

Amartya Sen's Capability Approach in the Analysis of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program

Givheart C. Dano

Faculty, Governor Alfonso D. Tan College, Tanguib City

Abstract— What is new about poverty? A question that anyone can answer and mostly can validate it through life experiences. Poverty is a concern for everyone, so it is hoped that everyone will work to interfere. However, with the number of research on poverty in a global context, it is practically difficult to track how each country addresses global poverty on its own. Hence, poverty is broad as its concept is concerned. Poverty is a difficult concept to describe, especially because it is a complicated and contentious social reality. Despite the challenges in obtaining a consensus description of poverty, the understanding for such concept is a significant endeavor, not just theoretically or empirically, but also practically, because this definition may be used in the future to orient public policies aimed at combating poverty or improving the living conditions of the impoverished. In most cases, poverty is associated to lack of income and to address as such is just a matter of wealth distribution. Which happens in the Philippines through a poverty reduction program the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program that aims to end poverty and yet, poverty remains a main concern and continue to persist. Thus, the aim of this paper is to scrutinize the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implemented by the government as human development measure to end the vicious cycle of poverty. It aims to look at the purpose if the 4Ps is really gird towards human development or it lacks the principle of a fully human development measure in addressing poverty. This critical analysis is brought for the reason that researches are limited only as to the effects of 4Ps to its beneficiaries if the 4Ps is helpful or not. However, the paper wants to dig deeper as the goal of the 4Ps is concerned. Also, to contribute in the strengthening of the human development program of the government in the lenses of philosophical undertaking. In doing so, it applies the capability approach of Amartya Sen in the analysis of the 4Ps. As this paper argued that the capability approach of Sen gives us a holistic perspective of poverty in which Sen envisions a fully human development for the poor.

Keywords— Amartya Sen, Capability Approach, Poverty, Functionings, Well-being.

I. INTRODUCTION

What is new about poverty? A question that anyone can answer and mostly can validate it through life experiences. Poverty is a concern for everyone, so it is hoped that everyone will work to interfere the inter-generational cycle of poverty. However, with the number of research on poverty in a global context, it is practically difficult to track how each country addresses global poverty on its own. Hence, poverty is broad as its concept is concerned. Poverty is a difficult concept to describe, especially because it is a complicated and contentious social reality. Despite the challenges in obtaining a consensus description of poverty, the understanding for such concept is a significant endeavor, not just theoretically or empirically, but also practically, because this definition may be used in the future to orient public policies aimed at combating poverty or improving the living conditions of the impoverished.

Yet, in most studies, poverty is a socioeconomic state defined by a lack of resources required for basic survival or the lack of means to satisfy a particular minimal level of living standards expected in the area where one lives (Vale, 2017 & Skeffington, et al., 2017 & Omar, et al.,

2020). Logically speaking, poverty is simply understood as the lack of income or wealth. It is then argued that, to address the problem of poverty is just a matter of income or wealth distribution and the expansion of economy (International Labor Organization, 2016).

In the same vein, the reduction of vicious cycle of poverty is the heart of the Philippine development agenda. Considering that the Philippines is a third-world country, with many people living in poverty, which has an impact on the economic development (Danday, et al., 2019). Thereby, the Philippine government created an initiative in order to mitigate the increase of poverty cases in the country. In fact, according to the research, sustained economic growth helped the Philippines poverty rate decline by 5 percentage points between 2006 and 2015, the most recent data available. Poverty fell from 26.6 percent in 2006 to 21.6 percent in 2015, because to the contributing factors such as the growth of non-agricultural occupations, government transfers, particularly to eligible impoverished Filipinos under the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), and remittances (The World Bank, 2018).

Furthermore, to address the problem of poverty in the country. The Philippine government initiated a program

that supports the poor financially. The government implemented a cash grant program or the so-called Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps). The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) is a national government-sponsored human development program that gives out conditional cash payments to the poorest of the poor. It is modeled after the conditional cash transfer (CCT) programs that have lifted millions of people out of poverty in Latin American and African countries (The World Bank, 2017).

Despite, its economic progress, the Philippines still continues to face the effects of poverty. In 2018, a quarter of the 105 million inhabitants in the Philippines, or about 26 million people, were poor (Opportunity International, 2018). In 2018, the population's poverty incidence, or the proportion of poor Filipinos whose per capita income is insufficient to cover their basic food and non-food needs, was assessed to be 16.6%. This corresponds to 17.6 million Filipinos living in poverty, with a family of five costing an average of P 10,727 in 2018. Subsistence incidence among Filipinos, on the other hand, was reported at 5.2 percent in 2018, referring to the proportion of Filipinos whose income is insufficient to cover even basic food demands. The monthly food budget for a household of five was calculated to be P 7,528.00 (Mapa, 2019).

According to studies, conditional cash transfer programs have a positive impact on people's education, health, and financial well-being in various countries throughout the world. Conditional cash transfer schemes have been shown to reduce poverty and inequality, according to empirical research (Raymundo, 2018 & De Vera, 2019). However, various studies have found that cash transfer systems fail to capture the overall human development index (Diaz, 2021). In the same sentiment, according to the former secretary of the Department of Social Welfare Development (DSWD) Judy Taguiwalo that the 4Ps is not an anti-poverty initiative. The program she argued is equivalent of providing assistance to poor families. Even the data would show that poverty has not decreased. She added that, in order to go out of poverty a person must use their own skills and community efforts rather than relying just on government assistance (Gonzales, 2016). Arguably, the cash grants programs of the government lack the idea that capture the tenets of human development. However, the program is not something bad at all, rather it needs to be strengthened in order to achieve a fully human development program for the poorest of the poor.

The most pressing issue in development is addressing the issue of poverty, which is inextricably linked to the

ultimate objective of social, political, and economic growth. Development will be inefficient and unsustainable if poverty is not properly addressed. In order to deal with poverty during the development process, it is necessary to investigate the definition of poverty and the causes of poverty. Understanding poverty and the standpoint of capability approach will help us discover the origins and causes of poverty, promote the capability of the poor. In this turning point, the understanding of poverty must be put into scrutiny. In line with the above arguments and perspectives about poverty and its response through program implementation like the distribution of wealth. It is then important to look the at reason why poverty should not be limited in the perspective of welfare economics as the lack of income and resources.

Thus, the aim of this paper is to scrutinize the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implemented by the government as human development measure to end the vicious cycle of poverty.

It aims to look at the purpose if the 4Ps is really girds towards human development or it lacks the principle of a fully human development measure in addressing poverty. This critical analysis is brought for the reason that researches are limited only as to the effects of 4Ps to its beneficiaries if the 4Ps is helpful or not. However, the paper wants to dig deeper as the goal of the 4Ps is concerned.

The paper aims also to contribute in the strengthening of the human development program of the government. That is, in the lenses of philosophical undertaking established by Sen's CA.

In doing so, the capability approach of Amartya Sen is utilized in the analysis of the 4Ps. As this paper argues that, the capability approach of Sen gives us a holistic perspective of poverty in which Sen envisions a fully human development for the poor. More so, the understanding for such concept of poverty is a significant endeavor, not just theoretically or empirically, but also practically, because this may be used in the future to orient public policies aimed at combating poverty or improving the living conditions of the impoverished.

This paper intends to do three things. First, the paper will present the 4Ps. Second, the paper will explicate the Capability Approach of Sen. And lastly, the analysis about the 4Ps looking through the lenses of Capability Approach if it is really a human development program

for the poor, and the understanding of poverty as new precepts to guide social policies.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE PANTAWID PAMILYANG PILIPINO PROGRAM (4Ps)

The Philippines is grappling with a serious poverty crisis. In most cases, their situation is normal. More of them are unemployed, and the extent of the scarcity appears to be continuing. Filipinos are suffering as a result of rising socioeconomic inequality. As a result, the Philippine government has suggested that it is a significant effort to combat poverty by continuing to develop projects and that is, the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) as a social aid. The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program's goal is to provide financial assistance to poor families for their daily needs and the needs of their children.

CCT programs were created in Mexico and Brazil in the mid to late 1990s in response to the economic upheavals that afflicted the poor and vulnerable in Latin America following the introduction of structural adjustment measures. These social security programs provide direct cash payments in exchange for beneficiaries meeting health and education standards, which are especially important for children and mothers. CCT schemes have been introduced around the country since then. Latin America and Africa, as well as Asia, particularly the Philippines, are fast gaining popularity (Howlett, 2018).

CCTs are based on the idea that building human capital is a form of development that can be achieved by giving money to poor families, often women, in exchange for ensuring their children's regular attendance in school, accompanying them to health clinics, and participating in classes and workshops on health, nutrition, and sanitation (St. Claire, 2009 & Bradshaw 2008 & Hall, 2006).

Philippine Adaptation of 4Ps

The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program, also known as the CCT program, began in 2007. It was held on an experimental basis under Arroyo's administration with the support of roughly 6,000 homes. In 2016, under the "Aquino government," this initiative was expanded. It increased the program's benefits by making it available to 4.5 million households. Cash payments are given to disadvantaged families with children aged 0 to 18 years old as part of this initiative. They can use this money on health and education, for example (Behrens, 2019). Pantawid Pamilya program implementation is under the supervision of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). In its first year, the

program enrolled 300,000 people, and by June 2018, it had grown to serve about 4.9 million people in 144 cities and 1,483 municipalities (DSWD 2018).

The 4Ps, the Philippines' version of the CCT, is based on the fundamental CCT framework. "The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps)," according to the DSWD, is a National Government's poverty reduction and social development policy that gives conditional cash payments to severely poor households in order to enhance their health, nutrition, and education, particularly for children aged 0-14 (Fernandez & Olfindo, 2011). It has two goals: first as Social Aid, which provides cash assistance to the poor to meet their immediate needs (short-term poverty reduction); and second as a Social Development, which aims to break the intergenerational poverty cycle through human capital investments. It contributes to the country's commitment to reach the Millennium Development Goals, which include: (1) eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, (2) achieving universal primary education, (3) promoting gender equality, (4) lowering child mortality, and (5) reducing child mortality (5) boost the health of mothers (United Nations New York, 2015).

The 4Ps program provides 6,000 pesos per year (P500 per month) for health and nutrition expenses to each home selected by the program. In addition, it offers 3000 pesos each child for a school year (ten months) or 300 pesos per month for educational expenses. A household can only receive a subsidy if it has a maximum of three children. Beneficiaries must comply with the following conditions: 1) pregnant women must receive pre and postnatal care, as well as be accompanied by a trained health professional during childbirth; 2) parents must attend family development sessions; 3) 0-5-year-old children must receive regular preventive health check-ups and vaccines; 4) 3-5-year-old children must attend day care or preschool classes (Official Gazette Website). The subsidy will be paid to the household recipients as long as they meet certain criteria. However, the above conditions is dependent upon the subsidy given to the poor families.

Moreover, the 4Ps program has brought a lot of changes in the lives of the poor Filipinos. Hayakawa et al., (2015) argued that, the program was achieving its goal of assisting impoverished children in maintaining their health. It was discovered that the program had a positive long-term influence on the nutritional status of younger children (6-36 months old). The program reduced severe stunting in early children (6-36 months old) by 10%, whereas 24 percent of the same age group in barangays that were not engaged in the program were badly

stunted. The key explanation for this improved long-term nutritional status is that the program allowed parents to give better and more consistent care for their children, such as feeding more protein rich foods like eggs. Furthermore, the study found that the program was assisting low-income families in increasing their investments in their children's health and education. Beneficiary households were changing their spending habits, spending more on health and education than non-beneficiary households, according to the report. It was also discovered that beneficiary households spent less money on vices like alcohol and that the program assisted them in increasing their savings (Hayakawa et al., 2015).

In terms of education of the child, the 4Ps program has partially achieved its goal of assisting students in improving their academic performance. In addition, the program reinforced in the pupils the importance of education as one of the best investments for a better future. The grant piques the 4Ps recipients' interest in attending lessons, which is higher than it was before they received the money. The possibility also reduced the number of youngsters who were compelled to drop out of school to help their families meet their financial obligations. The decrease in child labor cases indicates that the 4Ps program is succeeding in its mission to better the lives of disadvantaged families and to help parent-beneficiaries understand the value of education as a component of success (Flores, 2019). In the same sentiment, Frye (2019) argued that, one of the goals of conditional cash transfer is to help the educational needs of the beneficiaries. There is also evidence that the program's emphasis on education is benefiting to the students. 4Ps recipient households with students in the 16-17-year demographic range witnessed a 10% increase in school enrolment from a baseline of 60.8 percent. 4Ps beneficiaries boosted enrolment by 4.9 percent among 12- to 17-year-olds (Ibid.).

Furthermore, the 4Ps aims to strengthen in the investment on the health, education and the economic conditions of the poor. In mind, the cash grant program hopes to deviate from the traditional approach to welfare economics, that is putting more emphasis on the utilities and satisfaction of the person. Rather, the 4Ps focuses on human capital and investment through wealth distributions and not on the satisfaction and command of resources. According to Orbeta Jr., et al(2021), based on the studies, the 4Ps in general shows a desirable impacts on most of the education and health of the poor families.

Despite, the positive impact of the 4Ps to the lives of the poor through financial subsidies. Still, it was being

criticized for it only focuses on a short-term human development measure. Moreover, the program conceived the idea of poverty in its narrow sense – lack of income and resources.

The beneficiaries of the CCT programs based on the study conducted by the Word Bank, found out that 4Ps failed to achieve its goal of breaking the “cycle of intergenerational transmission of poverty.” The study focused on children aged 12.5 to 14 who enrolled in the program in 2008. According to the World Bank, after receiving financial handouts for one and a half years, these beneficiaries did not see any meaningful improvement in their schooling or labor market outcomes (Business World, 2021).

Based on the research about the 4Ps in relation to the educational well-being of the students. It was found out that, the educational investment is not enough to sustained the students schooling and opportunities. Thus, it was recommended that investments must be made to improve impoverished people's access to primary and secondary education so that they can take advantage of job opportunities that are mostly not available to them. It is suggested that Pantawid Pamilya Pilipino Program be redesigned to improve the poor's skills, allowing them to find more job options with higher pay (Tabuga, 2013).

Further, Chavez (2019) argued that it is important to highlight that 4Ps is not a fully human development anti-poverty initiative. The 4Ps has been criticized for preventing Filipinos from being self-sufficient and autonomous. The 4P's dole-out system creates the false impression that the government provides all essential financial support to meet families' basic necessities (Ibid.). In essence, the 4Ps just divert people's attention away from pressing for jobs and long-term livelihood possibilities, as well as accessible, inexpensive, and high-quality government services in health, education, housing, and disaster relief (Cagula, 2019).

With this, the 4Ps in addressing the problem of poverty in country lacks its essence and fails to look at the different social conditions of the poor. In which, it tends to reduce poverty as mere lack of means to achieve a valuable end. Thereby, fails to overcome the intergenerational cycle of poverty among the poor. In mind, this moral arrest will bother us to call for new ways of understanding poverty in its holistic sense. To further, what is the shortcoming of the program with its principle that need to be address in order to realize a fully-development measure for the poor. This scrutiny will bring us to light following to the philosophy of

Amartya Sen founded in the idea of capabilities. That is, putting the importance of individual freedom to achieve valuable living. This can be realizing, according to Sen, through the expansion of one's capabilities or in the space of human capabilities.

III. AMARTYA SEN'S CAPABILITY APPROACH

Amartya Kumar Sen an Indian economist and philosopher who first introduced the concept of capability approach in his ever-enduring Tanner lecture "Equality of What?" He combines economics and philosophy to investigate the best way to assess a person's well-being. It was his first work in which he elaborated on his capability approach. This focuses on people's ability and freedom to live the kind of life they value. Since then, the capability approach has emerged as a popular (inter-disciplinary) alternative to traditional economic frameworks for analyzing inequality (Robeyns, 2005). In this work Sen criticizes the traditional approach to economics which focuses on income and wealth as basis for the measurement of human wellbeing. Rather for Sen, well-being is more than just a matter of material prosperity or pleasure; it is also a matter of how people manage their lives and their ability to perform certain things that are essential to them (Robeyns, 2011).

Furthermore, Sen's capability approach is based on moral principles. It recommends that social arrangements be judged primarily on the extent to which people have the freedom to promote as well as achieve functions that they value. The capability approach of Sen is a theoretical framework based on two key normative propositions. First, the premise that having the freedom to pursue well-being is the most important moral goal. Second, the freedom to attain happiness must be viewed through the lens of person's capabilities. To put it another way, actual opportunity to do and be what they value (Sen, 1979).

Moreover, Sen's Capability Approach aims to address the problem of poverty. In doing so, he presented two key arguments for reformulating the concept of well-being in welfare economics. First, Sen claims that primary goods, which he defines only as means that assist everyone in achieving their ends, cannot provide sufficient information for judging well-being. Second, he claims that human capability, or the degree to which people are free, plays a direct, and crucial, part in achieving happiness. These two arguments are based on the premise that freedom is the fundamental basis of human development (Sen, 1999).

Unlike the traditional approach to economics which emphasized the equality of primary social goods. Sen distinguishes between equality in terms of primary goods and equality in terms of capabilities. According to Sen, assessments of equality should not merely be based on people's command of resources, sense of contentment, or want but should also include people's actual lives, their capabilities to convert such goods (Gore, 1997). The fact that equal benefits to those with differing needs will not yield equal well-being is a cause to reconsider our views on inequality (Gasper, 2004). As a result, Sen's use of equality as a starting point to reflects a clear principle of each person's value and importance, as well as their right to equality.

Sen argues the idea that indices like the Gross National Product, Gross Domestic Product, and per capita income that are being used in welfare economics to assess human well-being is not enough. To solve the problem of poverty and the expansion economy for the belief that it might ease the poor's low income. This process, according to Des Gasper (2000), stems from the fact economic production generates wealth, which is converted as income. Income is used on consumption, resulting in personal utility. In this sense, utility is defined as "economic wellbeing" This indicates that economic well-being is defined as the result of income obtained by increased economic inputs. Higher input to the process necessitates more labor, resulting in employment. People gain money through this, which allows them to consume goods and therefore satisfy their personal utility and needs. This type of satisfaction is referred to as wellbeing in welfare economics. In this sense, income is equated to well-being.

In the arguments, Sen sees welfare economics views poverty in a narrow sense as a lack of income. He goes on to say that this definition of poverty is inadequate as a foundation for understanding why individuals are robbed of their well-being. It also does not explain how much or what kind of deprivation people face, whether it is serious or inconceivable, as in the case of homeless orphans or families. If we focus exclusively on the size of incomes, according to Sen, the true extent of deprivation may be underestimated (Sen, 1992). According to Sen, when it comes to identifying and evaluating poverty, an income-centered perspective can be quite misleading (Sen, 1993). One explanation for this argument is that income equality does not guarantee equality in human well-being because a person (such as a pregnant woman, or a person with a physical disability or a child) may face challenges due to his or her unique circumstances. He claims that even when both of them have the same income, a pregnant woman may have to

overcome disadvantages in living comfortably than male of the same age (Sen, 1992). Inequality exists in life, according to Sen, because people are deprived of their capabilities, preventing them from achieving even the most basic of all functioning (Ibid, 1992). Insensitivity to a pregnant woman's health care demands, for example, has an impact on her well-being as well as the full nutrition of her future child. Inadequate health-care provision is an evident hindrance to achieving some goals that a pregnant woman might choose for herself.

Functionings and Capabilities

A normative commitment to define well-being in terms of capabilities and functionings is at the heart of the capability approach. Functionings are a person's "doings and beings", or the various states and activities that they can engage in, such as being well-nourished, getting married, being educated, and traveling, whereas capabilities are the real, or substantive, opportunity that they have to achieve these doings and beings (Robeyns, 2020). Furthermore, functionings correspond to an individual's physical state of being, such as whether he or she has enough food to eat; a mental state of being, such as whether she enjoys doing creative work that she finds fulfilling; and a social state of being, such as whether he or she is free to participate in social gatherings (Gore, 1997). As a result, functionings are the different things that a person may choose to achieve in his or her life and hence value doing. Sen claims that functionings is more closely linked to various living conditions (Sen, 1987). In some ways, a person's functionings reveal the type of life he or she leads. Capability, on the other hand, refers to a person's ability or strength to perform particular functionings. According to Sen, this capability will constitute the person's freedom – the actual opportunities (Sen, 1992 & 1987). Capability is meant to represent a person's freedom to live of life or another (Sen, 1999). In this view, capability equates to human freedom.

Capabilities as Substantive Freedom

Sen states that the capability approach to development considers individual substantive freedom to be the foundation upon which all of our presuppositions of social, political, and economic advantages are evaluated. As a result, the emphasis to the development of individual capabilities, as these are the ones that ensure an all-encompassing and thorough account of development. Development, according to the capability approach, is defined as "the extension of a person's skills to lead the kinds of lives they value – and have reason to value" (Sen, 1999). The primacy of individual

substantive freedom is founded on two main factors that support its relevance in the development paradigm. The first reason substantive freedom is important is that, as previously stated, freedom plays an evaluative role in determining an individual's actual state of development based on her capacities to choose and achieve various states of doing and living rather than the traditional focus of income and commodities. The development of a community or society is determined by the members' substantive freedom; therefore, a society develops when its members are able to exercise their positive freedom to choose the kind of functionings they have reason to value (Sen, 1999). Sen claims that having more freedom to do the activities one has reason to value is substantial in and of itself for one's total freedom, and crucial in nurturing one's opportunity to have valuable outcomes (Sen, 1999). The second argument is that emphasizing on individual freedom allows for a comprehensive assessment of development while also accounting for individual initiative. Individuals with more freedom have a greater chance of improving themselves and, as a result, contributing to society's success (Sen, 1999). Insofar as Sen is concerned, development is not entirely subjective; it is fundamentally holistic. While the capability approach emphasizes the importance of individual choice for human flourishing, it also recognizes the critical role that society and institutional arrangements play in achieving a truly human development for the poor.

Capabilities and Individual Heterogeneities

Sen believes that if we want to improve people's capabilities, we must consider their various differences. Internal or external differences in terms of attributes or qualities can exist. These differences and heterogeneities decide whether or not a person is capable of achieving well-being. The mere concentration on income says nothing about what a person can or cannot do in the context of human life's complexities. These are both internal and environmental factors. Sen categorizes diversities into five broad categories:

1. Personal Heterogeneities. People's health and physical traits (related to age, gender, sickness, and disability) vary, resulting in a wide range of demands. Such differences have an impact on a person's ability to translate particular goods and income into actual functionings. A person with a terminal disease may require more income to support her condition of deprivation; nevertheless, even with the money she has, she may not experience the same level of contentment and happiness as a healthy person with the same amount of money (Sen, 1999).

2. Environmental diversities. Environmental factors such as climatic conditions (temperature ranges, rainfall, flooding, and so on) might affect what a person gets out of a particular level of income (Ibid.).
3. Variations in social climate. Social factors, such as public education and the presence or absence of crime and violence in a given location, influence the conversion of personal incomes and resources into quality of life (Ibid.).
4. Differences in relational perspectives. The distribution of income and commodities varies by community. A somewhat poor person in a wealthy town may require more income to perform some basic functions, such as participating in community social life and gaining self-respect, than a poor person in a very impoverished neighborhood. This suggests that inter-societal differences can influence a person's level of development within a specific culture (Ibid.).
5. Distribution within the family. The level of real development of individual family members is determined by the intra-family distribution of income among family members, for example, if one person's income is shared by all family members who are not wage earners. A family of five with members who are frequently ill requires more resources than a family of three healthy persons (Ibid.).

According to Sen (1999), these various differences and changes in the relationship between income and wellbeing render opulence, in the sense of high real income a narrow guide to welfare and the quality of life (Sen, 1999). Equivalent resources for people with varying demands may not always result in equivalent development. To further, for Sen, these characteristics are critical in determining an individual's well-being in realizing the kind of life he or she may desire. Because what people can or cannot have, does not depend solely on income, social inequality cannot be completely grasped from the narrow perspective of economic activity (Ibid.). Sen argues that, while economic progress is important, we must go beyond it when evaluating human well-being (Sen, 1999). Sen's Capability Approach, which takes this into account, proposes that social structures be evaluated in terms of people's freedom (Alkire, 2002). The reason for this is that a person's level of freedom or capability is directly related to his or her level of well-being. The ability of a person to do many functionings is necessary for his or her well-being that determines the quality of his or her life, or how well that life is lived. If equality in society

is to be desired, it should be anchored in the area of capabilities (Ibid).

CAPABILITY DEPRIVATION AS POVERTY

To contextualize, economic expansion has long been associated with human development. Sen's Capability Approach, which introduced a paradigm in the way we conceive development, challenged this idea (Sen 1979, 1985, 1987, 1989). In comparison to the prior approach, this new development paradigm was built on the idea of individual capabilities. The person is now the unit of analysis rather than the economy, and the area in which development is measured is made up of capabilities and freedoms rather than income. The fact that per capita GDP has no direct relationship with people's well-being, this can not be the basis for the holistic understanding of poverty. Despite a country with higher per capita GDP, still higher poverty rates is rampant. As a result, people's well-being is unrelated to economic progress. It follows that, people are poor not because of the lack of wealth rather it was being deprived of freedom and capabilities (Robeyns, 2011).

IV. 4PS THROUGH THE LENS OF CA

The role of the 4Ps in addressing the issues on poverty in the country is very important. Yet, it lacks the holistic point of view in the analysis of the problem in achieving a truly human development for the poor. According to Diaz (2021), the conditional cash transfer to the poor promises to counter and end the problem of poverty and inequality to achieve a fully human development for the poor. However, the 4Ps as human development measure narrowed in its applications in alleviating the poor. The two goals of the 4Ps to provide the needs of the poor and to break the cycle of poverty fails to capture a holistic human development for the poor. For the reason that, the 4Ps is somehow looking the situation where the needs of the poor can be justified through the distribution of income in order to meet their well-being. According to Sen (1979), these goods are just simply means towards certain ends. And not an informational basis in understanding the dire situation of the poor. In principle, the 4Ps equates that this cash distribution is considered as ends in itself. In that perspective, the 4Ps fails to capture in the understanding of poverty as lack of capabilities.

In the preceding discussion, it is evident that the capability approach is concerned with evaluating individual well-being not on the basis of particular material possessions or wealth, but on the actual lives that people are living and whether they can truly choose among a variety of life functionings (Sen, 1999). Thus,

it can be argued, that the 4Ps did not escaped form the traditional approach of economics. Putting forward first and foremost the importance of consumption and economic expansion as human satisfaction. For the reason that, the distribution of wealth still under the principle of traditional welfare economics the emphasis in goods as end in itself. Sen maintains that the emphasis on individual substantive freedom provides for a broader viewpoint in looking at the problem of poverty and inequality. That is, by emphasizing on freedom, we are compelled to think of progress in terms of income and GNP and GDP growth, which are by no means insufficient to account for the people's deprivations.

To buttress this point, Sen (1999) argued that, human development should be based on freedom rather than material satisfaction, income and wealth. This claim stems from the notion that wealth is not synonymous with happiness or well-being. Wealth is just simple means, Sen says, it is only helpful and for the sake of something else (Ibid.). Income, according to Sen, are only valuable because they enable people to achieve particular life functionings. As a result, economic growth must be viewed as a means to human development rather than as a goal in itself (Gasper, 2002). This indicates that economic growth is only useful for people who want to achieve particular goals in life, such as buying a respectable home. However, possessing one's own home is not an end in and of itself. To create a respectable living, an individual must make critical life decisions, i.e., the well-being of one's family is not equivalent with the type of house in which one lives.

To strengthen the argument, the idea of the 4Ps can be subject to the famous Chinese proverbs which states that: "Give a man a fish you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime." This means that, focusing on income-centered view will delimit the effects of the program. By mere giving of money to the poor will not guarantee for a fully human development. Furthermore, to illustrate an example, persons A and B needs a bicycle for their transportation in order to go a certain place fast and safely.

The bicycle in this example is considered as goods while being transported to the destination safely and easily is the goal. However, persons A and B may not achieve the same functionings or goal. If, for instance, A happened to be a disable and handicapped, she may not be able to use the bike to travel far than the former (Basu et al., 2011). In this case, the idea of focusing solely on resources that individual needs will not give us a holistic understanding of the person situation.

The individual is entitled with a life they find reasonable to live. The concept of entitlements must not be reduced to that of money. This is because equality in terms of capabilities is the only criterion that can legitimately be used to assess human well-being. Sen uses the example of a pauper who is starving due to famine and an affluent person who decides to fast to explain this point (Sen, 1999). Despite the fact that both persons lack the functioning of being well-nourished, the ability they have to avoid being well-nourished is significantly different (Robeyns, 2000). The poor person who is starving due to famine clearly lacks the freedom or capability to obtain nourishment, whereas the wealthier person who decides to fast does so. The distinction is that, the hunger person lacks the ability or flexibility to achieve a specific level of well-being, being nourished, but an affluent person who chooses to fast has that ability or freedom. In this way, their well-being can be measured in terms of their substantive freedom or capability. Certainly, the poor do not live a well-lived life, whereas the wealthier person who chooses to fast has more options in life due to his higher sense of freedom. It could be argued that the destitute should be entitled to certain goods as a result of his predicament like literacy, education or a basic skill for livelihood. These will be crucial for a valuable living life because it will increase the individual capability to meet certain ends.

Capability Approach: Strengthening the 4Ps in the Understanding of Poverty

Poverty is defined as a lack of basic capabilities in the capabilities paradigm. People can be robbed of these qualities in a variety of ways, including ignorance, oppressive state policies, a lack of financial means, poor health, a lack of sufficient education, and unexpected accidents. The breadth of this method is fairly broad; all aspects that may have an impact on people's skills must be considered. All possible factors, social and political processes, gender, inequality, discrimination of all kinds, social exclusion, disability, environmental conditions, personal and psychological factors – that can influence human capabilities, which is the primary measure of human well-being, are included in the domain of capability theory. It is a complete human development model in this sense. The capability approach emphasizes two things: freedoms to accomplish and functional capabilities.

Sen claims that when people are deprived of their freedom, they lose their capabilities. The capabilities are enhanced by having the freedom to do so. As a result, all development, according to Sen, is the growth of human potential in a free environment. Moreover, according to

Sen, the goal of development is to increase individual freedom, and freedom is the primary means of achieving that goal. As a result, development also entails removing major sources of constraint (lack of freedom), such as racial, religious, gender, and community-based discrimination; unreliable public facilities and poor infrastructure; a lack of economic opportunities; social exclusion and political marginalization; and policies restricting human rights, among other things. We might also consider the fear of violence or terror attacks as freedom-restricting issues in many nations where there is ethnic war.

In the above contention, Amartya Sen's capabilities approach is based on the concept of "people" as a human being having for instance emotional and psychological needs; development is viewed as the growth of people's capabilities – it is an enabling one's ability to convert resources towards certain ends. Its goal is to improve people's well-being by increasing their skills, which is linked to their freedom of choice. It acknowledges the prevalence of differences and the multifaceted nature of human well-being. The emphasis is not just on how people really function, but also on their ability to get outcomes that they value and have reason to value through their capabilities, which are practical choices. Rather than amassing commodities, it defines capabilities in terms of people's real freedoms. It offers a somewhat universal grammatical framework for comprehending the components of human well-being. The capability approach is a method for thinking about and assessing challenges in terms of people's skills that will somehow strengthen the 4Ps program.

V. CONCLUSION

Poverty is a concern for everyone, so it is hoped that everyone will work to interfere. With the effort and the help of the government this crisis will be prevented. This is evident with the implementation of anti-poverty program that aims for poverty reduction. However, if we are inform its nature and dynamics of the crisis we will be able to make a comprehensive analysis and solution to the problem of poverty. In which, the capability theory proposed by Amartya Sen is gird in addressing poverty. This theory allows us to look poverty as a multidimensional rather than focusing one aspects – that is, on income. The 4Ps, despite its aim to end intergenerational cycle of poverty still it falls in the idea of utility and resources. It limits the program to really gives the poor a fully human development measure, that will give them the freedom to achieve certain life functionings. It must be noted that, the focus of one's capabilities remains the primary concern of development. This refers to individual circumstances

rather their material satisfaction. Although, this material resources will lead to something which is satisfactory, yet it lacks the holistic approach as far as poverty is concerned. As Sen, reiterated, poverty is a deprivation of capabilities rather than the deprivation of income and resources.

Furthermore, Sen considers people to be agents of change, rather than passive beneficiaries of benefits or obedient followers of expert-made rules. According to Sen, people have to be seen as actively involved – given the opportunity – in shaping their own destiny, and not just as passive recipients of the fruits of cunning development programs in the development process. Thus, the central theme of development is to enable people to become change agents in their own lives. When people are regarded as agents, whether individually or in groups, they are able to define their priorities and choose the best means to attain them. Thus, the human-centered approach must be deepened and given a priority in development process. Thus, this paper recommends for future studies about the relation of capabilities in the political process. That is, if the poor are given the freedom in any social arrangements that the government initiated as one way also to inform how this policy really address or fit in expanding human capabilities.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alkire, Sabina (2002). *Valuing Freedoms*. Oxford University Press.
- [2] Alma Sonia Sanchez-Danday and Lorena Ripalda (2019). Perception of the Recipients on the 4Ps Poverty Alleviation Program in the Philippines. *World Journal of Research and Review* 8(6): 34-41.
- [3] Business World (2021). Short-term cash handouts failed to make impact — WB. Available at <https://www.bworldonline.com/short-term-cash-handouts-failed-to-make-impact-wb/> (accessed 1 November 2021).
- [4] Chito Chavez (2019). 4Ps Dole-outs 'Not Enough' for Poor Families. Available at <https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/manila-bulletin/20190529/281573767174068> (accessed 1 November 2021).
- [5] Diaz, Ronald (2021). Effects of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) and other Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Programs of Low and Middle – Income Countries on Human Development. *Sapienza: International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 2(1): 2-11.
- [6] Fernandez, L. & R. Oflindo (2011). Overview of the Philippines Conditional cash Transfer Program:

- The Pantawid Pamilya Pilipino Program. Philippine Social Note No. 2.
- [7] Gasper, Des (2000). Development as Freedom: Moving Economics beyond Commodities: The Cautious Boldness of Amartya Sen. *Journal of International Development* 12 (7): 989:1001.
- [8] Gasper, Des (2004). *The Ethics of Development*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.
- [9] Gore, Charles (1997). Irreducibly Social Goods and the Informational Basis of Sen's Capabilities Approach. *Journal of International Development* 9 (2): 235-250.
- [10] Inaba, Kazuo & Omar, Abdullah (2020). Does Financial Inclusion Reduce Poverty and Income Inequality in Developing Countries? A Panel Data Analysis. *Journal of Economic Structures* 9 (37): 1-25.
- [11] International Labour Origination (2016). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2016*. ILO United States: 1-89.
- [12] Jessica Rea Jennifer & Sheehy-Skeffington (2017). How Poverty Affects People's Decisionmaking Process. Joseph Rowntree Foundation: 1-73.
- [13] Ken Cagula (2019). CWR: Institutionalization of 4Ps a Failure of Gov't to end roots of Poverty. Available at <http://davaotoday.com/main/politics/cwr-institutionalization-of-4ps-afailure-of-govt-to-end-roots-of-poverty/> (accessed 1 November 2021).
- [14] Orbeta Jr, Aniceto et al (2021). Reassessing the Impact of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program: Results of the Third Wave Impact Evaluation. Discussion Paper Series: (5): 1-135.
- [15] Richmond Vale (2017). 6 Main Causes of Poverty in the World. Richmond Vale Academy. Available at <https://richmondvale.org/en/blog/6-main-causes-of-poverty-in-the-world>(accessed 1 November 2021).
- [16] Robeyns, Ingrid (2005). The Capability Approach: A Theoretical Survey. *Journal of Human Development* 6(1): 93-114.
- [17] Robeyns, Ingrid (2011). The Capability Approach. Available at <https://stanford.library.sydney.edu.au/archives/win/2016/entries/capability-approach/>(accessed 2 November 2021).
- [18] Sen, Amartya (1992). *Inequality Reexamined*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [19] Sen, Amartya (1992). *Inequality Reexamined*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [20] Sen, Amartya (1993). Capability and Well-being. In Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum (eds.). *The Quality of Life*. Oxford University Press.
- [21] Sen, Amartya (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [22] The World Bank (2017). FAQs about the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps). World Bank. Available at: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/philippines/brief/faqs-aboutthe-pantawid-pamilyang-pilipino-program> (accessed 1 November 2021).
- [23] The World Bank (2018). World Bank, Philippines Sign US\$300 Million Additional Funding for the Philippines' Conditional Cash Transfer Program. World Bank. Available at: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/11/28/world-bank-andphilippines-sign-usd300-million-additional-funding-for-the-philippines-conditional-cashtransfer-program> (accessed 1 November 2021).
- [24] Zachary Frye (2019). The power of public programs: cash transfers are helping reduce poverty in the Philippines. Available at <https://www.aseantoday.com/2019/10/the-power-of-publicprograms-cash-transfers-are-helping-reduce-poverty-in-the-philippines/>(accessed 1 November 2021)