

THE INFLUENCE OF GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT ENTITY IN FOSTERING SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOOD

By:

ALEX L. SEÑARA, D.M, MARK R. NAMBATAC, DBM, ALEXANDER P. TAN, MAED

Abstract. *This study examined the relationship between respondents' demographic profiles and the influence of government and non-government entities on sustainable livelihoods. The findings revealed that most respondents were aged 31–50, a group associated with higher productivity, decision-making capacity, and active participation in community activities. There was a slightly higher proportion of female respondents, indicating stronger female engagement in livelihood programs. Most participants had been in the organization for 1–3 years, suggesting sufficient experience to evaluate program effectiveness. Cash assistance was the most commonly received form of support due to its accessibility and flexibility in addressing immediate household needs. However, newer members and those receiving less frequent assistance reported lower outcomes, indicating that limited exposure and inconsistent support reduce program benefits. In terms of institutional influence, the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Malitbog was perceived as highly influential, particularly in providing business support, training, and financial assistance, while the National Government Unit (NGU) showed a positive but less direct impact. Despite these efforts, challenges remain in market access and follow-up support, as some respondents struggle with product sales and lack continuous guidance after initial assistance. Lower outcomes were also observed in stable income and long-term sustainability, suggesting that while programs provide initial benefits, they do not always ensure lasting economic security. Regression analysis confirmed that institutional involvement significantly influences sustainable livelihoods ($R^2 = 0.667$). The Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative and the Malitbog Women Program showed significant positive effects, while LGU and NGU had no significant direct influence. This indicates that community-based and targeted programs are more effective in improving livelihood outcomes. Overall, the study highlights that cooperatives and women-focused initiatives have the strongest impact on livelihood improvement. However, issues such as limited targeting, inconsistent support, and weak coordination among institutions reduce overall effectiveness. Strengthening collaboration between government agencies and community organizations, improving program inclusivity, and ensuring continuous support are essential to achieving sustainable and long-term livelihood development in the community.*

Keywords. *Sustainable livelihood; government entities; non-government organizations; institutional support; collaboration; livelihood programs; community development; rural development; cooperatives; social assistance.*

Salmoro Nica B., Ubaob Joanna Mae C., Adaya Erika A., Baoy Dimple C., Medel, Arvil M.

INTRODUCTION

In a world marked by persistent poverty, joblessness, and inequality, achieving viable solutions to uplift minority groups' livelihood standards remains a formidable challenge in many developing nations, including the Philippines. As a lower-middle-income country, the Philippines grapples with rural-urban disparities, where rural areas like Bukidnon province face high underemployment rates—estimated at 15–20% in agrarian communities (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2024). Livelihood, in this context, encompasses the assets (human, social, natural, physical, and financial), skills, and income-generating activities that individuals or households own or acquire to improve their living conditions and achieve resilience (Sustainable Urban and Rural Development, 2023; DFID, 1999).

Government and non-government entities play pivotal roles in fostering sustainable livelihoods by addressing structural barriers to economic inclusion. National government agencies, such as the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) and Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), alongside local government units (LGUs), deliver targeted programs. These include the Livelihood Assistance Program and Tulong Panghanapbuhay sa Ating Disadvantaged Workers (TUPAD), which provide skills training in agro-processing, handicrafts, and entrepreneurship, alongside seed capital and employment linkages. Such initiatives enable participants to build marketable skills, secure stable incomes, and reduce poverty incidence. Empirical research affirms that government-led programs enhance economic security—reducing vulnerability by up to 25% in beneficiary households—and bolster community resilience against shocks like natural disasters or market fluctuations (World Bank, 2020).

Non-government entities—cooperatives, women's organizations, and people's groups—complement these efforts through grassroots, community-driven collaboration. In Bukidnon, the Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative (BARBECO) exemplifies this: by pooling land resources, providing microfinance, and facilitating collective marketing of coffee and vegetables, BARBECO has increased member incomes by 30-40% annually (BARBECO Annual Report, 2023). Similarly, women's groups like the Malitbog Women Program empower female-headed households via weaving and food processing ventures. Studies underscore that government-NGO partnerships amplify impact, yielding stronger livelihood outcomes—such as diversified income streams—and supporting long-term community development through shared governance and resource mobilization (FAO, 2021).

This study is grounded in the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA), which views livelihoods as a web of five capital assets influenced by external vulnerabilities (e.g., economic shocks) and transforming structures (e.g., policies, institutions). SLA emphasizes strategies that transform vulnerabilities into opportunities, aligning with Philippine development goals under the Philippine Development Plan 2023-2028 (NEDA, 2023). By applying SLA, this research evaluates how entities strengthen capital in a rural barangay context.

This study examines how government and non-government entities promote sustainable livelihoods in Barangay Poblacion, Malitbog, Bukidnon—a rural community of 1,200 households reliant on subsistence farming and informal trade. It focuses on financial, training, and market support, assessing contributions to job creation, business strengthening, and community resilience. Findings offer actionable insights for residents, entities, policymakers, academic institutions, and future researchers.

A core challenge is limited financial access: 60% of families aspire to launch micro-enterprises (e.g., sari-sari stores, backyard farming) but lack startup capital, averaging PHP 20,000-50,000 (Local Survey, 2024). Government and non-government entities respond with financial aid (e.g., DTI's Shared Service Facilities), training (e.g., DOLE's TESDA certifications), and skills development. Salonga (2020) documents collaborations among social enterprises, LGUs/NGAs, the Malitbog Women Program, and BARBECO, delivering tailored interventions like value-chain training for highland vegetables.

Yet gaps persist. Families struggle with product marketing, customer access amid poor infrastructure, and business scaling due to volatile markets. Limited evidence assesses social enterprises' capacity for sustained guidance, networking (e.g., buyer linkages), and market access to ensure consistent income and employment (Acosta et al., 2025). Moreover, few studies probe long-term poverty prevention—how programs build resilience against climate risks or economic downturns, enabling families to thrive beyond survival. This study bridges these gaps by investigating how social enterprises deliver financial support, skills training, market access, and ongoing guidance to enhance incomes, generate jobs, expand businesses, and secure sustainable livelihoods for Barangay Poblacion residents.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive quantitative research design to systematically document and analyze residents' experiences with government and non-government entities in promoting sustainable

livelihoods. The descriptive method was ideal for capturing current circumstances, patterns, and outcomes, while the quantitative approach gathered numerical data via surveys for statistical analysis. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (means, frequencies) and inferential tests (e.g., correlation, ANOVA) to identify relationships, such as support levels versus livelihood improvements. This combination ensured objective, evidence-based findings grounded in empirical facts.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in Barangay Poblacion, Malitbog, Bukidnon, a rural hub hosting diverse social enterprises in handicrafts, food processing, community-based tourism, and environmental stewardship. With a population of 107 direct beneficiaries from key associations, this locale provided rich, first-hand data on livelihood interventions. Its agrarian context—marked by coffee farming and cooperative activities—made it ideal for examining long-term outcomes like income stability and resilience.

Research Respondents and Sampling

Respondents were 84 residents from two beneficiary associations in Malitbog, Bukidnon, selected as direct recipients of government and non-government support. They offered insights into income changes, food security, skills gains, and adaptability. The total population was 107; using Slovin's formula ($n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$, where n is the sample size, N is the population size, and e is the margin of error), yielded a sample of 84 at 5% margin of error.

Scoring Procedure

The study used a Four-Point Likert Scale to measure participants' responses. Below are the scoring procedures that the researchers utilized to describe the study data:

Table 2. Scoring Guidelines

Scale	Numerical Range	Categorical Response	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Highly Influential
3	2.51 – 3.25	Agree (A)	Moderately Influential
2	1.76 – 2.50	Disagree (D)	Less Influential
1	1.00 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Not Influential

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Age

Profile	Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage

Age	20-30 yrs. Old	6	7.1
Age	31-50 yrs. Old	49	58.3
Age	51-60 yrs. Old	24	28.6
Age	61 yrs. old and above	5	6.0
Age	Total	84	100%

The table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to age. The findings show that the majority of respondents belong to the 31–50 years old age group, with 49 respondents or 58.3%, followed by those aged 51–60 years old with 24 respondents or 28.6%. Meanwhile, the 20–30 years old group accounts for 6 respondents (7.1%), while only 5 respondents (6.0%) fall under the 61 years old and above category, indicating the least representation.

This distribution suggests that most respondents are within the middle-adult stage, a life period commonly characterized by peak productivity, accumulated work experience, and strong involvement in decision-making roles within both professional and community settings. Individuals in the 31–50 age bracket are often more engaged in research-related activities due to their active participation in livelihood, governance, and organizational responsibilities (Mensah, 2025).

The researchers concur with the highest result, as it reflects the productivity and resilience-building stage of adulthood, where individuals are typically employed in government and non-government programs and utilize their experience to generate sustainable income and contribute to community development. Supporting this, Prayoga et al. (2024) emphasized that resilience-based systems enable working-age households to better respond to economic and environmental shocks, thereby reducing poverty and strengthening community stability.

On the other hand, the researchers also agree with the lowest representation observed among younger and older age groups. The limited participation of young adults may be attributed to migration, pursuit of higher education, or limited youth-focused engagement programs, while the low representation of older adults may be linked to mobility constraints and reduced access to age-appropriate services. In line with this, the World Bank (2023) highlights existing service gaps that continue to affect the productivity and participation of older populations.

The Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Sex

Profile	Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	39	46.4
Sex	Female	45	53.6
Sex	Total	84	100%

The table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of sex. The results show that 45 respondents, or 53.6%, are female, while 39 respondents, or 46.4%, are male, indicating a slightly higher representation of female participants in the study. This finding suggests that

females are somewhat more engaged or available to participate in the research compared to males within the selected sample. The relatively balanced distribution between male and female respondents further indicates that the study captures perspectives from both sexes, thereby enhancing the comprehensiveness and inclusivity of the findings. As noted in previous studies, sex distribution in survey research is significant because gender may influence perceptions, lived experiences, and levels of participation in various social and organizational contexts (Smith & Johnson, 2022).

The researchers agreed with the highest result, as it reflects the strong implementation and impact of women empowerment programs in Malitbog, which have contributed to increased female participation. These initiatives, including skills training, financial literacy programs, and support for social enterprise development, have enabled more women to actively engage in sustainable livelihood opportunities and community development activities. Supporting this, Zamayla (2024) emphasized that capacity-building initiatives among Higaonon women strengthen both human and financial resources, thereby enhancing their role in community advancement.

On the other hand, the researchers also agreed with the lower male representation, which may be attributed to traditional gender roles, work-related responsibilities, and the relatively limited targeting of men in similar livelihood and empowerment programs. In addition, existing policy and development efforts often prioritize women as part of vulnerability reduction strategies in rural areas, which may further influence participation trends. Consistent with this, Malhotra et al. (2023) noted that many structural interventions in rural development tend to focus on integrating women into value chains and expanding their access to markets and income opportunities, resulting in stronger program emphasis on women’s empowerment compared to men’s participation.

The Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Years in the Organization

Profile	Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Years in the Organization	Less than 1 year	10	11.9
	1-3 years	30	35.7
	4-6 years	22	26.2
	7 years and above	22	26.2
	Total	84	100%

The table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of their years in the organization. The data indicate that the largest group of respondents has been in the organization for 1–3 years, with 30 respondents or 35.7%, followed by those who have served for 4–6 years and 7 years and above, each comprising 22 respondents or 26.2%. Meanwhile, 10 respondents or 11.9% have been in the organization for less than one year, representing the smallest proportion of participants.

These findings suggest that most respondents have already acquired moderate to substantial experience within the organization. Such tenure is likely to contribute to a more informed understanding of organizational practices, operational procedures, and workplace dynamics. Studies have consistently shown that employees with longer organizational tenure tend to develop stronger institutional knowledge, higher levels of familiarity with systems, and greater organizational commitment, all of which can shape their perceptions and responses in research contexts (Kim & Park, 2023).

The researchers agreed with the highest result, as it reflects the active involvement of relatively new and mid-tenured members who are engaged in government and non-government livelihood programs. These programs support the development of skills, enhance financial access, and promote sustainable livelihood opportunities, which may explain the concentration of respondents within the 1–3 year category. Supporting this, the Asian Development Bank (ADB, 2021) emphasizes the importance of strengthening entrepreneurship and capacity-building initiatives in rural areas such as Malitbog, which attract participants during their early years of engagement as they begin to accumulate both human and financial capital.

On the other hand, the researchers also agreed with the lowest result, which is the less than one year category, as it suggests relatively low initial retention or early-stage turnover among new members. This may be associated with gaps in sustained support mechanisms, policy implementation, or limited access to resources for newly entering participants in social enterprise ecosystems. In line with this, Rodriguez-Pose and Ketterer (2021) highlight that in the absence of strong local governance and effective micro-enterprise support systems, vulnerable groups often struggle to maintain long-term engagement, a condition that may also be reflected in the organizational context of Malitbog.

The Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Types of Assistance Received

Profile	Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Types of Assistance Received	In-Kind	34	40.5
	Cash Assistance	50	59.5
	Total	84	100%

The table presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to the types of assistance received. Out of 84 respondents, 50 individuals (59.5%) reported receiving cash assistance, while 34 respondents (40.5%) indicated receiving in-kind assistance. This shows that cash assistance is the more commonly received form of support among the respondents, suggesting that direct monetary aid is more widely implemented or accessible in the study area. Cash-based assistance has become increasingly common in social protection programs because it allows beneficiaries to immediately address urgent needs (Gentilini et al., 2021).

The results imply that most respondents prefer or rely on cash assistance due to its flexibility in meeting immediate household needs such as food, education, and healthcare. This explains its higher proportion compared to other forms of support. Meanwhile, the 40.5% who received financial assistance indicate that structured support programs also play a significant role in the community’s assistance system. Financial assistance programs contribute to improving household economic stability by helping families manage essential expenditures and reduce vulnerability (Bastagli, 2022).

These findings suggest that maintaining and strengthening cash assistance programs is important due to their wide reach and practicality for beneficiaries. At the same time, the presence of financial assistance programs highlights the need for a balanced and diverse support system that addresses different needs and eligibility conditions. Enhancing transparency, sustainability, and monitoring of these programs is also essential to ensure effective implementation. Well-designed social assistance programs, particularly cash transfers, have been shown to reduce poverty and improve household welfare when consistently implemented (Beagle & Christiaensen, 2023).

The researchers agreed with the highest result because cash assistance is direct, accessible, and immediately useful for low-income households, allowing beneficiaries to quickly respond to basic needs such as food, education, and daily expenses. This supports the findings of Asis and Guerrero (2020), who

emphasized that cash transfer programs significantly improve household well-being, including health and livelihood outcomes. On the other hand, the researchers agreed with the lower result because financial assistance is often more structured and conditional, which limits its accessibility to all beneficiaries. It may require compliance with program requirements or participation in specific livelihood activities. In line with this, Gutiérrez-Nieto et al. (2022) noted that while institutional financial support programs are effective, they often reach fewer beneficiaries due to eligibility criteria and implementation constraints.

The extent of influence of government & non-government entities in terms of the Local Government Unit of Malitbog, Top of Form

Indicator	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
LGU-Malitbog allocates enough financial resources to promote the growth and sustainability of local livelihoods.	3.38	0.76	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
LGU programs aim to increase household income and generate more job opportunities for the community.	3.25	0.71	Agree	Moderately Influential
The LGU provides training programs that help residents acquire business and livelihood skills.	3.40	0.68	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The LGU promotes the growth and development of small businesses in the barangay.	3.48	0.67	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
LGU programs effectively reach and support poor families in our community	3.27	0.70	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The LGU provides fair and equal access to resources for both men and women.	3.30	0.72	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The LGU considers the community's needs and concerns when planning and implementing livelihood projects.	3.32	0.76	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The LGU collaborates with social enterprises to improve local income opportunities.	3.26	0.71	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The LGU supports women and youth in starting and developing their own small businesses.	3.25	0.67	Agree	Moderately Influential
LGU programs help residents become more self-reliant and less dependent on external assistance.	3.30	0.71	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
AVERAGE MEAN	3.32	0.71	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential

The table shows an overall mean of 3.32 with a standard deviation of 0.71, indicating that respondents strongly agree that the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Malitbog plays a highly influential role in promoting local livelihood development. This suggests that LGU programs significantly improve economic opportunities and support sustainable livelihoods in the community. The consistent responses further highlight the importance of local government in strengthening local economies and community welfare (Rodríguez-Pose & Ketterer, 2021).

The highest-rated indicator was “*The LGU promotes the growth and development of small businesses in the barangay,*” with a mean of 3.48 and a standard deviation of 0.67. This indicates that respondents clearly recognize the LGU’s support for micro and small enterprises. Such support is important because local government assistance to small businesses contributes to employment creation and economic growth (OECD, 2022).

The lowest-rated indicators were “*LGU programs aim to increase household income and generate more job opportunities for the community*” and “*The LGU supports women and youth in starting and developing their own small businesses,*” both with a mean of 3.25. Although still rated positively, these findings suggest that some residents may not yet fully feel the benefits of these programs. This indicates a need for the LGU to strengthen livelihood initiatives that focus on income generation and support for women and youth entrepreneurs (Kabeer, 2021).

The researchers agreed with these findings because local government support is essential for enterprise development, but its long-term impact also depends on leadership, community participation, and social support systems (Igalla et al., 2020).

The extent of influence of government & non-government entities in terms of the National Government Unit

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
The NGU provides livelihood programs aimed at supporting poor families.	3.38	0.76	Agree	Highly Influential
The NGU implements government programs such as DTI, DSWD, and DA initiatives that support small businesses.	3.39	0.68	Agree	Highly Influential
The NGU provides financial assistance to help residents start or expand their businesses.	3.31	0.71	Agree	Highly Influential
I have participated in training programs or seminars organized by national agencies.	3.19	0.77	Agree	Moderately Influential
The NGU helps small businesses access and connects with broader markets.	3.27	0.80	Agree	Highly Influential
The NGU provides fair and equitable support to all communities.	3.27	0.78	Agree	
The NGU helps people access capital or small loans to support their businesses.	3.35	0.75	Agree	Highly Influential
The NGU supports programs aimed at generating more employment opportunities.	3.30	0.77	Agree	Highly Influential
The NGU’s projects help increase and improve our household income.	3.20	0.82	Agree	Moderately Influential
The NGU’s programs help residents recover from financial difficulties.	3.24	0.82	Agree	Moderately Influential
AVERAGE MEAN	3.29	0.77	Agree	Highly Influential

The table shows an overall mean of 3.29 with a standard deviation of 0.77, indicating that respondents strongly agree that the National Government Unit (NGU) plays a significant role in supporting community livelihoods. This suggests that national programs are highly influential in improving economic opportunities, providing financial assistance, and supporting small enterprises. The moderate variation in responses implies generally consistent, though slightly varied, experiences among respondents. This

supports the view that national government interventions are vital in promoting inclusive growth and assisting vulnerable sectors (World Bank, 2022).

The highest mean (3.39, SD = 0.68) is for the indicator on the implementation of programs by agencies such as DTI, DSWD, and DA. This shows that respondents clearly recognize and benefit from these initiatives, particularly in supporting small businesses and livelihood development. The consistency of responses suggests these programs are visible and widely experienced in the community.

In contrast, the lowest mean (3.19, SD = 0.77) is for participation in training and seminars conducted by national agencies. Although still rated as agree, this indicates that access to or participation in capacity-building activities is less widespread. The higher variation suggests unequal exposure or awareness among respondents. This implies a need to improve the reach and accessibility of training programs, which are essential for strengthening skills and sustaining livelihoods (ADB, 2021).

Overall, the findings confirm that while NGU support is strong and impactful, enhancing participation in training and capacity-building initiatives would further improve livelihood outcomes and community development.

The extent of influence of government & non-government entities in terms of the Malitbog Women Program

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
The Malitbog Women Program provides training to help women start and manage small businesses.	3.12	0.87	Agree	Moderately Influential
I have learned how to save and manage money through the Malitbog Women Program.	3.10	0.87	Agree	Moderately Influential
I learned how to effectively save and manage my money through the Malitbog Women Program.	3.04	0.91	Agree	Moderately Influential
The program helps women connect with customers and access markets for their products.	3.11	0.92	Agree	Moderately Influential
The Malitbog Women Program gives equal chances for all women to learn.	3.00	0.98	Agree	Moderately Influential
The program leads women to find extra income for their families.	2.99	0.88	Agree	Moderately Influential
I have the confidence in running my own business through the support of Malitbog Women Program	3.13	0.83	Agree	Moderately Influential
The Malitbog Women Program supports each other through group activities.	3.25	0.86	Agree	Moderately Influential
The Malitbog Women Program link with other government agencies	3.20	0.82	Agree	Moderately Influential
The program helps me feel more independent and capable of supporting my family.	3.38	0.81	Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree
AVERAGE MEAN	3.13	0.88	Agree	Moderately Influential

The table shows an overall mean of 3.13 with a standard deviation of 0.88, indicating that respondents agree that the Malitbog Women Program has a moderate influence on their livelihood and empowerment. This means the program provides meaningful support—particularly in skills development, confidence, and financial awareness—but its overall impact can still be improved in terms of reach and effectiveness. The higher variation in responses suggests that not all participants experience the same level of benefit. Women-focused programs remain essential in enhancing economic participation and household well-being (Klasen, 2022).

The highest mean (3.38, SD = 0.81) shows that the program effectively builds women’s independence and confidence in supporting their families. This highlights its strong role in promoting self-reliance and decision-making, beyond just financial support (Hunt & Samman, 2021).

In contrast, the lowest mean (2.99, SD = 0.88) indicates that the program is less effective in generating additional income. While still positive, this suggests that some women have not fully translated skills and training into stable earnings. This points to a need for stronger support in market access, funding, and income opportunities to ensure sustainable livelihood outcomes (Banerjee et al., 2021). Overall, the program is impactful in empowerment but needs to be strengthened in income generation to maximize its benefits.

The extent of influence of government & non-government entity in terms of Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
The cooperative helps improve my income as a farmer.	3.30	0.83	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The cooperative provides useful services to its members.	3.36	0.86	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The officers of the cooperative manage the operation properly.	3.31	0.78	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The cooperative assists its members in selling their farm products	3.27	0.80	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I am satisfied with the training and support provided by the cooperatives.	3.39	0.81	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The cooperative listens to the concerns of its members.	3.32	0.76	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
D37. Being a member of the cooperative, it helps us improves my farming skills	3.38	0.77	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
The cooperative promotes unity and cooperation among members.	3.29	0.78	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I have the involvement in the decision-making of the cooperative	3.32	0.81	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I am satisfied with the performance of the cooperative.	3.31	0.86	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
AVERAGE MEAN	3.33	0.81	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential

The table shows an overall mean of 3.33 with a standard deviation of 0.81, indicating that respondents strongly agree that the Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative plays a highly influential role in supporting their agricultural livelihood. This suggests that the cooperative significantly

improves farmers’ welfare through training, services, and organizational support. The consistent responses reflect a shared recognition of its positive impact. Cooperatives are known to enhance productivity, income, and market access among smallholder farmers (Bernard, Spielman, & Taffesse, 2021). The highest mean (3.39, SD = 0.81) shows strong satisfaction with the training and support provided by the cooperative, highlighting the importance of capacity-building in improving farming skills, decision-making, and productivity (Ma & Abdulai, 2022).

Meanwhile, the lowest mean (3.27, SD = 0.80) relates to assistance in selling farm products. Although still rated highly, it indicates that market support is less consistently experienced. This suggests a need to strengthen market linkages, distribution channels, and product promotion to further enhance income opportunities (Abate, 2021).

Overall, the cooperative is highly effective in training and support, but can improve its impact by expanding marketing assistance and ensuring more inclusive access to market opportunities.

The Extent of Sustainable Livelihoods

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
I believe that social enterprises help improve the economic conditions of the community.	3.43	0.72	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I’m aware of the positive impact of social enterprises on sustainable livelihoods.	3.29	0.70	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I think social enterprises provide job opportunities for local residents.	3.29	0.70	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I had gained valuable skills through social enterprises programs.	3.26	0.73	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I feel more confident in managing livelihood activities because of social enterprises support.	3.20	0.77	Agree	Moderately Influential
I feel involvement in the decision-making of the cooperative	3.23	0.80	Agree	Moderately Influential
I considered social enterprises as important contributors to poverty reduction.	3.19	0.69	Agree	Moderately Influential
I participated actively in activities organized by the cooperative	3.21	0.84	Agree	Moderately Influential
I understand how social enterprises promote environmental sustainability.	3.14	0.78	Agree	Moderately Influential
Social enterprises empower women and youth in the community.	3.15	0.78	Agree	Moderately Influential
I’m satisfied with the support provided by social enterprises.	3.10	0.89	Agree	Moderately Influential
I recognized the role of social enterprises in strengthening community cooperation.	3.10	0.89	Agree	Moderately Influential
I experience improvement in my family’s standard of living because of social enterprises programs.	3.17	0.80	Agree	Moderately Influential
I feel motivated to sustain my livelihood due to the guidance of social enterprises.	3.27	0.81	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential

I have developed leadership skills through my involvement in social enterprises.	3.15	0.80	Agree	Moderately Influential
I consider social enterprises encourages being responsible on the use of local resources.	3.21	0.82	Agree	Moderately Influential
I'm inspired by how social enterprises promote innovation in community livelihoods.	3.20	0.80	Agree	Moderately Influential
I notice that social enterprises help maintain long-term livelihood stability.	3.30	0.72	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I appreciated the commitment of social enterprises to community development.	3.43	0.76	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
I believed social enterprises have a lasting influence on sustainable livelihoods.	3.45	0.75	Strongly Agree	Highly Influential
AVERAGE MEAN	3.25	0.81	Agree	Moderately Influential

The table shows an overall mean of 3.25 with a standard deviation of 0.81, indicating that respondents agree that government and non-government support through social enterprises is moderately influential in promoting sustainable livelihoods. This suggests that while social enterprises are recognized as beneficial, their impact is less strongly felt compared to other support systems. The variation in responses reflects differences in participation, access, and individual experiences. Strengthening engagement and expanding program reach can improve their overall effectiveness (Littlewood & Holt, 2021).

The highest mean (3.45, SD = 0.75) indicates that respondents strongly believe social enterprises have a lasting impact on sustainable livelihoods. This highlights their role in promoting long-term economic stability, resilience, and community development (Saebi, Foss, & Linder, 2021).

In contrast, the lowest mean (3.10, SD = 0.89) for satisfaction with support and community cooperation suggests less consistent experiences among respondents. This implies gaps in accessibility, inclusivity, and program delivery. Improving communication, participation, and resource distribution is necessary to enhance outcomes (Hota, Subramanian, & Narayanamurthy, 2022).

Overall, social enterprises are valued for long-term impact but require stronger implementation and inclusive engagement to maximize their benefits on livelihoods.

The Test of Significant Difference between the Profile of the Respondents and Sustainable Livelihoods

Profile	Category	Category	Mean	F f value	pp-value	Remarks	Decision on Ho
Age	20-30 yrs. Old	20-30 yrs. Old	.50	087	109	Not Significant	Failed to Reject
	31-50 yrs. Old	31-50 yrs. Old	.14				
	51-60 yrs. Old	51-60 yrs. Old	.54				
	61 yrs. old and above	61 yrs. old and above	.00				
Sex	Sex	Males	.36	980	325	Not Significant	Failed to Reject

	Female	Female	.20				
Years in the Organization	Less than 1 year	Less than 1 year	.90	.054	374	Not Significant	Failed to Reject
	1-3 years	1-3 years	.37				
	4-6 years	4-6 years	.32				
	7 years and above	7 years and above	.27				
Types of Assistance Received	Financial Assistance	Financial Assistance	.31	429	733	Not Significant	Failed to Reject
	Cash Assistance	Cash Assistance	.24				
Frequency of Assistance Received	1-2 times	1-2 times	.16	.034	382	Not Significant	Failed to Reject

The results show no significant differences in sustainable livelihoods across respondents' profiles. For age, the computed f -value = 2.087 and p -value = 0.109 (greater than 0.05) indicate that the null hypothesis is not rejected. Although the 51–60 age group obtained the highest mean (3.54), followed by 20–30 (3.50), 31–50 (3.14), and 61+ (3.00), these differences are not statistically significant, suggesting similar livelihood conditions across age groups.

In terms of sex, there is also no significant difference ($f = 0.980, p = 0.325$). Males (mean = 3.36) and females (mean = 3.20) have comparable perceptions, indicating that gender does not significantly influence livelihood outcomes.

Similarly, years in the organization ($p = 0.374$), type of assistance ($p = 0.733$), and frequency of assistance ($p = 0.382$) show no significant differences. Even though those receiving assistance seven times or more recorded the highest mean (4.00), the variation is not statistically meaningful. Overall, respondents experience similar levels of sustainable livelihood regardless of profile and assistance factors.

However, correlation results show that institutional support matters. Government and non-government entities all have significant positive relationships with sustainable livelihoods. The Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative shows the strongest influence, followed by the Malitbog Women Program, highlighting the effectiveness of community-based and women-focused initiatives. The Local Government Unit (LGU) shows the weakest, though still positive, relationship, suggesting that broader government programs may have less direct or visible impact compared to localized support systems. This supports findings that strong collaboration between institutions and communities enhances sustainable livelihood development (Nguyen et al., 2023).

The Test of Regression among the Government & non-government entities highly influences sustainable livelihoods.

	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Standardized Coefficients (β)	t-value	pp-value	Interpretation
(Constant)	0.430	.286	1.502	.137	----
Local Government Unit of Malitbog	0.062	.095	653	515	Significant
National Government Unit	0.010	.120	084	934	Significant
Malitbog Women Program	0.203	.091	.234	028	Significant
Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative	0.574	.084	.800	000	Significant
Model Summary:	Model Summary: R2=0.667; Adjusted R2=0.650; F-value= 39.598 p-value=0.000 (Reject H04); Interpretation= Significant	Model Summary: R2=0.667; Adjusted R2=0.650; F-value= 39.598 p-value=0.000 (Reject H04); Interpretation= Significant	Model Summary: R2=0.667; Adjusted R2=0.650; F-value= 39.598 p-value=0.000 (Reject H04); Interpretation= Significant	Model Summary: R2=0.667; Adjusted R2=0.650; F-value= 39.598 p-value=0.000 (Reject H04); Interpretation= Significant	Model Summary: R2=0.667; Adjusted R2=0.650; F-value= 39.598 p-value=0.000 (Reject H04); Interpretation= Significant

The regression analysis shows that government and non-government entities collectively have a significant influence on sustainable livelihoods. The model explains 66.7% of the variation ($R^2 = 0.667$; $Adjusted R^2 = 0.650$), while the F-value of 39.598 ($p = 0.000$) confirms that the model is statistically significant. This indicates that institutional support plays an important role in shaping livelihood outcomes. However, not all variables contribute equally. The Local Government Unit ($B = 0.062$, $p = 0.515$) and National Government Unit ($B = 0.010$, $p = 0.934$) show no significant effect, suggesting that their programs may have indirect, less visible, or insufficient impact on respondents' livelihoods.

In contrast, the Malitbog Women Program ($B = 0.203$, $p = 0.028$) and the Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative ($B = 0.574$, $p = 0.000$) show significant positive effects. The cooperative has the strongest influence, indicating that community-based and sector-specific initiatives provide more direct and practical benefits to beneficiaries.

These findings imply that localized, targeted interventions—such as cooperatives and women-focused programs—are more effective in improving income, productivity, and overall well-being than broader institutional programs. This supports evidence that targeted support systems and cooperative approaches are key drivers of sustainable livelihood development and poverty reduction (Gutiérrez-Nieto et al., 2022; Nguyen et al., 2023).

Top of Form

The Test of the Significant Relationship between Government & Non-Government Entity and Sustainable Livelihoods

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Local Government Unit	.457**	.000	Reject Ho2	Significant
National Government Unit	.589**	.000	Reject Ho2	Significant
Malitbog Women Program	.652**	.000	Reject Ho2	Significant
Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiary	.795**	.000	Reject Ho2	Significant
Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

The table shows that all government and non-government entities have significant positive correlations with sustainable livelihoods ($p = 0.000$), indicating that their involvement is meaningfully associated with improved livelihood outcomes.

Among the variables, the Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative has the strongest relationship ($r = 0.795$), reflecting a very strong influence on livelihood sustainability. This is followed by the Malitbog Women Program ($r = 0.652$), which also shows a strong positive relationship. In comparison, the National Government Unit ($r = 0.589$) and Local Government Unit ($r = 0.457$) demonstrate moderate correlations, suggesting a positive but less direct impact.

These results indicate that while all institutions contribute to improving livelihoods, community-based and targeted programs—such as cooperatives and women-focused initiatives—have a more immediate and stronger influence. Their close engagement with beneficiaries allows them to deliver practical support, including access to resources, training, and income opportunities.

The findings highlight the importance of strengthening partnerships between government agencies and grassroots organizations. While government units play a vital role, their broader and more indirect interventions may not always translate into immediate livelihood gains. In contrast, localized initiatives tend to produce more visible and measurable outcomes. This supports existing research that emphasizes the effectiveness of community-based approaches in enhancing sustainable livelihoods (Nguyen et al., 2023).

FINDINGS

This study examined the relationship between respondents’ demographic profiles and the influence of government and non-government entities on sustainable livelihoods. The findings show that most respondents were aged 31–50, a group typically associated with higher productivity, decision-making capacity, and active participation in community activities. There was a slightly higher proportion of female respondents, suggesting stronger female engagement. Most participants had been in the organization for 1–3 years, indicating sufficient experience to assess program effectiveness. In terms of support, cash assistance was the most commonly received, reflecting its accessibility and flexibility in addressing immediate household needs. However, lower results were observed among newer members and those receiving less frequent assistance, indicating that limited exposure and inconsistent support reduce the benefits gained.

Regarding institutional influence, the Local Government Unit (LGU) was perceived as highly influential, particularly in providing business support, training, and financial assistance, while the National

Government Unit (NGU) showed a positive but less direct impact. Despite this, challenges remain in market access and follow-up support, as some respondents struggled to sell products and lacked continuous guidance after initial assistance.

In terms of livelihood outcomes, lower results were observed in stable income and long-term sustainability, suggesting that while programs provide initial support, they do not always ensure lasting economic security. Regression analysis confirmed that institutional involvement significantly influences livelihoods ($R^2 = 0.667$), with the strongest effects coming from the Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative and the Malitbog Women Program. In contrast, LGU and NGU showed no significant direct effects, indicating that community-based and targeted programs are more impactful.

Overall, the findings highlight that cooperatives and women-focused initiatives have the most direct influence on livelihood improvement. However, limited program targeting, weak engagement, inconsistent assistance, and poor coordination among institutions reduce overall effectiveness. Strengthening collaboration, ensuring regular support, and improving program inclusivity are essential to achieve sustainable and long-term livelihood outcomes.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the influence of government and non-government entities in promoting sustainable livelihoods, focusing on the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Malitbog, the National Government Unit (NGU), the Malitbog Women Program, and the Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative. The findings show that all entities contribute to improving community welfare; however, the Malitbog Women Program and the Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative have the strongest and most direct impact. Their effectiveness is evident in enhancing skills, providing financial support, and strengthening community empowerment.

While the LGU and NGU were perceived as influential, their impact was more moderate and less direct compared to community-based programs. Regression results confirm that only the Women Program and the cooperative have a significant positive effect on sustainable livelihoods, highlighting that localized and sector-specific interventions are more effective in improving economic opportunities.

The study also found no significant differences in livelihood outcomes when respondents were grouped by age, sex, or years in the organization. However, correlation analysis showed strong positive relationships between participation in the cooperative and women's program and improved livelihoods. This reinforces the importance of targeted, community-driven initiatives, particularly those focused on women's empowerment and agricultural development.

In conclusion, both government and non-government entities are important in supporting sustainable livelihoods, but community-based programs deliver more immediate and tangible results. The study recommends strengthening collaboration between government agencies and local organizations, improving program targeting, and ensuring continuous support to maximize long-term livelihood outcomes.

RECOMMENDATION

1. New members of the Malitbog Women Program and the Belayong Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative should be provided with proper orientation, basic training, and continuous guidance to help them fully understand and engage with the programs. Regular and consistent assistance should also be ensured, especially for those who receive limited support, to promote steady improvement in their livelihood outcomes.
2. Government and non-government entities should strengthen efforts in improving market access for beneficiaries. This may include linking respondents to potential buyers, promoting local products, and organizing market events or trade fairs. In addition, regular follow-up activities such as mentoring and monitoring should be conducted to ensure that beneficiaries can effectively apply their knowledge and address challenges in their livelihood activities.

3. Programs should focus on promoting stable and sustainable sources of income among beneficiaries. This can be achieved through skills training, financial literacy education, and support for micro-enterprise development. Long-term planning and continuous support are also necessary to ensure that respondents can sustain their livelihoods even without constant external assistance.
4. Livelihood programs should be made more flexible and inclusive to address the diverse needs of beneficiaries. Support mechanisms should be tailored according to the specific conditions of different groups. Further assessments are also recommended to better understand these varying needs and improve program design and implementation.
5. All involved entities should enhance their presence and active participation within the community. Improved communication, regular updates, and clear information dissemination are essential to ensure that beneficiaries feel supported and well-guided throughout the implementation of programs.
6. Equal and consistent delivery of support should be prioritized to maximize program effectiveness. Strong coordination between government and non-government entities should also be established, with clearly defined goals and regular follow-up activities to ensure that interventions lead to meaningful and long-term improvements in livelihoods.

REFERENCES

- Acosta, L., Santos, J., & Dela Cruz, M. (2025). Assessing the long-term impact of social enterprises on rural livelihoods in developing economies. *Journal of Community Development Studies*, 18(2), 45–60.
- Acosta, P., Jiménez, E., & Tan, R. (2017). Education and employment linkages in developing economies: The Philippine experience. *Asian Development Review*, 34(2), 122–140.
- Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2022). Entrepreneurship, innovation, and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*.
- Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2022). Micro and small enterprises and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*.
- Al Mamun, A., Nawi, N. C., & Dewi, R. (2022). Innovation as a mediator in the relationship between social entrepreneurship and value creation. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 13(4), 567–585.
- Albert, J. R. G., Vizmanos, J. F. V., & Santos, A. G. (2024). The economic returns of education in the Philippines: Trends and inequalities. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies Discussion Paper Series*, No. 2024-06.
- Amorós, J. E., & Bosma, N. (2021). Constraints to microenterprise growth. *Small Business Economics*.
- Asis, M. M. B., & Guerrero, R. A. (2020). Evaluating the effects of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program on education, health, and livelihood outcomes in rural Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Social Policy*, 12(1), 45–61.
- Asli, D., & Rahman, N. (2023). Livelihood diversification strategies among paddy farmers: Implications for food security and sustainability. *Journal of Agricultural and Rural Development*, 18(2), 145–162.

- Atmani, R., & Messahel, F. (2025). Social enterprise and sustainable community development: The case of Davao Oriental Coco Husk Social Enterprise Inc. *Philippine Journal of Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), 55–70.
- Bacalso, J., & Reyes, P. (2022). Digital governance initiatives and community empowerment: Enhancing NGU service delivery in the Philippines. *Journal of E-Government and Development Studies*, 6(2), 88–104.
- Ballesteros, M., & Llanto, G. (2022). Creating an enabling environment for social enterprises in the Philippines. *Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) Policy Notes*, 2022–05.
- Baltes, P. B., & Baltes, M. M. (2020). Selective optimization with compensation: A model for successful aging. In P. B. Baltes & M. M. Baltes (Eds.), *Successful aging: Perspectives from the behavioral sciences* (pp. 1–34). Cambridge University Press.
- Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2021). Small and micro-enterprises in poverty reduction. *Annual Review of Economics*.
- Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2021). Small enterprises and poverty reduction in developing economies. *Annual Review of Economics*.
- Becker, J. B., McClellan, M., & Reed, B. G. (2022). Incorporating sex, gender, and sexual orientation into health research design and analysis. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 20(15), 1–10.
- Bender, R., & Egger, H. H. (2022). The role of location and accessibility in firm performance and competitiveness. *Regional Studies*.
- Bianchi, M. T., & Croce, S. (2021). Business location and firm competitiveness: Evidence from small enterprises. *Journal of Small Business Management*.
- Blanco, C. (2024). Policy entrepreneurship and local leadership in advancing sustainable development goals. *Governance and Policy Review*, 10(1), 33–49.
- Bustos, C., Reyes, M., & Villanueva, D. (2023). Impacts of conditional cash transfer programs on child nutrition and education in the Philippines. *Journal of Social Policy Studies*, 12(4), 89–102.
- Bustos, L., Dizon, F., & Ramos, E. (2023). Impact of conditional cash transfers on child nutrition and family well-being: Evidence from the Philippines. *Asian Social Science Review*, 9(3), 145–160.
- Bvuma, S., Kanyoka, P., & Moyo, T. (2020). Scaling sustainable livelihoods through social business models: Evidence from Grameen Telecom Trust. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 11(3), 321–339.
- Canadian Institutes of Health Research. (2023). *Sex and gender in health research*. Government of Canada.
- Capuno, J. J., & Pineda, V. (2021). National government performance and local accountability mechanisms in decentralized service delivery. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 42(2), 175–192.
- Celeste, M., & Resurreccion, A. (2024). Financial sustainability and social impact of social enterprises in conflict-affected areas: Evidence from Lanao del Sur. *Journal of Southeast Asian Development Studies*, 12(4), 221–238.

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2022). Glossary of income and socioeconomic indicators. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Chambers, R., & Conway, G. (1991). Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century. Institute of Development Studies (IDS) Discussion Paper 296.
- Chen, W., & Brown, R. (2022). Financial capital and the growth of small and medium-sized enterprises: Evidence from emerging markets. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Cheng, X. (2025). Social capital and empowerment of rural left-behind women in China: A pathway to sustainable livelihood. *Journal of Rural Sociology and Development*, 31(1), 15–29.
- Clark, D., Ramos, E., & Nguyen, T. (2022). Revisiting the Sustainable Livelihood Framework: Integrating relational, structural, and ecological dimensions. *Sustainability*, 14(11), 6823.
- Davies, J., Fraser, M., & Innes, R. (2022). Digital participatory budgeting in Scottish local councils: Innovation, inclusion, and institutional challenges. *Local Government Studies*, 48(7), 1156–1174.
- Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). (2023). Collaborative programs for MSME development in Northern Mindanao. Department of Trade and Industry, Philippines. Retrieved from
- Dordas, M. (2024). Evaluating the Department of Trade and Industry's Livelihood Seeding Program in Capiz: A social enterprise perspective. *Journal of Public Administration and Local Governance*, 19(2), 98–114.
- Eggers del Campo, M., & Steinert, J. I. (2022). The impact of women's economic empowerment programs on intimate partner violence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 23(4), 1123–1140.
- Elias, M., Arora-Jonsson, S., & Gurung, J. D. (2022). Gender dynamics in forestry, fisheries, and agriculture: Addressing inequality for sustainable livelihoods. *World Development*, 153, 105–127.
- Environmental Science and Pollution Research. (2023). Diversified livelihoods and household resilience: A global synthesis. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 30(18), 21504–21518.
- Fatusi, A. O., & Hindin, M. J. (2021). Adolescent sexual and reproductive health in sub-Saharan Africa: Progress and prospects. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 25(2), 76–90.
- Friedline, T., Despard, M. R., & Chowa, G. (2020). Household financial distress and its implications for family functioning and well-being. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 41(1), 77–91.
- Frontiers in Sustainability. (2025). Temporal shifts in livelihood capitals and poverty reduction: Evidence from Southeast Asia. *Frontiers in Sustainability*, 6(2), 101–112.
- García-Jurado, A., de la Fuente, J., & Arroyo, M. (2021). Mapping the evolution of social entrepreneurship research: A latent semantic analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 124, 340–352.
- Ghosh, S., & Guha, M. (2025). Social entrepreneurship and sustainable livelihoods among marginalized communities. In M. Guha (Ed.), *Social innovation and entrepreneurship for development* (pp. 145–172). Springer.

Gonzaga, M., Tan, R., & dela Peña, J. (2022). Women's resilience and recovery: Livelihood programs after Typhoon Haiyan. *Philippine Journal of Social Development*, 8(1), 33–49.

Gonzales, L. (2024, February 20). Poverty incidence drops as family income improves — PSA. *Philippine News Agency*.



Global
Scientific
JOURNALS