

## Research Article

### SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOOD PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: AN ANALYSIS

\* NOR-JANNAH G. RACMAT, MBA and KORSINEY N. CABASIS, DBA

St. Michaels College, Quezon Avenue, Iligan City, Philippines.

Received 13<sup>th</sup> February 2024; Accepted 14<sup>th</sup> March 2024; Published online 30<sup>th</sup> April 2024

#### ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine how the projects under Sustainable Livelihood Programs of DSWD transform the mindset of the residents of Poona Piagapo. A total of 100 respondents who had benefited the projects were involved. In a month of sampling, the data was directly distributed and compiled by the researcher. Descriptive-correlational method was used to determine the profile of the respondents and the extent of implementation of the livelihood programs generated from DSWD. To inquiry deeper on the impact of the livelihood programs to the mindset of the residents, an interview will be conducted. Stratified sampling method was used to obtain the needed number of respondents. On the extent of the implementation of the sustainable livelihood program received, most of the sustainable livelihood program are fully implemented under the Seed Capital Fund; the Skills Training Fund comes next and under Micro-enterprise development most are partially implemented. Some of sustainable livelihood program is partially implemented, other sustainable livelihood program is well implemented while some are fully implemented. Most of the sustainable livelihood program are fully implemented under the Seed Capital Fund; the Skills Training Fund comes next; and in Micro-enterprise development only few sustainable livelihood programs are fully implemented.

**Keywords:** Sustainable Livelihood Program, Project Implementation, Seed Capital Fund, Skills Training Micro-Enterprise Development.

#### INTRODUCTION

The gap between the worlds' rich and poor countries is widening still, as the 500 richest individuals have a combined income greater than the poorest 416 million (Banik, 2006). Despite several decades of debate on development and inequality in the distribution of global and national resources, it is difficult to spot the radical improvement in poverty reduction. Thus, it seems that the attempts to eradicate poverty have been unsuccessful so far. Throughout the last century, reflections on this matter have led to different re-conceptualizations of how to understand poverty and development. Beginning with an understanding of poverty as a lack of economic resources, poverty today is understood as a more multifaceted concept e.g. including social status, health and opportunities to decide over one's life. Also, it has been recognized that development has to be done from the perspective of the poor – understanding their subjective perception of what it means to be poor, and what a good life includes (Narayan *et al.*, 2007).

Poverty incidence among Filipinos families in the first semester of 2018 was estimated at 16.1 percent. This is clearly defined as the part of families whose income is below the poverty line to the total number of families. This was estimated at 22.2 percent in the same period in 2015. The subsistence incidence among Filipino families was estimated at 6.2 percent in the first semester of 2018. This is alternatively called as the proportion of Filipino families whose incomes fall below the food threshold. In the same period in 2015, the proportion of families who are food poor was recorded at 9.9 percent. The subsistence incidence among Filipino individuals was estimated at 8.5 percent in the first semester of 2018, and 13.0 percent in the first semester of 2015. It refers to the proportion of Filipinos whose incomes fall below the food threshold. Philippine Statistics Authority, (2019).

This research is conducted to determine the impact of Sustainable Livelihood Programs on the residents of Poona Piagapo. The researcher is a resident of Poona Piagapo. Every day, she witnesses the poverty of the people and the endeavors extended by the government and the Non-governmental organization to help alleviate the economic and social condition of the residents. Through this paper, the researcher attempts to recognize how Sustainable Livelihood Programs impacted the lives of the residents of Poona Piagapo.

#### METHODS

This research study aims to determine the how the Sustainable Livelihood Programs transform the mindset of the residents of Poona Piagapo. The study will utilize mix method. A descriptive-correlational method was used to determine the profile of the respondents and the extent of implementation of the livelihood programs generated from Department of Social Welfare and Development. This study is centered in the Municipality of Poona Piagapo. To inquiry deeper on the impact of the livelihood programs an interview will be conducted. This is to ensure that the study will acquire the data needed to determine how the Sustainable Livelihood Programs transform the mindset of the residents of Poona Piagapo.

This study used the descriptive co-relational that gained the benefits of both defining the relationship between variables and evaluating the impact on the dependent variables of independent variables. The variables of this analysis were: The Sustainable Livelihood Programs as the latent variable measured by the extent of the program implementation. It was conducted in the municipality of Poona Piagapo, Lanao del Norte covering 100 program beneficiaries as the respondents included the 5 respondents who partake in the interview. On the onset of the conduct of the data gathering, the research sought the approval of the Dean of Graduate School of St. Michaels College for the conduct of the research. Thereafter, the researcher will personally hand the questionnaire to the respondents and address further questions that the respondents may inquire. The

respondents will then conduct an interview or focus group discussion to determine further how the Sustainable Livelihood Programs transform the mindset of the residents of Poona Piagapo. Further, the researcher utilized secondary data provided the data from the Department of Social Welfare and Development who provides the respondents the much-needed livelihood program to determine the actual projects extended by the agency to the residents of Poona Piagapo. The method used by the researcher to collect data consisted of (3) three parts: Part I was the Demographic Profile of the Program Beneficiaries, Part II is the Status of the Sustainable Livelihood Program, and Part III was the Extent of implementation. The survey questionnaire was modified to suit the nature of this study from ("The Philippine Sustainable Livelihood Program: Providing and expanding access to employment and livelihood opportunities, 2018).The following scoring was used to arrive at an appropriate analysis and data interpretation. Part I. Profile defines the highest educational attainment, no. of family members, and average monthly income of the respondent. Part II. Assessment on the Status of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the respondents. Description from Not operational to Fully operational with the scale from 1 to 5.Part III. Assessment on the Extent of implementation of Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the respondents. Description from Not implemented to Fully implemented with the scale from 1 to 5.The demographic attributes of the respondents were represented using frequency and percentage. The Product Moment Correlation (Pearson R) will be used to determine the respondent's relationship between the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received and their extent of implementation. The null hypothesis was subjected and tested at 0.05 level of significance. The weighted mean was used to assess the rating given by the respondents on the variable of its extent of implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood program received by the beneficiaries.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Problem 1. What are the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the Respondents?

**Table 1 The Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the respondents**

Sustainable Livelihood Programs	Frequency	Percent
Sari-sari store	30	30.0
Rice trading	22	22.0
Virgin coconut oil production	8	8.0
Bakery	18	18.0
Poultry	22	22.0
Turmeric production	10	10.0
Palapa production	6	6.0
Carabao production	5	5.0
Other Livestock	1	1.0
Food processing	2	2.0
Carinderia, small food establishments	1	1.0
Carpentry and Furniture making	8	8.0

Table 1 presents the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the respondents. As reflected in the table, 30 or 30% of the respondents are beneficiaries of Sari-sari store; 22 or 22% received Rice trading and Poultry, 18 or 18% are a recipient of a bakery, and 10 or 10% received the Turmeric production. On the other hand, 1 or 1% received Carinderia, small food establishments and Livestock raising, 2 or 2% received Food processing business, 5 or 5% are beneficiaries of Carabao production, 6 or 6% are into Palapa production and 8 or 8% are a recipient of Carpentry and Furniture

making and Virgin coconut oil production. This implies that more of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries Sari-sari store, Rice trading, and Poultry business.

### Problem 2. What is the extent of implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries in terms of Skills Training Fund, Seed Capital Fund and Micro-enterprise Development?

**Table 2.1 The Mean Distribution of the extent of implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries in terms of Skills Training Fund**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Technical-vocational skills training fee	4.00	1.741	Well Implemented
2. Basic living allowance	4.00	1.723	Well Implemented
3. training supplies and materials	3.97	1.714	Well Implemented
4. Equipment and Materials needed for employment	4.04	1.717	Well Implemented
5. Assessment Funds	4.01	1.726	Well Implemented
Grand Mean	4.02	1.707	Well Implemented

Table 2.1 reflected the extent of implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries in terms of Skills Training Fund. It was revealed that Technical-vocational skills training fee ( $\mu=4.00$ ); Basic living allowance ( $\mu=4.00$ ); training supplies and materials ( $\mu=3.97$ ); Equipment and Materials needed for employment ( $\mu=4.04$ ); and Assessment Funds ( $\mu=4.01$ ). This implies that all of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries in terms of Skills Training Fund are well implemented. This means that the project implementation where the phase where visions and plans become reality has reach the point of logical conclusion, after evaluating, deciding, visioning, planning, applying for funds and finding the financial resources of a project. Technical implementation is one part of executing a project.

**Table 2.2 The Mean Distribution of the extent of implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries in terms of Seed Capital Fund**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Working capital for small tools	4.90	.482	Fully Implemented
2. Raw materials	4.89	.510	Fully Implemented
3. start-up expenses	4.88	.556	Fully Implemented
4. permit/s to operate	4.90	.482	Fully Implemented
5. large and long-lived tangible assets required to start or expand a microenterprise	4.46	1.352	Fully Implemented
Grand Mean	4.92	1.144	Fully Implemented

Table 2.2 present the extent of implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries in terms of Seed Capital Fund.

As reflected in the table, the seed capital fund received by the beneficiaries are fully implemented. These seeds capital fund is the working capital for small tools (4.90); raw materials (4.89); start-up expenses (4.88); permit/s to operate (4.90); and large and long-lived tangible assets required to start or expand a microenterprise (4.46). This implies that the all the seeds capital fund was 100% implemented.

**Table 2.3 The Mean Distribution of the extent of implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries in terms of Micro-enterprise development**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Sari-sari store	3.04	1.071	Implemented
2. Rice trading	3.00	1.257	Implemented
3. Virgin coconut oil production	3.42	1.782	Implemented
4. Bakery	2.88	1.495	Implemented
5. Poultry	4.32	1.086	Well Implemented
6. Turmeric production	3.80	1.320	Well Implemented
7. Palapa production	2.33	.577	Partially Implemented
8. Carabao production	2.00	.816	Partially Implemented
9. Other Livestock	3.00	1.000	Implemented
10. Food processing	2.00	.	Partially Implemented
11. Carpentry and Furniture making	1.67	.816	Partially Implemented
Grand Mean	3.37	1.342	Implemented

Table 2.3 displayed the extent of implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the beneficiaries in terms of Micro-enterprise development.

As reflected in the table there were Micro-enterprise development (MD) that were well implemented, like Poultry (4.32); and Turmeric production (3.80). Other were just implemented like; Sari-sari store (3.04); Rice trading (3.00); Virgin coconut oil production (3.42); Bakery (2.88); and other Livestock raising (3.00). The rest are partially implemented like; Palapa production (2.33); Carabao production (2.00); Food processing (2.00); and Carpentry and Furniture making (1.67)

**Table 2.4 The Summary of the Extent of the Implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Program Received**

Area of Implementation	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Skills Training Fund	4.02	1.707	Well Implemented
Seed Capital Fund	4.92	1.144	Fully Implemented
Micro-enterprise development	3.37	1.342	Implemented

Table 2.4 presents the extent of the implementation of the sustainable livelihood program received. As reflected in the table, most of the sustainable livelihood program are fully implemented under the Seed Capital Fund (4.92); the Skills Training Fund (4.02) comes next and in Micro-enterprise development (3.37) only few sustainable. livelihood programs are fully implemented.

**Problem 3. What are the issues and problems encountered in the process of the implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs?**

**Interview result**

Questions asked of the participants were based on the objectives of the study. One (1) question were thrown to the 5 participants who were beneficiaries of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs who painstakingly partake in the interviews. The researcher makes sure that the conduct of the interview was not tainted with biases as to veer the trajectory of the conversation. Specifically, the interview was conducted to answer the following question, "What are the issues and problems encountered in the process of the implementation of the

Sustainable Livelihood Programs?". Based on the content analysis, five (5) themes had been formulated; None Cooperative; Start-up weren't implemented as planned; Money was used for personal needs; Officers rules and Runaway Treasurer.

**Theme 1: None Cooperative**

Participants 1 thinks that from the very start of the program, she failed to participate in the preparation of the project so she intentionally didn't cooperate.

*"mas mapiyarakun so individual project inuako run saugop."*

*"I did not prepare the individual project that's why I did not cooperate in the project."*

**Theme 2: Start-up weren't implemented as planned**

Participants 2 relate that after the training, they planned to put a bakery shop but instead, they decided to split the money among themselves.

*"mapasad so training na mas miyatumoami a bagi-bagiin so inibgay a start-up kit adisapnegosyosa bakery."*

*"after training for the bread and pastries, we are supposed to put up a bakery shop but instead we individually divided the start-up kit."*

**Theme 3: Money was used for personal needs**

Participants 3 shares that she spend the money intended to start the business for personal needs and left with nothing to start the business.

*"miyausarakun so perakkokinanglanakunsawalay."*

*"I wanted to start business but I used the money for personal needs..."*

**Theme 4: Officers rules**

Participants 4 convey that it is useless to be with the group were the leaders does not consult and listen to the members.

*"inawaanakunsirankadisiranpaparuaanbomapiyana so lalago mga officer's. dikamiiranpamakenegen."*

*"I left the group project because we don't agree with each other in the group. And for one thing, only the officer's decision was followed. They don't listen to us members."*

**Theme 5: Runaway Treasurer**

Participants 5 thinks sadly say that their treasurer corrupted the money of their association.

*"inipalagoy o treasurer ami so perak o association nainindagangyanruo."*

*"our treasurer took the money of the association. She left to manila and start her own business using the money of the association.."*

**Problem 4. Is there a significant difference on the extent of implementation when compare in terms of Sustainable Livelihood Programs received?**

**Table 4.1 Analyses on the Extent of the Implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Program When Compare According to the Livelihood Received**

Livelihood Program Received (Independent Variable)	Area of Implementation					
	Skills Training Fund		Seed Capital Fund		Micro-enterprise development	
	Mean	DE	Mean	DE	Mean	DE
Sari-sari store	3.17	I	4.78	F	2.85	I
Rice trading	2.26	P	4.41	W	3.23	I
Virgin coconut oil production	4.95	F	5.00	F	3.63	W
Bakery	4.54	F	5.00	F	2.89	I
Poultry	4.96	F	5.00	F	4.73	F
Turmeric production	4.92	F	5.00	F	3.70	W
Palapa production	5.00	F	5.00	F	3.00	I
Carabao production	5.00	F	5.00	F	3.00	I
Other Livestock	5.00	F	5.00	F	4.00	W
Food processing	4.70	F	5.00	F	3.13	I
Carindaria, small food establishments	5.00	F	5.00	F	3.00	I
Carpentry and Furniture making	5.00	F	5.00	F	1.63	P
F-value	7.381		.804		6.020	
p-value	<.001		.636		<.001	

DE – Descriptive Equivalent; P – Partially Implemented; I – Implemented; W – Well Implemented; F – Fully Implemented

\*\* Significant at 0.01 level (*Highly Significant*)

Table 8 display the extent of the implementation of the sustainable livelihood program when compare according to the livelihood received. The respondents were able to received Among the Livelihood Program received by the respondents Skills Training Fund, Sari-sari store ( $\mu=3.17$ ) was implemented. The Rice trading ( $\mu=4.41$ ) was just partially implemented. Among those Livelihood Program received that were fully implemented were; Virgin coconut oil production ( $\mu=4.95$ ); Baker ( $\mu=4.54$ ); Poultry ( $\mu=4.96$ ); Turmeric production ( $\mu=4.92$ ); Palapa production ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Carabao production ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Other Livestock ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Food processing ( $\mu=4.70$ ); Carpinteria, small food establishments ( $\mu=5.00$ ); and Carpentry and Furniture making ( $\mu=5.00$ ).

The Livelihood Program received by the respondents under the Seed Capital Fund the Rice trading ( $\mu=2.26$ ) was well implemented. Among those Livelihood Program received that were fully implemented were; Sari-sari store ( $\mu=4.78$ ); Virgin coconut oil production ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Baker ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Poultry ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Turmeric production ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Palapa production ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Carabao production ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Other Livestock ( $\mu=5.00$ ); Food processing ( $\mu=4.70$ ); Carpinteria, small food establishments ( $\mu=5.00$ ); and Carpentry and Furniture making ( $\mu=5.00$ ).

With regards to the Micro-enterprise development under the Livelihood Program received by the respondents, the following are implemented Micro-enterprise development; Sari-sari store (2.85); Rice trading (3.23); Bakery (2.89); Palapa production, Carabao production and Carindaria, small food establishments (3.00); and Food processing (3.13). Some of the Micro-enterprise development are well implemented; like Turmeric production (4.00); Virgin coconut oil production (3.63); and Other Livestock (3.13). The Poultry farm (4.73) was fully implemented while the Carpentry and Furniture making (1.63) is partially implemented.

Results showed highly significant difference (p-value = 0.001; F-value= 7.381). This means that the extent of implementation of the sustainable livelihood program varies significantly according to the program awarded. There is significant difference on the extent of implementation when compare in terms of Sustainable Livelihood Programs received. This mean that the hypothesis is rejected. This is because extent of implementation varies. Some sustainable livelihood program is partially implemented, other sustainable livelihood program is well implemented while some are fully implemented. This means that the implementation of the sustainable livelihood program is dependent on the area of Implementation. Most of the sustainable livelihood program are fully implemented under the Seed Capital Fund (4.92); the Skills Training Fund (4.02) comes next and in Micro-enterprise development (3.37) only few sustainable livelihood programs are fully implemented.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings of the study, the following were the conclusions drawn;

Majority of the respondents belongs to a family of 6 or more, and receiving an average monthly income between 10,000 and below. As to the Sustainable Livelihood Programs received by the respondents, most of the respondents are beneficiaries of Sari-sari store; Rice trading and Poultry, bakery and the Turmeric production. On the extent of the implementation of the sustainable livelihood program received, most of the sustainable livelihood program are fully implemented under the Seed Capital Fund; the Skills Training Fund comes next and under Micro-enterprise development (3.37) most are partially implemented. 5 participants who were beneficiaries of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs who painstakingly partake in the interviews. Specifically, the interview was conducted to answer the question, "What are the issues and problems encountered in the process of the implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Programs?". Based on the content analysis, five (5) themes had been formulated; None Cooperative; Start-up weren't implemented as planned; Money was used for personal needs; Officers rules and Runaway Treasurer. The study should a highly significant difference between the extent of implementation when compare in terms of Sustainable Livelihood Programs received. The hypothesis is rejected.

From the conclusion of the findings of the study, the following recommendations were formulated;

1. Involve local experts in implementing modalities of the MD track to increase the likelihood of success for microenterprises. It is important to involve local experts to conduct market analysis to ensure that projects are adapted to the local economy and to any particular skills and specializations of the local population.
2. Select SLP participants through an objective procedure. The creation of an indicators-based system to effectively identify and sort participants into each track would improve program performance as the program will only be effective among certain groups of people. It is essential to narrow down the eligibility criteria and to rely on an objective tool to classify participants into tracks and program modalities that fits their characteristics best, instead of leaving the decision solely to the participant.

Set realistic expectations and refine program goals.

## REFERENCES

- Altarelli V, Carloni A (2000). (Editors). Operationalizing household livelihood security. Forum proceedings Department for International Development of the United Kingdom.
- Ashley, C, (2000). Applying Livelihood Approaches to Natural Resource Management Initiatives: Experiences in Namibia and Kenya. ODI Working Paper 134, ODI, London, 2000.
- Baum, F. (2008) Foreword to Health promotion in action: from local to global empowerment
- Campbell, D., Pyett, P., & McCarthy, L. (2007). Community development interventions to improve Aboriginal health: Building an evidence base. *Health Sociology Review*, 16(3-4), 304-314.
- CASTAÑEDA, D. (2007). The Maranaos of Lanao: Poorest of the Poor
- Community Engagement Step-by-Step Action Kit, Gottlieb, Hildy, 19-20 (2007)
- Gavilan, J. (2017). FAST FACTS: Poverty in Mindanao
- Johnston, K. A. (2018). Toward a theory of social engagement. In K. A. Johnston & M. Taylor (Eds.), *The Handbook of Communication Engagement* (pp. 19-32). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Johnston, Kim A. (2010). "Community Engagement: Exploring a Relational Approach to Consultation and Collaborative Practice in Australia". *Journal of Promotion Management*.
- Johnston, K. A. (2018). Engagement. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Strategic Communication*: Wiley
- Johnston, K. A., & Lane, A. (2018). Building relational capital: The contribution of episodic and relational community engagement. *Public Relation Review*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2018.10.006>
- Johnston, K. A., & Lane, A. (2018). Building relational capital: The contribution of episodic and relational community engagement. *Public Relation Review*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2018.10.006>
- Kamaruddin R, Samsudin S (2014). The Sustainable Livelihoods Index: A Tool To Assess the Ability and Preparedness of the Rural Poor in Receiving Entrepreneurial Project. *Journal of Social Economics Research*, 1(6), 108-117.
- Krantz, L. (2001). The Sustainable Livelihood Approach to Poverty Reduction An Introduction
- Labonté R. and Laverack G. (2008) Health promotion in action: from local to global empowerment
- Mog, M (2004). Struggling with Sustainability—A Comparative Framework for Evaluating Sustainable Development Programs
- Philippine Statistics Authority, (2019). Proportion of Poor Filipinos registered at 21.0 percent in the First Semester of 2018 Reference No.: 2019-053
- Taylor, Maureen; Kent, Michael L. (2014). "Dialogic Engagement: Clarifying Foundational Concepts". *Journal of Public Relations Research*. 26 (5): 384–398. doi:10.1080/1062726x.2014.956106. ISSN 1062-726X.
- Tsey, Komla (2009) *Community development and empowerment*. In: Jirojwong, Sansnee, and Liamputtong, Pranee, (eds.) *Population Health, Communities and Health Promotion*. Oxford University Press, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, pp. 215-231.
- UNDP, (1997). Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods: A Briefing Note Submitted to the Executive Committee, June 4, 1997
- Waisbord S. (2005) Five key ideas: coincidences and challenges in development communication, in Hemer, O. and Tufte, T. (eds) *Media and Glocal Change: Rethinking Communication for Development*, Nordicom and CLASCO