

Self-Esteem, Self-Regulation, Educational Aspirations and Priority Concerns of Student Grant's-in-Aid Program for Poverty Alleviation (SGP-PA) Grantees

*Ma. Lulu L. Loyola, Ed.D. RGC
Nove D. Jalandoni, Ph.D., RGC
Baby Rose G. Robles, Ph.D., RGC
West Visayas State University
*Email address: vpret@wvsu.edu.ph

Abstract

This study looked into the self-esteem, self-regulation, educational aspirations and priority concerns of the 226 SGP-PA grantees at West Visayas State University. Results revealed that the respondents had low self-esteem; mostly average self-regulation except those from the provinces of Antique and Guimaras who had poor self-regulation. Generally, they had moderate educational aspirations but high for those with average family size. Their topmost priority concern was their studies and the least was specific social issues. As to their studies, their topmost concern was: understanding their lessons and the least was working with classmates on projects. As regards self-development, planning their lives was topmost while knowing and understanding themselves was the least. As to family relationships, the topmost concern was improving their relationship with their siblings and least was teaching their parents how to handle their children effectively. In the area of social relationships, the topmost was developing their skills for starting/maintaining friendships and the least was getting rid of their fear of social situations. On specific social issues, their topmost concern was handling adjustments caused by financial crises, and the least was learning more about sexual abuse/harassment. Finally, significant differences existed only in the level of educational aspirations according to grantees' family size; none were observed in the level of self-esteem and self-regulation. As gleaned from these results, appropriate intervention program on self-development may be designed for the grantees of the program.

Keywords: educational aspiration; priority concerns; self-esteem; self-regulation; SGPPA grantees

A nation's progress hinges on the education of its people. Education has always been strongly viewed as a pillar of national development and a primary avenue for social and economic mobility (Philippine Education for All Report, 2008).

The 1986 Philippine Constitution mandated that government shall protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels and take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all and to establish and maintain a system of scholarship grants, student loan program, subsidies and other incentives which shall be available to deserving student in public and private schools specifically to the underprivileged (Art XIV, Sec. 2&3).

As part of a long term mechanism in addressing such needs and to break the vicious poverty cycle afflicting the poor but deserving Filipino youth and their families, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has instituted the Students' Grant's-in-Aid Program for Poverty Alleviation (SGP-PA) in partnership with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) (CHED CMO. No. 9, series of 2012).

The SGP-PA is a scholarship program that covers the college education of the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Program beneficiaries. The qualified beneficiaries shall be enrolled in leading state colleges and universities to take up priority courses that the CHED deem critical to national development. The program is giving opportunities to children of poor families to be able to have a college diploma for them to be employed to higher value-added occupation to break the vicious cycle of poverty and at the same time enable them to contribute productively to national development (CHED CMO No. 9 series of 2012).

West Visayas State University (WVSU), a government institution of higher learning in Western Visayas, is a partner institution in the implementation of this program. It has been observed that since the grantees come from deprived home environments, they have difficulty in their adjustment and in coping with the demands of college life. Thus, there is a need to look into some factors that may affect grantees' adjustment and completion of their college education. This includes self-esteem, self-regulation, educational aspirations, and other priority concerns.

Self-esteem is an overall, general feeling of self-worth that incorporates self-concepts in all areas of life, so it is the “summary judgment” about a person’s worth (O’Mara, Marsh, Craven & Debus, 2006 in Woolfolk, 2009). It is an affective reaction – an overall judgment of self-worth that includes feeling confident and proud of oneself as a person (Schunk, Pintrich & Meece, 2008 in Woolfolk, 2009). Self-esteem is how much persons like themselves and how much they value their self-worth, importance, attractiveness, and social competence (Plotnik, 2006).

Self-esteem being central to everything that one does influences every aspect of one’s life. It affects one’s behavior and thoughts (Perera, 2001) and even how one relates with other people. Self-esteem can spell the difference between success and failure as it affects one’s confidence and self-belief, having courage to try new things. Similarly, self-esteem affects motivation, functional behavior, and life satisfaction, and is significantly related to well-being throughout life. What individuals choose to do and the way they do it in part may be dependent upon their self-esteem (Guindon, 2010).

In fact, having high self-esteem is associated with positive outcomes, such as being cheerful and happy, having healthy social relationships, and promoting personal adjustment, while having low self-esteem is associated with negative outcomes, such as depression, anxiety, antisocial behavior and poor personal adjustment (Baumeister et al., 2003 in Plotnik, 2006). Besides, low self-esteem can have a crippling effect on a person’s life in varied forms (Laishram, 2013) as it influences many aspects of personality (Roberts et al., 2002 cited in Robins & Trzesniewski, 2010). Hence, self-esteem is crucial and is a cornerstone of a positive attitude towards living. It has a direct bearing on one’s happiness and well-being (Perera, 2011).

Longitudinal studies on how self-esteem affects a student’s behavior in school reveal that more positive self-beliefs are related to higher academic achievement, especially when the beliefs are specific to the subject studied (Valentine, DuBois, & Cooper, 2004 in Woolfolk, 2009). It may be that high achievement leads to high self-esteem, or vice-versa. In fact, it probably works both ways (Marsh, 1987 in Pintrich & Schunk 2002).

Self-regulation on the other hand, is important for human survival and is directly connected with the goal of social acceptance (Zimmerman, 2000). It allows individuals to appropriately respond to their environment (Bronson, 2000 as cited in Florez, 2011).

Self-regulation is a broad term denoting any kind of regulation of the self by the self; thus, whenever by use of some psychological capacity some psychological process—be it behavioral, motivational or attentional—is brought to desired state, this is an instance of self-regulation (Vohs & Baumeister, 2004 in Hofer *et al.*, 2010).

Baumeister and Vohs (2007), defined self-regulation as the self's capacity to alter its behaviors. These behaviors are changed in accordance to some standards, ideals or goals either stemming from internal or societal expectations.

Further, Ponitz (as cited in Hoffman 2010) defines self-regulation as the ability to control and direct one's own feelings, thoughts and actions. Self-regulation underlies our daily decisions and long-term behavioral tendencies. He says "when people make poor choices – for example about health, school, work, or relationships, it is usually because of failure of self-regulation". Self-regulation is increasingly seen as a good predictor of child's academic success. Good self-regulation skills are important for a child's social development. Self-regulation helps children succeed in classroom contexts, McClelland says. The children who can successfully navigate these learning environments have better relationships with their teachers, are more liked by their classmates, and do better academically. They are also more motivated to achieve because of these skills.

Self-regulation has also been found to be associated with success or failure in many different problems that impact society (Baumeister & Vohs, 2004, 2007; Worden *et al.*, 1989). When there is insufficient self-regulation these issues occur: abuse of drugs and alcohol, addiction, unwanted pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, gambling, violence, crime, eating disorders, anger control problems, underachievement in school, debt and bankruptcy, and more (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008).

Baumeister and Vohs (2007) assert that those with good self-regulatory skills have success in school, work, and relationships and have more positive mental health in general. In fact, successful self-regulation maybe defined as the willingness to exert effort towards one's most important goals while taking setbacks, difficulties, and even outright failure as an opportunity to learn, identify weaknesses and address them, and develop new strategies toward achieving those goals (Crocker *et al.*, 2006.)

Self-regulation also known as self-regulated learning refers to the process whereby learners systematically direct their thoughts, feelings, and actions toward the attainment of their goals. Educational psychologists and educators alike are increasingly advocating the importance of emphasizing self-regulation in the classroom both to increase learning and to equip students with the tools to educate themselves throughout their lives (Alexander *et al.* in Moreno, 2010). Research supports this idea by showing that high-achieving students are more likely to be self-regulated learners than low-achieving students. Specifically, high-achieving students are able to set more specific learning goals, use more learning strategies, better learning monitor, and systematically evaluate their progress toward learning goals than their counterparts (Alexander, 2006; Boekerts, 2006; Schunk & Zimmerman, 2006; Weinstien, Husman & Dierking, 2000 in Moreno, 2010).

Further, educational aspiration is the ideal amount of education a person would like to achieve (Reynolds & Pemberton, 2011). It is a decision, which the individual makes about what he wants to become in life and what course he wants to study (Hoppe in Singh, 2011). Individuals have aspirations in all stages of their development. An individual's aspiration level represents him not only as he is at any particular moment, but also as he would like to be some time in the future.

There are multiple influences on the formation of aspirations and it is helpful to recognize this as a dynamic process in which different interactions and experiences serve to moderate the goals which young people set for themselves. Although an established body of evidence highlights the central importance of family in shaping young people's aspirations, it is during the early teenage years that the influence of peers and wider society is thought to increase in importance. Theories about community level effects suggest three broad mechanisms, which may influence the formation of young people's aspirations: social networks; institutional effects and peer influences.

Geckova *et al.* (2010) studied the factors associated with educational aspirations among adolescents: cues to counteract socioeconomic differences. They aim to follow this effort and to explore the association between health, socioeconomic background, school-related factors, social support and adolescents' sense of coherence, and educational aspirations among adolescents from different educational tracks. The results show that the characteristics of the school environment, the family and the individual adolescent are all associated with the level of educational aspiration but in a different way for

different educational tracks.

In the same vein, this study looked into the different factors that might affect students' academic performance and completion of their college degree such as self-esteem, self-regulation, educational aspirations and other priority concerns of SGP-PA grantees enrolled at WVSU. The results may be of help in understanding the needs and concerns of the grantees which may be appropriately addressed by the partner school and other concerned collaborating agencies and stakeholders of the SGPPA program of CHED.

Methodology

A total of two hundred twenty-six (226) first year college SGP-PA grantees enrolled at West Visayas State University, Second Semester, Academic Year 2012-2013. The students were from the four identified priority degree programs of CHED namely: Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT), Bachelor in Special Education (BSpEd), Bachelor of Science in Agriculture (BSA) & Bachelor of Science in Forestry (BS Forestry).

The purposive sampling method was utilized in the study. Four (4) published instruments were used in gathering the data, to wit: the Self-esteem Inventory (Fleming & Whalen, 1990) composed of 15 items; the Self-Discipline and Self-Control (Roldan, 2003) to determine the participants degree of self-regulation having 20 items; the Educational Aspiration Questionnaire (Lorenzo, 2004) was used to determine the SGP-PA grantees educational aspiration; the Needs Assessment Inventory for Students Villar (2007) to assess the priority concerns of the respondents, comprised of five areas: self-development, family relationships, social relationships, studies, and specific social issues.

The accomplished instruments were examined for completeness of data, and the scores were tallied, tabulated and computer-processed. The descriptive statistics used were frequency counts, means, standard deviation, and ranks. The t-test and ANOVA were utilized for inferential statistics set at .05 level of significance.

Results and Discussions

The Profile of the Respondents

A total of 226 SGPPA Grantees participated in the study. Majority of the respondents are female, younger, taking up BS Agriculture in Lambunao Campus and come from intact families and large family sizes. Generally, belonging to a large family size is basically a primary reason of poverty. Moreover, more than half of the respondents come from Negros Occidental (Philippine Statistics Authority- National Statistical Coordination Board Region VI Western Visayas, 2012) which has the highest poverty incidence in Region VI. Table 1 shows the profile of respondents.

Table 1

Profile of Respondents (n=226)

Category	f	%
Entire Group	226	100
Sex		
Male	79	35
Female	147	65
Age		
Younger (16 - 21)	175	77
Older (22 - 29)	51	23
Residence		
Aklan	58	26
Antique	39	17
Guimaras	10	4
Negros Occidental	119	53
Family Size		
Average (1-3)	15	6.6
Large (4-Up)	211	93.4
Family Structure		
Intact	216	95.6
Disrupted	10	4.4
Degree Program		
BSIT	35	16
SPED	38	17
BS Agriculture	114	50
BS Forestry	39	17
Campus		
WVSU Main	73	32
WVSU CAF	104	46
WVSU CALINOG	49	22

Differences among SGP-PA Grantees according to Level of Self-Esteem, Self-Regulation and Educational Aspirations

Results in Table 2 show that the respondents had low self-esteem ($M=2.12$, $SD=.33$). This result is consistent with Ridge's review (2009 in Batty & Flint, 2010) which highlighted the psychological effects of poverty including loss of self-esteem, powerlessness, anger, depression, anxiety and boredom, and relational effects such as stigma. Wilkinson's (1996) evidence suggests that many individuals on low incomes feel devalued, useless, helpless, hopeless, and anxious and define themselves as a failure. The view that poverty is intimately linked to shame and low self-esteem is consistent with the prioritization given by people with direct experience of poverty (Walker et al., 2007 & Lister 2004) and was highlighted by the World Bank's "Voices of the Poor" project (Oduro, 1999) in Walton, 2011. Poverty itself can create or contribute to problems of low self-esteem although this link is by no means universal (Batty & Flint, 2010).

Generally, respondents had average self-regulation ($M=0.63$, $SD=1.77$). However, those coming from Antique ($M=1.64$, $SD=.071$) and Guimaras ($M=1.50$, $SD=0.72$) had low self-regulation. This confirms Kuhnle's (2012) assertion that poverty attributes to many factors surrounding a child's social and environmental well-being affecting the child's ability to self-regulate. In the same vein, childhood poverty not only increases stress levels but interferes with regulatory systems that enable children to manage the many environmental demands typically accompanying poverty. Self-regulation and coping rely on multiple processes—attention control, working memory, inhibitory control, delay of gratification, and planning—that can be directly compromised by chronic stress (Blair, 2010; Blair & Raver, 2012 in Evans & Pilyoung, 2013).

Further, the participants' level of educational aspirations was moderate except those coming from average family size that had high educational aspirations. Although research results show that the aspirations of poorer young people are not radically different than those of other students, a difference becomes apparent in understanding how to achieve these aspirations, what role education plays- its links to their future employment, and the effort required from them as learners. Poverty is more than a lack of financial resources and income; it can also mean a lack of material, cultural and social resources which affect the aspirations, experiences and life opportunities of individuals (A Report of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee, 2013).

The result seems to cohere with the phenomenon of the “satisfied poor” where poor people become accustomed to low standards of living and therefore less motivated to escape poverty. This has been widely noted in the literature (Neff, 2009 in Walton, 2011) which identifies a number of mechanisms for this process of adaptation. One of these mechanisms is the low levels of self-esteem associated with poverty, although it has been noted that there is little empirical evidence to demonstrate this mechanism.

Table 2

Level of Self-Esteem, Degree of Self-Regulation, and Level of Educational Aspirations of SGP-PA Grantees

Category	Level of Self Esteem			Degree of Self-Regulation			Level of Educational Aspirations		
	SD	Mean	Description	SD	Mean	Description	SD	Mean	Description
Entire Group	0.33	2.12	Low	0.63	1.77	Average	0.16	2.97	Moderate
Sex									
Male	0.36	2.15	Low	0.59	1.84	Average	0.19	2.96	Moderate
Female	0.31	2.11	Low	0.66	1.73	Average	2.5	3.18	Moderate
Age									
Younger (16 - 21)	0.31	2.11	Low	0.63	1.78	Average	2.27	3.14	Moderate
Older (22 - 29)	0.39	2.18	Low	0.64	1.71	Average	0.20	2.96	Moderate
Residence									
Aklan	0.31	2.10	Low	0.67	1.79	Average	0.26	2.93	Moderate
Antique	0.31	2.10	Low	0.71	1.64	Poor	0.16	2.97	Moderate
Guimaras	0.42	2.20	Low	0.71	1.50	Poor	0	3.00	Moderate
Negros Occidental	0.34	2.13	Low	0.58	1.82	Average	2.75	3.24	Moderate
Family Size									
Average (1-3)	0.27	2.07	Low	0.49	1.67	Average	7.75	5.00	High
Large (4-up)	0.33	2.13	Low	0.64	1.77	Average	0.17	2.97	Moderate
Family Structure									
Intact	0.33	2.12	Low	0.63	1.76	Average	2.05	3.11	Moderate
Disrupted	0.42	2.20	Low	0.74	1.90	Average	0	3.00	Moderate
Degree Program									
BSIT	0.17	2.03	Low	0.71	1.71	Average	0.28	2.91	Moderate
SPED	0.31	2.11	Low	0.66	1.79	Average	0.16	2.97	Moderate
Agriculture	0.35	2.14	Low	0.62	1.75	Average	2.81	3.24	Moderate
Forestry	0.39	2.18	Low	0.59	1.85	Average	0	3.00	Moderate
School Campus									
Main Campus	0.25	2.07	Low	0.68	1.75	Average	0.23	2.95	Moderate
WVSU CAF	0.35	2.14	Low	0.61	1.83	Average	0	3.00	Moderate
WVSU Calinog	0.37	2.16	Low	0.60	1.65	Poor	0.20	2.96	Moderate

Note: Level of Self-Esteem: 1.0 – 2.33 = low; 2.34 -3.66=average; 3.67– 5.00= high;
 Degree of Self-Regulation: 1.00 – 1.66 = poorly disciplined; 1.67 – 2.33 = average; 2.34 – 3.00=highly disciplined
 Level of Educational Aspirations: 1.00 – 2.33 =low aspiration; 2.34 – 3.66=moderate; 3.67 – 5.00=high aspiration.

Differences among SG-PPA Grantees according to Level of Self-Esteem, Self-Regulation and Educational Aspirations

Table 3 shows the t-test results indicating that no significant differences existed in the level of self-esteem and level of self-regulation of SG-PPA Grantees according to different variables. The results may be attributed to the fact that the respondents can be considered homogenous and classified as “poor” being recipients of the government grant. Further, no significant differences existed in the level of self-regulation of SGPPA grantees probably for the same reason that there was not much diversity in the sample.

However, significant differences were found in the level of educational aspirations of respondents when grouped according to family size. Generally, those who come from small family size had more resources and consequently aim higher than those coming from large family size.

Table 4 shows that there were no significant differences in the grantees’ level of self-esteem, self-regulation and educational aspirations in terms of place of residence and degree program. As mentioned earlier, the grantees of the program have to satisfy the same criteria set by CHED, hence, there was not much diversity in the sample.

The aforementioned tables are found in the succeeding pages.

Table 3

The t-test results on the Differences in Self-Esteem, Self-Regulation and Educational Aspirations according to Sex, Age, Family structure, and Family size

Category	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	df	t	p	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Self-Esteem								
Sex								
Male	2.15	.36	.04	224	.934	.351	-.05	.13
Female	2.11	.31						
Age								
Younger	2.11	.31	-.07	224	-1.294	.197	-.18	.04
Older	2.18	.39						
Family Structure								
Intact	2.12	.33	-.08	224	-.745	.457	-.20	.13
Disrupted	2.20	.42						
Family Size								
Average	2.07	.26	-.06	224	-.694	.488	-.24	.11
Large	2.13	.33						
Self-Regulation								
Sex								
Male	1.84	.59	.11	224	1.216	.225	-.07	.28
Female	1.73	.66						
Age								
Younger	1.77	.64	.08	224	.762	.447	-.12	.28
Older	1.90	.74						
Family Structure								
Intact	1.76	.63	-.10	224	-.685	.494	-.55	.26
Disrupted	1.90	.74						
Family Size								
Average	1.67	.49	-.11	224	-.623	.534	-.44	.23
Large	1.77	.64						
Educational Aspirations								
Sex								
Male	2.96	.19	-.22	224	-.792	.429	-.77	.33
Female	3.18	2.48						
Age								
Younger	3.15	2.27	.19	224	.588	.557	-.44	.82
Older	2.96	.20						
Family Structure								
Intact	2.12	.33	.11	224	.171	.864	-.12	1.39
Disrupted	2.20	.42						
Family Size								
Average	5.0	7.74	2.03	224	3.906	.000	1.01	3.05
Large	2.97	.17						

Note: * $p \leq .05$

Table 4

ANOVA for the Differences in Self-Esteem, Self-regulation and Educational Aspiration according to Residences and Degree Program

Sources	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	sig
Residence					
Self-esteem					
Between Groups	.11	3	.04	.34	.794
Within Groups	24.42	222	.11		
Total	24.53	225			
Self-Regulation					
Between Groups	1.65	3	.55	1.37	.253
Within Groups	88.92	222	.40		
Total	90.57	225			
Educational Aspirations					
Between Groups	4.82	3	1.61	.40	.755
Within Groups	88.92	222	4.05		
Total	90.57	225			
Degree Program					
Self-esteem					
Between Groups	.48	3	.16	1.49	.219
Within Groups	24.05	222	.11		
Total	24.53	225			
Self-Regulation					
Between Groups	.41	3	.14	.34	.798
Within Groups	90.16	222	.41		
Total	90.57	225			
Educational Aspirations					
Between Groups	4.61	3	1.54	.38	.768
Within Groups	898.84	222	4.05		
Total	903.45	225			

Note: * $p \leq .05$

Rank of SGP-PA Grantees Priority Concerns

The data in Table 5 show that of the five priority concerns of SGP-PA grantees, Studies ($M= 4.06$, Rank=1.5) and Self-Development ($M= 4.06$, Rank=1.5) were the topmost concerns while Specific Social issues ($M= 3.23$ Rank=5) was the least. Other priority concerns were Family relationships ($M= 3.87$ Rank=3), and Social relationships ($M= 3.60$ Rank=4).

The data also show that of the five priority concerns of SGP-PA Grantees in terms of their studies, Understand my lessons ($M= 4.28$, Rank=1) was the topmost while Work with classmates on projects ($M=3.77$, Rank = 5) was the least. Other studies-related priority concerns were: Develop confidence in recitations and discussions ($M =4.18$, Rank=2), Talk to the teacher about difficulty in understanding lessons ($M= 4.08$ Rank=3), and Balance between work at home and studies ($M=3.99$, Rank=4).

In terms of Self-Development, Plan my life ($M=4.30$, Rank=1) was the topmost while Know and understand myself better was the least ($M=3.86$, Rank=5) other priority concerns include Develop- self-confidence ($M=4.17$ Rank=2); Manage my time ($M= 4.10$, Rank 3); and Improve my appearance ($M=3.87$, Rank=4).

It was revealed that in the area of Family Relationship, SGP-PA grantees' topmost priority concern was Improve my relationship with siblings ($M=3.97$ Rank=1) while Teach parent how to handle their children effectively ($M=3.50$ Rank=5) was the least. Other family relationship-related priority concerns were: Develop ability to discuss problems with parents ($M=3.87$ Rank=2), Manage siblings in a parentless home ($M=3.54$, Rank=3.5), and Help parents manage stress/marital problems ($M=3.54$, Rank=3.5).

As to Social Relationships, it was revealed that Develop skills for starting/maintaining friendships ($M=3.82$ Rank=1); was the topmost priority concern of SGP-PA grantees while the least was Get rid of social situations ($M=3.44$, Rank=5). Other social relationships-related priority concerns include: Develop the ability to avoid being taken advantage ($M=3.69$, Rank=2), Know how to choose friends ($M=3.55$, Rank=3.5), and Settle quarrels with/among friends ($M=3.55$, Rank=3.5).

Finally, Table 5 shows that in the area of Specific Social Issues the topmost priority concern among the SGPPA grantees was: Handle adjustments

caused by financial crises ($M=3.39$, Rank=1) while the least among their concerns was Learn more about sexual abuse/harassment ($M=3.02$, Rank=5). Other specific social issues include: Learn more about physical abuse ($M=3.35$, Rank=2); Handle effects of disaster/crises/calamities ($M= 3.22$, Rank=3); and Learn more about emotional and verbal abuse ($M=3.15$, Rank=4).

Table 5

Priority Concerns of the SGP-PA Grantees in terms of Studies, Self-Development, Family Relationship, Social Relationships, and Specific Social Issues

Priority Concerns	SD	M	Rank
Studies			
Understand my lessons	0.71	4.28	1
Develop confidence in recitations and discussions	0.70	4.18	2
Talk to the teacher about difficulty in understanding lessons	0.70	4.08	3
Balance between work at home and studies	0.81	3.99	4
Work with classmates on projects	0.80	3.77	5
Self-Development			
Plan my life	0.67	4.30	1
Develop self-confidence	0.70	4.17	2
Manage my time	0.65	4.10	3
Improve my appearance	0.81	3.87	4
Know and understand myself better	0.81	3.86	5
Family Relationship			
Improve my relationship with siblings	0.98	3.97	1
Develop ability to discuss problems with parents	0.85	3.87	2
Manage siblings in a parentless home	1.15	3.54	3.5
Help parents manage stress/marital problems	1.11	3.54	3.5
Teach parent how to handle their children effectively	1.20	3.50	5
Social Relationship			
Develop skills for starting/maintaining friendships	0.88	3.82	1
Develop the ability to avoid being taken advantage	3.24	3.69	2
Know how to choose friends	0.97	3.55	3.5
Settle quarrels with/among friends	0.89	3.55	3.5
Get rid of fear of social situations	1.02	3.44	5
Specific Social Issues			
Handle adjustments caused by financial crises	1.13	3.39	1
Learn more about physical abuse	1.31	3.35	2
Handle effects of disaster/crises/calamities	1.22	3.22	3
Learn more about emotional and verbal abuse	1.28	3.15	4
Learn more about sexual abuse/harassment	1.37	3.02	5

Conclusions

It appears that regardless of the grantee's sex, age, place of residence, and degree program pursued, their levels of self-esteem, degree of self-regulation, and levels of educational aspiration remain comparable. It is only in their level of educational aspiration where they vary in terms of their family size. Perhaps, this is so because the respondents maybe considered homogenous as SGP-PA's grantees, being classified as poor.

Instability and unpredictability are the hallmarks of life in poverty (Berkman, 2015). Typically, being poor, one is characterized as having inadequate amount of food and poor quality housing and living conditions. Similarly, the children's relationship with their parents may be in constant tension, they may have poor social life and live in unsafe neighborhoods prone to violence; such that, eventually, they become marginalized, powerless, and voiceless members of the community. Such situation creates stress among the members of the family which can accumulate through time. Thus, belonging to the lower strata of society or social position can lead to an inferiority complex which might cause the person to develop a low self-image and over time a low self-esteem (Laishram, 2013).

Consequently, having low self-esteem may affect other areas of life such as one's self-regulation and educational aspiration such that, it is more likely that poor people have difficulty controlling their impulses and do not plan long-term, because if they do, they will just be frustrated. For many of them, it is best not to hope. They seem to just take what they can get at the moment. Adults who were raised in poverty tend to focus on the present over the future.

Nevertheless, with the availability of this grant, the government is trying to break the vicious cycle of poverty by giving opportunities to children of poor families to be able to have a college diploma for them to be employed and/or enable them to contribute productively to national development.

Recommendations

To ensure successful implementation of the SGPPA program, partner Universities must assess the status and priority concerns of the grantees. These will be the bases for designing an appropriate intervention program that would enable the grantees to develop as individuals and cope with demands of academic life, and will ultimately enable them to complete their college education.

Other participating agencies and institutions, the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), Local Government Unit (LGU) need to closely monitor and provide the needed assistance and guidance to the student-grantees. It is further suggested that the results of the study may be used as inputs to strengthen and enhance the government's family development program.

References

- A Report of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee (2013). *The impact of poverty on educational attainment in Cardiff*. Retrieved from <https://www.cardiff.gov.uk.pdf>.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2007). Self-regulation, ego depletion, and motivation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, 1-14. doi; 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007. 00001.x
- Baumeister R. F., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). *Social psychology & human nature*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education.
- Batty, E. & Flint, J. (2010). *Self-Esteem, comparative poverty and neighbourhoods* (Research Paper No. 7). Retrieved from http://research.shu.ac.uk/cresr/living-throughchange/documents/RP7_SelfEsteem.pdf
- Berkman, E. (2015). *Poor people don't have less self-control. Poverty forces them to think short term*. Retrieved from <https://Newrepublic.Com/Article/122887/Poor-People-Dont-Have-Less-Self-Control>.
- CHED CMO No. 9 series of 2012. *Guidelines on the students' Grants-In-Aid Program for Poverty Alleviation (SGP-PA) in the CHED disbursement acceleration program*.
- CHED CMO No. 22 series of 2012 Amendment to CMO No. 9 series of 2012. *Specifically Appendix 'C' Entitled Guidelines on the Students' Grants-in Aid-Program for Poverty Alleviation (SGP-PA) in the CHED Disbursement Acceleration Program*.
- Crocker, J., Brook, A., Niiya, Y., & Villacorta, M. (2006). *The Pursuit of Self-Esteem: Contingencies of Self-Worth and Self-Regulation*. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/The_Pursuit_of_Self-Esteem_Contingencies_of_Self-Worth_and_Self-Regulation.
- Evans, G.W., & Pilyoung, K. (2013). Childhood poverty, chronic stress, self-regulation, and coping. *Child Development Perspectives*, 7(1), 43-48. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12013>
- Fleming, J. S., & Whalen, D. J. (1990). The personal and academic self-concept inventory: Factor structure and gender differences in high school and college samples. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 50(4), 957-967. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164490504025>
- Florez, I.R. (2011). *Developing young children's self-regulation through everyday experiences*. *YC Young Children*, 66(4), 46-51. Retrieved from http://www.earlychildhoodireland.ie/wp_content/uploads/2014/02/Self_Regulation_Florez_OnlineJuly2011.pdf

- Geckova, A. M., Tavel, P. J., Dijk, P., Abel, T., & Reijneveld, S. A. (2010). Factors associated with educational aspirations among adolescents: cues to counteract socioeconomic differences? *BMC Public Health Journal*, doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-10-154.
- Guindon, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Self-Esteem across the lifespan: Issues and interventions*. Routledge.
- Hofer, J., Busch, H., & Kartner, J. (2010). Self-regulation and well-being: The influence of identity and motives. *European Journal of Personality*, 25(3): 211–224. doi: 10.1002/per.789.
- Hoffman, T. (2010, April 28). Self-regulation: *The key to successful students?* Retrieved from <http://www.education.com/reference/article/self-regulated-learning/>.
- Kuhnle, J. (2012). Childhood poverty and its effects on self-regulation. Retrieved from <https://prezi.com/wvdclggakefs/childhood-poverty-and-its-effects-on-self-regulation/>.
- Laishram, N. (2013, January 1). Causes of Self-Esteem. *How Low Self-esteem and What Causes Low Self-esteem Develops*. Retrieved from <http://www.buzzle.com/articles/causes-of-low-self-esteem.html>.
- Lister, R. (2004). *Poverty*, Polity Press, London. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com>.
- Lorenzo, R. (2004). *Home environment, attitude towards school, aspirations, and academic performance of college students*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). West Visayas State University.
- Moreno, R. (2010). *Educational psychology*. USA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Perera, K. (2001). The importance of self-esteem. *More-Self-esteem.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.more-selfesteem.com/importance.htm>.
- Perera, K. (2011). *What is self-esteem*. Retrieved from <http://www.more-selfesteem.com/what-is-selfesteem.htm>.
- Philippine Education for All Report. (2008). *Implementation and challenges unpublished UN Country*. Retrieved from http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/upload/Philippines/Philippines_EFA_MDA.pdf.
- Philippine Statistics Authority National Statistical Coordination Board Region VI Western Visayas (2012). Retrieved from: nap.psa.gov.ph/ru6.FS3-2013Poverty2012.htm.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D.H. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research and applications* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.
- Plotnik, R. (2006). *Introduction to psychology*. USA: Wadsworth.

- Reynolds, J.R., & Pemberton, J (2001). Rising college expectations among youth in the United States: *The Journal of Human Resources*, 36(4), 703-26.
- Robins, R. W., Orth, U., & Trzesniewski, K. H (2010). Self-esteem development from young adulthood to old age a cohort- Sequential Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98 (4), 645-658
- Roldan, A. S. (2003). *On becoming a winner "A workbook on personality development and character building" Ar skills development & management services*. Paranaque City, Metro-Manila.
- Singh, G. (2011). A study of educational aspiration in secondary school students. *International Referred Research Journal*, 3 (25), 35-36.
- The 1986 Philippine Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines – Article XIV.
- Villar, I.V.G (2007). *Implementing a comprehensive guidance and counseling program in the Philippines*. Aligned Transformations Publications.
- Walker, R., Tomlinson, M. & Williams, G. (2007). *Multi-dimensional measurement of poverty and wellbeing: (A UK Case Study)*. Retrieved from <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/PDF>.
- Walton, O. (2011). *Helpdesk research report: Self-esteem, shame and poverty*. (Governance & Social Development Resource Center). Retrieved from www.gsdc.org/does/open/hd788.pdf.
- Wilkinson, R.G. (1996). *Unhealthy societies*. London: Routledge.
- Woolfolk, A. (2009). *Educational Psychology* (11th ed.). Singapore: Pearson Education South Asia.
- Worden, J. K., Flynn, B. S., Merrill, D. G., Waller, J. A., & Haugh, L. D. (1989). Preventing alcohol-impaired driving through community self-regulation training. *American Journal of Public Health*, 79 (3), 287-290.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation. A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 13-39). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.