

Socio-Economic Benefits of Members of a Public Mutual Fund

By

Lorena Mae A. Lasquite, MBA

Accounting Support Assistant, Home Development Mutual Fund, Bacolod City, Philippines

Email: lasquitelorenamae11@gmail.com

Ma. Teresa B. Ballados, PhD

Graduate Studies Program Chairperson, Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Bacolod City, Philippines

Email: teresa.ballados@chmsc.edu.ph

Abstract

This study determined the socio-economic benefits of a public mutual fund. It utilized a descriptive research design and a researcher-made questionnaire that covered 396 participants. A proportionate stratified-random sampling was used to determine the samples. The data collected were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, Mann-Whitney u test, and Kruskal-Wallis's test. The findings reveal that members of a public mutual fund experienced a great extent of social benefits in education, medical needs, health and wellness, home improvement, and housing. On the other hand, the social benefits in travel and vacation obtained a moderate extent. As to the economic benefits of a public mutual fund to its members, findings reveal that it greatly benefited household finances, savings, and payment of other loans. However, economic benefits in capital for small businesses revealed a moderate extent. Moreover, the findings show that a significant difference occurs in the type of loans availed in the level of social benefits. As a result, the public mutual fund's multi-purpose and housing loan programs have aided members in meeting their socio-economic needs.

Keywords: socio-economic benefits, public mutual fund, members, descriptive research, Philippines

Introduction

Mutual funds are an essential intermediary between savers and borrowers [1] and investment vehicles for individuals with similar financial goals to pool their funds and then invest as necessary [2]. One of the main factors supporting the growth of mutual funds is that they elicit small investors' savings, which may, if not they would otherwise, remain in bank savings or capital markets. Mutual funds can be vital in investing for retirement. Developing countries' mutual fund industries have exhibited uneven growth [1]. Furthermore, reference [3] claim that private-sector mutual funds have outperformed public-sector mutual funds in the long run due mostly to stronger fund allocation, management, and portfolio manager performance [4]. Private-sector mutual funds are found to be less risky than their counterpart public mutual funds [cited in 5]. On the contrary, research shows that the following factors have a substantial impact on the fund performance of the public mutual fund: fund size, fund return, and fund dividend payout [6].

On June 11, 1978, the public mutual fund in the Philippines was established in response to the need for a national savings program and affordable home finance for working-class Filipinos. Apart from housing loan packages, members can now access Short Term Loans. Active members can use the multi-purpose loan to cover various requirements, including minor

home improvements, tuition, health and wellness, and small business capital. It envisioned that every Filipino worker to save and have decent shelter. Its mission is to sustain membership growth and retention that would result in a P2 billion annual increase in member's savings until 2022, and to provide affordable home financing to at least 361, 918 low-income earners through Socialized and Low-cost Housing from 2018 until 2020 [7].

The public mutual fund accomplished its objectives, such as breaching the P70-billion mark and registering P75.31 billion in housing loan take-out. The said amount has funded the home acquisition of 90,375 Filipino workers, a 12% increase from the 80,964 home loan borrowers in 2018. Under the BALAI Filipino (Building Adequate, Livable, Affordable, and Inclusive) Communities Program, Pag-IBIG Fund responded to the government's call to provide housing opportunities for low-income earners, especially those in the provinces or rural areas. Pag-IBIG Fund disbursed a total of P49.23 billion pesos worth of cash loans in 2018, which is 5% more than the P46.76 billion released in 2017. Almost 2.43 million members benefited from the release, 13% more than the 2.15 million borrowers from the previous year. Multi-purpose Loans (MPL) took up the bulk of the approved loan applications, where the fund released P46.96 billion – the highest MPL disbursed by the fund in its history, supplementing the financial needs of 2.27 million members [8].

During the pandemic in 2020, the public mutual fund in the Philippines adopted schemes to help members in their socio-economic conditions. First, the 3-month moratorium on loan payments program helped alleviate the financial burden of 283,349 borrowers whose jobs or businesses were affected by the pandemic. Second, the automatic grant of a grace period on loan payments and through this loan payment relief, the public mutual fund aided 4,061,559 short-term loan borrowers and 253,849 housing loan borrowers. The agency has allocated its financial resources to more pressing needs during the early days of implementing the Enhanced Community Quarantine. Third, the short-term loan program released P35.64 billion to 1,735,921 members under this program. Fourth, a special housing loan restructuring program, and by the end of 2020, 76,629 housing loan borrowers availed of the program. Lastly, a home construction fund with a total of 31 housing projects worth Php2.153 billion was approved under the financing line, helping boost housing in the country, allowing several players in the industry to maintain their operations, and continue providing jobs to Filipino [7].

A public mutual fund branch in one of the cities in the country provides its members' financial needs in Shelter Financing and Multi-purpose loan. In the last three years, 56 percent of members have renewed their multi-purpose loan, 40 percent have availed of the housing loan, and 1,397 members have simultaneously taken out a housing and multi-purpose loan. These members have availed of the multi-purpose loan for three or more renewal times with six (6) or more years of membership.

The researchers believed that the objectives of a public mutual should be realized and the measurement of effectiveness in implementing its loan programs is through improving the socio-economic conditions of its members. Being members of a public mutual fund motivates the researchers to assess the socio-economic benefits of a public mutual fund.

Based on the above premise, this research intends to answer questions about the benefits of various loan services provided by a public mutual fund on the socio-economic status of borrowers after they take out a loan. The results of this study are a helpful basis for developing an action plan to enhance the quality of the services offered to its members and provide realistic solutions that address their social and economic needs. This study can serve as baseline data

for introducing new loan services and policies for the members.

Methodology

This study utilized the descriptive research design to determine the social benefits of a public mutual fund in terms of education needs, medical needs, health and wellness, home improvement, housing, and travel and vacation, as well as the economic benefits of a public mutual fund in terms of capital for small business, household finances, savings and payment of other loans, were gathered, analyzed, and interpreted.

The participants of this study were the members of a public mutual fund who availed of the two (2) services, namely, housing loans and multi-purpose loans. These members are currently employed in government and private agencies in a highly urbanized city in the Philippines. They have availed the multi-purpose loan for renewal three or more from 2017 to 2020 with (6) years or more of membership. From the total population, the participants were chosen. In determining the sample size, Yamane's formula was used, and it generated a sample size of 396 from a population of 38,573. The members who availed of the housing loan answered the questionnaire on the extent of housing benefits of a public fund. Meanwhile, members who availed of the multi-purpose loan responded to the questionnaire on the extent of social and economic benefits of a public mutual fund in terms of education needs, medical needs, health and wellness, home improvement, travel and vacation, capital for small businesses, household finances, savings, and payment of other loans.

This study used proportionate stratified-random sampling to determine the samples. A random computer selection using a computerized approach was applied in choosing the respondents. Each population was allocated a number, which was then selected at random. The research instrument used was a researcher-made questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. Part I included the demographic profile: age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, household family size, average monthly income, occupation, membership category, length of membership, and type of loans availed. The Part II of the questionnaire measured the extent of the social benefits of a public mutual fund to its members. In contrast, Part III measured the extent of the economic benefits of a public mutual fund to its members.

The researcher-made survey questionnaire was subjected to content validity using Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR). The ten experts in the field of research, economics, and business management validated the researcher-made questionnaire. The evaluation of the questionnaire was validated by identifying each question if they are "essential," "important but not essential," or "not necessary." Before the validation, the researcher prepared a total of 61 items.

After the validation, only essential items were included in the final survey questionnaire. A total of fifty-three (53) items were validated as essential. CVR result was 0.81, interpreted as valid. After validating the questionnaire, it went through reliability testing of 30 members of a public mutual fund who were not part of the survey. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was measured by using Cronbach's Alpha. The reliability test yielded a result of .975, which shows that the questionnaire is reliable.

Before data gathering, the proper and official request was sent to the officer in charge of the various government and private agencies where participants were employed. During the administration of the request letter, some randomly identified employers refused to accept my request due to their hectic schedule and the risk of the COVID virus, so their replacement was also randomly selected. Upon approval of the request, the survey was conducted using a drop-

and-collect method. The persons assigned to administer the questionnaire per agency were oriented first on administering the questionnaire. Before the questionnaire was administered, the participants' informed consent was secured.

The mean and standard deviation were applied in determining the socio-economic benefits of a public mutual fund. In determining the significant difference in the extent of socio-economic benefits of a public mutual fund when participants are grouped according to identified profile variables, non-parametric test was used. Mann Whitney U test was applied for age, sex, income, household family size, average monthly income, membership category, and length of membership. Meanwhile, Kruskal-Wallis's test was employed for civil status, educational attainment, occupation, and type of loans.

Results And Discussions

The Extent of Social Benefits

Table 1 indicated that the social benefits of a public mutual fund to education needs, in general, was a *great extent* (Mean (M) = 4.31, Standard Deviation (SD) = 1.08). Findings revealed that the payment of the miscellaneous, purchase of electronic gadgets, school allowances, and the purchase of school supplies and books obtained a *great extent* of benefits. The findings mean that 51 to 75 percent of members benefited from the multi-purpose loans from a public mutual fund.

Reference [9] shows that education was the second reason for borrowing money from lending institutions. On the contrary, reference [10] reveals that loans are less commonly used for education.

Table 1

Extent of Social Benefits on Education Needs

Education Needs	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Payment of tuition fees	4.57	0.94	Very Great Extent
Payment of miscellaneous fees	4.49	0.89	Great Extent
School allowances	4.45	1.15	Great Extent
Purchase of electronic gadgets	4.02	1.21	Great Extent
Purchase school supplies and books	4.00	1.22	Great Extent
Overall	4.31	1.08	Great Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All (N)

Extent of Social Benefits in Medical Needs

Table 2 shows that the overall extent of social benefits in medical needs was *great* (M = 4.01, SD = 1.24), indicating that 51 to 75 percent of members benefited from the multi-purpose loan provided by the fund. Notable results were revealed in the payment of regular medical check-ups, laboratory examinations, purchase of maintenance medicines, and payment of hospitalization. The findings show that the members' multi-purpose loan significantly

impacts their medical needs.

A research study reveals that health was one of the dominant causes of why respondents borrowed money from lending institutions [9]. Additionally, reference [11] indicates that a personal loan is an excellent source of funds, particularly in times of need for healthcare and hospitalization that cost much money and depletes the finances. Obtaining a personal loan is one of the most effective ways to obtain funds to assist in the payment of unexpected medical expenditures. In contrast, reference [10] shows that loans are less commonly used for medical expenses.

Table 2
Extent of Social Benefits in Medical Benefits

Medical Benefits	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Payment of hospitalization	4.34	1.16	Great Extent
Purchase of maintenance medicines	4.00	1.20	Great Extent
Payment of laboratory examinations	3.89	1.29	Great Extent
Payment of regular medical check-ups	3.80	1.29	Great Extent
Overall	4.01	1.24	Great Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All (N)

Extent of Social Benefits in Health and Wellness

Table 3 illustrates the extent of the social benefits of a public mutual fund in terms of health and wellness. The overall results revealed a *great extent* ($M = 3.58$; $SD=1.35$), meaning that 51 to 75 percent benefited from the multi-purpose loan provided by the fund. The result showed that purchasing healthy and nutritious food yielded *very great extent*. Meanwhile, payment for a gym membership with a fitness program, purchase of health monitoring devices (like blood glucose monitor and blood pressure monitor), payment for social gathering expenses, and the payment for enrollment in health and diet clubs obtained *moderate extent*. This means that 26 to 50 percent benefited the members with the loans they availed from the public mutual fund.

Reference [12] confirms the results of this study that members of a home development mutual fund aged availed one time of a multi-purpose loan allotted for health and wellness. Moreover, a research study reveals that health was the number one reason for borrowing money and that the issue of how often teachers borrowed money from lending institutions was paired with basic food needs [9], [10].

Table 3
Extent of Health and Wellness Benefits

Health and Wellness	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Purchase of healthy and nutritious food	4.53	0.74	Very Great Extent
Purchase of vitamins and dietary supplements	4.13	1.09	Great Extent
Purchase of equipment for physical activity (like bicycle, exercise machines, etc.)	3.84	1.44	Great Extent
Payment for social gathering expenses (like clubmeetings, family gatherings, etc.)	3.31	1.48	Moderate Extent
Purchase of health monitoring devices (like bloodglucose monitor, blood pressure monitor, etc.)	3.30	1.50	Moderate Extent
Payment for enrollment to health and diet clubs	3.04	1.63	Moderate Extent
Payment for a gym membership with a fitnessprogram	2.90	1.60	Moderate Extent
Overall	3.58	1.35	Great Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All (N)

Extent of Social Benefits in Home Improvement

Table 4 showed a *great extent* ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.33$) of benefits in home improvement, meaning that 51 to 75 percent benefited from the multi-purpose loan in homeimprovement. The same results, of *great extent*, revealed in the repair of plumbing and electricalworks, upgrading of floor finishes, replacing the roof cover, accessories, and framing, and additionalroom extensions or improvement from single-story to two-story. However, solar panel installation got a *moderate* result, which means that 26 to 50 percent benefited from this indicator of social benefits of homeimprovement.

Reference [13], [14] claims that respondents utilize a loan for housing improvement after taking out a loan. On the other hand, in the Philippines, only 8.7 percent of respondents used loans to renovate or enhance a unit. At the same time, a large percentage was allocated to the purchase of houses and lots [10].

Table 4
Extent of Social Benefits in Home Improvement

Home Improvement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Replacement of roof cover, accessories, and framing	4.46	1.07	Great Extent
Additional room extensions or improvement from single-story to two-story	3.99	1.36	Great Extent
Repair of plumbing and electrical works	3.95	1.24	Great Extent
Upgrading of floor finishes	3.79	1.26	Great Extent
Solar panel installation	2.93	1.70	Moderate Extent
Overall	3.82	1.33	Great Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All (N)

Extent of Social Benefits in Housing

Table 5 presents the extent of social benefits in housing in terms of homeownership to a very *great extent* ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 0.77$), which means that 76 to 100 percent benefited from the housing loan program. On the other hand, savings from home rentals and longer payment schemes obtained a *great extent*. The overall result signified a *great extent* ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.03$), which means that 51 to 75 percent benefited from the fund's housing loan to its members.

Table 5
Extent of Social Benefits in Housing

Housing	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Home ownership	4.66	0.77	Very Great Extent
Savings from home rentals	4.18	1.19	Great Extent
Longer payment scheme	4.14	1.14	Great Extent
Overall	4.32	1.03	Great Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All (N)

Extent of Social Benefits in Travel and Vacation

Table 6 shows a moderate extent of social benefits in travel and vacation ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.33$). Travel and vacation benefits in terms of transportation (tickets, car rentals, food, and hotels/lodging) obtained a *great extent* which specified that 51 to 75 percent benefited the multi-purpose loan. Meanwhile, entertainment (museums, attractions, concerts) and shopping (gifts, souvenirs) resulted to a moderate extent, meaning that 26 to 50 percent benefited. On the other hand, the extent of travel and vacation benefits in terms of passport processing and visa processing yielded a *very slight extent* which means that 1 to 25 percent benefited the loan.

The results of this study are complemented by a research study that other reasons for borrowing money, like travel, were not favored by the respondents, which means that it is not important [9]. On the other hand, reference [15] claims that digital lending platform has seen a 55 percent increase in personal loans for travel.

Table 6
Extent of Social Benefits in Travel and Vacation

Travel and Vacation	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Transportation (tickets, car rentals etc.)	4.53	1.05	Very Great Extent
Food	3.92	1.29	Great Extent
Hotels/lodging	3.82	1.29	Great Extent
Shopping (gifts, souvenirs)	2.99	1.42	Moderate Extent
Entertainment (museums, attractions, concerts etc.)	2.82	1.45	Moderate Extent
Passport processing	2.43	1.41	Very Slight Extent
Visa processing	2.40	1.44	Very Slight Extent
Overall	3.27	1.33	Moderate Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All (N)

Extent of Economic Benefits in Capital for Small Business

In table 7, the data indicated that the overall extent of economic benefits in capital for small businesses was *moderate* ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.42$), which means that 26 to 50 percent benefited from the multi-purpose loan. Significant findings were noted in purchasing merchandise inventories/supplies and increasing business profit, which obtained *great* benefits. A *very slight extent* of benefits was found in putting up a new outlet and employees' salaries which means that 1 to 25 percent only benefited from the loan. Among the respondents of the study, 46 of them with a merchandising/trading business, ten (10) with a production/manufacturing business, and seven (7) with a business in the service industry.

The result of this study supports the findings of another study that capital for small businesses is not an important reason for borrowing money [9]. However, reference [10] claims that 27% of Filipino loan borrowers use the money they get from their loans to start a business. The second most common reason Filipinos take out loans is to fund a business venture or an investment.

Table 7
Level of Economic Benefits in Capital for Small Business

Capital for Small Business	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Purchase of merchandise inventories/supplies	4.43	1.04	Great Extent
Increase the business profit	3.71	1.30	Great Extent
Acquisition of physical facilities	3.41	1.52	Moderate Extent
Salaries of employees	2.41	1.63	Very Slight Extent
Put up a new outlet	2.30	1.59	Very Slight Extent
Overall	3.25	1.42	Moderate Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2. Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All (N)

Extent of Economic Benefits in Household Finances

In Table 8, the data indicated that the overall level of economic benefits in household finances was great ($M = 3.84$; $SD = 1.32$), meaning that 51 to 75 percent benefited from the multi-purpose loan availed by the members of the fund. The very great extent of benefits was revealed in the payment of utilities. Other indicators of economic benefits on household finances, such as the purchase of furniture and appliances, purchase of house and lot, vehicle, and payment of vehicle repairs, obtained a great extent. Furthermore, payment of credit card bills got a moderate extent of benefit.

This study revealed that payment of utilities topped the list of how the respondents spent their loan proceeds, which contradicts the study's findings that the acquisition of appliances, equipment, furniture, and electronic devices topped the list of how the earnings of other loans were spent [10]. Furthermore, reference [16] shows that assets such as motorcycles, livestock, washing machines, refrigerators, sewing machines, televisions, and air coolers are increasing in value for household finances. However, another research shows that loans have no significant effects on household assets such as electronics and appliances [17].

Table 8
Extent Economic Benefits in Household Finances

Household Finances	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Payment of utilities	4.55	0.93	Very Great Extent
Purchase of furniture and appliances	4.11	1.17	Great Extent
Payment of vehicle repairs	3.66	1.45	Great Extent
Purchase of house and lot, vehicle, etc.	3.56	1.51	Great Extent
Payment of credit card bills	3.32	1.52	Moderate Extent
Overall	3.84	1.32	Great Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at all(N)

Extent of Economic Benefits in Savings

Table 9 showed that the overall economic benefits of savings was *great* ($M=3.71$; $SD = 1.34$). Specifically, a great extent of the level of economic benefits in savings was found in personal savings, savings for the education of the household members, savings for special events (like marriage, christening, birthdays, and savings for retirement. The results indicate that 51 to 75 percent benefited from the multi-purpose loan for the participant's savings. Meanwhile, savings for leisure obtained *moderate extent*.

The great benefits of savings can be caused by the service provided by the public mutual fund, which pools together funds from members through members' savings and invests it through government bonds, housing, and short-term loans. Similarly, reference [18] indicates that the desire for voluntary savings of a particular amount emerges for safety reasons, to earn interest, and to cover the costs of children's education. On the other hand, a positive approach toward savings might originate from an optimistic outlook for income growth [19] which contradicts the results of this study.

Table 9
Extent of Economic Benefits in Savings

Savings	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Personal savings	4.10	1.20	Great Extent
Savings for special events (like marriage, christening, birthdays, etc.)	3.74	1.32	Great Extent
Savings for the education of the household members	3.73	1.25	Great Extent
Savings for retirement	3.51	1.43	Great Extent
Savings for leisure	3.48	1.48	Moderate Extent
Overall	3.71	1.34	Great Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All (N)

Extent of Economic Benefits in Payment of Other Loans

Table 10 presents the overall extent of economic benefits in payment of other loans was

great ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 1.41$). The payment for the principal amount of loans and interest also obtained a *great extent* of benefit. The results indicate that 51 to 75 percent benefited from the multi-purpose loan and used it to pay the principal amount and interest. Meanwhile, payment of other loans in terms of surcharges, penalties, and insurance got a *moderate* result.

Debt payment is one of the reasons for borrowing money from lending institutions [9]. However, reference [20] shows that over-indebted households do not take several loans to refinance unpayable debts.

Table 10
Extent of Economic Benefits in Payment of other Loans

Payment of other Loans	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Principal amount	4.18	1.29	Great Extent
Interest	3.52	1.42	Great Extent
Surcharges or penalties	3.34	1.50	Moderate Extent
Insurances	3.17	1.45	Moderate Extent
Overall	3.55	4.41	Great Extent

Note: 4.50-5.00 Very Great Extent (VGE); 3.50-4.49 Great Extent (GE); 2.50-3.49 Moderate Extent (ME); 1.50-2.49 Very Slight Extent (VSE); 1.00-1.49 Not Benefited at All(N)

Difference in the Extent of Social Benefits when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Table 11 presents the Mann-Whitney U test results about the difference in the extent of social benefits according to the profile of the participants. The results revealed that there was no significant difference in the extent of social benefits of a public mutual fund when grouped according to age ($p=0.180$), sex ($p=0.611$), household family size ($p=0.423$), average monthly income ($p=0.080$), membership category ($p=0.796$) and length of membership ($p=0.051$). Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. The results denote that the extent of social benefits availed by the participants in a public mutual fund in terms of age, sex, household family size, average monthly income, membership category, and length of membership is equally the same.

Reference [13] shows that there is no significant difference in the social benefits of respondents when grouped according to age, gender, educational attainment, monthly income, and length of years as members.

Furthermore, contradictory to the findings, reference [21] argues that women have traditionally been expected to manage the family's finances and spending. As a result, women participate in various activities, particularly finance and economics. Furthermore, female micro borrowers receive funding faster than male micro borrowers, particularly for basic needs loans. Additionally, a research study shows married consumers have higher credit scores and debt than single adults [22]. Moreover, in reference [10], married and working had a much higher borrowing.

Table 11
Difference in the Extent of Social Benefits when Grouped according to Profile Variables

Variables	Computed value	p-value
Age	15990.50	0.180
Sex	18456.00	0.611
Household family size	14654.50	0.423
Average monthly income	17316.50	0.080
Membership category	17276.00	0.796
Length of membership	17375.00	0.051

Note: *The difference is significant when $p \leq 0.05$

Table 12 illustrated the Kruskal-Wallis results that the extent of social benefits of a public mutual fund when grouped according to civil status ($p=0.098$), educational attainment ($p=0.190$), and occupation ($p=0.492$) were not significant. On the other hand, there was a significant difference when grouped according to the loan type ($p=0.000$). Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Post hoc analysis revealed that significant difference occurred between multi-purpose and housing loans. The result suggests that loan programs such as multi-purpose and housing loans have benefited its members.

Reference [13] shows that there is no significant difference in social benefits when grouped according to educational attainment. On the other hand, there is a significant difference in occupation. Moreover, a research study reveals that widespread usage of wealth-building house loans, a shorter-term mortgage, would benefit borrowers, lenders, and the financial system. These findings contradict this study's result, which revealed that a longer payment scheme for housing loans greatly benefits the members [23]. In addition, government teachers' financial well-being is poor, with debt problems, a low degree of homeownership, and significant housing debt [24].

Table 12
Difference in the Extent of Social Benefits when Grouped according to Profile Variables

Variables	Computed value	p-value
Civil status	6.294	0.098
Educational attainment	4.767	0.190
Occupation	2.410	0.492
Type of loans availed	43.867*	0.000

Note: *The difference is significant when $p < 0.05$

Difference in the Extent of Economic Benefits when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Table 13 shows the Mann-Whitney U test results about the difference in the extent of economic benefits according to the profile of the participants. The same results found that there was no significant difference in the level of economic benefits when participants were grouped according to age ($p=0.954$), sex ($p=0.114$), household family size ($p=0.329$), average monthly income ($p=0.992$), membership category ($p=0.766$), and length of membership ($p=0.883$). Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The findings showed that the extent of the public mutual fund's economic benefits was the same regardless of age, gender, household size, average monthly income,

membership category, or length of membership. Reference [13] reveals that there is no significant difference in the respondents' economic benefits when grouped according to age, gender, monthly income, and length of years in service, which complemented this study.

Table 13

Difference in the Level of Economic Benefits when Grouped according to Profile Variables

Variables	Computed value	p-value
Age	5752.5	0.954
Sex	5872.5	0.114
Household family size	5408	0.329
Average monthly income	6811	0.992
Membership category	6092	0.766
Length of membership	6761.5	0.883

*Note: *The difference is significant when $p \leq 0.05$*

Table 14 signifies the Kruskal-Wallis results, which showed that when participants are grouped by civil status ($p=0.651$), educational attainment ($p=0.355$), occupation ($p=0.346$), and type of loans availed ($p=0.446$), the extent of economic benefits of a public mutual fund was insignificant.

The data revealed that regardless of civil status, educational attainment, occupation, or type of loans availed, the economic benefits of a public mutual fund are most likely the same. The same results were revealed in another research study that there is no significant difference in economic benefits as to educational attainment [13]. However, there is a significant difference according to occupation. Moreover, reference [9] concludes that the lending institutions aided in settlement of several economic issues.

In addition, according to the survey results [18], older households were better at saving than young households. It could be because older people are aware that they would be unable to provide for themselves unless they have saved money for old age insurance after they retire.

Table 14

Difference in the Extent of Economic Benefits when Grouped according to Profile Variables

Variables	Computed Value	p-value
Civil Status	1.636	0.651
Educational attainment	3.245	0.355
Occupation	3.311	0.346
Type of loans availed	0.580	0.446

*Note: *The difference is significant when $p \leq .05$*

Conclusion

A public mutual fund had more likely to achieve its objectives regarding the services provided to its members, including savings, home financing, and multi-purpose loans. The great extent of socio-economic benefits in terms of education, medical, health and wellness, home improvement, housing, household finances, savings, and payment of other loans is evidence of the realization of the objectives of the agency. In line with the result, the agency was found to be effective in implementing its services that ultimately benefit its members.

The significant contributions of a public mutual fund in improving the socio-economic conditions of its members may be a consideration to continuously enhancing the services of the agency. On the other hand, the members may keep increasing their investment to gain more socio-economic benefits. Moreover, the members may use the proceeds of the loans to invest in small businesses to generate more economic benefits.

References

- [1] World Bank (2015). Mutual funds in developing markets: Addressing challenges to growth. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/23234/MutualOfunds0i0challenges0to0growth.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- [2] Kohli, G., Sanson, V., & Gupta, A. (2020). Performance evaluation of private and public sector mutual funds in India. *International Journal for Research Trends and Innovation*. Volume 3, Issue 11 | ISSN: 2456-3315. Retrieved from http://www.pbr.co.in/2020/2020_month/July/6.pdf
- [3] Sharma N. and Ravikumar R (2013). Analysis of the Risk and Return relationship of Equity based Mutual Fund in India. *International Journal of Advancements in Research & Technology*.2(8). 289-295
- [4] Kandpal, Dr. V., & Kavidayal, Prof. P. C. (2014). A Comparative study of selected public & private sector equity diversified mutual fund schemes in India. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(1), 92–101. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-161592101>
- [5] Saravanan, S. & Viswaprakash, V. (2021). Investor's

- perception regarding mutual funds considering moderation effect of investor's risk profile. *Ilkogretim Online – Elementary Education Online*. Vol 20 (Issue 6): pp. 894-900. doi: 10.17051/ilkonline.2021.06.097
- [6] Dewri, L. V., & Islam, Md. R. (2016). Performance of Public Mutual Funds (PMFs) in emerging economies: A case of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 11(6), 296. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v11n6p296>
- [7] Pag-ibig Fund (2021). The Pag-ibig Fund Corporate Annual Report 2020. Retrieved from [https://www.pagibigfund.gov.ph/document/pdf/transparency/2020/Pag-IBIG%20Fund%202020%20Annual%20Report%20\(Uploaded%2001%20October%202021,%20Updated%2003%20November%202021\).pdf](https://www.pagibigfund.gov.ph/document/pdf/transparency/2020/Pag-IBIG%20Fund%202020%20Annual%20Report%20(Uploaded%2001%20October%202021,%20Updated%2003%20November%202021).pdf).
- [8] Pag-ibig Fund (2019). 2018 Annual Report. Retrieved from [https://www.pagibigfund.gov.ph/document/pdf/transparency/2018/report/2018%20Pag-IBIG%20Fund%20Corporate%20Annual%20Report%20\(posted%2009%20September%202019\).pdf](https://www.pagibigfund.gov.ph/document/pdf/transparency/2018/report/2018%20Pag-IBIG%20Fund%20Corporate%20Annual%20Report%20(posted%2009%20September%202019).pdf).
- [9] Zaragoza, M.M. & Arceño, R.A. (2017). Consequences of borrowing money from lending institutions in relation to job performance. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*, Vol-2, Issue-5 160-172. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24001/ijels.2.5.20>
- [10] Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (2019). Financial inclusion survey. Retrieved from <https://www.bsp.gov.ph/Inclusive%20Finance/Financial%20Inclusion%20Reports%20and%20Publications/2019/2019FISToplineReport.pdf>
- [11] CIMB Philippines (2020). 5 reasons why Filipinos get a personal loan. CIMB Bank. PH. Retrieved from <https://www.cimbbank.com.ph/en/financial-literacy-articles/financial-essentials/5-reasons-why-filipinos-get-a-personal-loan.html>
- [12] Savellano, E.G. (2018). Satisfaction on Short-Term Loan Practices of Home Development (PAG-IBIG) Mutual Fund. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*. Vol.2. No.4. Retrieved from <https://ojs.aaresearchindex.com/index.php/AAJMRA/issue/view/25>
- [13] Flores, B. M., & Teruel, P. G. (2012). Social and economic development benefits of Bfi employees' multi-purpose cooperative in Don Carlos Bukidnon. *Advancing Social Science*
- [14] Habitat for Humanity (2017). The Impact of Housing Microfinance. Retrieved from <https://www.habitat.org/sites/default/files/tcis-the-impact-of-housing->
- [15] The Economic Times (2019). Millenials taking personal loans to travel on the rise: Report. Retrieved from <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/wealth/borrow/millennials-taking-personal-loans-to-travel-on-the-rise-report/articleshow/69145184.cms?from=mdr>
- [16] Zaidi, H. H. (2017). Impact of microfinance on socio-economic conditions of the borrowers: A case study of Akhuwat Foundation (Lahore). *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 6(2), 239. <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejms.v6i2.p239-248>
- [17] Ghalib, A.K., Malki, I. and Imai, K. (2014). Microfinance and Household Poverty Reduction: Empirical Evidence from Rural Pakistan. *Taylor & Francis in Oxford Development Studies*, 43 (1), pp. 84-104. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2014.980228>
- [18] Menza, S. K., & Kebede, T. (2016). The impact of microfinance on household saving: the case of amhara credit and saving institution feres bet Sub- Branch, Degadamot Woreda. *An International Peer-reviewed Journal*, 27. Retrieved from

- <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322953380>
- [19] Kłopotcka, A. M., & Górska, R. (2021). Forecasting household saving rate with consumer confidence indicator and its components: Panel data analysis of 14 European countries. *European Research Studies Journal*, . 874-898, Volume XXIV, Issue 3. Retrieved from <https://ersj.eu/journal/2389/download/Forecasting+Household+Saving+Rate+with+Consumer+Confidence+Indicator+and+its+Components%3A++Panel+Data+Analysis+of+14+European+Countries.pdf>
- [20] Chichaibelu, B. B., & Waibel, H. (2017). Borrowing from “Pui” to Pay “Pom”: Multiple borrowing and over-indebtedness in Rural Thailand. *World Development, Elsevier*, Vol. 98(C), pages 338-350. DOI: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.04.032
- [21] Stolba (2020). Married consumers have higher credit scores and debt than single adults. Retrieved from <https://www.experian.com/blogs/ask-experian/research/married-couples-have-higher-credit-scores-and-debt-than-single-adults/#:~:text=Overall%2C%20married%20adults%20had%20an,seven%20points%20since%20Q2%202015>
- [22] Dulliyao, R. J., Yumol, E. P. & Dulay, N. M.. (2013). Casigayan microfinance: A feasible project for the poor families of Northern Philippines. *IAMURE International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1). Retrieved from <http://ejournals.ph/form/cite.php?id=3663>
- [23] Oliner, S. D., Peter, T. J., & Pinto, E. J. (2020). The wealth building home loan. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 80/103389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2018.07.012>
- [24] Ferrer, J. C. (2017). Caught in a Debt Trap? An analysis of the financial well-being of teachers in the Philippines. *The Normal Lights*, 11(2). Retrieved from <https://po.pnuresearchportal.org/ejournal/index.php/normallights/article/view/538>