted Mean |     | Rank |
|---|------|-----|--------|-----|-------------------------|-----|------|
|   | WM   | VI  | WM     | VI  | WM                      | VI  |      |
| 1 If the solo parent has no I.D he won't receive the medical assistance.                                  | 2.55 | P.E | 2.75   | M.E | 2.65                    | M.E | 3    |
| 2. Long processes of medical assistance due to hospital's protocol or policies discouraged the applicant. | 2.65 | M.E | 2.90   | M.E | 2.78                    | M.E | 1    |
| 3. There are hospitals taking advantage of the benefits in terms of bills/fees.                           | 2.51 | P.E | 2.68   | M.E | 2.60                    | M.E | 4    |
| 4. Some of the accredited hospitals are not organized and systematic in terms of the service delivery.    | 2.5  | P.E | 2.83   | M.E | 2.67                    | M.E | 2    |
| Composite Weighted Mean   | 2.55 | P.E | 2.80   | M.E | 2.68                    | M.E |      |

As depicted from the data in Table 12, the male respondents rated components 2 states that “Long processes of medical assistance due to hospital’s protocol or policies discouraged the applicant.” **Moderately Encountered** as evidenced by the respective computed weighted mean value of 2.65. However, they rated components 1, 3 and 4 which are “If the solo parent has no I.D he won’t receive the medical assistance,” “There are hospitals taking advantage of the benefits in terms of bills/fees,” and “Some of the accredited hospitals are not organized and systematic in terms of the service delivery” **Poorly Encountered** with their respective computed weighted mean values of 2.55, 2.5 and 2.5 yielded a composite weighted mean value of 2.55 verbally interpreted as **Poorly Encountered**.

Also from the data presented in Table 12 the female respondents rated all components which are some of the solo parents cannot be prioritized to the said benefits because of the “influence peddling” (palakasan system), There are solo parents who

## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

cannot avail housing benefits because of absence of permanent income, No acquisition of housing program from NEDA shall be given such benefit if they fail in the requirements, and some of the solo parent cannot avail housing benefits because of “No Permanent Address” (NPA). Moderately encountered with their respective computed weighted mean values of 2.75, 2.90, 2.63 and 2.83 yielded a composite mean value of 2.80 verbally interpreted as **Moderately Encountered**.

Summarily, component 2 with a total mean of 2.78 rank 1; component 4 with a total mean of 2.67 rank 2; component 1 with a total mean of 2.65 rank 3; and component 3 with a total mean of 2.60 rank 4.

Moreover, the overall assessment of the male and female respondents presented under the degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 as to medical assistance was **Moderately Encountered** as supported by obtained **grand mean of 2.68**.

The degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 as to Government support is presented in Table 13.

Table 13

*Problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of Government Support*

| Variables   | Male |     | Female |     | Composite Weighted Mean |     | Rank |
|---|------|-----|--------|-----|-------------------------|-----|------|
|   | WM   | VI  | WM     | VI  | WM                      | VI  |      |
| 1. Not all the solo parents can avail the livelihood programs because they did not pass the entrepreneurial test.               | 1.63 | N.E | 1.76   | N.E | 1.7                     | N.E | 4    |
| 2. Some of the solo parents did not pass the requirements on the deadline indicated which contributed to dismiss the applicant. | 1.63 | N.E | 1.76   | N.E | 1.7                     | N.E | 1    |
| 3. Some of solo parents have no complete documents to avail comprehensive package of government support.                        | 1.63 | N.E | 1.93   | N.E | 1.78                    | N.E | 2    |
| 4. Some of the solo parents cannot be prioritized for being beneficiaries because of intervening people.                        | 1.63 | N.E | 2.26   | N.E | 1.95                    | P.E | 3    |
| Composite Weighted Mean   | 1.63 | N.E | 2.93   | N.E | 1.78                    | N.E |      |

As gleaned from the data presented in Table 13, the male respondents rated all the items which are “Not all the solo parents can avail the livelihood programs because they did not pass the entrepreneurial test.”, “Some of the solo parents did not pass the requirements on the deadline indicated which contributed to dismiss the applicant.”, “Some of solo parents have no complete documents to avail comprehensive package of government support.” And “Some of the solo parents cannot be prioritized for being beneficiaries because of intervening people.” As **Not Encountered** with their computed

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO**

weighted mean values of 1.63, 1.63, 1.63 and 1.63 yielded a composite weighted mean value of 1.63 verbally interpreted as **Not Encountered**.

As to female respondents they rated items 3 and 4, which are “Some of solo parents have no complete documents to avail comprehensive package of government support.” And “Some of the solo parents cannot be prioritized for being beneficiaries because of intervening people.” Poorly Encountered as shown by their respective computed weighted mean values of 1.93 and 2.26. Meanwhile, they rated items 1 and 2 which are “Not all the solo parents can avail the livelihood programs because they did not pass the entrepreneurial test.”, "Some of the solo parents did not pass the requirements on the deadline indicated which contributed to dismiss the applicant.” Not encountered as shown by their respective computed weighted mean values of 1.76 and 1.76 yielded a composite mean value of **1.93** verbally interpreted as **Poorly Encountered**.

Summarily, item 4 with a total mean of 1.95 rank 1; item 3 with a total mean of 1.78 rank 2; items 1 and 2 with a total mean of 3.5 both share in rank 3.5 respectively.

Moreover, the overall assessment of the male and female respondents presented criteria under the government support was **Not Encountered** supported by the obtained **grand mean of 1.78**.

The summary on the degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 is presented in Table 14.

Table 14

*Summary on the assessment on the degree of problems encountered by the group of respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972*

| Criteria                         | Male |     | Female |     | Composite Weighted Mean |     | Rank |
|----------------------------------|------|-----|--------|-----|-------------------------|-----|------|
|                                  | WM   | VI  | WM     | VI  | WM                      | VI  |      |
| In terms of Work Opportunities   | 2.98 | M.E | 2.82   | M.E | 2.9                     | M.E | 1    |
| In terms of Educational Benefits | 1.88 | P.E | 2.04   | P.E | 1.96                    | P.E | 3    |
| In terms of Housing Benefits     | 1.75 | N.E | 2.15   | P.E | 1.95                    | P.E | 4    |
| In terms of Medical Assistance   | 2.55 | P.E | 2.80   | M.E | 2.68                    | M.E | 2    |
| In terms of Government Support   | 1.63 | N.E | 2.93   | M.E | 1.78                    | N.E | 5    |
| Composite Weighted Mean          | 2.16 | P.E | 2.54   | P.E | 2.35                    | P.E |      |

Looking at the summary table, it could be observed that the male respondents rated work opportunities as **Moderately Encountered** with their respective obtained mean value of **2.98**. The medical and educational benefits were rated **Poorly Encountered** with obtained mean values of **1.88 and 2.55**. The housing benefits and government support were rated **Not Encountered** with respective obtained mean values of **1.63 and 1.75**.

As we go over to the assessment of the female respondents they rated medical assistance, work opportunities and government support as **Moderately Encountered** with their respective obtained mean values of **2.82, 2.80 and 2.93**. However, they rated housing benefits, and educational benefits as **Poorly Encountered** with their respective obtained mean values of **2.04 and 2.15**.

As a whole, work opportunities with a total mean of 2.9 rank 1; medical assistance with a total mean of 2.68 rank 2; educational benefits with a total mean of 1.96 rank 3;

## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

housing benefits with a total mean of 1.95 rank 4, and government support with a total mean of 1.78 rank 5.

The overall impression of two groups of respondents on the five variables presented above was **Poorly Encountered** with a **grand mean value of 2.35**.

### Conclusions

After performing all the necessary steps and procedures in conducting the study, the researchers came up with the following conclusions:

1. The study showed the most of the respondents' age range is 28 to 37 years old. Female respondents outnumbered male respondents. Most of the respondents are college graduates. The majority of the respondents are employed. Most of them are earning less than P10,000. The majority of the number of children is 2.

2. Level of implementation of RA. 8972

**2.1 Work Opportunities-** based on the level of implementation of work opportunities we found out that the results are “implemented”. The composite weighted mean of 4.14

**2.2 Educational Benefits-** based on the level of educational benefits we found out that the results are “moderately implemented”. The composite weighted mean of 2.65.

**2.3 Housing Benefits-** based on the level of housing benefits we found out that the results are “poorly implemented”. The composite weighted mean of 2.0.

**2.4 Medical Assistance-** based on the level of medical assistance we found out that the results are “moderately implemented”. The composite of weighted mean of 2.94

**2.5 Government Support-** based on the level of government support we found out that the results are “poorly implemented”. The composite weighted mean of 2.24.

3. There is no significant difference on the assessment of group of respondents in the implementation of R.A 8972 in terms of the above cited variables when grouped according to gender.

4. There are more problems encountered by the group of respondents on the implementation of R.A 8972 in the City of Manila.

### Recommendations

In the light of the findings and conclusions drawn above, the following recommendations are made:

#### A. Educational Benefits

1. Education must become the higher priority of the government to make it more productive, equitable, and coherent.
2. Minimum requirements for educational benefits.
3. Increase the benefits of education.
4. Government should make sure that proper education for the solo parents shall be provided.
5. An effective monitoring system is needed in the education department.
6. Ask for volunteers with specialized qualifications to contribute their services in their areas of work or residence.

### **B. Housing Benefits**

1. Government should make sure that housing benefits for the solo parents are provided.
2. Housing benefits should be redesigned in order to give people more choices and responsibility over their housing.
3. Housing benefits should be incorporated into mainstream means on tested benefits.

### **C. Medical Assistance**

1. Maximize the benefits and minimize the risks for solo parent.
2. Provide them checks payable to the hospital billing department where they are confined as well as giving them free medicines for treatment of their illness until they are discharged from the hospitals and until they are fully recovered.
3. Improve the quality of medical care.
4. Improve the quality of care by providing more accurate, effective and reliable diagnoses and treatment.
5. Give free medical treatment, surgery, vocational training and income generating projects.

### **D. Government support**

1. Supplement the government efforts with sustainable economic development.
2. Promote community participation and empowerment.
3. Promote, assess and prioritize the solo parent.
4. Develop skills and establish confidence to support them through livelihood program for the solo parent.

### **References**

- Adam, S., Brewer, M. and Reed, H. (2002), *The Benefits of Parenting: Government Financial Support for Families with Children since 1975*, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
- Anderson, B., (2010) *Single-Parent Family Strength: A Phenomenal Study* .
- Brooks, Jane S., (2011), *The process of parenting, Unmarried parents* , pp. 419
- Chao, R., & Tseng, V. (2002). *Parenting of Asian*. In Bornstein, M.H.(Ed.) *Handbook of Parenting*. (p.59-87). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Chen Jou-Chen (2010). *Parenting Styles of Taiwanese Single Mother Whose Elders Child Between the Ages of Seven to Seventeen*. (Master's Thesis). Indiana University.
- Conno, Claudia., (2013) *Children of Unmarried Parents*
- Estante, R., (2011), *Motherhood*, journal of Parenthood, pp 1-2
- Fung, H., Lieber, E., & Leung, P.W.L. (2003). *Parental beliefs about shame and moral socialization in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the United States*, In Yang, K.S., Hwang, K.K., Pedersen, P.B. & Daibo, I.(Eds.) *Progress in Asian Social Psychology : Conceptual and Empirical Contributions*.(p.83-105). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Haveman, R. H., Wolfe, Barbara L.; & Peterson E., (2010), *Children of early Child bear as young adult* pp. 257-284.
- Hertherington, M., (2011), *Divorced Parents* pp.356-361.  
<http://content.lib.utah.edu/cdm/ref/collection/etd1/id/1232>



## THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO

<http://crcw.princeton.edu/workingpapers/WP03-04-Usdansky.pdf>

<http://www.dswd.gov.ph/2013/05/solo-parents-call-for-more-benefits/>

[http://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2000/ra\\_8972\\_2000.html](http://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2000/ra_8972_2000.html)

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/64041002/Thesis-Single-Parent-as-a-Non#scribd>

Lee, Ka-ye Cavy., (2013) Effects of single parenthood on children: mediated by parenting stress and parent-child relationship

Mclanahan, S., and Teitler, J., Father's Presence and Absence (2011), pp. 389-428

Monk-Turner, E. and Turner, C. G. (2000). The relative pay of men and women in South Korea. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 11:223–236.

Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) (2004). Social expenditure database 1980-2001. [www.oecd.org/social/expenditure](http://www.oecd.org/social/expenditure).

Pascual, S.B., (2010), Mother and family responsibilities (College of Social and Community Development Journal/ University of the Philippines Q.C.

Ricafort, Maria Amelie., Prodigio, Julie Ann., Piñana, Winchell., (2010) The influence of single parents to the academic performance of students and rarely go beyond their parent accommodation to behave.

Sheeder, J., Tocce, K., & Stevens – Simon, (2010), Reason for Ineffectively Contraceptive use Antedating Adolescent Pregnancies Part 1: An indicator of gaps in Family planning services, *Maternal & Child health Journal*: Vol 13 Issues 3, pp 295-305.

Shoop, M. & Withal J., (2011), Unwanted Pregnancy, Teenage pregnancy & Motherhood PP. 1-13

Usdansky, Margaret L., (2013) Single-Parent Families and their Impact on Children

Waddell, M., (2010), Why Teenager have Babies, *Infant Observation* Vol. 12 Issue 3, pp 271-281.

[www.thefsi.com.au/us/bowen-theory/](http://www.thefsi.com.au/us/bowen-theory/)

Yoo, G. (2006). Changing views on family diversity in urban Korea. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 37:59–74.

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO**

**Appendix A**

**Proposed Enhancement Program of R.A 8972**

| <b>A. Work Opportunities</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| 1. A solo parent is allowed to have flexible work schedule.  | Allow Solo parent to have flexible work schedule.   |
| 2. A solo parent employee should avail the parental leave of not more than 7 working days every year.  | Exercise and empower parental leave of not more than 7 working days per year.                                     |
| 3. Any solo parent employee should not be discriminated against his/her employee.  | Avoid discrimination in justifying work opportunities.  |
| 4. The solo parent who wishes to avail the benefit can apply for parental leave in his/her office/organization after presentation of the solo parent I.D card.   | Uphold the application of presentation of I.D in any request of the Solo parent responsive to application of law. |
| <b>B. Educational Benefits</b>   |   |
| 1. Scholarship program for qualified solo parent and his children in institution of basic, elementary, secondary, tertiary, and technical/skills education.  | Uplift the extent of scholarship program between the Solo parent and their children in any Educational programs.  |
| 2. Non-formal education programs are offered appropriate for solo parent and his children.   | Give more right to Solo parent to avail non-formal education to upgrade their educational correspondence.         |
| 3. An educational benefit helps the solo parent and his children in terms of educational fees.   | Give the less amount of payment of educational fees of both solo parent and children in any educational programs. |
| 4. The applicant/ beneficiary decides what program he/she avail.   | Render time and effort to the solo parent to avail the chosen educational programs.                               |
| <b>C. Housing Benefits</b>   |   |
| 1. Solo parent shall be given allocation in housing project.   | Exhibit participation of solo parent in housing project.  |
| 2. Solo parents who are members of government funding institution such as GSIS, SSS, HDMF may avail of the housing loan packages.  | Empower to monitor housing loan packages to all solo parents who are government employee.                         |
| 3. Eligible solo parents shall file their application for housing unit/lot directly with the concerned NHA project office.   | Monitor the eligible solo parents in availing housing unit/lot with NHA project office.                           |
| <b>D. Medical Assistance</b>   |   |
| 1. The DOH shall develop a comprehensive health care program for solo parent and his children.   | DOH should add more health care programs benefited by the solo parent and his/her children.                       |
| 2. The solo parent can avail of the free medicines (if available)  | DOH and hospitals should make available necessary medicines for solo parent in all times.                         |
| 3. There are consultation and treatment for simple illness like fever, cough, severe wounds, check in blood pressure, pre-natal services, health advices and child immunization, or wellness for baby services.    | Uplift consultation method to solo parent and for wellness of babies in any medical and dental services.          |
| 4. The solo parent has the automatic availment of “gamot na mabisa at abot kaya”.  | Consider the urgent availment of necessary medicines needed by the solo parent.                                   |
| <b>E. Government Support</b>   |   |
| 1. The government agency creates livelihood development services which include training on the livelihood skills, basic business management, value orientation and the provision of SEED capital or job placement. | Incorporate more training and skills development programs   |
| 2. There are counseling services which include individual, peer family counseling which will focus on the resolution of personal relationship and conflicts.   | Render high extent of counseling services with a deep value of reconciliation of any conflicts.                   |

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REPUBLIC ACTS 8972 KNOWN AS “SOLO**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 3. Evaluation of parent effectiveness of services delivered w/c include the provision and expansion of knowledge and skills of the solo parent on early childhood development, behavior, management, health care, rights and duties of parents and their children. | Give a value regarding effectiveness of parenting, management, health care, rights and duties to further manifestation of rule of law. |
| 4. Critical incidence stress debriefing which includes preventive stress management strategy designed to assist solo parents in coping with crises and cases of abuse  | Protecting the solo parent in any form of abuses and aspect of coping such crises they encountered.                                    |