

# YOUTH EDUCATION INVESTMENT AND LABOR MARKET OUTCOMES IN THE PHILIPPINES 

SURVEY REPORT

JULY 2019

# YOUTH EDUCATION INVESTMENT AND LABOR MARKET OUTCOMES IN THE PHILIPPINES 

SURVEY REPORT

JULY 2019

ADB
© 2019 Asian Development Bank
6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City
1550 Metro Manila, Philippines
Tel +63 2632 4444; Fax +63 26362444
www.adb.org

Department of Education
DepEd Complex, Meralco Avenue, Pasig City
1600 Metro Manila, Philippines
Tel +63 2633 7206/636 6549; Fax +63 26318494
www.deped.gov.ph

Some rights reserved. Published in 2019.

ISBN 978-92-9261-686-1 (print), 978-92-9261-687-8 (electronic)
Publication Stock No. TCS190267-2
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22617/TCS190267-2
The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) or its Board of Governors or the governments they represent or the Department of Education of the Government of the Philippines (DepEd).

Neither ADB nor DepEd guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this publication and accept no responsibility for any consequence of their use. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by ADB nor DepEd in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

By making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area, or by using the term "country" in this document, neither ADB nor DepEd intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.

This work is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 IGO license (CC BY-NC 3.0 IGO) https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/igo/. By using the content of this publication, you agree to be bound by the terms of this license. For attribution, translations, adaptations, and permissions, please read the provisions and terms of use at https://www.adb.org/terms-use\#openaccess.

This CC license does not apply to non-ADB or non-DepEd copyright materials in this publication. If the material is attributed to another source, please contact the copyright owner or publisher of that source for permission to reproduce it. Neither ADB nor DepEd can be held liable for any claims that arise as a result of your use of the material.

Please contact pubsmarketing@adb.org if you have questions or comments with respect to content, or if you wish to obtain copyright permission for your intended use that does not fall within these terms, or for permission to use the ADB logo. Please contact DepEd directly for permission to use the DepEd logo.

Corrigenda to ADB publications may be found at http://www.adb.org/publications/corrigenda.
Notes:
In this publication, "\$" refers to United States dollars.
ADB recognizes "Korea" as the Republic of Korea.
On the cover: Various initiatives and programs of the private and public sectors are geared toward supporting and empowering young people and improving their access to education.
Cover photos by Ariel Javellana and Veejay Villaranca for ADB.

## Contents

Tables, Figures, and Boxes ..... iv
Foreword ..... vii
Acknowledgments ..... viii
Abbreviations ..... x
Executive Summary ..... xi
I. Introduction ..... 1
II. Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey ..... 4
Overview ..... 4
Survey Implementation ..... 10
III. Key Findings ..... 14
Profile of Sample ..... 14
Career Guidance ..... 17
Choice of Senior High School Track ..... 25
Choice of College Major ..... 34
Occupational Preferences and Expectations ..... 39
Other Findings ..... 42
IV. Summary ..... 62
Insights from Currently Employed Adults ..... 63
Considerations in Making Educational Investment ..... 63
and Career Planning Decisions
Primary Sources of Information When Making Educational Investment ..... 64and Career Planning Decisions
Other Contextual Considerations and Resource Complementarity ..... 64
Potential Areas for Future Research ..... 65
Appendixes
1 School Questionnaire ..... 66
2 Household Questionnaire ..... 77
3 Student Questionnaire ..... 99
4 Data Cleaning Steps Undertaken ..... 117
References ..... 119

## Tables, Figures, and Boxes

Tables
1 Proportion of Schools Offering a Specific Type of Guidance Service ..... 18
2 Proportion of Schools Citing a Specific Priority in Providing Guidance Programs ..... 18
3 Proportion of Schools Citing a Specific Source of Career Guidance ..... 19
Information Shared with Students, by School Type
4 Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of Specific Information ..... 21
while Choosing Career Path
5 Proportion of Household Members Indicating Preference to Have Had ..... 24Specific Information Available while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area
6.a Preferred Track versus Track Likely to Be Taken Given Current Circumstances ..... 30
in National Capital Region (Proportion of Grade 9 and 10 students)
6.b Preferred Track versus Track Likely to Be Taken Given Current Circumstances ..... 30in llocos Sur (Proportion of Grade 9 and 10 students)
6.c Preferred Track versus Track Likely to Be Taken Given Current Circumstances ..... 31in Eastern Samar (Proportion of Grade 9 and 10 students)
6.d Preferred Track versus Track Likely to Be Taken Given Current Circumstances ..... 31
in Davao del Sur (Proportion of Grade 9 and 10 students)
7 Proportion of Parents Identifying a Specific Major Consideration ..... 33
in the Choice of Child's Track, by Survey Area
8 Proportion of Students Preferring a Specific Occupation by Age 30, ..... 40by School Type
9 Proportion of Households with Information on Potential Financial Aid ..... 42for Children in Senior High School, by Survey Area and Locality
10.a Proportion of Grade 9 Students Who Qualified for Educational Service ..... 45
Contracting Program but Did Not Take It Up for a Specific Reason
10.b Proportion of Grade 10 Students Who Qualified for Educational Service ..... 46Contracting Program but Did Not Take It Up for a Specific Reason
11.a Proportion of Schools Citing Limited Funds for Facilities and Teaching Personnel ..... 47 as a Main Reason Why School Does Not Offer a Specific Track or Strand, by Survey Area
11.b Proportion of Schools with Available Funding that Cite Difficulty Finding ..... 47 Specialized Teaching Personnel as One of the Main Reasons for Not Offering a Specific Track or Strand, by School Type
11.c Proportion of Schools with Available Funding that Cite Difficulty Finding ..... 48
Specialized Teaching Personnel as One of the Main Reasons for Not Offering a Specific Track or Strand, by Survey Area
12.a Proportion of Schools Citing a Specific Issue as a Major Constraint ..... 50for the School, by School Type
12.b Proportion of Schools Citing a Specific Issue as a Major Constraint ..... 51 for the School, by Survey Area
13 Distribution of Transferees and Would-Be Transferees, ..... 52by Locality and School Type
14.a Proportion of Students Citing a Specific Reason for Transferring ..... 53 from Another School, by Grade Level
14.b Proportion of Students Citing a Specific Reason for Transferring ..... 53 from Another School, by Grade Level and School Type
14.c Proportion of Students Identifying Specific Reasons for Transferring ..... 54 from Another School, by Grade Level and Locality
15.a Proportion of Students Identifying Specific Reasons for Transferring ..... 55to Another School, by Grade Level
15.b Proportion of Students Identifying Specific Reasons for Transferring ..... 56 to Another School, by Grade Level and Locality
Figures
1 Components of Survey Instrument ..... 10
2.a Profile of Sampled Schools, by Survey Area ..... 14
2.b Number of Sampled Schools, by Survey Area and School Type ..... 15
3.a Profile of Sampled Students, by Location ..... 15
3.b Profile of Sampled Students, by Gender ..... 15
4.a Profile of Sampled Households, by Income Bracket ..... 16
4.b Profile of Sampled Households, by Educational Attainment ..... 16
5 Profile of Sampled Households, by Work Status ..... 17
6 Average Hours of Personalized Help Received by Students ..... 19from Career Guidance Counselors
7 Types of Information Received in Career Guidance, by School Type ..... 20
8.a Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability ..... 21of "Labor Market Information" while Choosing Career Path,by Survey Area and Locality
8.b Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of Information ..... 22
on "Types of Occupations and Training That Fit Personal Interests" while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area and Locality
8.c Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of Information ..... 23
on "Types of Occupations and Training That Fit Wage Preferences" while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area and Locality
8.d Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of Information ..... 23 on "Types of Occupations and Training That Fit Skills" while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area and Locality
8.e Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of "Information ..... 24 on Schools That Can Provide Quality Education Given Preferences" while Choosing Career Path, by Area and Locality
9.a Distribution of Students by Intended or Chosen Track and Survey Area ..... 26
9.b Distribution of Students by Intended or Chosen Track and School Type ..... 26
9.c Distribution of Students by Intended or Chosen Track and Locality ..... 27
9.d Distribution of Students by Intended or Chosen Track, by Survey Area and Gender ..... 27
10 Proportion of Students Identifying a Major Consideration for Choosing a Track, ..... 28by Survey Area
11.a Proportion of Students Citing a Specific Major Source of Information They Used ..... 29
or Planned to Use in Choosing a Track, by Locality and Gender
11.b Proportion of Students Citing a Specific Major Source of Information They Used ..... 29or Planned to Use in Choosing a Track, by Survey Area
12 Students' Preferred Track versus Parents' or Guardians' Preferred Track ..... 32
13 Proportion of Parents Identifying a Specific Major Consideration ..... 32in the Choice of Child's Track, by Locality
14 Proportion of Students Identifying Specific Reasons for Not Proceeding ..... 33 to Senior High School
15.a Proportion of Students Preferring Specific Courses, by School Type ..... 34
15.b Proportion of Students Preferring Specific Courses, by Gender ..... 35
16 Proportion of Students Identifying a Specific Major Consideration ..... 35for Choosing a College Major, by School Type
17 Proportion of Households Citing a Specific Source of Information ..... 36as One of the Three Major Sources of Information Used in ChoosingPostsecondary Education
18 Proportion of Students Reporting They Will Be Able to Take Up ..... 37
Preferred Course Given Current Circumstances
19 Proportion of Parents Expecting Their Children to Continue ..... 38on to Postsecondary Education, by Survey Area and Locality
20 Proportion of Parents Citing a Specific Factor for Their Children Not Continuing ..... 39with Postsecondary Education, by Locality
21 Proportion of Parents Identifying a Specific Type of Work That They Expect ..... 41Their Child to Do in Adulthood, by Locality
22 Proportion of High School Students Who Are Voucher Recipients, by Survey Area ..... 43
23 Proportion of Students in Private High Schools Who Are Educational Service ..... 44Contracting Program Grantees, by Survey Area
24.a Proportion of Public Schools Citing Limited Demand from Students ..... 49 as One of the Main Reasons Why School Does Not Offer a Specific Track or Strand
24.b Proportion of Private Schools Citing Limited Demand from Students ..... 49 as One of the Main Reasons Why School Does Not Offer a Specific Track or Strand
25 Distribution of Transferees and Would-Be Transferees for Each Grade Level ..... 52
26 Proportion of Households Reporting That an Unexpected Event ..... 57Affected Education-Related Decisions, by Survey Area
27 Proportion of Households Reporting That an Unexpected Event ..... 57Will Still Affect Education-Related Decisions in the Following Year
28 Households' Assessment of Usefulness of Formal Education ..... 58in Current Primary Work
29 Proportion of Workers Who Think Their Educational Attainment Exceeds ..... 59the Minimum Required for Their Current Job, by Survey Area and Locality30 Proportion of Workers Who Think Their Educational Attainment59Is Below the Minimum Level for Their Current Job, by Survey Area
31 Proportion of Workers Citing That Their Current Work Is Their Desired Career, ..... 60by Survey Area
32 Proportion of Workers Citing That Their Current Work Is Their Desired Career, ..... 60by Area and Highest Educational Attainment33 Proportion of Workers Citing That Their Current Work Is Their Desired Career,61by Income Quintile
Boxes
1 Basic Education System and Career Guidance Programs ..... 4
2 National Career Assessment Examination ..... 12

## Foreword

The implementation of the $K$ to 12 Basic Education Program in the Philippines aims to ensure that students are well prepared for tertiary education, skills development, employment, and entrepreneurship. The accompanying senior high school program requires students and their families to make a new series of decisions about education and potential career investments within the basic education system. These educational decisions may ultimately affect students' long-term labor market prospects and, as such, their consequences need to be understood so that appropriate policies and initiatives can be designed to optimize outcomes.

To understand the factors that shape decisions about youth education and career expectations, the Asian Development Bank (ADB), in partnership with the Department of Education of the Philippines, implemented the Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey (YEILMOS) in 2017. The survey gathered data from 238 schools; 3,172 junior and senior high school students; and 2,819 households randomly selected in the National Capital Region as well as provinces of Ilocos Sur, Eastern Samar, and Davao del Sur.

The YEILMOS builds on ADB's efforts to understand and bridge the information gaps that can limit gains from education investments. Insights into systematic information collection, management, and use for better education outcomes-initially published in a special chapter of ADB's Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2015-particularly guided the design of the YEILMOS. This report summarizes the survey methodology, results, experiences, and other insights drawn from the 2 -year survey implementation.

Key findings from the YEILMOS point to family members, particularly parents and guardians, as being the major source of information used by students when making education and career investment decisions. Hence, when providing career guidance information, it is important for educational institutions and other relevant government agencies to target not only students but also parents and guardians. In addition to providing advice on the types of jobs that align with students' interests and skills, it is important that career guidance programs share information about the costs of different educational programs, access to financial support and employment opportunities. Such information can give students a better understanding of the types of jobs demanded by the labor market, allowing them to adjust their expectations about the courses and careers that fit their interests, capabilities, and employment preferences.

The YEILMOS is intended as a first step toward producing baseline statistics on how educational decisions are made and how these decisions affect labor market outcomes. As the survey was created to contribute to education policy in the Philippines, advocates and policymakers can examine the data and use findings of this report to better align education decisions and investments with desired labor market outcomes.
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## Executive Summary

The adoption and implementation by the Philippines of the K to 12 Basic Education Program includes extending basic education beyond kindergarten from 10 years to 12 years. This move has ushered in a number of educational reforms, one of which is the introduction of senior high school (SHS). Whereas the country's previous high school system prepared Filipino students primarily to pursue certificate or diploma courses or degree programs after high school, the introduction of SHS is meant to produce graduates equipped not only for postsecondary education but also for work and entrepreneurship, should this be their desired path after graduation.

SHS students go through a core curriculum and take specialized subjects under one of four tracks: academic, technical-vocational and livelihood (TVL), sports, or arts and design. Choosing from these tracks means that, 2 years before finishing high school, students and their families must make additional decisions about educational investment and career planning. As such, it becomes necessary to explore how such decisions, which can affect long-term labor market outcomes, are made. It means determining what types of information households and students use in decision-making, and finding out which information sources have the most influence and are most used.

The Asian Development Bank and the Department of Education of the Philippines conducted the Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey (YEILMOS) to fill this knowledge gap. The survey was conducted in 2017 to collect baseline data on factors that influence young people's education investment decisions and career expectations. It was designed to inform refinements to the SHS career guidance program (CGP). It aims to lay the foundation for a follow-up survey that will help assess the impact of education and career choices and investments on labor market outcomes.

To ensure the representation of major island groups and metropolitan centers, the YEILMOS was conducted across four areas: llocos Sur for Luzon, Eastern Samar for Visayas, Davao del Sur for Mindanao, and the National Capital Region (NCR). Schools that offered grades 9-11 were randomly drawn from the Enhanced Basic Education Information System and Learner Information System, and were further stratified by type of school (i.e., public or private). A total of 238 schools took part in the study, from which 3,172 students stratified by grade and gender were interviewed. As part of the survey, 2,819 parents or guardians of respondent students were also interviewed.

Key findings from the survey were as follows:
Career guidance programs. CGPs in public and private schools generally gave priority to helping students identify which SHS track to take, rather than providing information and assistance on financial aid options. Students reported receiving information that mainly focused on the types of occupations and training that matched their interests and skills (i.e., what they like, what they can do, what values they have) as well as data on which schools best aligned with their career choices and could provide quality education.

CGPs varied depending on the type and setting of the schools. Private and urban schools tended to offer, and gave priority to, career guidance activities and information that provided enhanced industry access and significant financial and technical resources.

Choice of senior high school track. The academic track was the predominant choice for both students and parents. Moreover, the majority of students who indicated a preference for the non-academic tracks (TVL, sports, or arts and design) had parents who reportedly preferred that their children take up the academic track instead. This is noteworthy because family members, especially parents, ranked the highest among the sources of information students use when choosing a track. Peers, relatives, and teachers followed, while guidance counselors ranked low when students were asked to identify major sources influencing their choice of SHS track.

Students reported that their track preferences were based primarily on their interest in the field and personal strengths and/or skills, which are same factors cited by parents as influencing their track preferences for their children. Interestingly, fewer than 10\% of students reported costs and financial considerations as basis in choosing the SHS track they prefer to take.

Choice of college major. About $85 \%$ of student respondents expected to go to college and to take courses in personal services, engineering and engineering trades, teacher training and education science, and health. Students from private schools preferred professional college majors (health, engineering, business administration, law, and computing), while public school students preferred degrees related to teacher training and security services.

Interest in the career field and personal strengths and/or skills were important factors that students considered when choosing both the SHS track and college major. However, they rarely factored in costs of schooling and financial concerns when selecting their college major. Students and their parents also assessed employment prospects and wage considerations before making a choice.

Even when choosing a college major, social circles remained the main source of information for students. Parents, peers, and relatives rank highest in terms of information sources most used, while guidance counselors rank the lowest.

Occupational preferences and expectations. Most students preferred to be working as professionals by age 30, and their parents shared this expectation. Parents also preferred their child to work in the city and expected their monthly salary to be in the P20,000-P30,000 range as a minimum.

Other findings. Although more than half of the surveyed private school students received tuition subsidies, very few parents reported awareness of financial assistance programs and a majority cited financial limitation as the primary factor for not sending their children to postsecondary school. Many parents also under- or over-estimated the cost of postsecondary education.

Schools cited lack of funds, personnel, and student demand as the main reasons for not offering particular tracks, especially the more resource-intensive courses such as (i) science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) (often requiring laboratories); and (ii) TVL (often requiring specialist equipment, facilities, and consumables). Public schools mainly cited lack of funds and specialized teaching personnel as being the inhibitors to offering some tracks, while private schools mainly cited lack of student demand.

Many of the students who were either planning to transfer, or had recently transferred, to a different school for senior high were in the 11th grade, lived in highly urbanized areas (the National Capital Region and Davao del Sur), and/or studied in private schools. These students had common reason for their recent or planned transfer: they wanted to enroll in a school that offered their preferred SHS track and had better educational facilities.

About 65\% of the employed adults (who resided in the same households as the surveyed students) found their formal education useful in their current employment, and nearly half of these respondents reported being overqualified for their present job.

Based on these findings, the study puts forward some program and policy implications that could serve as input to the refinement of the CGPs for SHS. These include the following:
(i) The current CGP highlight personal attributes and interests to guide students in their choice of SHS track. It might also be useful to emphasize possible postsecondary outcomes (mainly tertiary education and/or employment) and available financial assistance programs. Doing so may provide a more holistic and comprehensive basis for good career choices.
(ii) Because career guidance activities require significant resources and access to employers or economic activities, they tend to be more available in private and urban schools. Education policymakers could explore programs to ensure that all students, especially those in rural and remote areas, have equitable access to career guidance activities, regardless of school type or location.
(iii) Immediate family and social circles are frequently cited by students and parents as the main source of information when making career choices. The influence of relatives and peers might therefore be more properly harnessed by factoring it into career guidance activities. Some CGP modules may be refined to facilitate parent-child discussions on important considerations when choosing an SHS track or college major. To bridge current information gaps, initiatives could also be developed to inform parents of actual college costs and assist them in applying for financial assistance.
(iv) Since some students who are inclined to choose nonacademic tracks might find themselves in conflict with the preferences of their parents, CGPs could be refined to provide adequate, updated, and timely information on potential labor market outcomes and corresponding competency requirements. Such information could work to assure students and parents of the viability of all tracks and postsecondary options.

## Introduction

The Philippines, a country of over 100 million people, has experienced significant economic growth during the second decade of the new millennium. With growth in gross domestic product (GDP) averaging $6.2 \%$ from 2010 to 2015, it is considered one of the fastest growing economies in Asia (NEDA 2017). This growth has been attributed to sound economic fundamentals, increased investor confidence, rising domestic consumption, and improved foreign remittances. The country's relatively young population and growing workforce are also projected to give the Philippines a demographic dividend in the coming years.

To sustain the country's growth and continually increase its competitiveness, it is important that concerning youth unemployment and underemployment are addressed.' People aged $15-24$ years comprise half of the total unemployed in the Philippines, and the country's youth unemployment rate of $18.3 \%$ in 2016 was substantially higher than the Association of Southeast Asian Nations average of $12 \%$ (PSA 2016). ${ }^{2}$ The Asian Development Bank (ADB) has drawn estimates from the Philippines Labor Force Survey (1991-2008) and the longitudinal database constructed from a survey of 500 households in Metro Manila and Cebu, two highly urbanized areas in the country, indicate that in 2013, one in four youth aged 15-24 was not in employment, education, or training (ADB 2018). It is also estimated that one in every six employed Filipinos hopes to work more hours.

These figures may indicate a mismatch between the supply of skills and available job opportunities in the Philippines. The lack of decent work and good-quality jobs drives up competition for employment and places youth at high risk of unemployment or underemployment. At the same time, there are concerns about the quality of education in the country. Employers in information technology, business process management, and other services sector generally hire more than half of the country's young and/or new entrants to the labor market. These employers report a hiring rate of only $7 \%-8 \%$, citing the lack of qualified skills as the main challenge in hiring (ITBPAP 2016).

Although obtaining education and training does not guarantee viable employment, policy initiatives in education access and quality remain important because studies show that number of years of schooling is positively correlated with potential wages and negatively correlated with risk of poverty. The World Bank estimates that in the Philippines, wage workers with a secondary education have an in-work poverty risk of $10 \%$, while it is negligible for those with a tertiary degree (World Bank 2016). Moreover, the quality of education and training is positively correlated with GDP per capita growth. Countries with significant knowledge capital as evidenced by high scores in international standardized exams such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) also have high per capita income (Hanushek and Peterson 2014).

Investments targeted to increase education access and quality have thus been made in recent years. In line with global commitments and international standards, government spending on

[^1]education as a percentage of GDP rose to $2.9 \%$ in 2016, up from $2.6 \%$ in 2015 and $2.4 \%$ in 2014 (Briones 2016). Additional resources for more classrooms, better teachers, and improved learning materials have also been allocated.

Moreover, the country adopted the K to 12 Basic Education Program, which covers kindergarten and 12 years of basic education. The introduction of senior high school (SHS) through the K to 12 Basic Education Program ushered in a lot of educational reforms specific to postsecondary outcomes and curriculum. Whereas the previous high school system prepared Filipino students primarily to pursue certificate or diploma courses or degree programs after 4 years in high school, the K to 12 Program is designed for preparedness for other desired postsecondary paths like employment and entrepreneurship. SHS students need to go through a core curriculum as well as take specialized subjects under one of four tracks on offer: academic, technical-vocational and livelihood (TVL), sports, and arts and design. Two of the four tracks-academic and TVL—are further divided into strands from which SHS students would also need to choose. ${ }^{3}$

Various mechanisms to provide financial support have been put in place to ensure that education is accessible even for the economically challenged segments of the population. For instance, the conditional cash transfer program called the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program was also implemented to encourage low-income families to send their children to school and keep them there, while a voucher program to subsidize SHS education in private schools has likewise helped widen access to education. To help students and their families make informed education and career decisions, the Philippines' Department of Education (DepEd) has also recently rolled out SHS career guidance programs (CGPs).

Such initiatives have led to significant improvements in school participation, with more youth of school-going age enrolling and fewer dropping out (Albert 2016). Enrollment in grade 11 is also significantly higher than the average enrollment in college after grade 10 in the previous system, with around 1.5 million enrolled grade 11 students for the academic year 2016-2017 versus the college enrollment of approximately 600,000 before the implementation of the new system (DepEd 2018).

The challenge now is to get enrolled students to find education meaningful and beneficial so that they complete their schooling, as lack of interest is often cited as the main reason for dropping out of school. As seen in other country contexts, this could mean that students either disengage from the learning content or underestimate the benefits of education to their future (Bonilla, Bottan, and Ham 2016). ${ }^{4}$ If the students disengage from the learning content, policies that try to understand and improve student motivation and facilitate transitions between education levels would need to be explored. If the students underestimate the benefits of education, research and policies that provide information on actual labor market outcomes could be considered to empower students and households to adjust their education investment and career planning based on more realistic post-education expectations. Either way, given scarce resources, evidence on education quality and relevance needs to be bolstered to better optimize future policy initiatives.

Raising the quality of education requires a commitment to evidence-based policy decisions and accountability. It means promoting financial efficiency that delivers better skill outcomes

[^2]per dollar of public investment, expanding educational delivery and access, and generating conditions for learning on the job (ADB 2015). In the context of the SHS program, choosing from the available tracks means that, 2 years before finishing high school, students and their families must make new and additional decisions about educational investment and career planning. It therefore becomes necessary to explore how such decisions, which can affect long-term labor market outcomes, are made. It means determining what types of information households and students use in decision-making, and finding out which information sources have the most influence and are most often used.

To help fill these knowledge gaps, ADB partnered with DepEd and conducted the Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey (YEILMOS) in the Philippines. Designed to gather vital information pertaining to educational investments and expected labor market outcomes, the survey collected baseline data on factors that influence youth education investment decisions and career expectations. The YEILMOS is intended to complement ongoing efforts by the Government of the Philippines to enhance the country's education system and labor market, specifically through the use of CGPs. In particular, the YEILMOS was designed to address the following research questions:

- What factors do students and their families take into account when making educational investment and career planning decisions?
- What are their primary sources of information when making such decisions?
- What other realities in their macroeconomic environment impact on decision-making around educational investment and career planning?


# Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey 

## Overview

Box 1 presents a background on the basic education system in the Philippines, including the newly implemented K to 12 Basic Education Program and CGPs. Under the K to 12 Basic Education Program, families need to make additional education decisions within the basic education system as students move from junior high school to SHS, and from SHS to postsecondary education. They need to choose which SHS track and strand to take, whether to transfer from public to private schools or vice versa, and whether to seek employment or take up postsecondary education after graduating from SHS.

## Box 1: Basic Education System and Career Guidance Programs

The Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 mandated the implementation of the K to 12 Basic Education Program in the Philippines. The K to 12 Basic Education Program involves 1 year of kindergarten followed by 12 years of compulsory basic education-6 years of primary education, 4 years of junior high school education, and 2 years of senior high school (SHS) education.

Figure: Basic Education System in the Philippines


[^3]
## Box 1 continued

Prior to the implementation of the $K$ to 12 Basic Education Program, high school in the Philippines entailed just 4 years of education. After high school, graduates were able to pursue 2 years of vocational education or 4 to 6 years of tertiary education under bachelors' programs. Estimates from the Annual Poverty Indicators Survey suggest that, among youths aged 15-19 years in 2014, 33\% were studying in high school (of whom, $5 \%$ were studying in high school while working), less than $2 \%$ were taking certificate or technical vocational courses, and about $29 \%$ were in college (of whom , $4 \%$ were studying in college while working).

Data collected from the Annual Poverty Indicator Survey also show that $21 \%$ of youths aged 15-19 in 2014 were working (and not studying), and 15\% were neither studying nor working. There is also evidence suggesting that a significant number of those who graduated through the old high school system do not possess the skills needed to enter and become productive members of the labor force.

Working with the Commission on Higher Education and Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, the Philippines' Department of Education (DepEd) enhanced the basic education curriculum to ensure global competitiveness of the Filipino graduates. This entailed incorporating into the basic education curriculum some of the general education subjects that were originally taught in college.

SHSs retain mathematics, science, and language as core subjects, but students are able to pursue a degree of specialization thanks to the four educational tracks offered in SHS: academic, technicalvocational and livelihood (TVL), sports, or arts and design. Two tracks are further divided into strands as shown in the table below. For the academic track, there are four strands available: accountancy, business, and management; science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; humanities and social sciences; and a general academic strand. For the TVL track, the four strands available are home economics, information and communication technology, agri-fishery arts, and industrial arts. In general, the academic track is designed for students who wish to advance to specialized fields in college, while TVL courses aim to increase the students' chances of moving directly to employment in decent jobs.

Prior to the implementation of the K to 12 Basic Education Program, decisions about career planning were mostly made after completing the basic education program. The introduction of SHS, however, prompts students and their families to start making such decisions while still in the basic education system.

Table B1.1: Senior High School Track and Strand Offerings

| Track | Strand | Sample Subjects |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Academic | Accountancy, business, and management | Business Finance, Principles of <br> Marketing |
|  | Science, technology, engineering, and <br> mathematics | Basic Calculus, <br> General Chemistry 1 |
|  | Humanities and social sciences | Creative Writing, <br> Philippines Politics and Governance |
|  | General academic strand | Social Science 1, <br> Applied Economics |
|  | Pre-baccalaureate maritime | Introduction to Maritime Career; <br> Empowerment Technologies; Inquiries, <br> Investigations, and Immersion |
| Technical- <br> Vocational <br> and Livelihood <br> (TVL) | Home economics | Food and Beverage Services <br> (National Certificate [NC] II), <br> Wellness Massage (NC II) |

Box 1 continued

| Track | Strand | Sample Subjects |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Information and communication <br> technology | Animation (NC II), <br> Contact Center Services (NC II) |
|  | Agri-fishery arts | Animal Production (NC II), <br> Crop Production (NC I) |
| Industrial arts | Consumer Electronics Servicing (NC II), <br> Electrical Installation and Maintenance <br> (NC II) |  |
| Sports | Human Movement, <br> Sports Officiating, <br> Activity Management |  |
| Arts and Design |  | Developing Filipino Identity in the Arts, <br> Leadership and Management in <br> Different Arts Fields |

Career guidance and counseling programs. As part of the transition made to the K to 12 Basic Education Program, the Government of the Philippines has worked to strengthen DepEd's CGPs. Working with the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority, and the Commission on Higher Education, DepEd regularly conducts career advocacy activities for students at the secondary level.

Some of the key practices of CGPs include the general orientation of students during the start of classes in Grade 7, the administration of the high school occupational interest inventory in Grade 8, and the administration of the National Career Assessment Examination in Grade 9. DepEd's comprehensive guidance program also carries out career action plans and, toward the end of both junior high school and SHS, provides information and counseling to help secondary education students make career decision of students. DepEd teachers, tagged as teacher advocates, augment the need for licensed career and employment guidance counselors in public high schools. Each teacher advocate is trained to conduct career advocacy activities to high school students to ensure a comprehensive and extensive implementation of the school's CGP.

DepEd's CGPs for SHS are oriented toward helping students with their choice of tracks and career planning as shown in the table below. Regional administrators are then tasked to operationalize these modules and train their guidance counselors and advocates for in-school implementation.

Table B1.2: Main Objectives of Senior High School Career Guidance Programs

| Grade | Objectives | Modules |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | (i)Assist senior high school (SHS) entrants <br> in making informed decisions regarding <br> their choice of SHS track | 1. Embarking on a Journey of Self-Awareness |
| (ii)Promote awareness in the importance <br> of choosing a track that suits their skills <br> and interests, and matches the available <br> resources and needs of the society | 3. Charting Your Own Course |  |

Box 1 continued
Table B1.2 continued

| Grade | Objectives | Modules |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | (i) Apply decision-making skills to careerplanning course selection and career transitions <br> (ii) Realize that the changing workplace requires lifelong learning and acquiring new skills | 1. Road to the Right Choice <br> 2. Releasing the Power Within <br> 3. Reaffirming the Chosen Track <br> 4. Fit Me Right <br> 5. Rising Toward the Reality of My Dreams <br> 6. Up, Up in the Ladder of My Career <br> 7. Beginning the Journey Where I Am <br> 8. I Plan to Succeed |

Sources: Government of the Philippines, Department of Education. 2017. Implementation of Grade 11 Career Guidance Program for School Year 2017-2018. http://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/10/18/october-18-2017-dm-165-s-2017-implementation-of-grade-11-career-guidance-program-for-school-year-2017-2018/; Government of the Philippines, Department of Education. 2015. Senior High School Career Guidance Program and Early Registration. http://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/DO_s2015_41.pdf.

Department of Labor and Employment's career guidance programs. In addition to CGPs provided through schools, private institutions and government agencies also provide career-related information to students. DOLE's career guidance and employment coaching is one of the notable programs of the government. It is implemented by the Bureau of Local Employment in the country's geographic regions, targeting high school and college students. It is conducted in partnership with public employment service offices, a local government office, and school-based guidance counselor networks in the form of workshops and seminars that provide students with labor market information. The seminars are designed to help students make career choices based on labor market needs, rather than on what might be popular, thereby increasing the chances of finding a good job after graduation.

For these seminars, DOLE has developed two modules that offer complementary perspectives: the Career Guide for High School Students and the Employment Guide for College Students and Jobseekers. Since these career workshops are often conducted by local government representatives and school teachers, rather than trained career specialists or licensed guidance counselors, the modules provide a consistent approach to effective career planning and employment coaching for students who are about to graduate.

The expansion of student and household educational decisions under the K to 12 Basic Education Program brings about the need for data that could be used to further refine policy initiatives such as CGPs for SHS. Refinements to CGPs could keep families from making misinformed decisions that result in long-term adverse impacts on education investments and labor market outcomes.

When looking at optimized decision-making in education, an economic theory of demand and supply could be of guidance. The decisions of the parents and students on the type and quantity of educational investments will depend on their perceived returns to education. In other words, the higher the perceived returns are to schooling, the more inclined the parents and students are to invest in education. Increased demand for education could theoretically lead to increased supply, all else equal. However, the quantity and quality of supply could also constrain demand, as the availability of quality educational choices might hinder access to education. Decision-making
could thus be informed by a better understanding of education demand and supply, and the perceived returns to educational investments. ${ }^{5}$

Some nuances need to be taken into account, however, as students in urban and rural areas face different challenges when making crucial educational decisions. The wider access to information and range of choices that living in an urban area affords a student could make the decisionmaking process more complex. Social stratification also becomes an issue because poor students in urban areas face additional cost implications of access to good education as well as information acquisition. For students in rural areas, the issue is the lack of information and educational options due to location. Even with the right information, the distance of good schools from a student's hometown could be a limiting factor.

While quality surveys on the labor market in the Philippines exist, ${ }^{6}$ there remains limited evidence on how educational decisions that could affect career expectations are made. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) aimed to address this research gap by partnering with the Department of Education (DepEd) to conduct the Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey (YEILMOS). Students, households, and school heads were interviewed to gather baseline data on factors that influence youth's education-related choices and investments such as socioeconomic and family background, information about and expectation of available jobs and wage returns, credit or financial constraints, school services and availability of financial aid, and other behavioral factors (e.g., risk aversion).

Students were asked questions on formal schooling, postsecondary education, CGP, internship, career plans, and parent involvement in education. Questions on formal schooling revolved around students' access to quality education. For example, questions on whether a student has access to financial aid, advanced classes and preferred SHS tracks, one-on-one career counseling, and computers and online connectivity were asked. This is because the availability of institutional support could lower barriers to entry, increase student integration, and positively affect a student's decision to persist in school and pursue further education (Jensen 2011).

An understanding of the demand for education is important in determining policies for future education investments. As such, questions regarding postsecondary education, personal and parental career preferences, expectations, and the likelihood of pursuing education beyond high school were raised. Students were also asked about the usefulness of DepEd's current CGPs for SHS and their modes of information delivery. Since exposure to the workplace may also impact educational investments and career planning, data on internship and on-the-job training experiences, if any, were likewise collected. Finally, because the likelihood of persisting in school and transitioning to higher education increases with higher levels of parental involvement, students were also asked about the frequency with which parents look at report cards, discuss educational experiences, and participate in school activities and meetings.

[^4]In countries like the Philippines where families face additional costs to education and limited access to credit, parents play a big role in decision-making and calculating the returns to education, albeit this role decreases as the learner grows older (Banerjee et al. 2013). Therefore, households were asked about socioeconomic status, formal schools and types of training received, unexpected events recently experienced, educational requirement for current occupation, types and sources of information obtained on career prospects, parent involvement in children's education, and career expectations.

Details about socioeconomic status and educational attainment were gathered because parental level of education and income are positively correlated with education investments (Asad, Iqbal, and Tasneem 2015). As education levels go up, incomes become more stable and education is given more priority. In a study by the Philippine Institute for Development Studies, those in the fifth income quintile are four times more likely than those in the bottom quintile to have attained higher education (Albert, Dumagan, and Martinez 2015). Parents were also asked about unexpected events that could negatively impact educational investments, such as natural disasters that could cause significant credit constraints that lead parents to pull their children out of school. The state of a family's housing and access to clean water and sanitation were also explored given the difficulty for families with informal housing to provide a clean and comfortable environment for their children and to sustain their education due to continued risk of eviction. ${ }^{7}$ To validate students' responses to parental involvement, similar questions on parent participation in school-related activities were asked of parents and guardians.

Given the positive correlation between quality and availability of education and student persistence and informed career planning, suggested by Watts and Fretwell in 2004, school heads were asked about available school resources, staffing specific to career guidance and counseling, and types of information provided through CGPs. Data on the number of teaching and nonteaching staff as well as the qualifications of teaching personnel were collected. Because school and teacher quality and governance have an impact on good student outcomes, ${ }^{8}$ particularly in terms of enrollment, persistence, and postsecondary outcomes, questions on how often the curriculum is updated and the level of autonomy school administrators have to hire personnel, make curricular decisions, and acquire facilities were also asked. School administrators were also asked about mechanisms in place to facilitate the involvement of parents, which could increase student outcomes, to consolidate information from students and households (Kremer, Brannen, and Glennerster 2013). Lastly, school heads provided information on their school's CGP to validate if what is being offered by the schools is similar to the experiences of student respondents.

Ultimately, the YEILMOS aims to inform policy and program initiatives intended to help students and households make informed educational decisions and career plans. In particular, ADB hopes that the survey results could be used in refining the design of the CGPs for SHS, a worthwhile initiative given the potential of these programs to reduce socioeconomic stratification in, and maximize the benefits of education decisions and investments.

[^5]
## Survey Implementation

Survey instrument. The staff of ADB's Economic Research and Regional Cooperation Department, in coordination with the staff from DepEd's Policy Research and Development Division, developed the draft questionnaires. Inputs from other education experts within ADB and DepEd were incorporated in the design of the survey instrument. Key components of the questionnaire are identified in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Components of Survey Instrument


Source: Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey.

The survey instruments were pilot tested to ensure that the survey is detailed enough to answer and understand the key factors affecting educational investments and decisions, and concise enough to encourage school principals, head teachers, students, and households to participate in the survey. The inputs from the pilot test were used to refine the questions for clarity and to develop guidelines for the training of enumerators.

Survey design. The sampling strategy is informed by key questions, costs available to administer the survey, and targeted population. While there is interest in making the sample nationally representative, the survey was rolled out only in selected areas due to resource constraints.

A total of 250 public and private schools were initially selected randomly to participate in the survey. The total number of target schools was allocated proportionately across the selected survey areas, stratified by locality (urban and rural). Some of the initially targeted schools were unable to participate in the survey due to various administrative reasons and were thus randomly replaced with schools of the same type and from the same location where possible. After field operations, a total of 238 schools participated in the survey.

Student rosters for sampled schools were derived from DepEd's administrative database. The rosters served as sampling frames to randomly select students. Students who were unable to participate in the survey were randomly replaced with other students of the same gender and from same grade level and school. Thereafter, parents and guardians of interviewed students were identified as target respondents of the survey's household module.

Respondents. The survey instrument has three modules: school, student, and household. For the school module, data were collected from school principals and/or head teachers. Five randomly selected students in each grade level ( $9,10,11$ ) per school were interviewed for the student module. The parents and guardians of interviewed students served as respondents for the household module. Other adult household members were also interviewed for selected questions in the household module.

Interview protocol. The interview protocol required interviewing target respondents individually and separately. For the school module, school principals and/or head teachers were provided copies of the survey instrument ahead of the scheduled face-to-face interview as some questions referred to administrative records. For the student module, the survey team coordinated with schools in identifying an appropriate time to interview students. Whenever possible, interviews were scheduled during breaks or noncritical periods (e.g., during extracurricular activities). The survey team also requested school management and homeroom teachers to provide a suitable venue where the interviews could be conducted, respective of child protection policies. For the household module, the survey team reached out to target respondents through short messaging service or phone calls to identify an appropriate time for the interview. Although most respondents were interviewed in their respective houses, some parents and/or guardians were interviewed in the school premises or public spaces (e.g., restaurants) as mutually agreed by the respondents and the survey team.

English and Tagalog translations were made available, but enumerators (who were hired from the surveyed areas) were instructed to interview in their local language as they saw fit.

To elicit candid and honest responses, the enumerators assured all respondents that other than research, any information they provide would not be used for performance assessment and evaluation or any other purpose. Parents and guardians were requested to sign consent forms allowing the use of data they and their children have provided to meet the study's research objectives.

Data collection tool. The survey data collection platform was designed by Real-Time Analytics using tablet technology and cloud-based software that enhances capacity to ensure data quality by allowing real-time tracking and monitoring of enumerators. Intended to catch outliers, the software provided ways to give enumerators feedback when data points did not seem to be consistent with expected responses so that they could ask follow-up questions. This survey technology also enabled easy production of key graphs and statistics that were continuously updated and lessened the time needed to collect or clean the data.

Selection of survey areas. One of the crucial steps in conducting YEILMOS was the selection of provinces to be covered in the study. Although the survey was not designed to be nationally representative, it was deemed ideal to have representation from various geographic and sectoral areas. In consultation with DepEd, the following geographic areas were chosen: National Capital Region (NCR) and Ilocos Sur from Luzon, Eastern Samar from Visayas, and Davao del Sur from Mindanao. These geographic areas also have heterogeneous socioeconomic characteristics. For instance, NCR and Davao del Sur are highly urbanized areas, while llocos Sur and Eastern Samar have relatively higher population concentration in rural areas.

## Box 2: National Career Assessment Examination

To help identify the types of career-related information available to students, one of the questions asked through the Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey was whether or not students receive information about career that are aligned with their interests and skills.

Starting in 2007, the National Career Assessment Examination (NCAE) has been one of the analytical tools used by schools to assist students in identifying their interests and skills. Questions asked in the NCAE are designed to test students' general scholastic knowledge, vocational aptitude, occupational preferences, and entrepreneurial skills. Since the implementation of the K to 12 Basic Education Program, the NCAE has been administered to Grade 9 students in all public and private schools in the Philippines.

The results of the NCAE are recommendatory in nature. The examination profiles a student's aptitude in the four senior high school tracks and their corresponding strands. In particular, the NCAE is designed to gauge a student's interests and career inclination, whether it is technical-vocational, entrepreneurial, or toward further education in college. It is intended to provide information to students and parents that will guide them in determining which career track is best for a student to take after completing senior high school.

Source: https://www.deped.gov.ph/?s=NCAE.

Survey period. The field operations were conducted from February to April 2017, but with different survey periods across the four survey areas. The variations in the survey period were mainly due to the calendar of activities of the schools and availability of the households.

Training. Several rounds of training were conducted for the survey team leaders, coordinators, and enumerators on various aspects of data collection. In particular, the survey team members were taught the rationale and key objectives of the survey, how each question should be asked, how to navigate the tablet-based data collection platform, and the DepEd protocols for data collection. The training comprised of lectures, recapitulation, mock interviews, and field practice interviews. Significant time was allotted for role-playing activities to simulate what could happen during the field operations and how enumerators should respond to such scenarios. Training lasted for 2 days for team leaders and coordinators, and 3 days for enumerators. Continuous training support was given by the team leaders.

Quality assurance of survey data. The survey team was divided into four groups, one for each of the four survey areas. Each group comprised of a team leader, school coordinators, and enumerators. School coordinators did the initial liaising with sample schools to schedule the survey team's visit. Team leaders were tasked with organizing their respective teams, recruiting and training enumerators, and supervising enumerators' work. Enumerators, on the other hand, did the actual respondent interviews under the supervision of the team leader. Upon completion of the interview, enumerators were instructed to carefully review the questionnaire to ensure that all questions were answered appropriately before leaving the schools or households. All interviews completed within the day were then submitted to team leaders who were responsible for further reviewing the accomplished questionnaires for completeness, consistency, and accuracy. Any inconsistencies spotted were then highlighted and returned to the enumerators for validation.

Debriefing sessions on the inconsistencies or errors in the filled-out questionnaires, including the proper recording of responses and following skip patterns in questions and instructions, were also conducted to ensure high quality data.

The Appendix lists some of the data cleaning done after the survey was conducted.
Limitations. The YEILMOS was intended to provide baseline information on factors that shape decisions about educational investment and career planning for high school students and their families in the National Capital Region, Ilocos Sur, Eastern Samar, and Davao del Sur. Although these areas were strategically identified to provide diverse insights on the subject matter, data collected from the survey do not necessarily provide nationally representative estimates. However, to facilitate higher participation rates, only educational service contracting schools were targeted among private schools in the study areas. Among the 250 schools originally targeted, the participation rate stood at $98.5 \%$ among public schools and $91 \%$ among private schools. Originally targeted private schools that were not able to participate tended to be larger in terms of student population. No systematic characteristics were observed among originally targeted public schools that were unable to participate.

Sampled students who were initially listed in the census but turned out to have dropped out or moved to other schools that were not part of the study were replaced with other enrolled students of the same grade and gender. In addition, there were instances when parents or guardians of student respondents were not interviewed due to various personal reasons. At the time of writing this report, no imputations were done for households that chose not to provide information on income, assets, and other economic indicators.

Several questions asked in YEILMOS were designed to capture the perceptions of students regarding career-related information and financial assistance, and the responses may not necessarily reflect reality. For example, when students (or their parents) were asked if they received certain types of career-related information from a specific source, it is possible that some respondents answered that they did not receive such information, even if they did, and vice versa. One reason for this may be that the respondents were not able to absorb the information they received. Furthermore, when students were asked whether they received financial assistance, it is possible that some answered "yes", even if they did not receive any financial assistance, or "no" even if they did receive it. Hence, the responses provided by these students (or their parents) can be interpreted only as the perception of whether or not they received information on financial assistance.

Similarly, when asked to rank major sources of information, low ranks do not necessarily imply that a certain source is not important. Rather, a low rank might simply suggest that respondents used other sources of information. On the other hand, when students (or their parents) were asked to assess their (their children's) likelihood of continuing in the education system, it is possible that some respondents indicated they were likely to proceed to further education, but eventually dropped out, and the opposite may also be true. In other words, what the survey tried to capture was the level of optimism of each student because perception and level of optimism are considered influential factors when making decisions.

## Key Findings

The findings presented in this section are divided into six parts, with the first part showing the characteristics of the sampled schools, students, and households. The next four parts-from career guidance to occupational preferences and expectations-discuss the factors that students and households consider when making educational investment and career planning decisions as well as their primary sources of information while going through this process. Finally, the last part dwells on some issues and realities in the wider context that may affect the education and career choices of students and households.

## Profile of Sample

A total of 238 schools, 3,172 students, and 2,819 households were successfully interviewed. The schools were distributed such that $47.0 \%$ are from the National Capital Region (NCR), 29.0\% are from Davao del Sur, 13.0\% are from llocos Sur, and 11.0\% are from Eastern Samar (Figure 2.a). The majority of sampled schools are public schools as shown in Figure 2.b.

The majority of sampled students live in urban areas, are female, and attend public schools. (Figures 2.b, 3.a, and 3.b).

Figure 2.a: Profile of Sampled Schools, by Survey Area
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 2.b: Number of Sampled Schools, by Survey Area and School Type


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 3.a: Profile of Sampled Students, by Location
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 3.b: Profile of Sampled Students, by Gender
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

In terms of the socioeconomic profile of sampled households (Figure 4.a), 18\% have an annual (self-reported) income range of $P 80,000$ and below, $16 \%$ earn between $P 80,000$ and $P 160,000$, $15 \%$ earn $P 540,001$ or higher, $15 \%$ earn between $P 250,001$ and $P 540,000$, and $13 \%$ earn between P160,000 to $P 250,000$. About $23 \%$ of the sampled households did not report their income.

Most of the adults who responded to the household module are either college (27\%) or high school (32\%) graduates (Figure 4.b), while about 89\% of adult respondents are engaged in work (Figure 5).

Figure 4.a: Profile of Sampled Households, by Income Bracket
(\%)


Note: Value labels refer to the income ranges for each income bracket.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 4.b: Profile of Sampled Households, by Educational Attainment
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 5: Profile of Sampled Households, by Work Status
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Career Guidance

## Career Guidance Received by Current Students

Activities offered by schools. Group counseling sessions, SHS career guidance program (CGP), and one-on-one career counseling sessions are the most common activities offered by schools for their CGP. When asked about the types of guidance services offered in school (Table 1), public schools reported that they generally focus on SHS CGP (69\%), group counseling (68\%), and vocationally oriented seminars with experts talking to classes ( $62 \%$ ). On the other hand, private schools cited group counseling sessions ( $89 \%$ ), one-on-one career counseling sessions ( $85 \%$ ), and SHS CGP ( $81 \%$ ) the most.

In more urbanized areas like NCR and Davao del Sur, more schools reported offering a variety of career guidance activities compared with schools in other provinces. This is particularly true for activities that require private sector participation like career or job fairs, student immersion, and jobsite tours or visits.

Jobsite tours or visits, training in other job-seeking skills, and tours of postsecondary institutions. Only a fourth of sampled schools reported conducting activities such as jobsite tours or visits, training in other job-seeking skills, and tours of postsecondary institutions as part of their career guidance activities. When asked about the types of services they offer, about 40\% of private schools reported offering the aforementioned activities, while significantly less public schools reported doing so.

Priorities of guidance programs. Across the geographic areas included in this study, guidance programs in public and private schools generally give priority to helping students identify their SHS tracks and less priority to assisting them with financial aid issues. When asked about goals in the provision of guidance program services (Table 2), at least $38 \%$ of schools reportedly emphasized helping students identify their SHS track. Majority of sampled schools reported giving less priority to financial aid issues in their guidance programs.

Table 1: Proportion of Schools Offering a Specific Type of Guidance Service (\%)

| Activity | Public | Private | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group guidance and counselling sessions ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 67.8 | 88.9 | 78.4 |
| Senior high school (SHS) career guidance program (CGP) | 68.8 | 80.7 | 74.8 |
| Career counseling sessions (one-on-one) | 44.7 | 85.3 | 65.2 |
| Vocationally oriented assemblies and speakers in class $^{\text {b }}$ | 61.9 | 60.9 | 61.4 |
| Résumé writing | 47.2 | 74.8 | 61.1 |
| Use of noncomputerized career information sources ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 49.8 | 69.0 | 59.5 |
| Testing and having tests interpreted for career planning purposes ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 37.4 | 70.2 | 53.9 |
| Use of college catalogs | 34.1 | 61.0 | 47.7 |
| Career and job fairs | 25.9 | 66.0 | 46.1 |
| Occupational information units in subject matter courses | 38.8 | 52.7 | 45.8 |
| School elective coursework in career decision-making | 42.1 | 47.3 | 44.8 |
| Use of computerized career information sources | 26.4 | 40.9 | 33.7 |
| Student immersion in the industry |  |  |  |
| Jobsite tours or visits | 24.1 | 40.1 | 32.1 |
| Training in other job-seeking skills | 9.4 | 46.8 | 28.3 |
| Tours of postsecondary institutions | 17.1 | 38.8 | 28.0 |
|  | 10.9 | 38.9 | 25.1 |

Notes:
a These are activities conducted by the guidance counselor, involving more than one student, and are separate from the modules stipulated in the SHS CGP.
b Experts, professionals, and other industry representatives are invited to speak about their respective profession, vocation, or job.
c Sources include brochures and other printed materials on career planning.
d This refers to the National Career Aptitude Exam for public schools and other types of assessments employed by private schools.
e This includes site visits, simulation labs, and on-the-job training.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Table 2: Proportion of Schools Citing a Specific Priority in Providing Guidance Programs (\%)

| Goals | Public | Private | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Help students identify their SHS track | 30.5 | 46.1 | 38.3 |
| Help students with their academic growth in high school | 14.5 | 13.2 | 13.8 |
| Help students with personal, social, and psychological growth <br> and development | 13.3 | 13.8 | 13.5 |
| Help students plan and prepare for their careers or education <br> after high school | 10.5 | 7.4 | 8.9 |
| Help students with financial aid issues | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |

## SHS = senior high school.

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Duration of personalized assistance. On average, students reportedly get 5 hours of personalized assistance. When asked about the number of hours of personalized help received from their guidance counselors (Figure 6), students from NCR reported the highest average of 7 hours, while llocos Sur has the lowest average of 2 hours.

Figure 6: Average Hours of Personalized Help Received by Students from Career Guidance Counselors


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Source of career guidance information shared to students. Overall, universities, colleges, or tertiary institutions are cited by schools as the most common source of career guidance information shared to students. This is closely followed by the internet and colleagues of guidance counselors and career advocates (Table 3).

Table 3: Proportion of Schools Citing a Specific Source of Career Guidance Information Shared with Students, by School Type
(\%)

| Source of information | Public | Private | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Universities, Colleges, or Tertiary Institutions | 89.1 | 92.5 | 90.9 |
| Internet | 79.9 | 94.4 | 87.8 |
| Colleagues | 83.2 | 90.2 | 86.9 |
| Personal connections | 80.2 | 87.3 | 84.0 |
| Government agencies | 78.5 | 86.5 | 82.8 |
| Radio, TV, Newspaper | 75.1 | 78.6 | 77.0 |

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Information shared during career guidance activities according to students. According to students, information typically shared with them during career guidance activities focus on the types of occupations and training that match their interest, types of occupations and training aligned with their skill sets, and data on schools that can provide quality education given their preferences. All three were consistently mentioned across grade levels, school types, locality,
and gender. When asked about the types of information they received in CGP (Figure 7), 55\% of students from private schools and $56 \%$ from public schools reported the types of occupation and training that fit their interests. Roughly $49 \%$ of private school students and $43 \%$ of public school students said that they received information on types of occupations that fit their skills, and 39\% of private school students and 34\% of public school students received information on schools that can provide quality education.

Figure 7: Types of Information Received in Career Guidance, by School Type
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Career Guidance Received by Adults When They Were Studying

Types of information received by household respondents when they were choosing careers. The majority of household respondents received some information when they were choosing careers. In addition to asking students about the types of career-related information that they receive, it is also instructive to get retrospective information from adults because presumably, these are people who have more insights about the labor market and are in a position to assess the importance of career-related information with subsequent labor market outcomes. When asked whether they received information that was useful in choosing careers, $86 \%$ reported that they received some information, while $14 \%$ said they did not. NCR (16\%) had the highest number of households that did not receive any information, followed by llocos Sur (14\%). Only 1\% of the household respondents from Eastern Samar and Davao del Sur reported being uninformed while considering careers.

Table 4 and Figures 8.a, 8.b, 8.c, 8.d, and 8.e summarize the proportion of household respondents with access to specific types of information while choosing careers, disaggregated by area.

## Table 4: Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of Specific Information while Choosing Career Path <br> (\%)

| Area | Labor Market Information | Information on Types of Occupations and Training that Fit Personal Interests | Information on Types of Occupations and Training that Fit Wage Preferences | Information on Types of Occupations that Fit Skills | Information on Schools that Can Provide Quality Education Given Preferences | Information on Funding Options | No Information |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NCR | 32.5 | 35.7 | 14.7 | 21.2 | 17.8 | 4.2 | 16.2 |
| Ilocos Sur | 20.2 | 59.1 | 6.7 | 9.4 | 4.6 | 1.4 | 13.6 |
| Eastern <br> Samar | 29.9 | 54.8 | 20.1 | 39.1 | 32.4 | 7.3 | 1.3 |
| Davao del Sur | 35.9 | 50.8 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 18.6 | 9.4 | 1.4 |
| All | 32.5 | 38.6 | 17.5 | 23.5 | 17.9 | 4.9 | 14.0 |

NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 8.a: Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of "Labor Market Information" while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area and Locality
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Roughly a third of the surveyed households cited that labor market information was available during the time they were choosing a career path, higher than what was reported by students. There are small differences among the regions, but all figures fall in the $30 \%-35 \%$ range except for llocos Sur, which is at 20\%.

When it comes to the differences between types of localities, more than half of adult household members in rural areas shared that they were informed of the types of occupations and training that fit personal interests compared with people from urban areas. About 59\% of households in Ilocos Sur reported being given this particular information, while only $36 \%$ of households in NCR reported the same. Figure 8.b further disaggregates the provincial estimates by urban and rural areas.

Figure 8.b: Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of Information on "Types of Occupations and Training That Fit Personal Interests" while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area and Locality
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

More people from rural areas (31\%) reported being informed of the types of occupations and training that fit their wage preferences compared with their urban counterparts (17\%). The provincial estimates by urban and rural areas were further disaggregated for the proportion of people citing the availability of types of occupations and training that fit wage preferences (Figure 8.c) and skills (Figure 8.d).

When asked if they were informed of schools that can provide quality education given their preferences, only $18 \%$ of people from urban areas and $15 \%$ of people in rural areas answered in the affirmative. About a third (32\%) of respondents from Eastern Samar mentioned receiving such information at the time they were selecting their career, while other figures noted were 19\% for Davao del Sur and 18\% for NCR. Only 5\% of sampled households in Ilocos Sur reported having knowledge of good schools that met their preferences when choosing a career. Figure 8.e further disaggregates the provincial estimates by urban and rural areas.

Across survey areas, only a few households were given information on funding options when considering their careers. About 9\% of households in Davao del Sur reported having access to such information, followed by Eastern Samar with 7\%, NCR with 4\%, and Ilocos Sur with 1\%.

Figure 8.c: Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of Information on "Types of Occupations and Training That Fit Wage Preferences" while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area and Locality
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 8.d: Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of Information on "Types of Occupations and Training That Fit Skills" while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area and Locality
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 8.e: Proportion of Household Members Citing Availability of "Information on Schools That Can Provide Quality Education Given Preferences" while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area and Locality (\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

It is also worth noting that respondents with higher educational attainment reported having received more types of information that were useful for choosing careers.

Table 5 summarizes the types of information surveyed households preferred to have had while they were choosing their career path.

Table 5: Proportion of Household Members Indicating Preference to Have Had Specific Information Available while Choosing Career Path, by Survey Area
(\%)

| Area | Labor Market Information | Information on Types of Occupations and Training that Fit Personal Interests | Information on Types of Occupations and Training that Fit Wage Preferences | Information on Types of Occupations that Fit Skills | Information on Schools that Can <br> Provide Quality Education Given Preferences | Information on Funding Options |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NCR | 29.0 | 27.7 | 18.5 | 19.6 | 20.2 | 18.6 |
| Ilocos Sur | 24.9 | 34.3 | 10.6 | 19.4 | 7.8 | 10.6 |
| Eastern <br> Samar | 24.8 | 54.7 | 20.2 | 32.8 | 26.8 | 12.4 |
| Davao del Sur | 32.0 | 31.6 | 34.3 | 29.7 | 17.0 | 16.9 |
| All | 29.1 | 29.0 | 20.1 | 21.1 | 19.7 | 18.0 |

NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Types of information that should have been made available while choosing a career path according to households. Almost a third of the surveyed household members preferred to have had labor market information available to them while they were choosing a career path. When asked what type of information they preferred to have had when they were still contemplating which career to take (Table 5), 29\% of household respondents mentioned labor market information. More respondents from Davao del Sur (32\%) and NCR (29\%) indicated this piece of information to be crucial, while only $25 \%$ of respondents in Eastern Samar and Ilocos Sur believed this to be the case.

Number of household respondents who indicated that information on occupations and training that fit interest should have been made available when choosing careers. In most of the surveyed provinces, $29 \%$ of household respondents indicated that they would have appreciated receiving data on occupations and training that fit their interest when choosing careers. It is only in Eastern Samar where more than half of the households (55\%) said they would have appreciated access to such information. Looking at locality, more household members from rural areas ( $39 \%$ ) than urban areas ( $28 \%$ ) preferred receiving information on an occupation that matches their interests.

Number of household respondents who indicated that information on funding options should have been made available when choosing careers. About $18 \%$ of household respondents would have wanted information on funding options while choosing career paths. NCR registered the highest percentage at $19 \%$, followed by Davao del Sur at 17\%, Eastern Samar at $12 \%$, and Ilocos Sur at $11 \%$. The percentage for urban areas ( $18 \%$ ) was slightly higher than that for rural areas (15\%).

## Choice of Senior High School Track

Students' track choices. Academic track is the most popular track choice among students across provinces and grade levels, although percentages in Eastern Samar (59\%) and Davao del Sur (63\%) are relatively lower than those in NCR and Ilocos Sur (Figure 9.a). Coming in second is technical-vocational and livelihood (TVL) with only about a third of students in Eastern Samar and Davao del Sur and a quarter in NCR and llocos Sur preferring this track. Across grade levels, $71 \%$ prefer the academic track and $23 \%$ prefer the TVL track.

Students' preference for academic track. Preference for academic track is higher amongstudents in private schools than those in public schools by about 20 percentage points (Figure 9.b). About $83 \%$ of private school students prefer the academic track, while only $62 \%$ of those in public schools do.

Students' preference for TVL track. Preference for TVL track is slightly stronger among students in rural areas than in urban areas, and among students in public schools than in private schools. Among students in rural schools, $34 \%$ chose or intend to choose the TVL track, versus $22 \%$ in urban schools (Figure 9.c).

Although both males and females show a higher preference for the academic over the TVL track, females show a higher preference for the academic track on average across all four geographic areas ( $77 \%$ of females as against $63 \%$ of males) (Figure 9.d). Eastern Samar and Davao del Sur have a higher share of TVL preference (more than 40\%), particularly among male students.

Figure 9.a: Distribution of Students by Intended or Chosen Track and Survey Area (\%)


NCR = National Capital Region, TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 9.b: Distribution of Students by Intended or Chosen Track and School Type (\%)


TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Reasons for choosing a specific track. Across areas, interest in field or subject matter is the reason most often cited by students for their choice of SHS track. A large majority ( $80 \%$ in urban areas and $79 \%$ in rural areas) claim it to be one of their three major considerations when choosing a track. This applies to more than $80 \%$ of students in NCR and Davao del Sur, and more than $70 \%$ of students in Ilocos Sur and Eastern Samar (Figure 10). Compatibility with one's skills comes in second with almost half of the students citing it as a major consideration. Results also show that a quarter of the students still value their parents' recommendation.

Figure 9.c: Distribution of Students by Intended or Chosen Track and Locality (\%)


TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 9.d: Distribution of Students by Intended or Chosen Track, by Survey Area and Gender
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region, TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

There also appears to be no difference between the structure of student responses when disaggregated by gender and locality, although students in rural areas seem to put greater importance on potential wages and broad employment opportunities, and lesser importance on their parents' recommendation. Interestingly, cost or financial consideration was not as common for the respondents, with only less than 10\% of students citing it among their three top reasons.

Figure 10: Proportion of Students Identifying a Major Consideration for Choosing a Track, by Survey Area
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Source of information used by students when choosing tracks. Across locality and gender, family (parents and siblings) is the source of information most used by students when making a track choice. Peers are also an often-cited source at $52 \%-61 \%$, and so are relatives at $35 \%-44 \%$ and teachers at $30 \%-34 \%$ (Figure 11.a). There is a higher tendency among students in rural areas to cite peers as an information source, while students in urban areas tend to use internet sources more than those in rural areas. It is worth noting that guidance counselors rank low when students were asked to identify the sources of information they use when choosing a track (5\%-6\%).

Ranking of sources of students used or plan to use in choosing their track, across areas. The ranking of sources students used or plan to use in choosing their track is largely consistent across the four areas, with parents, peers, and relatives on top of the list. The internet is not as popular a source in llocos Sur as much as it is in the other areas, particularly NCR where internet use is heaviest (18.7\%) (Figure 11.b). Students in NCR and Ilocos Sur also rely on their peers' advice although not as heavily as their counterparts in Eastern Samar and Davao del Sur.

Preferred track vs. track most likely to take. Most students preferring the academic track also reported it to be the track they are most likely to take, with only $5 \%$ reporting that they will most likely take a different track. Students' preferred tracks are not necessarily what students end up taking for various reasons. The likelihood of taking a different track from what one prefers is higher among students preferring TVL, with $15 \%$ believing that they are likely to take another track given current circumstances. It is even higher among those preferring the sports (39\%), and arts and design (27\%) tracks. In cases where the preferred track is different from the one likely to be taken, the academic track is most often cited as the track they are most likely to take.

Figure 11.a: Proportion of Students Citing a Specific Major Source of Information They Used or Planned to Use in Choosing a Track, by Locality and Gender
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 11.b: Proportion of Students Citing a Specific Major Source of Information They Used or Planned to Use in Choosing a Track, by Survey Area
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Overall, the likelihood of taking one's preferred track is high across areas, particularly in Ilocos Sur where $100 \%$ of students preferring the sports track also reported the likelihood that they will take this track, while only $2 \%$ of those who prefer the academic track and $8 \%$ of those who prefer the TVL track think that they are more likely to take a different track (Tables 6.a-6.d).

Differences between students' and parents' track preferences. There are some differences between students' and parents' track preference especially among students who prefer tracks other than the academic track. Among students who prefer TVL, only $31 \%$ have parents who share their preference, while $67 \%$ have parents whose preference is to have their children take the academic track instead (Figure 12). Among students who prefer the sports track, only 4\% have parents preferring the same, while $68 \%$ have parents who prefer the academic track instead. The same goes for the arts and design track, with only $6 \%$ having parents preferring the same track, while $83 \%$ have parents preferring the academic track instead.

## Table 6.a: Preferred Track versus Track Likely to Be Taken Given Current Circumstances in National Capital Region (Proportion of Grade 9 and 10 students, \%)

|  | Likely to be Taken |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Academic | TVL | Sports | Arts and <br> Design | Don't <br> Know | TOTAL |
| Preferred | 95.4 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Academic | 12.7 | 83.0 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| TVL | 24.2 | 11.6 | 57.1 | - | 7.1 | 100.0 |
| Sports | 6.0 | 13.0 | 0.6 | 74.0 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| Arts and Design | 20.3 | 10.3 | 7.8 | - | 61.5 | 100.0 |
| Undecided | $\mathbf{7 0 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- = magnitude equals zero, TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Table 6.b: Preferred Track versus Track Likely to Be Taken Given Current Circumstances in llocos Sur (Proportion of Grade 9 and 10 students, \%)

| Preferred | Likely to be Taken |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Academic | TVL | Sports | Arts and Design | Don't Know |  |
| Academic | 98.0 | 0.7 | - | - | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| TVL | 8.4 | 91.6 | - | - | - | 100.0 |
| Sports | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | 100.0 |
| Arts and Design | 38.7 | - | - | 61.3 | - | 100.0 |
| Undecided | 24.5 | 26.2 | - | - | 49.3 | 100.0 |
| All | 74.1 | 20.7 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 100.0 |

[^6]Table 6.c: Preferred Track versus Track Likely to Be Taken Given Current Circumstances in Eastern Samar (Proportion of Grade 9 and 10 students, \%)

| Preferred | Likely to be Taken |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Academic | TVL | Sports | Arts and Design | Don't <br> Know | TOTAL |
| Academic | 92.8 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| TVL | 7.9 | 77.5 | 2.2 | - | 12.3 | 100.0 |
| Sports | - | - | 47.5 | 27.3 | 25.2 | 100.0 |
| Arts and Design | - | 22.9 | - | 5.1 | 72.0 | 100.0 |
| Undecided | 9.5 | 30.7 | - | - | 59.9 | 100.0 |
| All | 57.6 | 27.2 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 11.2 | 100.0 |

- = magnitude equals zero, TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Table 6.d: Preferred Track versus Track Likely to Be Taken Given Current Circumstances in Davao del Sur (Proportion of Grade 9 and 10 students, \%)

|  | Likely to be Taken |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Academic | TVL | Sports | Arts and <br> Design | Don't <br> Know | TOTAL |
| Preferred | 92.5 | 5.0 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| Academic | 8.9 | 90.3 | - | - | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| TVL | 11.0 | 7.5 | 81.5 | - | - | 100.0 |
| Sports | 12.3 | - | - | 85.5 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Arts and Design | 26.3 | - | - | - | 73.7 | 100.0 |
| Undecided | $\mathbf{6 1 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- = magnitude equals zero, TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Parental considerations in the choice of children's track. Parental considerations in the choice of their child's track are similar to factors the students themselves would consider when choosing a track, with the addition of potential wage and broad employment opportunities. Interest, potential wage, and broad employment opportunities are the top considerations of parents in both urban and rural areas (Figure 13). However, ranking in terms of how often a reason is cited varies across provinces (Table 7). For instance, an overwhelmingly large proportion of parents (74\%) in Davao del Sur, $55 \%$ in NCR, and $64 \%$ in Ilocos Sur cited potential wage among their considerations, and only 39\% of parents in Eastern Samar believed this to be a factor. More parents in rural areas choose tracks based on potential wage and broad employment opportunities. While a child's interest is only the third consideration in rural areas, it ranks first in urban areas together with potential wage.

Figure 12: Students' Preferred Track versus Parents' or Guardians' Preferred Track
(\%)


TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 13: Proportion of Parents Identifying a Specific Major Consideration in the Choice of Child's Track, by Locality
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Table 7: Proportion of Parents Identifying a Specific Major Consideration in the Choice of Child's Track, by Survey Area
(\%)

| Consideration for Choosing a Track | NCR | Ilocos <br> Sur | Eastern <br> Samar | Davao <br> del Sur | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Interest | 58.0 | 54.0 | 64.1 | 56.1 | 57.8 |
| Potential wages | 54.6 | 63.8 | 39.0 | 73.6 | 57.3 |
| Broad employment opportunities | 46.7 | 64.4 | 51.9 | 63.9 | 50.3 |
| Best fits my skills | 33.4 | 26.3 | 36.1 | 31.6 | 32.9 |
| Ability to work abroad | 21.4 | 20.0 | 15.9 | 20.4 | 21.0 |
| Employment opportunities in Manila | 17.4 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 6.7 | 14.9 |
| Recommendation of other family members | 13.7 | 23.1 | 28.5 | 14.9 | 14.8 |
| Cost or financial consideration | 9.0 | 7.5 | 17.7 | 9.6 | 9.3 |
| Social acceptability expectations | 4.8 | 0.1 | 6.3 | 4.3 | 4.6 |
| Location and proximity of school offering <br> the major or vocation | 4.6 | 0.1 | 6.6 | 4.5 | 4.4 |
| Recommendation of friends or peers | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| Others | 7.2 | 0.3 | 10.2 | 5.9 | 6.8 |

NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Number of students not proceeding to senior high school. Meanwhile, only less than $1 \%$ of surveyed students indicated that they would not be proceeding to SHS. All of them mentioned financial problems as one of three reasons they would not continue to SHS. This is followed by being unprepared and being not interested.

Figure 14: Proportion of Students Identifying Specific Reasons for Not Proceeding to Senior High School
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Choice of College Major

Number of students who expect to go to college. About 85\% of student respondents expect to go to college. When asked about their preferred college course, $22 \%$ of the students said that they prefer personal services, 18\% prefer engineering and engineering trades, and 15\% prefer courses related to teacher training and education services (Figure 15.a).

More private school students prefer the profession-based college majors such as engineering, health, business administration, and architecture, compared with public school students who favor teacher training and security services. In terms of locality, more students from urban areas prefer health, business administration, architecture, and personal services, while more students in rural areas prefer teacher training.

Differences in preferred college majors between boys and girls. College major preferences reflect gender variations. More girls prefer teacher training, business administration, health, and personal services, while more boys prefer engineering, architecture, computing, transport services, and security services (Figure 15.b).

Students' primary considerations in choosing a college major. Generally, most students cite interest, best fit their skills, potential wages, recommendation of parents, and broad employment opportunities as primary considerations in choosing a college major. The majority of students (64\%) choose courses based on their interest, while a good proportion of them consider their skills (36\%) and potential wages from related careers (29\%) when making a choice. As was the case with choosing an SHS track, cost or financial consideration does not

Figure 15.a: Proportion of Students Preferring Specific Courses, by School Type


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 15.b: Proportion of Students Preferring Specific Courses, by Gender (\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 16: Proportion of Students Identifying a Specific Major Consideration for Choosing a College Major, by School Type
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
show up as a major factor, with only $6.1 \%$ of students mentioning it. The recommendation of teachers $(0.2 \%)$ and location ( $2 \%$ ) do not seem to factor in the students' top considerations in choosing a college major.

The top considerations are the same across private school and public school students (Figure 16), and across students in rural and urban schools.

Students' source of information when choosing a college course. According to students, social circles seem to be the predominant information source when choosing a college course. Students cited parents (68.8\%), peers (48.3\%), and relatives (40.5\%) as the most used sources of information, while guidance counselors were the least cited source of information (2.5\%) for choosing a college course.

Parents' source of information when choosing a college course for their children. Consistent with student-reported information sources, social circles seem to be the primary information source as well for household respondents when choosing a college course for their children. This holds true across locality, province, and educational attainment. Household respondents identified parents (38\%), peers (34\%), and relatives (32\%) as the most used sources of information, while the least cited sources of information include television and radio (3.8\%) and guidance counselors (3.0\%) (Figure 17). It is worth noting that the top three and least used sources of information are the same for both choosing an SHS track and choosing a college course.

Figure 17: Proportion of Households Citing a Specific Source of Information as One of the Three Major Sources of Information Used in Choosing Postsecondary Education
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

In terms of locality, parents ( $48 \%$ vs. $37 \%$ ), relatives ( $42 \%$ vs. $32 \%$ ), self ( $21 \%$ vs. $19 \%$ ), and teachers ( $27 \%$ vs. $12 \%$ ) as sources of information when choosing a college course are higher among people in rural areas than among those in urban areas. Mass media such as books, newspapers, and magazines ( $5 \%$ vs. $2 \%$ ); television and radio ( $4 \%$ vs. $1 \%$ ); and the internet ( $6 \%$ vs. $2 \%$ ) are generally used more in urban households. There is no variation in the use of guidance counselors in urban and rural households.

Results from the survey also show that the influence of parents and relatives is often used by households in all provinces. Parental influence is highly mentioned in llocos Sur (56\%) and Davao del Sur (53\%), while influence of relatives is cited most in llocos Sur (70\%). Even when educational attainment is considered, parents continue to be the primary source of information across all categories (highest for those who finished postgraduate courses [53\%]). The same applies to the impact of relatives, which is also high across all types of graduates and highest among those with a postgraduate degree (40\%). Meanwhile, the impact of peers (35\%) and self ( $20 \%$ ) is higher for bachelor's degree holders. Interesting to note is the variation in the use of guidance counselors on the choice of college major or postsecondary education among postgraduate degree finishers (16\%), bachelor's degree holders (2\%), and those without college degrees (4\%).

Preferred college course vs. course that will be most likely taken. Four in every five students are optimistic that their preferred course is also what they will most likely take given present circumstances. Ilocos Sur has the highest proportion of students who are optimistic about taking their preferred course (84\%), which is well above the $79 \%$ average of the entire sample (Figure 18).

On the other hand, there are also cases of students planning to take up profession-based courses (health, engineering, business administration, law, and computing) who stated that they are

Figure 18: Proportion of Students Reporting They Will Be Able to Take Up Preferred Course Given Current Circumstances (\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
more likely to take lower-value courses (personal services and security services) given their circumstances. For instance, out of the students who prefer to take up health, $4 \%$ stated that they are likely to take up courses related to personal services instead. This trend is most apparent in NCR at $6 \%$. For those who prefer engineering, $7 \%$ said that they are likely to take up courses related to security services due to their circumstances. This trend is strongest in Davao del Sur, where $11 \%$ of students said that they are likely to take up courses different from their preferred engineering course.

In addition, 4\% of students who want to take up business-related courses said that they are likely to end up taking courses related to personal services. This phenomenon seems to be most apparent in Eastern Samar where it applies to 13\% of students. Similarly, 3\% of law school aspirants and $4 \%$ of students who hope to take up computing-related courses said that they are likely to end up in personal services courses as well. The trend of law school hopefuls seeing themselves in personal services is strongest in NCR (6\%). Meanwhile, in Eastern Samar, 16\% of students wanting to do computing see themselves taking up personal services courses instead due to current circumstances.

Parents expecting their children to continue on to postsecondary education. Almost all parents (95\%) expect their children to proceed to postsecondary education. The expectation is highest in NCR with $96 \%$ of households seeing that their children will continue onto postsecondary education. Meanwhile, Davao del Sur (88\%) and Ilocos Sur (91\%) exhibit lower percentages of households expecting their children to proceed to postsecondary schooling. In terms of locality, overall, more urban households (96\%) believe that their children will go for postsecondary education compared with rural households (89\%) (Figure 19). The pattern is also observed in other areas but is strongest in Eastern Samar, with $98 \%$ of urban households expecting their children to proceed to postsecondary education as opposed to $91 \%$ for rural households.

Figure 19: Proportion of Parents Expecting Their Children to Continue on to Postsecondary Education, by Survey Area and Locality


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.


#### Abstract

Reasons for Not Continuing with Postsecondary Education according to Household Respondents. Financial problems seem to be the most frequently cited factor among households for not proceeding to postsecondary education. Specifically, $97 \%$ of households cited financial problems, followed by household responsibilities (26\%), job offer (12\%), indecision (11\%), and unpreparedness (10\%) as reasons for not proceeding to postsecondary education. Financial problems are the most common factor among urban households while household responsibilities is the top factor for rural households (Figure 20). More rural households cite unpreparedness and undecidedness than urban households. Notably, marriage was a factor mentioned only by rural households.


Financial constraint is the predominant factor and is most apparent in llocos Sur (100\%) and NCR (97\%). While "household responsibilities" is mostly cited among Davao del Sur households (34\%), "being unprepared" is also frequently cited in both Davao del Sur (20\%) and Ilocos Sur (14\%). "Being undecided" is the strongest factor for not proceeding to postsecondary education among Eastern Samar households (16\%), and "job offers" is the strongest in Davao del Sur households (18\%). Similarly, while "insufficient grades" generally registers at $1 \%$ overall, it comes up to $7 \%$ of households in Eastern Samar.

Figure 20: Proportion of Parents Citing a Specific Factor for Their Children Not Continuing with Postsecondary Education, by Locality


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Occupational Preferences and Expectations

Students' preferred occupation. When asked about their preferred occupation by age 30, the majority of students across grade levels reported an inclination to become professionals (51\%). The top three occupation choices for grade 9 students include professionals (50\%), service and sales workers (14\%), and managers (11\%). For grades 10 and 11, the top 3 choices are professionals
(grade $10-53 \%$, grade $11-51 \%$ ), managers (grade $10-14 \%$, grade $11-18 \%$ ), and services and sales workers (both at 12\%). ${ }^{9}$

The top choices remain the same even when results are disaggregated by school type (Table 8), but there is a higher preference for professional (59\%) or managerial positions (19\%) among private school students compared with those attending public schools ( $46 \%$ and $14 \%$, for professional and managerial positions, respectively). Slightly more public school students also expressed a preference for services and sales occupations (15\%) than their counterparts in the private schools (8\%).

Table 8: Proportion of Students Preferring a Specific Occupation by Age 30, by School Type
(\%)

| Occupation | Public | Private |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Managers | 14.2 | 19.0 |
| Professionals | 46.4 | 58.8 |
| Technicians and associate professionals | 14.9 | 9.1 |
| Clerical support workers | 2.1 | 0.8 |
| Services and sales workers | 14.8 | 7.5 |
| Skilled agricultural, forestry, and fishery workers | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Craft and related trades workers | 2.0 | 1.8 |
| Plant and machine operators and assemblers | 3.4 | 1.7 |
| Elementary occupations | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Armed forces occupation | 1.0 | 0.7 |

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

When overall preferences are disaggregated by gender, male students are inclined to pursue occupations as professionals (57\%), technicians and associates (14\%), services and sales workers (14\%), managers (12\%), and plant and machine operators and assemblers. Female students, on the other hand, foresee careers as professionals (57\%), managers (16\%), services and sales workers (12\%), technicians and associates (10\%), and clerical and support workers (2\%). Female students hardly consider becoming plant and machine operators, while barely $1 \%$ of the male students see themselves in clerical work.

Parents' preferred occupations for their children. Similar to students' expectations, most parents (72.6\%) expect their children to become professionals. This preference is followed by technicians and associates (10\%) and managers (7\%). Across areas, there seems to be little difference as far as the top two choices-"professionals" and "technician and associates"are concerned. The least favored type of work across provinces appears to be agricultural and elementary types of work, both of which average at below $0.5 \%$ of households.

[^7]Figure 21: Proportion of Parents Identifying a Specific Type of Work That They Expect Their Child to Do in Adulthood, by Locality (\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

In terms of locality (Figure 21), more urban households (73\%) expect their children to become professionals relative to rural households (68\%). Similarly, more urban households (7\%) expect their children to become managers compared with rural households (4\%). On the other hand, more parents in rural areas (13\%) expect their children to become technicians and associates relative to urban households ( $10 \%$ ). Similarly, there are more rural households (5\%) that expect their children to enter the armed forces compared with urban households (3\%).

Parents' preferred place of work for their children. When asked about their children's workplace as adults, about $44 \%$ of households answered that they expect their children to be employed in the city. Davao del Sur has the highest proportion of households ( $56 \%$ ) with this expectation, while NCR has the most households (29\%) expecting their children to find employment overseas. llocos Sur has more households (19\%) expecting their children to stay within the region, while more Eastern Samar households (31\%) expect their children to move out of the region.

More rural households (50\%) expect their children to be employed in the city relative to urban households (43\%), while more urban households (28\%) expect their children to find work overseas than rural households (20\%). There is little difference between responses from rural and urban households as far as employment within the region and outside the region are concerned.

Parents' expected income for their children. About $78 \%$ of households expect their children to earn at least $\mathbf{P} 20,000$ monthly by the age of 30 . Specifically, $33 \%$ of households expect children to be earning $P 20,000-P 30,000$ monthly, while $26 \%$ expect $P 30,000-P 50,000$ monthly. Approximately $20 \%$ of households expect earnings greater than $P 50,000$ per month, with $11 \%$ expecting a monthly income of $P 50,000-\mathrm{P} 70,000$, and $9 \%$ expecting a monthly salary greater than $P 70,000$. Such distribution of responses is true across provinces and type of locality.

## Other Findings

This part expounds on realities in the larger context that may impact the educational investment and career planning choices of students and households. Survey findings related to financial aid programs, factors that affect SHS tracks offered in schools, school transfers, unexpected events experienced by households that impact educational decisions, and insights on formal education from those currently working are discussed to capture pertinent facets of the macro-environment in which crucial education and career decisions are being made.

## Financial Aid

Knowledge on potential funding options for children's attendance in senior high school. When asked about information on potential funding options to support their children in SHS, only $14 \%$ of household respondents noted knowing about financial aid programs. Parents from urban areas fared better at 15\%, while parents from rural areas registered only 8\% (Table 9).

Table 9: Proportion of Households with Information on Potential Financial Aid for Children in Senior High School, by Survey Area and Locality
(\%)

| Province | Urban | Rural | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NCR | 15.3 |  | 15.3 |
| Ilocos Sur | 2.5 | 4.6 | 3.6 |
| Eastern Samar | 12.8 | 8.4 | 10.3 |
| Davao del Sur | 10.9 | 9.3 | 10.1 |
| All | $\mathbf{1 4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 8}$ |

NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Main source of information on financial aid programs. Social circles remain to be the main source of information for those aware of financial aid programs. Parents from urban areas typically get their information from friends and relatives (39\%) followed by their children's teachers (35\%) and websites (24\%). Parents from rural areas, on the other hand, cited their friends and relatives (49\%), teachers (44\%), and admission officers (22\%) as their sources of information for financial aid for their children.

When disaggregated by area, survey data show that households from NCR often rely on their friends and relatives (38\%), teachers (33\%), and admission officers to provide information on potential funding for SHS. In llocos Sur, parents count on their children's teachers (42\%) as well as friends and relatives (36\%) to identify sources of financial aid. The majority of the parents in Eastern Samar rely on teachers ( $60 \%$ ) followed by their friends and relatives ( $52 \%$ ), while the percentages for Davao del Sur are at $49 \%$ for friends and relatives and $44 \%$ for teachers.

Interestingly, despite the small percentage of households that reported having access to information on SHS financial aid programs for their children, the majority ( $74 \%$ ) of current grade 11 students from the sampled private schools are voucher recipients. NCR schools noted

Figure 22: Proportion of High School Students Who Are Voucher Recipients, by Survey Area
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Notes: As discussed in Chapter 2, only educational service contracting (ESC) schools were targeted among private schools. These schools tend to have more students availing financial aid from government than other types of private schools. Furthermore, the numbers shown in this chart were based from the responses of students who were asked directly whether they are voucher recipients or not. It is possible that students may answer "yes" even if they are not voucher recipients or "no" even if they are voucher recipients.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
that $62 \%$ of their total student population have accessed the SHS voucher program, and even higher proportions in other regions: 83\% in Ilocos Sur, 91\% in Eastern Samar, and 95\% in Davao del Sur (Figure 22).

Reasons for not availing voucher program. Among those who did not avail of the voucher program, $43 \%$ of grade 11 students reported that the quality of public schools is still better than private schools when asked why they did not avail of such program. This is followed by those who believe that the process is too difficult and that more time is needed to complete the requirements ( $17 \%$ ). Other reasons for not availing of the voucher program include not needing the subsidy and having no conscious decision on whether to avail of the program or not. Among grade 11 students whose reason is the absence of private schools in the area, $32 \%$ came from Davao del Sur, followed by 16\% from NCR and 9\% from Eastern Samar.

About $21 \%$ of grade 11 students from NCR also said that they could not afford the top-up school fees not covered by the voucher value. About one in five students from NCR ( $21 \%$ from public schools, $16 \%$ from private schools) and many private school students (46\%) in Eastern Samar disclosed that they found the steps in availing of the voucher program complicated and that they needed more time to prepare the documents.

Among the parents of students who chose not to avail of the educational service contracting (ESC) program despite their children's eligibility, most parents cite the difficulty of the process (4\%) closely followed by the perception that education provided in private school is not at par
with that in public schools (4\%) and the high top-up fee in private schools that parents and guardians can barely afford. Other reasons cited include the misconception about the student's eligibility (i.e., the ESC program is offered to SHS students only) or not availing of the subsidy due to school transfers.

Within provinces, $37 \%$ of parents of grade 10 public school students in Ilocos Sur shared that there were no private schools in the area. Of the parents of grade 10 public school students, $38 \%$ in NCR and all the parents in Davao del Sur shared that they cannot pay for the high cost of private education despite the deduction in school fees from the ESC program. In Eastern Samar, the parents of grade 9 private school students mentioned that the complicated application process of the ESC program deters them from availing of the tuition subsidy.

On the other hand, some of the reasons cited by parents of voucher-eligible grade 11 students were the difficulty of applying for the program (5\%), high cost of private education not covered by the voucher program (4\%), and lack of private school providers in the area (3\%). Other reasons cited by parents include the lack of information about the program, not needing the subsidy due to other scholarship programs such as the one offered to varsity players, delayed enrollment of the students, and incomplete requirements for the application process.

Parents of eligible public school students in Eastern Samar mentioned the lack of private school providers in the area. Almost half of the parents from private schools in Eastern Samar shared that their kids were not accepted in the preferred private school and thus chose not to avail of the voucher program.

As for private school students in grades 9 and 10, more than half are educational service contracting (ESC) program grantees. NCR recorded $48 \%$ of its sampled students to be ESC grantees, Ilocos Sur 72\%, Eastern Samar 69\%, and Davao del Sur 51\% (Figure 23). About 71\% of private school grade 9 students and $64 \%$ of grade 10 students are reported to be ESC grantees.

Figure 23: Proportion of Students in Private High Schools Who Are Educational Service Contracting Program Grantees, by Survey Area
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Reasons for not availing the Education Service Contracting program. Some of the reasons why qualified grade 9 students opted not to avail of the ESC program include the perceived high fees they would still have to pay despite the subsidy ( $19 \%$ ), the perceived difficulty of accessing the program $(16 \%)$, and finding that the private school does not offer the track they prefer ( $16 \%$ ) (Table 10.a). Other reasons are having no need for it, lacking letters for the program application, and having parents who are not aware of the program.

## Table 10.a: Proportion of Grade 9 Students Who Qualified for Educational Service Contracting Program but Did Not Take It Up for a Specific Reason (\%)

| Reason | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| No affordable private schools or value for subsidy from ESC is not enough for private <br> school expenses | 19.2 |
| Process for accessing ESC is difficult or requires more time | 16.1 |
| Private school did not offer track that was of interest | 16.1 |
| Was not accepted into preferred private school | 6.8 |
| Other | 43.0 |

ESC = educational service contracting.
a Other reasons include having no need for the program, lacking letters for the program application, and having parents who are not aware of the program.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

All public school grade 9 students in Eastern Samar and $21 \%$ in NCR reasoned out that the value of the ESC is not enough to cover the school fees.

A number of grade 9 students from NCR (33\% public school students, $7 \%$ private school students) mentioned that the processing of ESC grants is too difficult or that it requires more time. Further, $17 \%$ of public school students in NCR were not accepted in their preferred private schools, while $20 \%$ shared that they chose not to avail of the program altogether since their target private schools do not offer their preferred track.

## Perceived complexity of application process for the Education Service Contracting program.

About 24\% of grade 10 students who opted not to avail of the ESC program reasoned that the process is too difficult to complete. A few thought the quality of private school education is not as good as the one offered in public schools ( $6 \%$ ), while some said they have no private schools in the area (Table 10.b). Among grade 10 public school students from Davao del Sur, 21\% mentioned that they have no private schools to choose from, $23 \%$ believe that the quality of public schools is better than private schools, and $53 \%$ said that the process is too difficult or that they needed more time to process their ESC applications.

All grade 10 private school students from Eastern Samar thought that the process is too difficult or that they needed more time to process their ESC applications.

Other reasons cited by grade 10 students for deciding not to avail of the program include not needing the subsidy and having no decision yet regarding which school or track to enroll in.

# Table 10.b: Proportion of Grade 10 Students Who Qualified for Educational Service Contracting Program but Did Not Take It Up for a Specific Reason 

(\%)

| Reason | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Process of accessing ESC is difficult or requires more time | 24.4 |
| Private school quality not good compared with public school | 5.7 |
| No private schools in the area | 5.1 |
| Was not accepted into preferred private school | 2.9 |
| Private school did not offer track that was of interest | 1.2 |
| Others | 67.3 |

ESC = educational service contracting.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Constraints on Track Offerings

Tracks and strands not offered due to limited funds for facilities and teaching personnel. Data show that information and communication technology (ICT) (51.6\%); science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) ( $50.3 \%$ ), and home economics ( $50.3 \%$ ) are often the tracks not offered by schools due to limited funds for facilities and teaching personnel (Table 11.a). Public schools often opt not to offer home economics (64\%) and ICT (59\%) tracks for this reason, while private schools do not offer STEM (53\%) and ICT (44\%) tracks for the same reason.

For schools in NCR, the lack of funds affects the offerings for the STEM (43\%), ICT (43\%) and industrial arts (42\%) tracks. In llocos Sur, what is affected is the provision of STEM (67\%) and home economics (63\%) tracks. Eastern Samar associates the non-offering of ICT (52\%) and home economics (51\%) tracks with the same reason, while schools in Davao del Sur reported being constrained from offering ICT (67\%) and home economics (61\%) tracks due to limited funding for adequate facilities and personnel.

Tracks and strands not offered due to the challenge of filling teaching posts. Aside from financial constraints, schools also face the challenge of filling teaching posts given the need to hire teachers with specializations for different SHS tracks. Among schools with this issue, 19\% do not offer the general academic strand (GAS), $18 \%$ skipped the accountancy, business, and management (ABM) strand, and 10\% opted not to offer STEM (Table 11.b). Among public schools, $14 \%$ shared that they do not offer ABM, $13 \%$ have opted out of GAS, and $12 \%$ do not offer humanities and social sciences (HUMSS). Private schools also attribute their failure to offer the pre-baccalaureate maritime strand (12\%), aside from GAS (24\%) and ABM (23\%), to the lack of qualified teachers with specializations.

The issue of hiring teachers for specialized subjects is felt differently across provinces. In NCR, ABM (30\%), GAS (26\%), and STEM (11\%) were not offered in schools due to the shortage of specialized teaching personnel (Table 11.c). In Ilocos Sur, schools were not able to teach prebaccalaureate maritime ( $17 \%$ ) and agri-fishery arts ( $11 \%$ ) due to the same problem. In Eastern Samar, GAS (27\%), HUMSS (19\%), and ABM (17\%) were not offered because of the same limitation. In Davao del Sur, schools shared that they opted not to open up STEM (19\%), ABM (18\%), and home economics (18\%) tracks due to limited teachers.

Table 11.a: Proportion of Schools Citing Limited Funds for Facilities and Teaching Personnel as a Main Reason Why School Does Not Offer a Specific Track or Strand, by Survey Area (\%)

| Track | NCR | Ilocos Sur | Eastern <br> Samar | Davao <br> del Sur | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 48.4 | 68.3 | 40.1 | 62.0 | 54.1 |
| Accountancy, business, and <br> management strand | 21.4 | 62.3 | 37.6 | 39.9 | 40.0 |
| Humanities and social sciences <br> strand | 30.8 | 51.5 | 34.0 | 49.5 | 41.0 |
| Science, technology, engineering, <br> and mathematics strand | 43.1 | 66.9 | 39.0 | 55.4 | 50.3 |
| General academic strand | 28.5 | 59.4 | 24.1 | 51.3 | 37.8 |
| Pre-baccalaureate maritime | 37.6 | 40.8 | 22.1 | 44.0 | 36.5 |
| Technical or vocational | 44.4 | 53.0 | 44.7 | 64.8 | 49.8 |
| Agri-fishery arts | 36.9 | 36.0 | 46.8 | 47.6 | 39.8 |
| Home economics | 40.0 | 62.9 | 51.0 | 60.7 | 50.3 |
| Information and communication <br> technology | 42.7 | 57.7 | 52.3 | 67.3 | 51.6 |
| Industrial arts | 41.6 | 40.0 | 41.7 | 55.1 | 43.0 |
| Technical-vocational <br> and livelihood maritime | 38.3 | 40.6 | 33.1 | 56.7 | 40.7 |
| Livelihood | 39.7 | 49.4 | 38.0 | 45.7 | 42.8 |
| Sports | 39.0 | 37.6 | 38.1 | 45.8 | 39.5 |
| Arts and design | 39.4 | 36.8 | 34.8 | 42.2 | 38.3 |

NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Table 11.b: Proportion of Schools with Available Funding that Cite Difficulty Finding Specialized Teaching Personnel as One of the Main Reasons for Not Offering a Specific Track or Strand, by School Type
(\%)

| Track | Public | Private | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 15.6 | 35.1 | 25.5 |
| Accountancy, business, and management strand | 14.3 | 22.7 | 18.1 |
| Humanities and social sciences strand | 12.1 | 5.5 | 9.6 |
| Science, technology, engineering, <br> and mathematics strand | 11.6 | 8.6 | 10.2 |
| General academic strand | 12.5 | 24.3 | 18.7 |
| Pre-baccalaureate maritime | 7.3 | 11.5 | 9.4 |

continued on next page

Table 11.b continued

| Track | Public | Private | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Technical or vocational | 12.0 | 7.6 | 9.8 |
| Agri-fishery arts | 7.7 | 1.7 | 4.5 |
| Home economics | 8.8 | 1.3 | 4.6 |
| Information and communication technology | 9.2 | 3.4 | 6.3 |
| Industrial arts | 7.3 | 1.6 | 4.2 |
| Technical-vocational and livelihood maritime | 6.9 | 1.8 | 4.3 |
| Livelihood | 8.4 | 4.7 | 6.5 |
| Sports | 7.7 | 8.0 | 7.9 |
| Arts and design | 7.7 | 8.3 | 8.0 |

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Table 11.c: Proportion of Schools with Available Funding that Cite Difficulty
Finding Specialized Teaching Personnel as One of the Main Reasons
for Not Offering a Specific Track or Strand, by Survey Area (\%)

| Track | NCR | Ilocos Sur | Eastern <br> Samar | Davao <br> del Sur | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Academic | 35.1 | 18.1 | 21.3 | 17.8 | 25.5 |
| Accountancy, business, and <br> management strand | 30.4 | 5.8 | 16.5 | 17.6 | 18.1 |
| Humanities and social sciences <br> strand | 7.0 | 1.5 | 19.1 | 17.4 | 9.6 |
| Science, technology, engineering, <br> and mathematics strand | 10.6 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 19.2 | 10.2 |
| General academic strand | 25.5 | 6.8 | 26.8 | 3.4 | 18.7 |
| Pre-baccalaureate maritime | 8.0 | 16.8 | 2.5 | 8.9 | 9.4 |
| Technical or vocational | 6.3 | 11.7 | 7.6 | 18.2 | 9.8 |
| Agri-fishery arts | 1.8 | 11.1 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 4.5 |
| Home economics | 1.3 | 6.2 | 2.8 | 17.9 | 4.6 |
| Information and communication <br> technology | 3.1 | 10.8 | 2.3 | 12.3 | 6.3 |
| Industrial arts | 2.1 | 6.6 | 2.9 | 8.1 | 4.2 |
| Technical-vocational <br> and livelihood maritime | 1.7 | 6.3 | 0.9 | 12.0 | 4.3 |
| Livelihood | 2.5 | 10.0 | 6.2 | 11.6 | 6.5 |
| Sports | 7.9 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 14.5 | 7.9 |
| Arts and design | 7.9 | 5.3 | 6.1 | 15.3 | 8.0 |

[^8]Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Tracks and strands not offered due to limited student demand. Another factor for the nonoffering of certain SHS tracks is the limited student demand for these tracks. Overall, $49 \%$ of schools cited the lack of demand from students in arts and design closely followed by TVL maritime and agri-fishery arts (both at 48\%). Figures 24.a and 24.b further disaggregate estimates by public and private schools. Among public schools, they decided not to offer pre-baccalaureate

Figure 24.a: Proportion of Public Schools Citing Limited Demand from Students as One of the Main Reasons Why School Does Not Offer a Specific Track or Strand (\%)


TVL = technical-vocational livelihood.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 24.b: Proportion of Private Schools Citing Limited Demand from Students as One of the Main Reasons Why School Does Not Offer a Specific Track or Strand (\%)


TVL = technical-vocational livelihood.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
maritime (50\%), arts and design (43\%), and TVL maritime (43\%) since they were not able to get enough students enrolling in these tracks. Private schools, on the other hand, opted not to open academic and industrial arts tracks (both at 57\%) and arts and design track (55\%) since there were very few students who expressed interest in the said tracks.

Impact of student interest on tracks offered. Student interest influences the schools' track offering. In NCR, schools noted the lack of demand for academic (58\%), HUMSS (57\%), and home economics (53\%) tracks as the reason for not offering these tracks.

In llocos Sur, schools decided not to offer arts and design (57\%), sports (56\%), and industrial arts (53.\%) tracks due to limited student demand.

About 60\% of schools in Eastern Samar did not offer pre-baccalaureate maritime, 50\% opted out of TVL maritime, and $44 \%$ skipped the arts and design track.

Davao del Sur also observed the limited demand for agri-fishery arts (48\%), pre-baccalaureate maritime (47\%), and GAS (45\%) and decided not to offer these tracks.

Differences in constraints confronted by public and private schools. Public and private schools face varying major constraints. The number of classrooms and adequacy of facilities is the major constraint among public schools (43\%), followed by the lack of teachers (29\%), and the application requirements to be able to offer different SHS tracks (18\%) (Table 12.a). Among private schools, limited student enrollment is considered as the top constraint (33\%), followed by the application requirements to be able to offer different SHS tracks (13\%), and number of classrooms and adequacy of facilities (13\%).

The number of classrooms and adequacy of facilities remains to be in the top three major constraints cited by the schools, followed by limited student enrollment and the lack of teachers (Table 12.b). NCR reported limited student enrollment (35\%), lack of classrooms and inadequacy of school facilities (22\%), and the lack of application requirements to offer SHS tracks (16\%) to be the major constraints for schools. In Eastern Samar, schools noted the lack of application requirements to be

Table 12.a: Proportion of Schools Citing a Specific Issue as a Major Constraint for the School, by School Type
(\%)

| Issue or Type of Constraint | Public | Private | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of classrooms and adequacy of facilities | 43.1 | 12.7 | 27.8 |
| Limited student enrollment | 8.5 | 32.9 | 20.8 |
| Lack of teachers | 28.6 | 7.5 | 18.0 |
| Application requirements to be able to offer different <br> SHS tracks | 17.5 | 13.2 | 15.3 |
| High student enrollment | 6.6 | 11.4 | 9.0 |
| Schedule of disbursement of subsidies for voucher <br> or ESC recipients | 3.0 | 4.1 | 3.6 |
| ESC application requirements | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| Others | 5.4 | 3.5 | 4.4 |

ESC = educational service contracting, SHS = senior high school.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Table 12.b: Proportion of Schools Citing a Specific Issue as a Major Constraint for the School, by Survey Area
(\%)

| Issue or Type of Constraint | NCR | Ilocos Sur | Eastern <br> Samar | Davao <br> del Sur | All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Limited student enrollment | 35.3 | 19.9 | - | 10.0 | 20.8 |
| Number of classrooms and <br> adequacy of facilities | 21.7 | 42.6 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 27.8 |
| Application requirements to be <br> able to offer different SHS tracks | 16.1 | 9.5 | 29.2 | 6.1 | 15.3 |
| High student enrollment | 15.4 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 8.0 | 9.0 |
| Lack of teachers | 5.1 | 42.2 | 11.4 | 18.2 | 18.0 |
| ESC application requirements | 4.9 | 0.4 | 3.3 | - | 2.7 |
| Schedule of disbursement <br> of subsidies for voucher <br> or ESC recipients |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others | 4.5 | 1.2 | 6.0 | 2.1 | 3.6 |

- = magnitude equals zero, ESC = educational service contracting, NCR = National Capital Region, SHS = senior high school.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
able to offer different SHS tracks as their key issue (29\%), followed by the need for more classrooms and better facilities ( $24 \%$ ) and more teachers ( $11 \%$ ). Ilocos Sur recorded the limited number of classrooms (43\%) as its top constraint while Davao del Sur cited inadequacy of facilities (24\%). llocos Sur also listed the lack of teachers (42\%) and limited student enrollment (20\%) as other key concerns, while schools from Davao del Sur shared that the lack of classrooms and facilities (24\%) as well as the limited number of teachers (18\%) are a major problem.


## School Transfers

Number of school transferees. Grade 11 has the highest proportion of transferees at $41 \%$, and an even larger percentage of transferees is expected the following school year (2017-2018) as 61\% of current grade 10 students have expressed plans of transferring schools the following school year (Figure 25).

More students from urban schools reported to have transferred or have plans to transfer schools compared with those in rural schools. On the other hand, the proportion of students reported to have transferred is higher among those in private schools, while the proportion is higher in public schools for those who are planning to transfer (Table 13).

Preferred track not offered in previous school is the most cited reason for transferring among grade 11 students, while for grades 9 and 10, it is mainly the parents' decision for reasons unknown to the student. When asked to cite the reason why they transferred schools, $54 \%$ of grade 11 students explained that their preferred track was not being offered in their previous school. On the other hand, $49 \%$ of grade 9 and $54 \%$ of grade 10 students, said that they did not know the parents' reason for transferring schools. Results also show the importance of students' or parents' preference for better school facilities and non-curricular

Figure 25: Distribution of Transferees and Would-Be Transferees for Each Grade Level
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Table 13: Distribution of Transferees and Would-Be Transferees, by Locality and School Type
(\%)

|  | Transferred from <br> another school | Plans to transfer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Location Type |  |  |
| Urban | 21.0 | 29.1 |
| Rural | 12.3 | 18.2 |
| School Type | 13.3 |  |
| Public | 29.8 | 30.9 |
| Private |  | 23.6 |

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
activities as this was the second most popular reason among transferees for all three grade levels. Financial consideration is also an issue as at least a third of transferees in grades 9 and 10 cited this among the reasons.

Furthermore, "parents' decision for reasons unknown to the student" and "preference for better facilities and non-curricular activities" are high on the list of reasons for transferring cited by students both in private and public schools, and urban and rural areas. However, "too high school-related expense" seems to be a more common issue for those in public schools and those in rural areas, compared to those private and urban schools. "Better facilities and non-curricular activities" is a more common reason for those in private schools. Among grade 11 transferees, "preferred track not being offered in previous school" is equally a concern both for those in public and private schools as well as for those in urban and rural areas.

## Table 14.a: Proportion of Students Citing a Specific Reason for Transferring from Another School, by Grade Level <br> (\%)

| Reason | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Top-up expenses (of previous school) are unexpectedly too high, <br> or the voucher amount, ESC subsidies, and/or other scholarship <br> subsidies are unexpectedly not enough to cover all fees in <br> previous school | 15.6 | 21.3 | 9.8 |
| Expected that school-related expenses (of previous school) are high <br> but can no longer afford | 32.6 | 34.8 | 14.0 |
| Cannot cope with academic requirements of previous school | 15.3 | 17.9 | 12.4 |
| Feeling of unbelongingness in previous school | 9.2 | 6.6 | 2.8 |
| Teachers in previous school did not have technical expertise | 4.4 | 15.0 | 7.0 |
| Previous school did not offer student's preferred track | 14.3 | 12.6 | 54.4 |
| Want to move to a school that offers better facilities and non- <br> Curriculum activities | 39.8 | 26.5 | 47.6 |
| Parents' or guardians' reason for wanting to move is unknown | 48.5 | 54.1 | 44.7 |
| Present school is near home | 22.9 | 21.4 | 18.9 |
| Other | 13.6 | 11.5 | 6.6 |

ESC = education service contracting.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Reasons for transferring schools according to students. Among those with plans to transfer, "preferred track not offered," "parents' decision for reasons unknown to the student," and "preference for better facilities and non-curricular activities" are the top reasons for planning to transfer. When asked to cite the three major reasons why they plan to transfer schools, grade 10 students identified "preferred track not offered" (59\%), "wants better facilities and noncurriculum activities" (47\%), and "parents' decision for reasons unknown to the student" (38\%)

## Table 14.b: Proportion of Students Citing a Specific Reason for Transferring from Another School, by Grade Level and School Type

(\%)

| Reason | Grade 9 |  | Grade 10 |  | Grade 11 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private |
| Top-up expenses (of previous school) are unexpectedly too high, or the voucher amount, ESC subsidies, and/or other scholarship subsidies are unexpectedly not enough to cover all fees in previous school | 14.9 | 17.6 | 22.8 | 16.6 | 10.1 | 9.7 |
| Expected that school-related expenses (of previous school) are high but can no longer afford | 37.8 | 18.6 | 41.7 | 14.0 | 26.9 | 10.4 |
| Cannot cope with academic requirements of previous school | 16.6 | 12.1 | 16.1 | 23.4 | 8.0 | 13.6 |

Table 14.b continued

|  | Grade 9 |  | Grade 10 |  | Grade 11 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private |
| Reason | 8.9 | 9.9 | 3.8 | 15.1 | 1.8 | 3.0 |
| Feeling of unbelongingness in <br> previous school | 1.5 | 12.2 | 15.7 | 13.0 | 12.7 | 5.5 |
| Teachers in previous school did not <br> have technical expertise | 12.7 | 18.4 | 13.1 | 11.1 | 54.8 | 54.2 |
| Previous school did not offer <br> student's preferred track | 22.7 | 58.9 | 19.3 | 48.0 | 39.4 | 49.8 |
| Want to move to a school that offers <br> better facilities and non-curriculum <br> activities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parents' or guardians' reason for <br> wanting to move is unknown | 45.2 | 57.6 | 51.4 | 62.1 | 36.0 | 47.0 |
| Present school is near home | 28.0 | 9.4 | 24.6 | 12.0 | 8.4 | 21.8 |
| Other | 15.6 | 8.2 | 13.9 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 7.1 |

ESC = education service contracting.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Table 14.c: Proportion of Students Identifying Specific Reasons for Transferring from Another School, by Grade Level and Locality

|  | Grade 9 |  | Grade 10 |  | Grade 11 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reason | Rrban | Rural | Urban | Rural | Urban |
| Top-up expenses (of previous school) <br> are unexpectedly too high, or the voucher <br> amount, ESC subsidies, and/or other <br> scholarship subsidies are unexpectedly not <br> enough to cover all fees in previous school | 16.0 | 12.4 | 22.1 | 12.3 | 8.3 | 33.9 |
| Expected that school-related expenses <br> (of previous school) are high but can no <br> longer afford | 31.8 | 40.2 | 33.1 | 54.5 | 12.9 | 31.4 |
| Cannot cope with academic requirements <br> of previous school | 13.4 | 33.1 | 19.3 | 2.0 | 12.0 | 19.4 |
| Feeling of unbelongingness in previous <br> school | 8.2 | 18.6 | 5.9 | 15.6 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| Teachers in previous school did not have <br> technical expertise | 3.7 | 10.9 | 15.6 | 8.8 | 6.9 | 9.7 |
| Previous school did not offer student's <br> preferred track | 15.2 | 5.5 | 11.8 | 21.2 | 54.8 | 46.7 |
| Want to move to a school that offers better <br> facilities and non-curriculum activities | 39.8 | 39.7 | 27.0 | 20.4 | 47.8 | 44.0 |
| Parents' or guardians' reason for wanting to <br> move is unknown | 47.5 | 57.4 | 54.1 | 53.7 | 44.6 | 45.7 |
| Present school is near home | 23.8 | 14.8 | 22.7 | 7.3 | 19.9 | 2.1 |
| Other | 13.5 | 14.3 | 11.7 | 8.8 | 6.4 | 10.3 |

ESC = education service contracting.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Table 15.a: Proportion of Students Identifying Specific Reasons for Transferring to Another School, by Grade Level

(\%)

| Reason | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Top-up expenses (of previous school) are unexpectedly <br> too high, or the voucher amount, ESC subsidies, and/or other <br> scholarship subsidies are unexpectedly not enough to cover <br> all fees in previous school | 10.4 | 13.7 | 14.9 |
| Expected that school-related expenses (of previous school) <br> are high but can no longer afford | 16.1 | 11.1 | 20.1 |
| Cannot cope with academic requirements of current school | 15.8 | 11.1 | 19.1 |
| Feeling of unbelongingness in current school | 18.9 | 11.9 | 9.1 |
| Teachers in current school do not have technical expertise | 8.9 | 10.5 | 21.9 |
| Current school does not offer student's preferred track | 32.2 | 58.5 | 32.3 |
| Want to move to a school that offers better facilities and <br> non-curriculum activities | 30.6 | 46.6 | 25.0 |
| Parents' or guardians' want to move but their reasons are <br> unknown | 49.4 | 37.5 | 21.3 |
| Other | 15.2 | 18.9 | 15.3 |

ESC = education service contracting.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
among the reasons, while percentages for grade 9 are $32 \%$, $28 \%$ for grade 10 , and $35 \%$ for grade 11 students. It is important to highlight that the majority of grades 9 and 11 students in rural areas cited parents' decision, while the share in urban areas is less than half.

Differences between parents' and students' reported reasons for transferring schools. When asked for their reasons for transferring schools, $29 \%$ of students reported the same reasons as parents. Of these reported matched responses, household issues (which typically involved separation of parents and sickness in the family) had the largest proportion at $69 \%$, followed by location (the current school being too far from home as a common reason) with $44 \%$, and the current school not offering the preferred track (which involved some responses highlighting that the current school is not offering SHS ) with $39 \%$. It is also noteworthy to emphasize the response choices that were available but had little or no match between student and parent responses. Specifically, students did not agree with parent responses in terms of their belongingness and inability to cope with academic requirements.

As for the main reasons of students with plans of transferring, $34 \%$ reported the same reasons as parents. About $68 \%$ had to do with the current school not offering the preferred track. The preference for a school with better facilities (44\%) and location (18\%) are the other reasons that students and parents agree on. It is also interesting to focus on the minimal agreement between students and parents when it came to reasons relating to belongingness (4\%), new environment (4\%), and the inability to cope with academic requirements (4\%).

Table 15.b: Proportion of Students Identifying Specific Reasons for Transferring to Another School, by Grade Level and Locality
(\%)

| Reason | Grade 9 |  | Grade 10 |  | Grade 11 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural | Urban | Rural |
| Top-up expenses (of previous school) are unexpectedly too high, or the voucher amount, ESC subsidies, and/or other scholarship subsidies are unexpectedly not enough to cover all fees in previous school | 10.7 | 7.9 | 14.2 | 7.6 | 15.1 | 10.2 |
| Expected that school-related expenses (of previous school) are high but can no longer afford | 15.8 | 18.9 | 11.1 | 10.0 | 20.3 | 16.0 |
| Cannot cope with academic requirements of current school | 15.9 | 14.9 | 10.6 | 18.1 | 19.4 | 11.9 |
| Feeling of unbelongingness in current school | 18.3 | 23.7 | 11.3 | 19.7 | 9.1 | 10.2 |
| Teachers in current school do not have technical expertise | 8.5 | 12.2 | 10.3 | 12.8 | 22.3 | 13.1 |
| Current school does not offer student's preferred track | 31.7 | 36.5 | 58.0 | 64.9 | 32.7 | 24.0 |
| Want to move to a school that offers better facilities and non-curriculum activities | 30.3 | 33.2 | 45.7 | 59.3 | 22.6 | 72.8 |
| Parents' or guardians' want to move but their reasons are unknown | 45.7 | 79.2 | 37.0 | 44.2 | 19.5 | 56.8 |
| Other | 17.1 | - | 19.9 | 6.3 | 15.7 | 7.9 |

- = magnitude equals zero, ESC = education service contracting.

Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Unexpected Events Experienced by Households

Impact of unexpected events on households' education-related decisions. About 45\% of sampled households reported that unexpected events affected their education-related decisions. The effect of an unexpected event seems to be most apparent in Eastern Samar (86\%), which could be attributed to a relatively recent calamity, followed by Davao del Sur (49\%), NCR (42\%), and llocos Sur (29\%) (Figure 26). In terms of locality, generally, more rural households ( $56 \%$ ) than urban households ( $43 \%$ ) report that unexpected events affected education-related decisions. This trend applies to Davao del Sur ( $51 \%$ rural vs. $47 \%$ urban) and Ilocos Sur ( $38 \%$ rural vs. $14 \%$ urban) as well. In Eastern Samar, while both rural and urban households posted proportions greater than $80 \%$, the proportion of urban households ( $89 \%$ ) is slightly higher than that of rural households ( $83 \%$ ). ${ }^{10}$

[^9]Figure 26: Proportion of Households Reporting That an Unexpected Event Affected Education-Related Decisions, by Survey Area
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Similarly, $46 \%$ of households state that unexpected events will continue to affect educationrelated decisions in the following year. The response is still highest for Eastern Samar with 54\% of households reporting the persistence of unexpected events in education-related decisions for the next year, followed by NCR (47\%), Davao del Sur (39\%), and Ilocos Sur (17\%) (Figure 27). Overall, there does not seem to be much difference between rural and urban households regarding whether or not unexpected events will still affect education-related decisions for Eastern Samar

Figure 27: Proportion of Households Reporting That an Unexpected Event Will Still Affect Education-Related Decisions in the Following Year, by Survey Area (\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
households. For Davao del Sur and llocos Sur, more rural households believe that unexpected events will still affect decisions in the following year.

## Insights from the Currently Employed

Perceived usefulness of formal education to current work. Overall, the majority of adult household respondents find their formal education to be either useful or very useful in their current primary work. In particular, about 26\% find it very useful and 39\% find it useful, while only a small portion (14\%) think it is not useful at all (Figure 28). The same trend applies across locality and areas except in Eastern Samar, where more workers find their formal education to be very useful in their current primary work (40\%).

Many household respondents think they are overqualified for their current job functions, with percentages ranging from $46 \%$ to $58 \%$ across provinces (Figure 29).

On the other hand, about a quarter of workers feel they are educationally underqualified for their current job (Figure 30). This is lowest in Ilocos Sur (21\%), while the rest of the areas have shares of more than $25 \%$.

On average, roughly 30\% of workers are in their desired career (Figure 31). This is highest in Davao del Sur (34\%) and lowest in Eastern Samar (22\%).

The majority of those with higher educational attainment reported finding themselves in a career they desire. On average, only 33\% of technical and vocational education and training graduates and $42 \%$ of college graduates find themselves in their desired career, while $77 \%$ of postgraduate graduates claim that their current work is the career they desire (Figure 32). The same pattern

Figure 28: Households' Assessment of Usefulness of Formal Education in Current Primary Work
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 29: Proportion of Workers Who Think Their Educational Attainment Exceeds the Minimum Required for Their Current Job, by Survey Area and Locality (\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 30: Proportion of Workers Who Think Their Educational Attainment is Below the Minimum Level for Their Current Job, by Survey Area (\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 31: Proportion of Workers Citing Their Current Work Is Their Desired Career, by Survey Area
(\%)


NCR = National Capital Region.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

Figure 32: Proportion of Workers Citing Their Current Work Is Their Desired Career, by Survey Area and Highest Educational Attainment (\%)


NCR = National Capital Region, TVET = technical and vocational education and training.
Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.
can be observed in all areas except llocos Sur, where a large share of technical and vocational education and training graduates ( $79 \%$ ) reported being in their desired career. Also noteworthy is that all postgraduates in Eastern Samar believe that they are in their desired career.

Many workers in high-level jobs claim that they are in their desired career. Professionals have a significantly higher share of such workers (almost two-thirds) compared with managers, technicians and associate professionals, and members of the armed forces. The same trend is true across areas except for Eastern Samar, where a tiny share of clerical support workers and those in the armed forces claimed being in their desired career. The unusually large share (71\%) of armed forces members in Davao del Sur who say that they are in their desired career is also worth noting.

About two in five workers (41\%) in the top income quintile also reported being in careers they desire (Figure 33). Workers in the upper $40 \%$ of annual income distribution have higher shares of workers in their desired career than those in the lower 60\%.

Figure 33: Proportion of Workers Citing Their Current Work Is Their Desired Career, by Income Quintile
(\%)


Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

## Summary

The introduction of the Senior High School program in the Philippines is the latest in a series of reform initiatives comprising the multiphase implementation of the K to 12 Basic Education Program, which is meant to better prepare graduates for both postsecondary education and employment. SHS requires students and their families to new and make additional decisions about educational investment and potential career planning. These decisions include which SHS tracks to take and they must be considered 2 years before the completion of basic education. Although the CGPs for SHS have been instituted to help guide students and their families through this process, there is a need to look more closely and systematically at how such critical educational decisions, which can impact long-term labor market outcomes in the Philippines, are made.

These considerations were explored through the Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey (YEILMOS), conducted by ADB and DepEd. It surveyed a total of 238 schools, 3,172 students, and 2,819 households to gather baseline data on factors that influence youth education investment decisions and career expectations, and to explore how such choices affect subsequent labor market outcomes.

The aim of the YEILMOS was to inform the policy and program initiatives that will help students and their families make informed educational decisions and set out effective career plans, through CGPs for SHS. This section therefore highlights selected survey findings and puts forward related policy implications grouped into the following clusters: (i) insights from those currently employed, (ii) factors that students and their families take into account when making educational investment and career planning decisions, (iii) primary sources of information when making educational investment and career planning decisions, and (iv) other contextual considerations and resource complementarity.

The first cluster summarizes survey findings about the working population's employment outcomes and how they are aligned with the educational investments made by those currently employed. The extend to which their education investments are reciprocated with commensurate socioeconomic returns could be incorporated into the design of programs that aim to better align educational investment with employment outcomes for the younger generation. The second and third clusters directly answer the study's main research questions on factors that shape educational investment and career planning decisions and sources of career information. These topics provide information on whether educational and career planning decisions are well-informed, while also suggesting ways to ensure that there is a seamless flow of adequate information that can better inform such decisions. The fourth cluster addresses constraints that schools, students, and their families confront when making educational and career decisions. Identifying bottlenecks and how they could be addressed will place Filipino youths and their families in a good position to make optimal decisions with the support of schools.

## Insights from Currently Employed Adults

- Among those currently employed, many adults interviewed as part of the YEILMOS indicated that their education was at least useful in their current employment, but that they were also overqualified for their current jobs. This points to a misalignment of credentials and jobs. It is clear that higher education is important to future employment. However, the quality of jobs offered in the Philippines also needs to be examined. Matching the quality, level, and nature of education to the jobs available, both in the present day and in the future, requires a more nuanced policy that ideally involves all sectors of society. Employers, in particular, should be involved in crafting qualification standards and career guidance information to deliver better labor market outcomes. ${ }^{11}$
- Those with higher education and earning higher incomes, perhaps not surprisingly report higher job satisfaction and better alignment of credentials to job description. These people should be further surveyed so that lessons can be derived from their experiences, particularly in the ways they leverage their education, their incomes, and presumably their social networks to access better employment opportunities.


## Considerations in Making Educational Investment and Career Planning Decisions

- ManySHS students in the Philippines opt to take the academic track, with the expectation of proceeding to college after high school. Parents share the same expectations for choosing tracks and planning for college. Policy initiatives should endeavor to meet student and parental expectations by ensuring access to relevant information on track choices and postsecondary options. Such policy initiatives should aim to shift mindsets and be able to demonstrate to students and their parents the viability of tracks other than the academic one. They should support alternative tracks and postsecondary options by providing information on economic trends and labor market outcomes.
- In terms of employment, traditional professions are still most desired by both parents and students. Many parents also expect their children to stay in the city and be earning above the minimum wage by the age of 30 . These expectations need to be aligned with recent labor market trends of automation, artificial intelligence, rapid innovation, job mobility, and government development targets. The government must design and implement policy initiatives that explore how these expectations, particularly those of the parents, can be better informed.
- Personal attributes and skills, availability of educational options, household issues, and financial considerations are usually cited as the reasons for choosing an SHS track, a college major, or a school. While schools and CGPs can influence decisions related to personal attributes and skills, they may have difficulty addressing the other three reasons, which are all driven by external factors. However, this should not preclude the implementation of policy initiatives that meet these macroeconomic considerations. Career guidance activities should give more emphasis on financial aid opportunities and educational options beyond SHS. Parental involvement in career guidance should be increased to minimize household issues that prevent students from successfully transitioning to further education or desired careers.

[^10]- Economic shocks and natural disasters are reported to continually affect education decisions. Resilience initiatives therefore need to be explored. As in the case of Eastern Samar, these initiatives cannot be successfully implemented by one entity alone and require a whole-of-society approach.


## Primary Sources of Information When Making Educational Investment and Career Planning Decisions

- Immediate family members and social circles are frequently cited by students and parents as the main influencers when discussing education choices and career planning. For schools, the primary sources of information on further education are the universities and/or tertiary education institutions. Family members, especially parents, and social circles therefore need to be factored into career guidance activities. Schools, meanwhile, need to build strong partnerships with tertiary institutions and share information on accessibility and standards to help students transition to their desired postsecondary option.
- When asked about what information they received (or hoped to receive) when helping to choose careers for their children, parents cited information on courses or occupations that matched the skills and interests of their children. This points to a need for policy initiatives that would help broaden the minds of parents by offering information that takes into account labor market trends and possible future shifts in employment demand.
- While the National Career Assessment Examination is seen as an important and objective tool to help students identify their true skills and interests, it is not used optimally. The benefits of the examination should be given more prominence and schools should endeavor to adequately explain its results to students, thereby providing a broader perspective on positive personal attributes and career prospects.
- In CGPs, details on postsecondary outcomes (e.g., tertiary education options or employment trends) and financial aid are often sidelined in favor of information based on personal aspirations or preferences. Clearly, sound knowledge of tertiary education and/or future jobs could help guide students in their choice of SHS tracks. As such, policy initiatives should balance and respond to both presently held aspirations and future labor market demand. Information on financial aid, which is cited as an important consideration in plans to pursue postsecondary education, should be widely disseminated and made easily available.
- Career guidance activities that require significant resources and access to employers or industry groups are more readily available in private and urban schools. Policy initiatives should endeavor to address these resource shortfalls and access gaps to ensure that public and rural schools are not left behind.


## Other Contextual Considerations and Resource Complementarity

- Throughout the Philippines, financial aid opportunities for education, such as the educational-service-contracting schools and vouchers, are not accessed by students because of a lack of information or perceived high barriers. It is evident that these informational gaps need to be bridged. Policy measures, such as informing parents
of actual costs of college and helping them with the application process for financial aid, have improved enrollment levels and longevity of schooling in other countries and should be explored in the Philippines.
- Many students cite the availability of certain SHS tracks as the primary reason for transferring schools. However, since changing schools could be detrimental to a student's welfare by disrupting his or her momentum and/or diminishing his or her sense of belonging, school transfers should be carefully examined. Ideally, schools should endeavor to provide as much variety as possible in the SHS tracks offered to accommodate their students. To maximize resources, however, the government should pilot initiatives that explore resource complementarity between and among public and private and rural and urban schools. One such initiative is the clustering of schools to ensure wide reach and high quality. Additionally, support for transferring students should also be strengthened to boost educational continuity and ensure a sense of belonging.
- A school's ability to offer different SHS tracks is affected by various factors such as lack of funds, difficulty in finding specialized teaching personnel, limited student demand, etc. Survey data demonstrate a reduced ability to offer all tracks for public schools compared to private schools, and for rural schools compared to urban schools. There is a need to develop policies for complementarity and resource-sharing between school types and localities to ensure that choice is maximized for all students. The first step is to provide better data on student demand and mobility as well as teaching personnel requirements, so that adequate funds can be allocated across the education system.


## Potential Areas for Future Research

The YEILMOS was designed to collect baseline information on factors that shape youth education investment decisions and career expectations. It is intended to provide well-founded input for education policy, particularly efforts to improve existing CGPs. Through follow-up data collection activities, this objective may be expanded to examine how the implementation of the K to 12 Basic Education Program can be further enhanced. For instance, tracking baseline survey respondents after they complete SHS, will allow researchers to gauge how SHS track preferences affect student performance in postsecondary education. Do college students who took the academic track in SHS tend to perform better than those who took nonacademic tracks? Are those who took nonacademic tracks any better equipped with practical skills that increase their likelihood of getting jobs right after SHS? With recent statistics suggesting that a non-trivial number of Filipino students drop out of secondary school before completing it, tracking of students over time and monitoring drop-out behavior may be especially important in helping future SHS students to choose tracks or schools that better match their preferences, which may ultimately reduce drop-out rates. In addition, future data-collection activities may test different models for providing career guidance information. Results from such an analytical exercise may be used to develop ways to standardize and consistently deliver information that is relevant depending on each student's interests, skills, and employment aspirations as well as desired labor market outcomes for the Philippines. Furthermore, data-collection activities may be designed to test how programs that provide financial assistance to students and their families evolve over time as well as exploring how such changes to such programs affect education outcomes and fulfill labor market demand.
SECTION A: CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL

|  1. How many teachers teach for each of the following grades?   <br>  GRADE9  GRADE 10 |
| :--- |
| PERMANENT/DepEd-funded |
| TEMPORARY/LGU-funded |



| 9a. Which tracks and strands does your school offer? (Please tick the programs that your school offers) | 9b. For each track and strand that your school offers, kindly provide the number of teachers available for each grade |  |  | 9c. How many teachers have Industry Experience ( $>=3$ years professional experience - TVET Only)? |  |  | 9d. Please tick the main reasons why your school does not offer this track? |  |  | 9e. If you think that limited funding is one of the main reasons why your school does not currently offer this track / strand, approximately how much additional funding (per school year) you think is needed for your school to be able to offer this track? | 9f. If you think that lack of specialized teachers is one of the main reasons why your school does not currently offer this track/ strand, approximately how many additional specialized teaching personnel you think are needed for your schoo o be able to offer this track? | 9g. If you think that limited demand from students is one of the main reasons why your school does not currently offer this track/ strand, approximately how many students you think are needed for your school to be able to offer this track? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 |  | Funds are available but cannot find enough specialized teaching personnel for this track/ | Limited demand from students |  |  |  |
| ACADEMIC [] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| ACCOUNTANCY, BUSINESS and MANAGEMENT(ABM) STRAND [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| HUMANITIES and SOCIAL SCIENCE (HUMSS) STRAND [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| SCIENCE,TECHNOLOGY and ENGINEERING and MATHEMATICS(STEM) STRAND [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| GENERALACADEMICSTRAND [] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| PRE-BACCALAUREATEMARITIME [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| TECHNICAL/VOCATIONAL [] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| AGRI-FISHERY ARTS [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| HOMEECONOMICS [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY(ICT) [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| INDUSTRIALARTS [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| TVLMARITIME [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| LIVELIHOOD [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| SPORTS [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| ARTS AND DESIGN [ ] |  |  |  |  |  |  | [] | [] | [] |  |  |  |
| OTHER, SPECIFY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 10. How often is the general curriculum updated by the school? | 11. What resources are used for updating the curriculum (check all that apply) | 12. How often is the TVET curriculum updated by the school? | 13. What resources are used for updating the TVET curriculum (check all that apply) | 14. How are students allocated into different section? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Never } \\ & 2=\text { When DepEd standards are updated } \\ & 3=\text { Yearly } \end{aligned}$ | $1=$ Formal consultations with teachers <br> $2=$ DepEd government educational practice material <br> $3=$ International educational practice material <br> 4 = Outside advisors <br> $5=$ Consultation with private sector | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Never } \\ & 2=\text { When DepEd standards are } \\ & \text { updated } \\ & 3=\text { Yearly } \end{aligned}$ | $1=$ Formal consultations with teachers <br> $2=$ National educational practice material <br> $3=$ International educational practice material <br> $4=$ Outside advisors <br> $5=$ Consultation with private sector industry | $1=$ Students are randomly allocated <br> $2=$ According to date of enrollment (first come, first serve basis) <br> $3=$ According to academic aptitude <br> 4 = Students who are ESC grantees / voucher recipients are grouped in a separate section |


| Grade | 15. Number of shifts this school operates under? | 16. What time does school start for each of the shifts | 17. What time does school end for each of the shifts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade 9 |  | Shift 1 <br> Shift 2 <br> Shift 3 <br> Shift 4 | Shift 1 <br> Shift 2 <br> Shift 3 <br> Shift 4 |
| Grade 10 |  | Shift 1 <br> Shift 2 <br> Shift 3 <br> Shift 4 | Shift 1 <br> Shift 2 <br> Shift 3 <br> Shift 4 |
| Grade 11 |  | Shift 1 <br> Shift 2 <br> Shift 3 <br> Shift 4 | Shift 1 <br> Shift 2 <br> Shift 3 <br> Shift 4 |
| Grade 12 |  | Shift 1 <br> Shift 2 <br> Shift 3 <br> Shift 4 | Shift 1 <br> Shift 2 <br> Shift 3 <br> Shift 4 |


|  | 18. How far is this school from |  |  |  | 19. Does your school face any constraints with the following? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \|[Record distance in Kilometers] |  |  |  |  | $1=$ No constraint <br> $2=$ Minor Constraint <br> $3=$ Moderate Constraint <br> $4=$ Major Constrain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Closest market | Closest cinema hall | Closest college or university | Closest public transportation terminal | Closest business district | Lack of Teachers | Limited <br> Student Enrollment | High <br> Student <br> Enrollment | Number of classrooms and adequacy of facilities | Schedule of disbursement of subsidies for voucher/ESC recipients | ESC <br> Application Requirements | Application Requirements to be able to offer different SHS tracks | Other Specify) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 20. Approximately, how many public <br> secondary schools are within 45 minutes of <br> driving distance from this school (via most <br> common vehicle used to commute in this <br> area)? | 21. How many public secondary schools <br> within 45 minutes of driving distance offer <br> the same courses as your school, if at all? | 22. Approximately, how many private <br> secondary schools are within 45 minutes <br> of driving distance from this school? | 23. How many private secondary <br> schools within 45 minutes of driving <br> distance offer the same courses, if at <br> all? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |

SECTION B: SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

| Q1. Is there a Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) for this school? $\begin{aligned} & 1=\mathrm{Yes} \\ & 2=\mathrm{No}>\mathrm{Q}_{3} \end{aligned}$ | Q2. How often does the PTA meet? <br> $1=$ More than once a month <br> 2 = Once a month <br> 3 = Once per term <br> 4 = Once every six months <br> 5 = Once a year <br> $6=$ Never | Q3. How often are staff meetings held between you and teachers of the school? <br> $1=$ More than once a month <br> $2=$ Once a month <br> 3 = Once per term <br> 4 = Once every six months <br> 5 = Once a year <br> 6 = Never | Q4. How often is the school usually visited by an official from DepEd? <br> $1=$ More than once a month <br> 2 = Once a month <br> 3 = Once per term <br> 4 = Once every six months <br> 5 = Once a year <br> $6=$ Never |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

Q5. What are the criteria for hiring teachers? (Rank all that apply)
$1=$ Passed the licensure exam
$2=$ Completed Bachelor's in Education
3 = Industry experience
4 = Recommendation
Rank 1: --------------

Rank 3:
Q6. What are the five issues most commonly raised during the parent meetings? Identify at most five issues.

SECTION C: SCHOOL FINANCES

| Q1. Does this school collect any school fees from the parents? | Q2a. How much are the school fees (tuition) for a student (PHP) for a full-academic year? |  |  | Q2a. On top of the school fees, on the average, how much are the other expenses that students need to incur throughout the full-academic year (books, school supplies, uniform, study trips, etc)? |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1=\mathrm{Yes} \\ & 2=\mathrm{No}>\mathrm{Q}_{3} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GRADE 9 | GRADE 10 | GRADE 11 | GRADE 9 | GRADE 10 | GRADE 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Q7. For PRIVATE schools only: What is the } \\ \text { average teacher wage per month of full-time } \\ \text { teachers at the following levels? (if public } \\ \text { school skip to next module) }\end{array}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Entry level } \\ \text { Mid-level } \\ \text { Supervisor/Head teacher }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |

SECTION D: AUTONOMY IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT (for PRIVATE SCHOOLS only)

| Q1. Does the school set criteria for student admissions?$\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Yes } \\ & 2=\text { No (Skip to Q3) } \end{aligned}$ | Q2. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the most important), how important are the following criteria for admission? |  | Q3. To offer a completely new class (e.g. Art, photography) what agreement would the principal or head of academics need? (Encircle all that apply) | Q4. To expand school size in terms of number of students (e.g. $>5 \%$ ) what agreement would the principal/administrator need? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 = Academic | - |  |  |
|  | Performance in entrance test |  | $1=$ Board of Trustees <br> 2 = School administration | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Board of trustees } \\ & 2=\text { School administration } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 2 = Extracurricular activities/leadership |  | 3 = Parents' association <br> 4 = DepEd/ Outside Authority <br> 5 = Other, please specify | 3 = School or SGC and outside authority |
|  | 3 = Quota on maximum no. of students/school capacity |  | ----- | $5=$ Other, please specify $\qquad$ |
|  | 4 = Sibling attendance |  |  |  |
|  | 5 = Recommendation from reputable group |  |  |  |
|  | 6 = Capacity to pay school fees |  |  |  |


| Q5. Who decides to promote or reward a teacher for good performance? | Q6. What type of indicators does the school systematically collect? (multiple responses allowed) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| performance? $1 \text { = Board of trustees }$ | Student satisfaction | Performance on standardized tests | Dropout rates of students | Teacher/staff satisfaction | Student Attendance Rates |
| administration <br> 3 = School or SGC and outside authority <br> 4 = Outside Authority | $1=$ Do not collect <br> $2=$ Collect through ad hoc interviews <br> $3=$ Collect systematically through focused questionnaire (once year) $4=$ Collect at least twice a year | 1 = Do not collect <br> $2=$ Collect at end of year only <br> $3=$ Collect bi-annually <br> 4 = Collect quarterly <br> $5=$ Collect monthly | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Do not collect } \\ & 2=\text { Collect at end of year } \\ & \text { only } \\ & 3=\text { Collect bi-annually } \\ & 4=\text { Collect quarterly } \\ & 5=\text { Collect monthly } \end{aligned}$ | $1=$ Do not collect <br> $2=$ Collect through ad hoc interviews <br> 3 = Collect systematically through focused questionnaire (once year) $4=$ Collect at least twice a year | $1=$ Do not collect <br> $2=$ Collect through ad hoc interviews <br> 3 = Collect systematically through focused questionnaire (once year) $4=$ Collect at least twice a year |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^11]| Q7. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the most important), rank the targets that the school set in terms of evaluating its overall performance. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student satisfaction | Performance on school standardized test | Dropout rates of students | Teacher/staff satisfaction | Attendance rate | Other (specify) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |




SECTION E: CHARACTERISTICS OF PRINCIPAL

| 1. Gender <br> $1=$ Male <br> 2 = Female | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2. Age (in years) } \\ & \text { PUT '99' IF DONT KNOW } \end{aligned}$ | 3. Do you belong to a teacher's union?$\begin{aligned} & 1=\mathrm{Yes} \\ & 2=\mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | 4. How long have you been in this position in this school? |  | 5. How long did you work as a teacher in this school before taking this position? |  | 6. How long did you work as a teacher in total before taking this position? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | YEARS | MONTHS | YEARS | MONTHS | YEARS | MONTHS |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 7. What was your main reason for joining this school when you first moved here? | 8. What is the highest level of schooling that you have completed? | 9. Have you received any training on career guidance counselling? | 10. How frequently have you received such training? | 11. Name the top 3 most frequent training providers. | 12. Have you ever received any kind of training on school management or administration for the past 5 years? | 13. How frequently have you received such training? | 14. Name the top 3 most frequent training providers. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1=$ Routine application of posting and transfer rules (including rebalancing of load) <br> $2=$ Political interference/ pressure <br> $3=$ Personal request <br> $4=$ Punishment <br> $5=$ Strained personal relations at | $1=$ Primary School <br> $2=$ Secondary School <br> 3 = High School Diploma <br> $4=$ Bachelors degree or equivalent <br> $5=$ Master's degree <br> $6=$ Ph.D. and above <br> $7=$ Other, specify |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Quarterly } \\ & 2=\text { Twice a year } \\ & 3=\text { Yearly } \\ & 4=\text { Bi-annual } \\ & 5=\text { Once or twice during the } \\ & \text { past } 5 \text { years } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Quarterly } \\ & 2=\text { Twice a year } \\ & 3=\text { Yearly } \\ & 4=\text { Bi-annual } \\ & 5=\text { Once or twice during the } \end{aligned}$ $\text { past } 5 \text { years }$ |  |
| $7=$ Other (specify) |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 1-\mathrm{Yes} \\ 2-\mathrm{No} \text { (skip to } \\ \mathrm{Q}_{12} \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { - Yes } \\ & 2-\mathrm{No} \text { (skip to Q15) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 15. Do you have grade-level coordinators at your school? | 16. If yes, how often do you meet with grade-level coordinators or teachers in grades 9-11 individually to talk about their performance? | 17. How often do you meet with students in grades 9-11 individually or in a group to talk about their performance? | 18. How often do you meet with parents as a group? | 19. What action did you take the last time a teacher was absent for an extended period without official clearance? | 20. On average, how many hours per week do you spend on the following schoolrelated activities? |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Yes } \\ & 2=\text { No }>17 \end{aligned}$ | $1=$ More than once a month <br> $2=$ Once a month <br> 3 = Once every 3 months <br> 4 = Once every six months <br> 5 = Once a year <br> $6=$ Never | $1=$ More than once a month <br> $2=$ Once a month <br> $3=$ Once every 3 months <br> $4=$ Once every six months <br> $5=$ Once a year <br> $6=$ Never | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { More than once a month } \\ & 2=\text { Once a month } \\ & 3=\text { Once every } 3 \text { months } \\ & 4=\text { Once every six months } \\ & 5=\text { Once a year } \\ & 6=\text { Never } \end{aligned}$ | ENCIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { No action } \\ & 2=\text { Informal query } \\ & 3=\text { Oral warning } \\ & 4=\text { Written warning (memo) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Superintendent <br> $6=$ Termination | Teaching | Supervising/ Supporting Teachers | Supervising/ Supporting Students | Administrative Tasks (e.g., meetings) | Attending <br> Trainings | Other (specify) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SECTION F: TEACHER INCENTIVES AND CAREER GUIDANCE

| STUDENTS'ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TEACHER PEER REVIEW OF LESSON PLANS, ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |  |
| PRINCIPAL OR SENIOR STAFF OBSERVATION OF LESSONS | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |  |
| OBSERVATION OF LESSONS | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |  |
| PERFORMANCEAPPRAISAL OF TEACHERS (PAST) | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |  |
| PERFORMANCE BASED BONUS PROGRAM (PBB) | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |  |
| OTHER SPECIFY: | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |  |

Q2. On a scale of the 1 to 5 (1 being the most important and frequently used), rank the following methods adopted by your school to incentivize teachers who perform well at their job. (Should an option not apply to your school, enter 99)
PROMOTION
SALARY INCREASE
FINANCIAL BONUS OR OTHER MONETARY REWARD

| PROMOTION |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SALARY INCREASE |  |
| FINANCIAL BONUS OR OTHER MONETARY REWARD |  |
| OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES |  |
| PUBLIC RECOGNITION (AT AN ASSEMBLY OR OTHER FORUM) |  |
| OTHER SPECIFY: |  |


| Question 3 applies only to PRIVATE schools (skip to Q4 if not a private school) |
| :--- |
| Q3. For the following tasks, tick the one with the most considerable responsibility. <br> Should an option not apply to your school, enter "-1". School <br> administration Principal  <br> Hiring teachers  Teachers  <br> Laying off teachers    <br> Establishing salaries of teachers    <br> Determining salary increases of teachers    <br> Formulating school budget    <br> Establishing student disciplinary policies    <br> Approving students for admission    <br> Choice of textbooks    <br> Determining course content    <br> Deciding what courses are offered    <br> Deciding whether Grade 11 and 12 should be offered at this school    |

Q4. Indicate in column A the number of full-time guidance counselors/advocates assigned to high school students at your school. Of those assigned, indicate in column B the number of counselors that are certified high school guidance counselors. (Complete each row. If none, write "o".)

|  | A. Number <br> Assigned | B. Of those assigned, number professionally certified as guidance counselors |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a. Guidance counselors* |  |  |
| b. Guidance "career" advocates** |  |  |

*     - School personnel with guidance counselor plantilla
** - School personnel and upperclassman engaged in career advocacy


## ACTIVITY


( 1 -YES, 2 -NO) NO
NO
NO
NO
NO
NO
$-2-2$ $\underset{\succ}{\sim} \underset{\succ}{\sim} \underset{\succ}{\underset{\sim}{\mu}} \underset{\succ}{\underset{\sim}{\mu}}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { YES } & 1 \\ \text { YES } & 1\end{array}$
Q5. For each of the following activities indicate whether the activity is currently ava

p. Use of college catalogs

[^12]$\square$
Q7. On average, how many hours of personalized help from career counsellor does each student get per school year? (Write "o" if none).
Q8.

Q9. Where do you usually get career guidance information shared to students? (If answer to any of Q8b-h yes, if no skip to Q10)

| Types of Information | Yes/No |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Universities/Colleges/Tertiary Institutions | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |
| Government Agencies (CHED, TESDA) | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |
| Colleagues | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |
| Personal Connections (friends and relatives) | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |
| Radio, TV, Newspaper | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |
| Internet | YES | 1 | NO | 2 |



Q10. Among the types of information provided to students in Q7, rank (1 being the highest) the information emphasized by career guidance counselors (rank will depend on the number of 'yes' answers in Q7) \begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline Types of Information \& Rank <br>
\hline

 

\hline Types ofance in interpreting NCAE scores \& Rank <br>
\hline Assister \& <br>
\hline

 

\hline Identify fields that best fit students' academic aptitude and skills \& <br>
\hline Id \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| Identify fields that best fit students' interests |  |
| :--- | :--- |


| Wage prospects for different fields |  |
| :--- | :--- |

Identify fields that offer high employment opportunities in the Philippines
Assistance in finding sources of financial support or scholarship opportunities
Assistance in post-secondary application process
Q11. What are other types of information that are not currently provided, but you think would be useful students?

PAHINTULOT


-----------------------------(PANGALAN NG ENUMERATOR) ngayong
PANIMULA

 K-12 sa ating edukasyon. Nais po namin na maging katuwang namin kayo sa gawaing ito sa pamamagitan ng pagbibigay inyong saloobin at karanasan sa paggabay sa inyong mga anak sa pagpili ng kanilang
Kung mamarapatin ninyo, nais ko rin pong hilingin na ang inyong anak ay maging isa sa mga respondent ng pag-aaral na ito. Kabilang sa pag-aaral na ito ang paghingi sa Kagawaran ng Edukasyon ng mga datos sa paaralan ng inyong anak gaya ng kanilang Learner's Profile.
Maari po bang pirmahan ninyo ang bahaging ito (Consent Area) upang patunay ng inyong pagpayag sa pag-uusap na ito?
SECTION A-2: SURVEY STAFF DETAILS

| OBSERVATIONS DURING THE INTERVIEW |
| :--- | :--- |
| RECORD GENERAL NOTES ABOUT THE INTERVIEW AND RECORD ANY SPECIAL INFORMATION THAT WILL BE |
| HELPFUL FOR SUPERVISORS AND THE ANALYSIS OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. |


| MEANINGS FOR COMMON SKIP PATTERNS/ABBREVIATIONS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | SKIP TO A SPECIFIC QUESTION IF CHOSEN |
| NEXT PERSON | SKIPTO THE NEXT PERSON IF CHOSEN |
| NEXT SECTION | SKIPTO THE NEXT MODULE/SECTION IF CHOSEN |
| PHP $\quad$ PHILIPPINE PESOS |  |

\footnotetext{
PAGE

SECTION B: HOUSEHOLD MEMBER ROSTER

IN ORDER TO MAKE A
COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS, USE
THE FOLLOWING PRROBING
QUESTIONS TO THE HEAD OF
THE HOUSEHOLD:

1. First, ask names of all the
immediate family of the household
head who normally live and eat
their meals together here.
2. Write down names, sex, age and
relationship to household head.
FILL IN QUESTIONS 1TO 5.
3. Then ask names of any other
persons related to the head of the
household or any other household
member that normally lives and
eats their meals together here.
FILL IN QUESTIONS 1TO 5
4. Also ask about other persons
not here who normally live and eat
their meals here. For example,
household members studying
elsewhere or traveling.
FILL IN QUESTIONS 1 TO 5 .
5. Then ask names of any other
persons not related to the head of
the household or other household
members, but who normally live
and eat their meals together here
such as live-in servants.
FILL IN QUESTIONS 1 TO 5

| 9. |  | 10. |  | 11. | 12. | 13. | 14. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| What is the highest grade completed by [NAME]? |  | If "Diploma" and above in item 9, |  | Has [NAME] ever attended a technicalvocational certificate to improve employment prospects for the past 5 years?$\begin{aligned} & \text { YES ......... } 1 \\ & \text { NO........ } 2 \vee 15 \end{aligned}$ | What kind of technical-vocational certificate course did (NAME) take? [Indicate all that applies] | Duration of technicalvocational certificate course? (months) | Did (NAME) receive a diploma for technical-vocational certificate course? |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | EDUCATION $\qquad$ <br> BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, <br> ACCOUNTANCY, COMMERCE, RETAIL SHOP |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRIMARY ${ }_{\text {G1 }}$ | POST SECONDARY NON- |  |  | AGRICULTURE AND FISHERY $\qquad$ |  |  |  |
| G1...................................... ${ }^{3}$ |  | PUABLIC AD | and PLANNING ...... |  |  |  |  |
| G3 ...................................... 5 | PS2....w | LAW and LE | +.- |  |  |  |  |
|  | PS3..... | MEDICAL, H | ES,NURSING,etc. ....... |  | FOOTWEAR AND LEATHER GOODS................. 5 |  |  |
|  |  | SCIENCE,M | OMPUTING, etc. ........ |  | FURNITURES AND FIXTURES............................ 6 |  |  |
| G6. $\ldots \ldots \ldots$ | PRE-BACCALAUREATE/ | OTHER TEC | NEERING, |  | GARMENTS..... |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CERTIFICATE/DIPLOMA } \\ & \text { PCD.................................. } \end{aligned}$ | INCLUDING CRAFT, BU | E, INDUSTRY, , etc. |  | HEALTH, SOCIAL AND OTHER COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES. $\qquad$ .. 8 |  |  |
| JUNIOR HIGH |  | AGRICULTU | FORESTRY............ |  | HEATING, VENTILATION, AIRCONDITIONING |  |  |
| JH1........ | BACHELOR's | SOCIALAN | STUDIES, |  | AND REFRIGERATION................ |  |  |
| JH2.............................. 11 |  | MEDIA, CU | AND LEISURESTUDIES, |  | INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS |  |  |
|  |  | TOURISM, | Wun |  | TECHNOLOGY $\qquad$ .10 |  |  |
| JH4....... |  | ART OR HUM CLASSICS, | GUAGES, LOGY,etc...... |  | LAND TRANSPORTATION.................................... 11 |  |  |
| VOCATIONAL UPPER | B5.... | PERSONAL | CATERING, |  | METALSAND ENGINEERING...................... 13 |  |  |
|  | MASTERS \& ABOVE | PUBLIC ORD | Y-POLICE, |  | TOURISM (HOTEL AND RESTAURANT...............15 |  |  |
| V2...............................15 | M1. | ARMY, FIR |  |  | OTHER, SPECIFY...................................... 16 |  |  |
| SENIOR HIGH | PHD.... | GENERAL |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | OTHER (SPE | $\cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A\&E Accreditation Elementary....... 18 <br> A\&EAccreditation Elementary....... 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Duration | Field/Specializatio |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


PRIMARY JOB

| 27. | 28. | 29. | 30. | 31. |  | 32. | 33. |  | 34. | 35. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| For wage workers ONLY, are you entitled to paid leave in your present job? $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES ........... } 1 \\ & \text { NO........... } 2 \end{aligned}$ | For wage workers ONLY, do you have a legal written contract with your employer? $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES........... } 1 \\ & \text { NO........... } 2 \end{aligned}$ | For wage workers ONLY, is (NAME)'s employer for this work... <br> GOVERNMENT POLITICAL PARTY COOPERATIVE NGO ORG RELIGIOUS ORG PRIVATE SECTOR. OTHER, SPECIFY $\qquad$ $\qquad$ ... 1 $\qquad$ $\qquad$ 2 3 .5 $\qquad$ $\qquad$ .. 8 | For wage workers ONLY, how many years has [NAME] worked for this employer? | What kind of work does (NAME) usually do in this job? <br> DESCRIBE THE OCCUPATION AND MAIN TASKS OR DUTIES IN AT LEAST 2 WORDS. |  | How many years has (NAME) worked for this specific occupation? | What kind of trade or business is it connected with? <br> [CODE: PSIC SECTOR] |  | Approximately how many wage workers are usually employed in the establishment where (NAME) works? (include NAME) | How useful were (NAME)'s formal education for this work? |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\square$ | \|ix|iminil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SECONDARY JOB



SECTION C: HOUSING, WATER, AND SANITATION

| 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How did you get this dwelling? | How much does this household pay per month to rent this dwelling? <br> COMBINE BOTH CASH AND IN-KIND PAYMENTS FOR RENT | Estimate the rent per month you could receive if you rented this dwelling? | The roof of the main dwelling are predominantly made of what materials? <br> STRONG MATERIALS (GALVANIZED IRON, ALUMINUM, TILE, CONCRETE, BRICK, STONE, ASBESTOS LIGHT MATERIALS (COGON, NIPA ANAHAW. SALVAGED/MAKESHIFTMATERIAL............................ MIXED, BUT PREDOMINANTLY STRONG MATERIALS MIXED, BUT PREDOMINANTLY LIGHT MATERIALS MIXED BUT PREDOMINANTLY SALVAGED MATERIALS. | The toilet and bathroom are inside the dwelling. $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES .... } 1 \\ & \text { NO.... } 2 \end{aligned}$ | What is the main source of water for household activities (cooking, cleaning, bathing, etc)? <br> INDOOR TAP <br> NEIGHBORHOOD MANUAL <br> WATER PUMP. <br> RIVER/CREEK $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ .5 | What is the household's major fuel used for lighting? |

## SECTION D1: HOUSEHOLD ASSETS

| CODE | 1 |  | Number of [ITEM]s purchased in the past twelve months? [IF NONE WRITE 'o'] | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | How many [ITEMS] does your household own? [IF NONE WRITE 'o'] AND MOVE TO NEXT ITEM | Number of [ITEM]s owned at present? [IF NONE WRITE 'o' AND SKIP TO NEXT ITEM] |  | What is the total value of all [CURRENT MARKET VALUE OF ITEM]s? |
|  |  | NUMBER | NUMBER | PHP |
| 1 | Refrigerator |  |  |  |
| 2 | Laptop |  |  |  |
| 3 | Personal Computer |  |  |  |
| 4 | Internet Connection |  |  |  |
| 5 | Cell Phone |  |  |  |
| 6 | Land Lines |  |  |  |
| 7 | Jewelry |  |  |  |
| 8 | Books/Magazines/Novels/Religious Texts, etc. |  |  |  |
| 9 | Educational Software |  |  |  |
| 10 | Bank Accounts |  |  |  |
| 11 | Agricultural Land |  |  |  |
| 12 | Residential Land |  |  |  |
| 13 | Residential House |  |  |  |

## SECTION D2: HOUSEHOLD ASSETS (continued)


SECTION E: RECENT SHOCKS TO HOUSEHOLD WELFARE

| 3. | 4. |  | 5. | 6. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Did [SHOCK] cause a reduction in | When did this [SHOCK] |  | Did this | Do you think |
| ousehold income | JANUARY.... |  | education- | these shocks will |
| and/or assets? | FEBRUARY................................. 02MARCH.................................. 03 |  |  | still affect educated-related |
| INCOME LOSS ... 1 | APRIL.... |  | decisions? |  |
|  |  |  |  | decision in the next year? |
| ASSET LOSS........ 2 | JULY ...ns |  |  |  |
| LOSS OF BOTH.. 3NEITHER ............ 4 | AUGUST......................................... 09 |  |  |  |
|  | SEPTEMBER................................ 09OCTOBER.............................. 10 |  |  |  |
| NEITHER .............. 4 |  |  | YES ........... 1 | YES ............ 1 |
|  |  |  | NO........... 2 | NO........... 2 |
|  | MONTH | YEAR | ( NEXT <br> ITEM) | IT |


[ASK HOUSEHOLD HEAD OR MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE RESPONDENT]


| 301 | Drought/Floods/Typhoons |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 302 | Crop disease or crop pests such as ground-hog attacks |  |  |
| 303 | Livestock died or were stolen |  |  |
| 304 | Household business failure, non-agricultural |  |  |
| 305 | Loss of salaried employment or non-payment of salary |  |  |
| 306 | Large fall in sale prices for crops |  |  |
| 307 | Large rise in price of food |  |  |
| 308 | Increase in school costs |  |  |
| 309 | Severe water shortage/electricity problems |  |  |
| 310 | Restricted access to markets |  |  |
| 311 | Chronic/severe illness or accident of household member |  |  |
| 312 | Death of a member of household |  |  |
| 313 | Death of other family member |  |  |
| 314 | Break-up of the household |  |  |
| 315 | Bushfire/Fire |  |  |
| 316 | Hijacking/Robbery/burglary/assault/Theft/Kidnapping |  |  |
| 317 | Dwelling damaged, destroyed |  |  |
| 318 | Unplanned Pregnancy |  |  |
| 319 | Lawsuits |  |  |
| 320 | Other --------------- |  |  |

SECTION F: PARENTAL/LEGAL GUARDIAN INVOLVEMENT
[ASK PARENT OF THE STUDENT UNDER CONSIDERATION OR LEGAL GUARDIAN OR MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE RESPONDENT] [IN THIS SECTION, "NAME" REFERS TO THE STUDENT UNDER CONSIDERATION]

1. COPY ID FOR RESPONDENT TO THIS SECTION FROM HOUSEHOLD ROSTER




| 10. | 11. | 12. | 13. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES.............. } 1 \\ & \text { NO........... } 2>12 \end{aligned}$ | What are the 3 major reasons why (NAME OF STUDENT) has transferred from another school? <br> TOP-UP EXPENSES(OF PREVIOUS SCHOOL) ARE UNPEXCTEDLY TOO HIGH / THE VOUCHER AMOUNT, ESC SUSBSIDIES, AND/OR OTHER SCHOLARSHIP SUBSIDIES ARE UNEXPECTEDLY NOT ENOUGH TO COVER ALL FEES IN PREVIOUS SCHOOL. <br> EXPECTED THAT SCHOOL-RELATED EXPENSES <br> (OF PREVIOUS SCHOOL) ARE HIGH BUT CAN NO LONGER AFFORD. <br> STUDENT CANNOT COPE WITH ACADEMIC <br> REQUIREMENTS OF PREVIOUS SCHOOL.. <br> STUDENT FELT THAT HE/SHE DID NOT BELONG <br> TO PREVIOUS SCHOOL <br> TEACHERS IN THE PREVIOUS SCHOOL DID NOT HAVE TECHNICAL EXPERTISE. <br> PREVIOUS SCHOOL DID NOT OFFER STUDENT'S PREFERRED TRACK. <br> WANT TO MOVE TO A SCHOOL THAT OFFERS BETTER FACILITIES AND NON-CURRICULUM ACTIVITIES........................ 7 OTHER (SPECIFY). $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | For the next school year, do you have plans of transferring (NAME OF STUDENT) to another school?$\begin{aligned} & \text { YES .............. } 1 \\ & \text { NO............. } 2 \text { - } 14 \end{aligned}$ | What are the 3 major reasons why you are planning to transfer (NAME OF STUDENT) to another school? <br> TOP-UP EXPENSES(OF PREVIOUS SCHOOL) ARE UNPEXCTEDLY TOO HIGH / THE VOUCHER AMOUNT, ESC SUSBSIDIES, AND/OR OTHER SCHOLARSHIP SUBSIDIES ARE UNEXPECTEDLY NOT ENOUGH TO COVER ALL FEES IN PREVIOUSSCHOOL. <br> EXPECTED THAT SCHOOL-RELATED EXPENSES <br> (OF PREVIOUS SCHOOL) ARE HIGH BUT CAN NO LONGER AFFORD. <br> STUDENT CANNOT COPE WITH ACADEMIC <br> REQUIREMENTS OF PREVIOUS SCHOOL. <br> STUDENT FELT THAT HE/SHE DID NOT BELONG <br> TO PREVIOUS SCHOOL <br> TEACHERS IN THE PREVIOUS SCHOOL DID NOT HAVE <br> TECHNICALEXPERTISE. <br> PREVIOUS SCHOOL DID NOT OFFER STUDENT'S <br> PREFERRED TRACK. <br> WANT TO MOVE TO A SCHOOL THAT OFFERS BETTER <br> FACILITIES AND NON-CURRICULUM ACTIVITIES ........................ 7 <br> OTHER (SPECIFY). $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ |
|  | Rank 1: <br> Rank 2: <br> Rank $3:$ |  | Rank 1: <br> Rank 2: <br> Rank 3: |



| 19. | 20. | 21. | 22. | 23. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On a scale of 1-10, with 1 having the highest quality and 10 having the lowest quality, how much do you think the quality of school matter in determining your child's job outcomes? | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being very important and 10 not important, how much do you think school track matters in determining your child's job outcomes? | Do you expect your child to continue onto post-secondary education?$\begin{aligned} & \text { YES .......... } 1>23 \\ & \text { NO.......... } 2 \end{aligned}$ | What are the 3 most important factors for not continuing with post secondary education or do not know about your decision. Rank in order of preference (1-most important and so on). | What level of education do you expect your child to complete? |
|  |  |  | FINANCIAL PROBLEM |  |
|  |  |  | HOUSEHOLD RESPONSIBILITIES....................... 2 | (SKIP TO NEXT SAMPLED STUDENT. IF NO |
|  |  |  | GRADES NOT SUFFICIENT................................... 3 | MORE SAMPLED STUDENT, SKIP TO NEXT |
|  |  |  | NOT NECESSARY FOR CHOICE OF | SECTION) |
|  |  |  | EMPLOYMENT ............................................... 4 | Senior High School............................................. 2 |
|  |  |  | ALREADY HAVE A JOB OFFER .............................. 5 | (SKIP TO NEXT SAMPLED STUDENT. IF NO |
|  |  |  | NOT INTERESTED ............................................ 6 | MORE SAMPLED STUDENT, SKIP TO NEXT |
|  |  |  | UNDECIDED ON WHAT TO STUDY.................. 7 | SECTION) |
|  |  |  | WANT TO PURSUE OTHER INTERESTS............... 8 | Post-secondary non-tertiary....................................... 3 |
|  |  |  | FELT UNPREPARED FOR POST-SECONDARY | Certificate/Diploma Course ...................................... 4 |
|  |  |  | SCHOOL......................................................... 9 | Bachelor's Degree.................................................. 5 |
|  |  |  | MARRIAGE ....................................................... 10 | Masters Degree............................................................ 6 |
|  |  |  | OTHER, SPECIFY................................................ 11 | PhD and Above........................................................ 7 |
|  |  |  | Rank 1: <br> Rank 2: <br> Rank 3: |  |



| 27. | 28 | 29 | 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| On average, how much monthly income do you expect your child to make at age 30 , in today's terms? | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being very satisfied and 10 not satisfied, how satisfied are you in the following aspects of (NAME OF STUDENT)'s current school? <br> A) Overall School Satisfaction <br> B) Congeniality of Atmosphere/(NAME of STUDENT)'s Feeling of Belongingness <br> C) Location $\qquad$ $\qquad$ D) (NAME OF STUDENT)'s Chosen Track/Strand <br> E) Curriculum Requirements <br> F) Competency of Teachers $\qquad$ G) Quality of Career Guidance provided to (NAME OF STUDENT) $\qquad$ H) Quality of School Facilities $\qquad$ $\qquad$ I) Transparency of School on the Actual Affordability of School Fees <br> J) Amount of Government Subsidies $\qquad$ K) Process of Applying for Government Subsidies $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | During last academic year, how often have you participated in any of the following school-related activities? <br> A) Discussed my child's behavior with a teacher on my own initiative. <br> B) Discussed my child's behavior on the initiative of one of his/her own teachers. <br> C) Discussed my child's progress with a teacher on my own initiative. <br> D) Discussed my child's progress on the initiative of one of his/her own teachers. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ E) Volunteered in physical activities, e.g. building maintenance, carpentry, gardening or yard work. <br> F) Volunteered in extra-curricular activities, e.g. book club, school play, sports, field trip. <br> G) Volunteered in the school library or media centre. <br> H) Assisted a teacher in the school. <br> I) Appeared as a guest speaker. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ J) Participated in local school, e.g. parent council or PTA. <br> K) Checked and discussed my child's report card with him/her. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | Overall, on a scale of 1 to 10 ( 1 being very involved to 10 being disengaged), how involved are you in your child's schooling? |
|  |  | Once a week <br> Once a month <br> Once every quarter <br> Once a school year. <br> Never. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ 1 2 $\qquad$ $\qquad$ 3 $\qquad$ |  |


SECTION A: SURVEY STAFF DETAILS
SECTION A: SURVEY STAFF DETAILS
9. NAME OF ENUMERATOR:




YOUTH EDUCATION INVESTMENT AND LABOR MARKET OUTCOMES SURVEY

Ang sarbey na ito ay alam at may kapahintulutan ng Kagawaran ng Edukasyon ng Pilipinas. Lahat ng impormasyon na makokolekta ay pag-iingatan at ituturing kompidensyal (This survey is authorized by the the Department of Education of the Philippines. All information collected herein will be treated with utmost care and strict confidentiality).
PAHINTULOT
PANIMULA ng K-12 sa sektor ng edukasyon. Nais po namin na m
kanilang educational tracks sa Senior High School.
Kung mamarapatin ninyo, nais ko rin pong hilingin na ang inyong anak ay maging isa sa mga respondent ng pag-aaral na ito. Kabilang sa pag-aaral na ito ang paghingi sa Kagawaran ng Edukasyon ng mga datos sa paaralan ng inyong anak gaya ng kanilang Learner's Profile.
Maari po bang pirmahan ninyo ang bahaging ito (Consent Area) upang patunay ng inyong pagpayag sa pag-uusap na ito.
SECTION C: FORMAL SCHOOLING

|  | 1. | 2. |  | 3. |  | 4. |  | 5. | 6. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{S} \\ & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{H} \\ & \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{~L} \\ & \mathrm{I} \\ & \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ | What type of school is student attending? (LOAD ANSWER FROM G1, Question \#6) <br> PUBLIC <br> PRIVATE SECULAR ............. 2 <br> PRIVATE NON- <br> SECULAR $\qquad$ $\qquad$ PUBLICLY FINANCED BUT PRIVATE. $\qquad$ COMMUNITY BASED. OTHER SPECIFY. 3 .. 4 $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | Is your attendance at private school partially funded by the following programs? |  | Are you aware of the following programs? |  | Are you qualified to access the following programs? |  | If you were qualified for a voucher but did not avail the program, why did you not access it? | If you were qualified for ESC but did not avail the program, why did you not access it? |
|  |  | YES <br> NO $\qquad$ $\qquad$ DON'T KNO |  |  |  | NO PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN AREA NO PRIVATE SCHOOLS THAT COULD AFFORD / VALUE OF VOUCHER <br> IS NOT ENOUGH FOR PRIVATE SCHOOL EXPENSES. <br> PRIVATE SCHOOL QUALITY NOT <br> GOOD COMPARED TO PUBLIC........................... 3 <br> PROCESS OF ACCESING VOUCHER <br> IS DIFFICULT. <br> WAS NOT ACCEPTED INTO PREFERRED <br> PRIVATE SCHOOL <br> PRIVATESCHOOL DID NOT OFFER <br> TRACK THAT WAS OF INTEREST ...................... 6 <br> OTHER (SPECIFY). $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | NO PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN AREA. <br> NO PRIVATE SCHOOLS THAT COULD <br> AFFORD / VALUE OF VOUCHER <br> IS NOT ENOUGH FOR PRIVATE SCHOOL <br> EXPENSES.. <br> PRIVATE SCHOOL QUALITY NOT GOOD COMPARED TO PUBLIC. <br> PROCESS OF ACCESING VOUCHER <br> IS DIFFICULT. <br> WAS NOT ACCEPTED INTO PREFERRED PRIVATE SCHOOL. <br> PRIVATE SCHOOL DID NOT OFFER <br> TRACK THAT WAS OF INTEREST <br> OTHER (SPECIFY). $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ |
|  |  | 2.a Voucher | 2.b <br> Education Service Contract | 2.a Voucher <br> YES <br> NO. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | 2.b Education Service Contract YES........ 1 NO........ 2 |  |  | 4.a Voucher <br> YES <br> NO. <br> 7 <br> DON'T <br> KNOW..... 998 -7 $\qquad$ $\qquad$ |  |  |  |




| 22. | 23. | 24. | 25. | 26. | 27. | 28. | 29 a | 29b | 30. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| During this school year, have you taken any advanced classes/courses at [SCHOOL]? <br> YES <br> NO. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | What was your academic ranking in your class in your previous grade level? | What is your academic ranking in your class in your current grade level? | Have you taken NCAE? $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES........... } 1 \\ & \text { NO.......... } 2 \text { - } 28 \end{aligned}$ | Have you already received the results of your NCAE? $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES.......... } 1 \\ & \text { NO........... } 2-28 \end{aligned}$ | On a scale of 1-10, 1 being very useful to 10 being not useful, how useful do you consider the information from the NCAE while making education/career decisions? | Besides NCAE, have you taken any other career assessment tools? $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES.......... } 1 \\ & \text { NO.......... } 2 \text { - } 30 \end{aligned}$ | Please specify name of career assessment tool taken. <br> Philippine Aptitude <br> Classification Test. <br> Philippine Occupational Interest Survey. <br> Admission Test for Colleges and Universities. <br> Science and Technology Scholarship Examination <br> Other, Specify $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ | On a scale of 1-10, 1 being very useful to 10 being not useful, how useful do you consider the career assessment tool in Q29a was/will be in making <br> education/career decisions? | What degree track are you currently enrolled in (only for 11th graders)? <br> ACADEMIC. <br> -32 <br> TECHNICAL/ $\qquad$ VOCATIONAL / LIVELIHOOD. <br> SPORTS... <br> - 33 $\qquad$ <br> ARTS AND DESIGN. <br> -33 .. 1 $\qquad$ $\qquad$ |


SECTION D: JOBS/APPRENTICESHIP/IN FORMAL TRAINING/INDUSTRY IMMERSION DURING SCHOOL


## SECTION E: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL CHOICE (FOR GRADES 9 AND 10)

| SN | Question | Code | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Do you expect to continue onto senior high school education? | YES.................................. 2 NO DONTKNOW........... 998 |  |
| 2 | What are the 3 most important factors for not continuing with senior high school education or do not know about your decision. Rank in order of preference ( 1 - most important, etc). (SKIP TO NEXT SECTION AFTER RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTION) |  | Rank 1 <br> Rank 2 <br> Rank 3 |
| 3 | What degree track do you plan to enroll in? |  |  |
| 4 | Ideally, what strand/specialization would you like/prefer to pursue for your senior high school education? |  | Option 1: <br> Option 2: |
| 5 | What are the 3 major considerations for choosing your first two options in Question 4? Rank in order of preference with 1 as the most important. |  | Rank 1 <br> Rank 2 <br> Rank 3 |
| 6 | Considering your current circumstances, what track are you more likely to end up pursuing? |  |  |
| 7 | How many people who have pursued this track have influenced your decision? | NUMBER |  |
| 8 | How many people who have pursued this strand (i.e., your identified Option 1 strand in Q4) have influenced your decision? | NUMBER |  |
| 9 | What are your three top school choices for senior high school? | Option 1 |  |
|  |  | Option 2 |  |
|  |  | Option 3 |  |
| 10 | Which source of information did you use/plan to use regarding your choice of senior high school and track/strand? Identify and rank the three most important sources (1-most important and so on). |  |  |
|  | 10. a Senior high school |  | Rank $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |


| SN | Question | Code | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 10. b Track/Subtrack |   | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
| 11 | How much do the following factors play a role in choosing this school? (1-most importan |  |  |
|  | 11a. Location | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 11b. Parental recommendation | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 11c. Relative recommendation | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 11d. Counselor recommendation | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 11e. Peer recommendation | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 11f. School Reputation | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 119. Degree offerings | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 11h. Interest in track/subtrack/vocation | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 11i. Costs | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 111. Future employment/salary prospects | [Scale 1-10] |  |
|  | 11k. Other, Specify | [Scale 1-10] |  |
| 12 | Do you have any information on financial aid (scholarships, student loans) for senior high schools? |  |  |
| 13 | What were your sources of information on financial aid for senior high school? Check all that apply. |  |  |
| 14 | Do you plan to apply for any scholarships or student loans? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES ............................................................... } \\ & \text { NO........... } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 15 | Why don't you want to apply for scholarship/student loan? |  |  |
| 16 | Do you expect to take some time off from school for a year before you start your senior high school education? If yes, why? |  |  |
| 17 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being the most important and 10 the least important, how much do you think the chosen track matters in college preparedness? |  |  |
| 18 | On a scale of $1-10$, with 1 having the highest probability and 10 the lowest probability, what do you think is the probability that training in this track will lead to employment in any occupation (if applicable)? |  |  |
| 19 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being most certain and 10 least certain, how certain are you that this your desired track over long term? |  |  |
| 20 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being very important and 10 not important, how much do you think the quality of school matters in determining job outcomes? |  |  |
| 21 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being very important and 10 not important, how much do you think the chosen track matters in determining job outcomes? |  |  |

## SECTION F: COLLEGE CHOICE

| SN | Question |  | Code | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Do you expect to continue onto post-secondary education? |  | YES........................... 1 2 NO DONT KNOW....... 998 |  |
| 2 | What are the 3 most important factors for not continuing with post secondary education or do not know about your decision. Rank in order of preference (1most important, etc). (SKIP TO NEXT SECTION AFTER RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTION) |  |  | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
| 3 | How many people who have pursued post-secondary education infludence your decision? |  | NUMBER |  |
| 4 | What is the highest degree you want to obtain? |  |  |  |
| 5 | What major would you like/aspire to pursue for your post-secondary education? | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 1st Choice } \\ \hline \text { 2nd Choice } \end{array}$ | INCLUDE OPTIONS IN APPENDIX (Include Don't Know (998) as one of the possible answers) |  |
| 6 | What are your 3 major considerations for choosing this major/vocation? Choose top 3 considerations ( 1 - most important, etc) | 1st Choice <br> 2nd Choice |  | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ <br> Rank $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
| 7 | What are you more likely to end up studying? |  | INCLUDE OPTIONS IN APPENDIX (Include Don't Know (998) as one of the possible answers) |  |
| 8 | What is the monthly income you expect to receive upon accepting a job after graduating with this degree? Report in PHP |  |  |  |
| 9 | What type of degree program do you need to enroll in in order to pursue this career? |  |  |  |
| 10 | What are your three top choices for post secondary schools? | Option 1 |  |  |
|  |  | Option 2 <br> Option 3 |  |  |


| SN | Question |  | Code | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | What are your 3 major considerations for choosing this school? Choose top 3 considerations | Option 1 |  | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
|  |  | Option 2 |  | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
|  |  | Option 3 |  | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
| 12 | Which source of information did you use/plan to use regarding your choice of post-secondary school and post-secondary major/vocation? Identify and rank the three most important sources. |  |  |  |
|  | 12. a Post-secondary school |  |  | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
|  | 12. b Post-secondary major/vocation |  |  | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
| 13 | Do you have any information on finan secondary schools? | aid (scholarships, student loans) for post- |  |  |
| 14 | What were your sources of informatio schools? Identify and rank the three m | financial aid for post-secondary mportant sources. |  | Rank 1 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 2 $\qquad$ <br> Rank 3 $\qquad$ |
| 15 | Do you plan to apply for any scholarship | or student loans? | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YES.................................................................... } \\ & \text { NO...... } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 16 | Why don't you want to apply for schola | hip/student loan? |  |  |
| 17 | Do you expect to take some time off ff secondary education? If yes, why? | school before you start your post |  |  |
| 18 | On as scale of $1-10$, with 1 having very hi confident are you in completing your po | level of confidence and 10 very low, how t-secondary education? |  |  |
| 19 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 having very hig what do you think is the probability that employment in any occupation (if appli | probability and 10 very low probability, ompleting the program will lead to ble)? |  |  |
| 20 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being most like yourself in this field of work in the next | and 10 least likely, how likely do you see years? |  |  |
| 21 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being very imp you think the quality of school matters | tant and 10 not important, how much do determining job outcomes? |  |  |
| 22 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being very imp you think the major matters in determin | tant and 10 not important, how much do g job outcomes? |  |  |

## SECTION G: OCCUPATION CHOICE

| SN | Question | Code | Answer |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | What is your main occupational choice at age 30? [asked of everyone] | INSERT CODE 998 FOR DON'T KNOW |  |  |  |
| 2 | On average, how much monthly income do you expect to make in this occupation at age 30, in today's terms? |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | How much education is needed for this kind of work? |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Which 3 major sources of information did you use in your choice of occupation/skill? Rank in order of influence/importance each source encircled ( 1 - most important, and so on). |  | Rank 1 | Rank 2 | Rank 3 |
| 5 | How many relatives who have a similar occupation have influenced your decision? | NUMBER |  |  |  |
| 6 | How many community members/friends who have a similar occupation of your choice have influenced your decision? | NUMBER |  |  |  |
| 7 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being the highest and 10 the least, how influential are/were the following factors in your choice of occupation? <br> 7.a Employment Opportunities In Manila <br> 7.b Ability to Work Abroad <br> 7.c Interest <br> 7.d Best Fits My Skills <br> 7.e Cost/Financial Consideration <br> 7.f Recommendation of Parents <br> 7.g Recommendation of Other Family <br> 7.h Recommendation of Friends/Peers <br> 7.i Location/Proximity of School Offering the Major/Vocation <br> 7.j Social Acceptability/Expectations <br> 7.k Other, Specify |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being very certain and 10 uncertain, how certain are you that this your desired skill/occupation over long term? |  |  |  |  |

## SECTION H: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL CAREER GUIDANCE PROGRAM

| SN | Question | Code | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | During the last academic year, how often have your parents / guardians participated in any of the following school-related activities? |  |  |
| 2 | Is it part of of the DepEd's Senior High School Career Guidance Program? | YES ........................................... 12 NO................................... 998 DONT KNOW.......... |  |
| 3 | During this school year, how many hours did you get personalized help from career counsellor? (Write "o" if none). |  |  |
| 4 | What types of information did you receive? (select all that apply) | LABOR MARKET INFORMATION $\qquad$ <br> TYPES OF OCCUPATIONS AND TRAINING <br> THAT FIT PERSONAL INTERESTS. $\qquad$ <br> TYPES OF OCCUPATIONS AND TRAINING <br> THAT FIT PERSONAL WAGE PREFERENCES <br> TYPES OF OCCUPATIONS AND TRAINING <br> THAT FIT SKILLS $\qquad$ <br> SCHOOLS THAT CAN PROVIDE A QUALITY EDUCATION <br> GIVEN PREFERENCES <br> INFORMATION ON FUNDING OPTIONS $\qquad$ <br> OCCUPATION OUTCOMES OF THOSE <br> FROM SCHOOLS IN REGION. $\qquad$ <br> WAGE OUTCOMES OF THOSE FROM SCHOOLS <br> IN REGION $\qquad$ <br> OCCUPATION OUTCOMES FROM NATIONL <br> LABOR MARKET. $\qquad$ <br> OCCUPATION IN DEMAND OUTSIDE THE COUNTRY ................................................ <br> OTHER, SPECIFY $\qquad$ |  |
| 5 | On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being highly useful and 10 least useful, please rate the usefulness in making education-related decision of each type of information received as indicated in Question 4. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rank } \\ & \text { 1.....-- } \\ & 2 \ldots \ldots-- \\ & 3 \ldots \ldots-- \\ & 4 \ldots \ldots- \\ & 5 \ldots \ldots- \\ & 6 \ldots \ldots- \\ & 7 \ldots \ldots- \\ & 8 \ldots \ldots- \\ & 9 \ldots \ldots- \\ & 10 \ldots-- \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 6 | What types of other information would you find useful in making decisions about future career paths but have not been provided to you by the school's career guidance program? | LABOR MARKET INFORMATION $\qquad$ <br> TYPES OF OCCUPATIONS AND TRAINING <br> THAT FIT PERSONAL INTERESTS $\qquad$ <br> TYPES OF OCCUPATIONS AND TRAINING <br> THAT FIT PERSONAL WAGE PREFERENCES. <br> TYPES OF OCCUPATIONS AND TRAINING <br> THAT FIT SKILLS $\qquad$ <br> SCHOOLS THAT CAN PROVIDE A QUALITY EDUCATION <br> GIVEN PREFERENCES $\qquad$ <br> INFORMATION ON FUNDING OPTIONS............................................. 6 <br> OCCUPATION OUTCOMES OF THOSE <br> FROM SCHOOLS IN REGION. $\qquad$ <br> WAGE OUTCOMES OF THOSE FROM SCHOOLS <br> IN REGION $\qquad$ <br> OCCUPATION OUTCOMES FROM NATIONL <br> LABOR MARKET. $\qquad$ <br> OCCUPATION IN DEMAND OUTSIDE THE COUNTRY ............ 10 <br> OTHER, SPECIFY $\qquad$ |  |

## SECTION I: PERSPECTIVE ON PARENT'S INVOLVEMENT AND EXPECTATIONS

| SN | Question | Code | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | During the last academic year, how often have your parents/guardians participated in any of the following school-related activities? <br> a) Discussed my behaviour with a teacher on their own initiative. <br> b) Discussed my behaviour on the initiative of one of my teachers <br> c) Discussed my progress with a teacher on my their own initiative. <br> d) Discussed my progress on the initiative of one of my teachers. <br> e) Volunteered in physical activities, e.g. building maintenance, carpentry, gardening or yard work <br> f) Participated in extra-curricular activities, e.g. book club, school play, sports, field trip. <br> g) Volunteered in the school library or media centre. <br> h) Assisted a teacher in the school. <br> i) Appeared as a guest speaker. <br> j) Participated in local school , e.g. parent council or PTA. <br> k) Discussed my progress with me, e.g. talked about my report card |  |  |
| 2 | What do you think is the track that your parents/guardians would prefer you to enroll in Senior High School? |  |  |
| 3 | What are your parent's/guardian's three major considerations in preferring this track for you? Rank all that applies in order of magnitude of each source in your decision making. |  | Rank 1 <br> Rank 2 <br> Rank 3 |
| 4 | Do you think your parents/guardians expect you to continue onto post-secondary education? |  |  |
| 5 | What are the 3 most important factors why you think your parents/guardians do not expect you to continue with post secondary education or do not know about your decision? Rank in order of preference ( 1 - most important, etc). (SKIP TO NEXT SECTION AFTER RESPONDING TO THIS QUESTION) |  | Rank 1 <br> Rank 2 <br> Rank 3 |
| 6 | Where do your parents/guardians expect you to study after junior high school? |  |  |
| 7 | Where do your parents/guardians expect you to study after senior high school? |  |  |
| 8 | Would your parents/guardians expect you to work part time to support part of your educational costs in post secondary education? |  |  |
| 9 | What type of work are you expected to engage in as an adult? | Professional (e.g., doctor, lawyer, manager, teacher, etc.). $\qquad$ <br> Working class/manual laborer/trades/ blue collar (e.g., factory, maintenance, carpenter, electrician, etc.). $\qquad$ 2 <br> Service industry (e.g., food service, customer service, hospitality, etc.)..... $\quad 3$ <br> Clerical (e.g., office assistant, record keeping) $\qquad$ <br> Technical (e.g., computer programming, electronics repair) $\qquad$ 5 6 6 Other type of work (please specify). <br> Don't Know. $\qquad$ $\qquad$ .7 998 |  |
| 10 | On average, how much monthly income are you expected to earn at age 30 by your parents? |  |  |
| ${ }^{11}$ | Where do your parents expect you to work? |  |  |

## SECTION J: STUDENT'S OVERALL SATISFACTION

|  | 1. On a scale of 1 to 10,1 being very satisfied to 10 not satisfied, how satisfied are you in the following aspects of your current school? | 2. Which three factors were most important in making the final decision in attending this school? Also, rank in order of preference ( 1 - most important, and so on). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall School Satisfaction |  |  |
| Congeniality of School |  |  |
| Atmosphere/Feeling of belongingness |  | NEAR PARENTS' HOME........................................ 3 NEAR RELATIVES' HOME............................... 4 |
| Location |  | SCHOOL QUALITY................................... 5 |
| Chosen Track/Strand |  | SCHOOL'S ACCREDITION.......................... 7 |
| Curriculum Requirements |  | EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT <br> OUTCOMES................................................. |
| Competency of Teachers |  | COURSE OFFERINGS COINCIDE <br> WITH PREFERENCES $\qquad$ |
| Quality of Career Guidance |  | LACK OF GOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS <br> NEAR PARENTS' HOME... |
| Quality of School Facilities |  | OTHER, SPECIFY....................................... 11 |
| Transparency of School on the Actual Amount of Tuition and Other Miscellaneous Fees Prior to Enrollment |  |  |
| Affordability of School Fees |  | Rank 1: - |
| Government Subsidies |  | Rank |
|  |  |  |

## APPENDIX 4: Data Cleaning Steps Undertaken

1. Corrected the miscoded and unmatched student ID number in the student and household databases, e.g., the original student ID number was used instead of that of the interviewed replacement student. This was done by (i) checking unmatched learner reference numbers (LRNs) between the student and household databases bearing the same home address and/or contact numbers, and (ii) confirming the correctness of the LRN encoded in the household database by comparing it to the name of the student in the Department of Education (DepEd) database.
2. Corrected the miscoded student ID number in the student and household databases, e.g., duplicate records of a unique LRN observed in the two databases. This was done by (i) confirming the correct LRN as indicated in step 1; (ii) identifying the miscoded LRN in the student database and/or household database; and (iii) encoding the correct LRN by comparing the name of the student, home address, gender, and grade level to those pieces of information in the DepEd database.
3. Corrected miscoded student ID, e.g., lacked " 0 " in front, had one of the 12 digits miscoded, had less than or more than 12 digits.
4. Dropped students (and their corresponding household data) with no matching household.
5. Dropped households (and their corresponding student data) with more than one sampled student.
6. Dropped miscoded student IDs, i.e., student IDs are supposed to be numeric with 12 digits, but the name of the student was encoded instead of the student ID in a few cases.
7. Sampled students' ages go as high as $40-60$ years old. It turned out that this was due to erroneous merging by the database specialist; data for some sampled students were recorded against the household head, or in the row corresponding to the household head, instead of the sampled student's row. Erroneous age data were corrected.
8. Corrected miscoded school ID of some students, i.e., some sampled students were not assigned their proper or correct school IDs.
9. Corrected miscoded school IDs, i.e., school IDs are supposed to be numeric with six digits, but the name of the schools was encoded instead of the school ID in a few cases.
10. Corrected miscoded household head tag and gender of students and household members.
11. Recoded categories to reflect respondent's correct answer, e.g., a mismatch between the input of Philippine Standard Occupational Classification category of survey enumerators and the interviewee's preferred or anticipated occupation. ${ }^{12}$ This was done by checking for trends in miscoding occupational classification categories, e.g., police officers are usually tagged under "Armed Forces Occupations" (category 10); and tagging all variations of police officer responses, e.g., SPO1, spo1, po1, police, etc. under "Service and Sales Workers" (category 5).

[^13]12. Recoded "Others" if the respondent's answer could fit under an existing category. This was done by manually checking respondents' specific reason and recoding the response if the comment falls under existing options.
13. Manually recoded the number of individual guidance counseling hours reported by school principals. This was done by (i) checking for outliers among reported number of personalized guidance counseling hours of schools, e.g., 8,000 per school year; (ii) confirming the number by calling the school; and (iii) recoding the noted response as confirmed by the school head and/or guidance counselor.
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# Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes in the Philippines Survey Report 

This report presents findings from a survey in the Philippines on what shapes young people's decisions about their education. The survey focused on students' choice of track in senior high school-academic, technical-vocational and livelihood, sports, or arts and design-their choice of college course, and their occupational preferences and expectations. It was conducted by the Asian Development Bank in collaboration with the Philippine Department of Education. Its results highlight the most influential considerations and information sources for students and households. This report aims to help enhance career guidance programs and long-term labor market outcomes.
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[^0]:    Chief Economist and Director General
    Economic Research and Regional Cooperation Department
    Asian Development Bank

[^1]:    1 The United Nations defines "youth" as persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years.
    2 Philippine Statistics Authority. 2016. Annual Labor and Employment Estimates. Metro Manila.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ DepEd. Senior High School. http://www.deped.gov.ph/k-to-12/faq/senior-high-school.
    ${ }^{4}$ L. Bonilla, N. Bottan, and A. Ham. 2016. Information Policies and Higher Education Choices: Experimental Evidence from Colombia. http://www.cedlas-er.org/sites/default/files/aux_files/ham.pdf.

[^3]:    Source: Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey research team.

[^4]:    5 An interesting discussion on economic theory as guide to education supply and demand policies can be found in A. Banerjee et al. 2013. Expanding Access and Increasing Student Learning in Post-Primary Education in Developing Countries: A Review of the Evidence. J-PAL Post-Primary Education Initiative Review Paper. Boston, MA: Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL). pp. 5-8.
    ${ }^{6}$ For some examples, see the World Bank's Skills Toward Employment and Productivity Survey and the International Labour Organization's School-to-Work Transition Survey.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ In Kenya, a deworming program significantly increased enrollment, probability of passing primary leavers exam, and adult wages. Kremer and Holla (2009) and Baird et al. (2012), p. 34.
    ${ }^{8}$ A discussion on existing evidence may be found in A. Banerjee et al. Expanding Access and Increasing Student Learning in Post-Primary Education in Developing Countries: A Review of the Evidence. J-PAL Post-Primary Education Initiative Review Paper. Boston, MA: Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL), pp. 39-45

[^6]:    - = magnitude equals zero, TVL = technical-vocational and livelihood.

    Source: Authors' estimates based on Youth Education Investment and Labor Market Outcomes Survey results.

[^7]:    9 Based on 2016 Philippine Labor Force Survey, among workers aged 30-40 years, approximately 17\% are in managerial positions; $6 \%$ are professionals; $4 \%$ are technicians and associate professionals; $6 \%$ are clerical support workers; $15 \%$ are services and sales workers; $11 \%$ are skilled agricultural; forestry; and fishery workers; $8 \%$ are crafts and related trades workers; $8 \%$ are plant and machine operators and assemblers; $24 \%$ are holding elementary occupations; and less than $1 \%$ are in the armed forces.

[^8]:    NCR = National Capital Region.

[^9]:    ${ }^{10}$ In the survey instrument used in this study, unexpected events or shocks include the following: (i) drought, flood, or typhoon; (ii) crop disease or pest; (iii) livestock loss; (iv) failure of household-operated business; (v) steep crop price changes; (vi) steep food price changes; (vii) sudden increase of school-related costs; (viii) severe water shortage or electricity problems; (ix) restricted access to markets; ( $x$ ) chronic or severe illness or accident of household member; (xi) death of a household member; (xii) break-up of the household; (xiii) bushfire or fire; (xiv) dwelling damaged or destroyed; (xv) unplanned pregnancy; (xvi) lawsuits, etc.

[^10]:    ${ }^{11}$ There are policies that act on labor demand, i.e., policies that influence what types of jobs are created. These lie outside the scope of the education sector and are outside the scope of this study.

[^11]:    Q7. On a scale of 1 to 5 ( 1 being the most important), rank the targets that the school set in terms of evaluating its overall performance.

[^12]:    Q6. On a scale of 1 to 5 ( 1 for the goal with the most important emphasis, and so on through 5 for the goal with the least emphasis), rank the extent to which the following goals are currently emphasized by the guidance program at your school. (Do not duplicate rankings.) (Answer Q6 only if Q5a is yes, if no skip to Q12) GOAL
    RANK (write 1 for the goal with most emphasis and 5 for least emphasis. Leave blank if no emphasis)
    $\qquad$

    | GOAL | RANK (write 1 for the goal with most emphasis and 5 for least emphasis. Leave blank if no <br> emphasis) |
    | :--- | :---: |
    | Help students identify their Senior High School track |  |
    | Help students plan and prepare for their careers or education after high school |  |
    | Help students with personal, social, psychological growth and development |  |
    | Help students with their academic growth in high school |  |
    | Help students with identifying financial aid issues |  |

    $\square$ $\square$
    ,

[^13]:    ${ }^{12}$ Philippine Statistics Authority. Philippine Standard Occupational Classification. https://psa.gov.ph/sites/default/ files/4publication.pdf.

