

## **Identification of Livelihood Projects of Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries in Ilocos Sur**

MATEO L. CABANTING, JR.  
CONCEPCION B. AZARES  
GERTRUDESC. CABEBE

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study sought to determine the benefits derived by the agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARB) of Ilocos Sur from the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP), particularly in their livelihood projects other than farming.*

*Specifically, it aimed to: present the profile of the ARB's of Ilocos Sur; determine their livelihood projects and their reasons for venturing in such projects; identify the assistance derived by the ARB's from the different organizations involved in the CARP; determine their prospective livelihood projects; identify the problems they encountered in their on-going livelihood projects; and identify the problems they foresee in their prospective projects.*

*Most of the ARB's were male, between 30-59 years old, elementary graduates, and earned below P6000 a month.*

*They ventured in piggery, cattle raising, poultry raising, and carabao raising as their livelihood projects. Only a few engaged in commerce, raising quails, horses, turkeys, or ducks & geese, fish culture, mushroom culture, and food and meat processing. They ventured in these projects for the following reasons: it is easier to manage; it is their area of interest; it gives higher profit; support is given by cooperatives, government agencies, and local/national officials; and it augments their income.*

*The ARB's received cash and material assistance from the Department of Agriculture, Department of Interior and Local Government, and the Land Bank of the Philippines. They also received material assistance from the Department of Trade and Industry. Moreover, they received cash and material assistance from their cooperatives and private enterprises. Some received little cash assistance from the rural banks; cash and material assistance for non-government organizations and local/national government officials.*

*The ARB's planned to venture in other livelihood projects like livestock production, poultry raising, and fish culture. They expressed their need for cash, material, and technical assistance in their prospective projects.*

*In their on-going livelihood projects, the ARB's encountered mostly financial problems. They could foresee problems on capital, technical know-how and facilities in their prospective projects.*

## Introduction

### Background of the Study

The agrarian problem has been one of the major issues relative to the country's underdevelopment which cannot be overlooked because the Philippines is basically an agricultural country and majority of the people live and work in the countryside. This agrarian problem includes: a skewed land ownership, relatively backward agricultural technology; poor extension system; unavailability of credit at affordable rates; lack of basic physical infrastructure and postharvest facilities; inadequate agriculture-based industrialization; over dependence on foreign markets; and insufficient social infrastructure. These hinder the attainment of higher farm production.

One of the measures done by the Philippine government to minimize, if not eradicate, these problems is the Agrarian Reform Program which works on land tenure improvement with land ownership redistribution and support services delivery. It also includes human resource and institutional development on social infrastructure and strengthening. The Agrarian Reform Program aims to rectify the unjust distribution of land ownership and to improve structures and systems for technological extension, credit delivery, basic physical infrastructure, post-harvest assistance, agriculture-based industrialization, and institutional development.

The Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) is based on the fundamental principles of just distribution of all agricultural lands and recognition of farmers'/farm workers' rights to directly or collectively own the land they till and to receive a just share of the fruits of these lands. The CARP envisions the expansion of agrarian reform to cover all agricultural land areas of the country. The major objectives of the CARP are to improve the land tenure system in the country and to improve the socio-economic status of beneficiaries by providing them with support services. The objectives are expected to contribute to the goal of increasing agricultural productivity and, ultimately, improving the small farmers' standard of living.

Covering a total of 10.3 million ha, the CARP intends to help some 3.9 million beneficiaries in the 10-year period of implementation. The program also projects that about 400,000 ha out of the total 2.3 million ha of private agricultural lands will be voluntarily offered for sale to the government.

The beneficiaries are the landless barangay residents or those who own less than 3 ha land, show willingness, aptitude, and ability to make the land productive, and reside in the same barangay or municipality. They are in the following order of priority: agricultural lessees and share tenants; regular farm workers; seasonal farm workers; other farm workers; actual tillers or occupants of public lands; cooperatives of the aforementioned beneficiaries; others directly working on the land; and other landless individuals as identified by the Presidential Agrarian Reform Council (PARC).

The CARP goes beyond redistribution of land ownership. It seeks not only to provide land titles to small farmers and farm workers but also to provide necessary support services, credit, and farm related infrastructure facilities. Cooperatives and other associations are extended to the beneficiaries to enable them to undertake economic activities collectively and acquire greater bargaining power. The aim is to develop self-reliant communities that are capable of managing their farm and off-farm business and establishing linkages with government agencies and NGO's.

The benefits granted to CARP beneficiaries are indeed extensive and it is but fitting to undergo a study relative to the agrarian beneficiaries, hence this research undertaking.

## Objectives

This study was conducted to determine the benefits derived by the agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARB) of Ilocos Sur from the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP), particularly in their livelihood projects other than fanning.

Specifically, it sought to:

1. Present the profile of the agrarian reform beneficiaries of Ilocos Sur.
2. Determine their livelihood projects and their reasons for venturing in such projects.
3. Identify the assistance derived by the ARB's from the different organizations involved in the CARP.
4. Determine their prospective livelihood projects.
5. Identify the problems encountered by the ARB's in their on-going livelihood projects.
6. Identify the problems foreseen by the ARB's in their prospective projects.

This research work hoped to provide data needed in formulating effective agrarian reform policies, program planning, and decision-making for agencies/organizations directly or indirectly involved in agrarian reform management. Hopefully, the study would also assist in the systematic formulation of flexible strategies in the implementation, program management, monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment especially in the beneficiaries' economic life. Likewise, the study hoped to provide a basis for testing and developing alternative reform models and/or schemes.

## **Review of Related Literature**

Related literature concerning the study with several views and opinions were gathered to make this research easier to understand .

Luzviminda B. Cornista and Marideth R. Bravo of the UPLB Institute of Agrarian Studies view agrarian reform as a strategy for social transformation through poverty alleviation of the rural poor - the farmers and farm workers. However, there is still a need for improving the access to productive assets and productivity or income-enhancing support services that will ultimately lead to beneficiaries development. A more equitable, productive, and efficient socio-economic system(s) ensuring participation and improvement of the farmers and farm workers should be attained. Cornista and Bravo (1990) recommend measures to improve CARP implementation such as: setting up a realistic target; adherence of CARP to the land-to-the tiller principle; land acquisition and distribution to remain with DAR but provision of support services to be pursued in partnership with LGU's; increased allocation of agrarian reform funds for landowners compensation and assistance to support services; documentation and assessment of ARC's; supporting the population program of the government; and protecting the gains and pursuing advocacy for agrarian reform.

Father Antonio J. Ledesma, SJ. of Xavier University presented a paper in 1980 citing discussions of land reform models. In the case of the Philippines, the post 1980 period saw significant development in the land/agrarian reform program models. Based on the concept of private property and free enterprise, owner cultivatorship of the family farm has been upheld as model for land reform in Asian countries influenced by U.S. policy during the post-war period. He differentiated "land reform" from "cooperative" when applied to either socialist or capitalist economy.

In 1989 Romana P. De Los Reyes and Ma Sylvia G. Jopello of Ateneo de Manila University Institute of Philippine Culture discussed the adoption of a different strategy in advocating for agrarian reform by a group of non-government organizations (NGO's). Confident in the opportunities offered by the CARP Law, the Philippine DHRRA, a group of NGO's, engaged in rural development works. This movement initiated a program in which NGO's, and People's Organizations (PO's) would work with the

government in carrying out agrarian reforms. This work discussed the programs' achievements in land distribution and the impact of the NGO organizing projects and services brought into the site.

## Methodology

The descriptive research method using the questionnaire as the primary tool in gathering data and supplemented by personal interviews was used in this study. The number of respondents was taken proportionately from the number of agrarian reform beneficiaries enlisted in the Department of Agriculture (DA) office in each municipality. Random sampling technique was employed. Frequency counts and percentages were used in the analysis of data.

## Discussion of Results

### Profile of Respondents

Table 1 presents the profile of the agrarian reform beneficiaries in the different municipalities of Ilocos Sur.

**Sex.** The majority of the respondents (82.72%) were male while 17.28% were female. These farmers were, indeed, lucky to have been granted ownership of a portion of the land they are tilling.

**Age.** The greater bulk of the ARB respondents were between 40-49 years old (27.34%) and 50-59 years old (26.63%). More than one-fourth of the respondents (22.25%) were 30-39 years old. At the extremes, 12.07% were 60-69 years old; 6.51%, below 30 years old; and 5.2%, 70 years and above.

**Educational attainment.** These beneficiaries were categorized into elementary graduate (62.37%), high school graduate (30.89%), college graduate (4.73%) and vocational graduate (2.01%). It seems that the government made a right decision to introduce the CARP to give the less fortunate, especially the non-white collar job sector, the opportunity to own and till a piece of land that would help alleviate their standard of living.

**Monthly income.** The majority (81.54%) were earning below P6000 a month; 12.42% earned P6000-7999, while only 6.04% earned P8000 & above. The data imply that very few among the ARB respondents could earn above the poverty threshold and that the earnings from the land awarded them is not enough to maintain a decent livelihood.

Table 1. Profile of the agrarian reform beneficiaries.

CHARACTERISTIC	NO.	%
Sex		
Male	699	82.72
Female	146	17.28
Age (years)		
70 & above	44	5.20
60 -69	102	12.07
50-59	225	26.63
40 -49	231	27.34
30-39	188	22.25
Below30	55	6.51
Educational attainment		
Elementary graduate	527	62.37
High School graduate	261	30.89
Vocational graduate	17	2.01
College graduate	40	4.73
Monthly income (pesos)		
Below 6000	689	81.54
6000- 7999	105	12.42
8000- 9999	20	2.37
10000 - 11999	17	2.01
12000 & above	14	1.66

### Livelihood Projects

Besides fanning the piece of land given them through the CARP, the ARB respondents ventured in other livelihood projects. Table 2 shows that they undertook more than one livelihood project for the last five years.

Piggery was the number one project ventured in by 48.64% of the ARB respondents. This was followed by cattle raising which was ventured in by (42.37%); poultry raising, 29.47%; carabao raising, 27.10% and goat raising, 21.89%. Only a few had other livelihood projects like: buy and sell enterprise, fish culture, duck/goose raising, food and meat processing, mushroom culture, horse raising, quail raising, and turkey raising.

**Table 2. Livelihood projects ventured in by agrarian reform beneficiaries for the last five (5) years.**

LIVELIHOOD PROJECT	NO.	%
Piggery	411	4864
Cattle raising	358	4037
Poultry raising	249	2947
Carabao raising	229	27.10
Goat raising	185	21.89
Buy and sell enterprise	89	1053
Fish culture	49	580
Duck/Goose raising	28	3.31
Food processing	20	2.37
Meat processing	15	1.77
Mushroom culture	15	1.77
Horse raising	15	1.77
Quail raising	10	1.18
Turkey raising	10	1.18

The results imply that the ARB respondents did their best to engage in any kind of livelihood project aside from farming to augment the income they get from their farm products. It is further implied that these beneficiaries were not contented with what they earned from farming, thus, they sought other livelihood projects.

**Table 3. ARB respondents' reasons for engaging in/choosing the projects.**

REASON	NO.	%
Easier to manage	316	37.40
My area of interest	263	33.49
Higher profit	276	32.66
Support from:		
Cooperatives	187	22.13
Government agencies	113	13.27
Local officials	53	6.27
Congressmen/Senators	32	3.79
To augment income	39	4.62

The ARB respondents chose/engaged in their respective livelihood projects for several reasons. Table 3 shows that the respondents gave multiple responses.

More than one-third (37.40%) of the ARB respondents claimed that it was easier to manage; 33.49% declared that it was their area of interest; 32.66% said they derived higher profit from it.

Another reason was the support they derived from various sectors such as: cooperatives (22.13%), government agencies (13.27%), local officials (6.27%), and congressmen/senators (3.79%). Only 4.62% claimed that their project could augment their income.

The findings imply that the reasons mentioned by these ARB respondents were their motivating factors in engaging in or choosing such livelihood projects.

### Assistance from Different Organizations

The ARB respondents were assisted in various ways by government agencies, private organizations, and other sectors who were interested in helping them become self-reliant.

**Government agencies.** Aside from the piece of land awarded them by the CARP, the ARB respondents also received assistance from different government agencies. These are presented in Table 4.

Out of the 845 ARB respondents, 4.97% received assistance in the form of cash and 46.27% received material assistance from the Department of Agriculture (DA). The cash assistance ranges from P1000 to more than P11000. The material assistance were the following: fry/fingerlings, cattle, hog, goat, chicken, feeds, training & seminars, assistance on project study, follow-up/advice, and vegetable seeds.

From the Department of Trade & Industry (DTI), 5.21% of the ARB respondents received material assistance like: fry/fingerlings, cattle, goat, chicken, training and seminars, assistance on project study and follow-up and advice.

The beneficiaries also received cash and material assistance from the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG). The cash assistance ranges from P1000 to more than P 11000 as declared by 3.31% of the ARB respondents. A few (4.85%) also received material assistance like: fry/fingerlings, cattle, hog, goat, chicken, feeds, training and seminars and follow-up and advice.



Table 4. Assistance received by the agrarian reform beneficiaries from the different government agencies.

<b>AGENCY AND ASSISTANCE RECEIVED</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Department of Agriculture (DA)</b>		
<b>Cash</b>		
P 1000- 2999	7	0.83
3000- 4999	0	0
5000- 6999	2	0.24
7000- 8999	0	0
9000 - 10999	12	1.42
11000 & above	21	2.49
<b>Materials</b>		
Fry/fingerlings	11	1.30
Cattle	52	6.15
Hog	52	6.15
Goat	26	3.08
Chicken	11	1.30
Feeds	17	2.01
Training & seminars	115	13.61
Assistance on project study	10	1.18
Follow-up and advice	81	9.59
Vegetable seeds	16	1.89
<b>Department of Trade &amp; Industry (DTI)</b>		
<b>Materials</b>		
Fry/fingerlings	1	0.12
Cattle	4	0.47
Goat	9	1.06
Chicken	4	0.47
Training & seminars	8	0.95
Assistance on project study	6	0.71
Follow-up and advice	12	1.42

**Table 4. Continued.**

<b>AGENCY AND ASSISTANCE RECEIVED</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG)</b>		
<b>Cash</b>		
P 1000 -2999	4	0.47
3000- 4999	0	0
5000- 6999	10	1.18
7000- 8999	0	0
9000 - 10999	0	0
11000 & above	14	1.66
<b>Materials</b>		
Fry/fingerlings	10	1.18
Cattle	5	0.59
Hog	1	0.12
Goat	9	1.06
Chicken	4	0.47
Feeds	3	0.36
Training & seminars	7	0.83
Follow-up and advice	2	0.24
<b>Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP)</b>		
<b>Cash</b>		
Below P 1000	1	0.12
P 1000- 2999	1	0.12
3000- 4999	1	0.12
5000- 6999	5	0.59
7000- 8999	1	0.12
9000 - 10999	14	1.66
11000&above	17	2.01
<b>Materials</b>		
Cattle	8	0.95
Hog	2	0.24
Goat	7	0.83
Chicken	2	0.24
Feeds	5	0.59
Training & seminars	3	0.36
Assistance on project study	1	0.12
Follow-up and advice	2	0.24
Loan	9	1.06
Water pump	2	0.24

The Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP) extended assistance also to the agrarian reform beneficiaries in the form of cash ranging from P1000 to more than P11000 which was awarded to 4.73 % of the respondents. Material assistance received by 4.85% of the respondents were the following: cattle, hog, goat, chicken, feeds, training and seminars, assistance on project study, follow-up and advice, loan, and water pump.

During informal talks with the ARB respondents, they said that they tried to seek assistance in cash or in kind from any government agency that could extend them any help because it took a long time to wait for their farm products, thus, it was difficult for them to sustain their families. The assistance derived from the different government agencies helped them in their other livelihood projects and, in one way or another, could help them in their daily subsistence.

**Private organizations (PO's).** Aside from the assistance received from the different government agencies, the ARB respondents also sought assistance from private organizations like cooperatives, rural banks, and private enterprises. These are presented in Table 5.

Only 10.53% of the 845 ARB respondents received cash assistance ranging from below P1000 to more than P11000 from cooperatives. Less (4.26%) received material assistance like: goat, chicken, feeds, training and seminars, assistance on project study, and follow-up and advice.

On the other hand, cash assistance ranging from P1000 to less than P9000 was received by 1.06% of the respondents from Rural Banks.

The beneficiaries also sought assistance from private enterprises, who responded by giving some respondents (1.66%) some cash assistance ranging from below P 1000 to less than P 11000. Others (1.3%) received material assistance like: cattle, feeds, and everyday needs.

The findings imply that not only the government agencies but also private organizations are concerned with the welfare of the less fortunate farmers and are also willing to extend their assistance to help alleviate their standard of living.

**Other sources of assistance.** Assistance to the ARB respondents also came from other sources such as officials (Table 6).

The non-government organizations (NGO's) gave cash and material assistance. Cash assistance ranging from below P1000 to less than P9000 was given to 2.01% of the ARB respondents and the material assistance in the form of fry/fingerlings, hog, and chicken was given to 1.78% of the respondents.

**Table 5. Assistance received by the agrarian reform beneficiaries from private organizations (PO's).**

<b>PRIVATE ORGANIZATION AND FORM OF ASSISTANCE</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Cooperatives</b>		
Cash (pesos)		
Below 1000	19	2.25
1000- 2999	17	2.01
3000- 4999	25	2.96
5000- 6999	11	1.30
7000- 8999	1	0.12
9000 - 10999	10	1.18
11000 & above	6	0.71
<b>Materials</b>		
Goat	1	0.12
Chicken	6	0.71
Feeds	7	0.83
Training & seminars	10	1.18
Assistance on project study	0	0
Follow-up and advice	12	1.42
<b>Rural Banks</b>		
<b>Cash</b> (pesos)		
1000- 2999	2	0.24
3000- 4999	2	0.24
<b>5000-</b> 6999	4	0.47
7000- 8999	1	0.12
<b>Private enterprise</b>		
Cash (pesos)		
Below 1000	1	0.12
1000- 2999	4	0.47
3000- 4999	1	0.12
5000- 6999	6	0.71
7000- 8999	0	0
9000- 10999	2	0.24
<b>Materials</b>		
Cattle	4	0.47
Feeds	2	0.24
Everyday needs	5	0.59

**Table 6. Assistance received by ARB respondents from other sources.**

<b>SOURCE AND FORM OF ASSISTANCE</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Non-Government Organizations (NGO's)</b>		
<b>Cash (pesos)</b>		
Below 1000	6	0.71
1000–2999	10	1.18
3000 - 4999	0	0
5000 - 6999	0	0
7000 - 8999	1	0.12
<b>Materials</b>		
Fry/fingerlings	1	0.12
Hog	4	0.47
Chicken	10	1.18
<b>Local/National Officials</b>		
<b>Cash (pesos)</b>		
1000– 2999	2	0.24
3000– 4999	0	0
5000– 6999	0	0
7000– 8999	1	0.12
9000 - 10999	0	0
11000&above	2	0.24
<b>Materials</b>		
Cattle	4	0.47
Hog	1	0.12
Goat	1	0.12

From local/national officials like: congressmen, senators, governors, and the like, cash assistance ranging from P1000 to more than P11000 was given to 0.59% of the respondents while material assistance like cattle, hog, and goat was given to 0.71% of them.

The results imply that some private individuals were generous enough to extend assistance to the agrarian reform beneficiaries to alleviate their standard of living.

### Prospective Projects

The ARB respondents also planned to put up some projects other than those they were engaged in during the time of the study. These are presented in Table 7.

Table 7, Projects which the agrarian reform beneficiaries planned to put up.

<b>PROSPECTIVE PROJECT</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Livestock production</b>		
Swine	194	22.96
Cattle	224	26.51
Goat	189	22.37
Horse	4	0.47
Carabao	191	22.60
<b>Poultry production</b>		
Chicken (45 days)	412	48.76
Chicken (fighting cocks)	58	6.86
Duck/goose	27	3.20
Turkey	20	2.37
Quail	12	1.40
<b>Fish culture</b>		
Tilapia	161	19.05
Bangus	51	6.04
Catfish	26	3.08

The prospective projects which they planned to put up were the following: livestock production (cattle - 26.51%; swine - 22.96%; carabao - 22.60%; goat - 22.37%; horse - 0.47%); poultry production (45 days chicken - 48.76%; fighting cocks - 6.86%; duck/goose - 3.20%; turkey - 2.37%; quail - 1.40%); and fish culture (tilapia - 19.05%; bangus - 6.04%; and catfish - 3.08%).

These findings imply that although they were engaged in some projects, they wanted to reinforce and increase their investment in other projects for faster economic growth.

Table 8 shows the assistance needed by the ARB respondents to be able to accomplish their prospective projects.

Almost half (45.21 %) of the respondents claimed they needed financial assistance amounting to P11000 and above. One-fourth (21.42%) said they needed P7000-9999 and 15.98% needed less than P1000. Others signified the following need for financial assistance: P10000-10999 (7.10%); P1000-3999 (6.75%) and P4000-6999 (3.55%).

**Table 8. Assistance needed by the ARB respondents in putting up the prospective project.**

<b>ASSISTANCE NEEDED</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Financial</b> (pesos)		
Below 1000	135	15.98
1000- 3999	57	6.75
4000- 6999	30	3.55
7000 - 9999	181	21.42
10000- 10999	60	7.10
11000 & above	382	45.21
<b>Material</b>		
Swine production	12	1.42
Animal raising	17	2.01
Animal feeding	23	2.72
Business management	154	18.22
Tilapia culture	111	13.14
Livestock	415	49.11
Marketing	159	<b>18.82</b>
Technology	347	41.06
Poultry	593	70.18
<b>Seminar/training</b>	237	28.05

For material assistance, the beneficiaries needed the following: swine production (1.42%), animal raising (2.01 %), animal feeding (2.72%), business management (18.22%), tilapia culture (13.14%), livestock (49.11%), marketing (18.82%), technology (41.06%), and poultry (70.18%).

Moreover, 28.05% of the ARB respondents also needed seminars/trainings for the realization of their prospective projects.

These results imply that the amount of financial assistance needed by the beneficiaries depends upon the kind of project the proponent wanted to undertake and that they need more materials to be able to put up their dream project. It further implies that in addition to financial and material assistance they also need seminars and trainings so that they could efficiently and effectively implement these projects.

## Problems

In any endeavor, whether successful or not, problems cannot be avoided. In this study, the ARB respondents identified two kinds of problems: those they encountered in their on-going projects (Table 9) and those they could foresee in their prospective project (Table 10).

**Problems encountered.** In their on-going projects they encountered some problems during the preparation aspect, production, and marketing aspect of the project.

Table 9. Problems encountered by agrarian reform beneficiaries on their on-going livelihood projects.

PROBLEM	NO.	%
<b>Preparation of the project</b>		
Lack of capital	598	70.77
Determination & selection of location	146	17.28
Materials needed for housing	301	35.62
<b>Production</b>		
Lack of capital	487	57.63
Low production	332	39.29
Lack of manpower	198	23.43
Disease control problem	160	18.93
Lack of technical know-how	105	12.43
<b>Marketing</b>		
Low market prices	641	75.86
Lack of transportation facilities	325	38.46

In the preparation aspect of the project, they encountered the following problems: lack of capital needed (70.77%), materials needed for housing (35.62%), and determination and selection of location (17.28%). That capital is the priority need in any project is clearly implied here.

In production, the following problems were mentioned: lack of capital (57.63%); low production (39.29%); lack of manpower (23.43%); disease control problem (18.93%); and lack of technical know-how (12.43%). It is clearly shown that lack of capital is again the most encountered problem which implies that money is really the first priority in putting up a livelihood project. The second most encountered problem was



low production. This could be due to their lack of the technical know-how on the project they ventured in.

In marketing, the beneficiaries posted only two problems, namely: low market prices (75.86%) and lack of transportation facilities (38.46%). Low market prices imply that by the time their products are ready to be sold, they are no longer in demand, hence, the low prices. These happen especially in the interior municipalities. Moreover, due to lack of transportation facilities, the farmers could not sell their products, so they either gave them free to their neighbors or they just spoiled.

Foreseen problems. The ARB respondents could also foresee the following problems in their prospective projects: lack of capital (55.27%); lack of technical know-how (50.77%); and lack of/ no facilities available (33.85%). Some (9.94%) mentioned no interest to engage in any livelihood activity as their problem (table 10).

Table 10. Problems foreseen by the ARB respondents in their prospective livelihood projects.

PROBLEM	NO.	%
Lack of capital	467	55.27
Lack of technical know-how	429	50.77
Lack of/no facilities available	286	33.85
No interest to engage in any livelihood activity	84	9.94

## Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study.

### Profile of Respondents

Majority of the agrarian refonn beneficiaries (ARB's) were male. Most of them were between 30-59 years old, were elementary graduates, and earned below **P6000** a month.

### Livelihood Projects

Most of the ARB respondents ventured in piggery, cattle, poultry, and carabao production as their livelihood projects other than farming. The rest engaged in buy

and sell enterprise, fish culture, duck/goose raising, food and meat processing, mushroom culture, horse, quail, and turkey production.

They ventured in these livelihood projects for the following reasons: it is easier to manage; it is their area of interest; it gives higher profit; support is given by cooperatives, government agencies and local/national officials; and it augments their income.

### **Assistance From Different Organizations**

The ARB respondents received cash and material assistance mostly from the Department of Agriculture (DA). They also received material assistance from the Department of Trade & Industry (DTI), cash and material assistance from the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) and the Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP).

They also received cash assistance mostly from cooperatives and little assistance from rural banks and private enterprises. Material assistance was also given by cooperatives and private enterprises.

Moreover, some ARB respondents received little cash and material assistance from non-government organizations (NGO's) and from the local/national government officials.

### **Prospective Projects**

The ARB respondents also planned to put up other livelihood projects like: livestock production, poultry raising and fish culture. To be able to put up their prospective project, most of them needed cash and material assistance and technical preparation.

### **Problems**

The ARB respondents encountered problems during the preparation, production and marketing aspects of their livelihood projects. Most of them encountered financial problems.

On the other hand, in the fulfillment of their prospective projects, most of them could foresee problems on capital, technical know-how, and facilities.

## Recommendations

1. The agrarian reform beneficiaries and their family members should venture in more alternative livelihood projects to augment their income for their daily subsistence and for future use.
2. The ARB's should organize themselves at the municipal level and authorize their officers to coordinate with the municipal officials and provincial government officials so that their livelihood projects would be improved.
3. The ARB's should exert more effort in availing of cash and material assistance from different sources so that they could improve their projects and finally, their economic condition and standard of living.
4. Before planning to put up bigger projects, the ARB's should improve their present livelihood projects to give consolation to their benefactors.
5. Before putting up a project, the ARB's should be technically trained to enable them to manage their projects efficiently and effectively.

## References

- CONGRESS FOR A PEOPLE'S AGRARIAN REFORM. n.d. *"CPAR" Assessment of the Second Year of Republic Act 6657*. Quezon City: CPAR.
- CORNISTA, LUZVIMINDA B. and MARIDETH R. BRAVO. 1990. *"The Philippine Agrarian Reform Program: Issues, Problems and Prospects; International Issues in Agrarian Reform: Past Experiences - Future Prospects."* Report of the International Colloquium on Agrarian Reform Program (CARP), Quezon City, 26-30 March 1990.
- DELOS REYES ROMANA P. and MA. SYLVIA G. JOPELLO. 1989. *"Process Documentation: Social Science Research in a Learning Process Approach to Program Development."* Ateneo de Manila University, Institute of Philippine Culture.