Journal of Positive School Psychology http://journalppw.com
2022, Vol. 6, No. 8, 10470-10480

Economic Impact Of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4ps) Implementation On The Agricultural Protection In Selected Towns In Northern Samar, Philippines

Eunice L. Lluz

College of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Natural Resources,University of Eastern Philippines, Catarman, Northern Samar, eunicelluz@gmail.com

Abstract

This study focused on the economic assessment of PantawidPamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) on the agricultural production implemented in selected towns in Northern Samar. A total number of 92 registered farmer 4Ps beneficiaries were identified. The study used a descriptive research design with the structured interview as the tool for gathering data. The findings revealed that most of the respondents had age ranging from 26-35 years old, were elementary graduates, with 4-6 household size, family income of 1,000-3,000 before the implementation of the program, increased to 4,000-6,000 during the implementation of the program, farming was the main sources of livelihood and majority owned their house and lot. Most of the beneficiaries into farming for 31- above years, majority were tenants, their farming system was monocropping since they planted one after the other, and most of them planted "palay" in a with 1–3-hectare farm. Most of the produce are for consumption. Majority of agricultural inputs given by the government are seeds, fertilizer, and farm equipment. Government programs and agencies are active in giving assistance to the beneficiaries. Respondents claimed that they have strongly agreed that their live became bit easier with the aid of the program because they had been exposed to different activities like communal gardening through bio-intensive gardening. These kinds of activities promote and strengthen the implementation of the 4Ps program. The most problem encountered was typhoons/unfavorable weather condition for agricultural production, and for marketing problem: fluctuating price/unstable price and delay of granting financial aid for 4Ps beneficiaries other problem encountered.

Keywords:4Ps, Implementation, Economic Impact, Agricultural Production

I. INTRODUCTION

Very low productivity in the agriculture sector is one of the root causes of poverty in the Philippines and the reason why people migrate to urban areas. Agriculture is the one that provides basic things in our country specially foods. But now, the agriculture sector is the poorest sector in the country. What will happen to our economy if agriculture is the poorest sector, yet it plays an important role in our society. Agricultural lands are being developed into industrial areas, shopping malls and subdivisions. Farmers are growing old and agricultural industry has not progressed in ages.

To alleviate poverty in the country, a lot of poverty programs have been implemented. The most recent known is the PatawidPamilyang Pilipino Program or 4Ps Program that aims to provide cash assistance to the poor by helping them invest in the health, nutrition, education of their children and investing heavily in human capital development. The municipal link, municipal staff and the parent leaders are those responsible for assessing the program activities

and implementing the policies and guidelines of the 4Ps program.

Data from the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA) showed that a total number of employed people in the agriculture sector declined by 2.89 percent to 10.985 million in 2016, from 11.312 million recorded in 2015. The agricultural sector made up the second-largest segment, accounting for 26.9 percent employed but in November 2017 update, 25.96% percent of the Filipinos workers are employed in agriculture (psa.gov.ph). It means that the farmers are dependent to the monthly financial support given by the government.

Agriculture sector helps the 4Ps program by distributing seeds, fertilizers, and technology assistance, engaging them in farming activities like communal gardening, backyard gardening, backyard raising and other income generating activities. This study tried to assess the economic status, of the 4P's beneficiaries, to determine the impact of 4Ps program to agricultural production and the problems encountered by the 4Ps farmer beneficiaries if they have experienced some changes of their lifestyles particularly in Bobon and Palapag Northern Samar. Through this paper, the government, agricultural sectors, policy makers and implementers of the program were expected to give information on how the program went through and will serve as future reference.

This study sought to asses is the PantawidPamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) on the agricultural production in selected towns in Northern Samar Its economic impact of the implementation and the problems encountered by the beneficiaries in relation to agricultural production.

II. METHODOLOGY

The respondents of this study were the 4Ps beneficiaries in Bobon and Palapag, Northern Samar. The researcher has chosen these barangays because most of the people in these places are engaged in farming and these are located near the towns. There are 1,782 registered farmers in the municipality of Bobon and 1,800 registered farmers in the municipality of Palapag. The data were taken from the Municipal Agriculturist Office (MAO) but the respondents were limited only to the farmers who were included in the 4Ps program and members of a farmers' association in each barangay. The total number of 92 registered farmer 4Ps beneficiaries was identified as the respondents of this study.

A survey questionnaire was used as the principal instrument in gathering data to obtain the necessary information needed for the assessment of 4Ps program on the agricultural production of the beneficiaries. The research instrument will be composed of three (3) parts: Part I, socio-economic profile of the respondent; Part II, the economic impact of 4Ps program implementation on the agricultural production; Part III, the problems encountered by the beneficiaries in relation to agricultural production.

To gather the needed information of the study, the researcher first wrote a letter to the municipal mayor, municipal link, Municipal Agriculture Office, and to the barangay captain to ask permission to conduct the study. A copy and the data of registered farmer 4Ps beneficiaries in Barangay San Isidro, Dancalan and Quezon from the municipality of Bobon, and Barangay Campedico, Magsaysay and Mabaras from the municipality of Palapag which are the locales of the study.

Upon approval, the researcher personally administered the questionnaire to the respondents and retrieved them thereafter. A letter of introduction from the research adviser was presented to the respondents. During the personal interview with the respondents, the questions were translated to the local dialect to ensure the appropriateness of their responses and to encourage them to answer the questions. They were made to understand that their answers to the questions will be confidential. Their responses led to the findings of the study that served as the bases for assessing the program effectively.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

IMPACT OF 4PS TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Table 1 shows the number of years in farming. Most of the respondents 35.87% were in 31 and above years in farming, however 17.39% were in 21-30 years in farming, followed by 16.30% were in 5-10 years in farming, while 15.28% of the respondents were both 11-15 and 16-20 years in farming. It reveals that most of the farmers were within the 31- above years in farming. The respondents were in the adulthood and within the middle part of their life so they need to work hard for their family to survive.

Table 1. Number of years in farming

Settlement status	Frequency	Percentage
31-above	33	35.87%
21-30	16	17.39%
16-20	14	15.22%
11-15	14	15.22%
5-10	15	16.30%
Total	**92**	**100%**

OWNERSHIP OF LAND

Table 2 shows the ownership of land. A majority the respondents 83.69% were tenants, 5.43% were both inherited and bought rights, and 2.17% were in renting and through agrarian reform program, while only 1.09% were farm workers. This indicates that the 4Ps farmer's beneficiaries predominantly own land of 83.69% as farm tenant. Tenant will be the one to till the land and do the agricultural production. Then profit sharing with the owners either through cash or products that will depend on their agreements.

Table 2. Ownership of land area

Ownership of land	Frequency	Percentage
Inherited	5	5.43%
Through agrarian reform	2	2.17%
Brought rights	5	5.43%
Rental	2	2.17%
Tenant	77	83.70%
Other: farm worker	1	1.09%
Total	**92**	**100**

FARMING SYSTEM

Table 3 shows the farming system of the respondents. A majority of the respondents 67.39% used monocropping as farming system, however 16.30% used intercropping farming system, followed by 8.69% were backyard raisers, and 7.61% were into backyard gardening. This means that the 4Ps farmer beneficiaries were predominantly practicing monocropping farming system. The farmers produce a crop one after the other. This indicates that the farmers were not aware of diversified farming and multi-cropping.

Table3. Farming system

Farming system	Frequency	Percentage
Monocropping	62	67.39%
Intercropping	15	16.30%
Backyard gardening	7	7.61%
Backyard raiser	8	8.70%
Total	**92**	**100%**

TYPES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Table 4 shows the area of crop production. A majority of the respondents had 1-3 hectares or 77.17% area for rice production, however 8.70% had of 4-6 hectares and 1.09% had an area of 7-9 hectares and 10-above. Abaca production had 3.26% with an average of 1-3 hectares. A majority of respondents had 1-3 hectares or 58.70% planted abaca, and for coconut plantation a majority 58.70% had 1-3 hectares, 15 or 16.30% had 4-6 hectares, 3 or 3.26% had 7-9 hectares, while 2.17% had 10-above hectares. This means that majority of the respondents produced rice since rice is the staple food for consumption and most Filipinos eat rice as their main source of food.

Table 4. Area of production

Area of production	Frequency	Percentage
Rice		
1-3	71	77.17%
4-6	8	8.70%
7-9	1	1.09%
10-above	1	1.09%
Abaca		
1-3	3	3.26%
Coconut		
1-3	54	58.70%
4-6	15	16.30%
7-9	3	3.26%
10-above	2	2.17%

*Multiple response

CROPS PRODUCED

Table 5 shows the crops produced. For vegetable productions, 50% of the respondents produced pechay, 42.39% had planted okra, 35.87% pole sitao, and 19.59% in corn, respectively. For root/tuber production 56.52% planted sweet potato, 40.48% cassava, 31.52% gabi, 5.42% ube, and 1.09% palawan. For fruit production, 68.47% planted banana, 35.87% papaya, 29.355 pineapples, 2.17% in jackfruit and cacao, and 1.09% in kalamansi.

Table 5. Crops produced

Crops	Frequency	Percentage
Vegetables		
Corn	18	19.57%
Pole sitao	33	35.87%
Okra	39	42.39%
Pechay	46	50.00%
Eggplant	17	18.48%
Upo	12	13.04%
Squash	12	13.04%
Patola	7	7.61%
Ampalaya	17	18.48%
Root/tuber		
Sweet Potato	52	56.52%
Cassava	40	40.48%
Ube	5	5.42%
Others; Gabi	29	31.52%
Palawan	1	1.09%
Fruit		
Banana	63	68.47%
Papaya	33	35.87%
Pineapple	27	29.35%

Others: Jackfruit	2	2.17%
Kalamansi	1	1.09%
Cacao	2	2.17%

*Multiple response

PRODUCTS SOLD

Table 6 shows the characteristics of the products sold. The highest form of production sold, 80.43% were fresh products, as the unit of production most of the products were sold by pieces. They usually processed there food 7.61% when there is oversupply of the products and sell as food vending, 6.5 % give to the neighborhood for the food of the swine and other livestock, while the least is 1.09% is decomposed and source of food for the fish and animals.

Table 6. Products sold

Products sold	Frequency	Percentage
Form of product sold		
Raw/fresh	74	80.43%
Milled (rice/corn)	6	6.62%
Copra	24	26.09%
Unit of production		
Pieces	75	82.52%
Kilogram	19	20.65%
Bunch	3	3.26%
Cavans	2	2.17%
The product sold if there is oversupply		
Processed food	7	7.61%
Decompose	1	1.09%
Sources of feeds for animal/fish	1	1.09%
Other: Give to the neighborhood	6	6.62%

ANIMAL PRODUCTION - POULTRY PRODUCTION

Table 7 shows the poultry production. Most of the respondents produced native chickens or 40.22% with 1-5 heads, 17.39% were 6-10 heads, 7.61% were 11-15 heads, and least of 6.62% with 16-above heads. It was followed by duck production or 2.17%, and goose production or 1.09% with 11-15 heads.

Native chicken production is the most promising business nowadays.

Filipinos are conscious with their health. It is in the mind of most Filipinos now days that native chicken is more nutritious rather than boilers.

Table 7. Poultry Production

Number of heads	Frequency	Percentage
Native chicken		
1-5	37	40.22%
6-10	16	17.39%
11-15	7	7.61%

16-above	6	6.62%
Duck		
1-5	2	2.17%
Goose		
11-15	1	1.09%

*Multiple response

LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

Table 8 shows the livestock production. Almost all of the respondents 69.57% resorted to swine production with 1-5 heads and 1.09% had 6-10 heads. This was followed by carabao 60.87% with number of head with 1-5 heads and 1.09% had 6-10 heads while, 2 or 2.26% had cows.

This indicates that the 4Ps beneficiaries preferred swine production because it is easy to raise, fast in growth, and capital is manageable. Swine production has also a good market. Filipinos love to eat pork, and almost all occasions pork is the more preferred menu.

Table 8. Livestock production

Number of heads	Frequency	Percentage
Swine		
1-5	64	69.57%
6-10	1	1.09%
Carabao		
1-5	56	60.87%
6-10	1	1.09%
Cow		
1-5	2	2.17%

*Multiple Response

MARKETING OF ANIMAL PRODUCTS

Table 9 shows the marketing of animal products. A majority of the respondents 67.39% sold their products live, while 6.52% sold them dressed. Most respondents 45.65% sold their products on wholesale basis for poultry and livestock production, 34.78% in kilogram, 2.17% in retail and the least 1.09% sold the products by pieces.

Table 9. Marketing of products

Marketing	Frequency	Percentage
Form of product sold		
live	62	67.39%
dressed	6	6.52%
Unit of production		
Kilogram	32	34.78%
Wholesale	42	45.65%
Retail	2	2.17%
Pieces	1	1.09%

FISH PRODUCTION

The fish production reveals that few of the respondents preferred to fish production since the system of the productivity is very low but it provides entrepreneurial opportunity. The combination of climate change, pollution and pressure from the fishermen can reduce the

supply of fish but it is healthier to eat fresh meat because it is more nutritious.

CHOICES OF TYPE OF PRODUCTION

Most of the respondents' answers the choice of production are; no other choice of income, it is easy to raise, production makes as alternative source of income, and agricultural production is a traditional habit.

It implies that the 4Ps farmer beneficiaries have no other source of income since farming was the earliest civilized man's occupation and it has been one of the economic basis to survive.

ANNUAL CAPITAL

Table 10 shows the annual capital of the different productions namely crop, poultry, livestock, and fish production. Most of the respondents 46.74% had annual capital of 0-5,000 for livestock production, 36.96% for poultry and 33.70% for crop production with 0-5,000 annual capital, while fish production has the lowest distribution of 2.17% but the annual income of Php. 6,000-10,000 and Php. 16,000- 20,000.

This suggests that most of the farmers are poor and do not have enough capital for production. They live in a debt paying usurious rates of interest have no choices but to accept this term that eventually eats up their income.

Table 10. Annual capital in production.

Capital (Php.)	Crop		Poultry		Livestock		Fish	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
25,000-30,000	1	1.09%	-	-	-	-	-	-
21,000-25,000	1	1.09%	1	1.09%	1	1.09%	-	-
16,000-20,000	5	5.43%		-	-	-	2	2.17%
11,000-15,000	15	16.30%	1	1.09%	2	2.17%	-	-
6,000- 10,000	16	17.39%	4	4.35%	16	17.39%	2	2.17%
0-5,000	31	33.70%	34	36.96%	43	46.74%	1	1.09%

*Multiple response

ANNUAL COST OR EXPENSES

Table 11 shows the cost/expenses on the different types of production. A majority of the respondents 43.48% had 0-5,000 annual cost/ expense on livestock, however 33.70% for both poultry and crops, while only 4.25% had annual cost/expenses of Php.16, 000-20,000.

This means that majority of the respondents increased their annual cost/expenses than the annual capital on the different production. Cost of inputs has increased because of higher price tags on transportation, labor, energy, and raw materials.

Table 11. Annual cost/ expenses

Capital (Php.)	Crop		Poultry		Livestock		Fish	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
31-above	1	1.09%	-	-	-	-	-	-
25,000-30,000	0	0%	1	1.09%	-	-	-	-
21,000-25,000	2	2.17%	1	1.09%	-	-	-	-
16,000-20,000	3	3.26%	-	-	-	-	4	4.25%
11,000-15,000	16	16.30%	-	-	2	2.17%	-	-
6,000- 10,000	16	16.30%	8	8.70%	20	21,74%	-	-
0-5,000	31	33.70%	31	33.70%	40	43.48%	1	1.09%

*Multiple response

MARKETING OUTLET

Table 12 shows the marketing outlet. A majority of the respondents 86.96% used their product for consumption only, 44.56% sold their products in the neighborhood, 11.09% were marketed in rice millers, and 8.70% sold the products in market, while 7.61% sold the products in the buying station. This implies that among the respondent's predominantly uses their products for consumption only to be able to eat nutritious and healthy foods taken from their farm within 3 times per day.

Table 12. Marketing Outlet

Marketing outlet	Frequency	Percentage
Market	8	8.70%
Buying station	7	7.61%
Rice miller	11	11.09%
Neighborhood	41	44.56%
For consumption	80	86.96%

*Multiple response

VOLUME OF PRODUCT BROUGHT TO THE MARKET

Table 13 shows the volume of products brought to the market. Most of the respondents 58.69% picked-up their products, followed by 28.26% were being delivered to the buyer, and 19.67% were being pick-up in the road side, while only 2.17%, were delivered to the market. This indicates that since most of the products are just being picked-up by the buyers at the farm the farmers have no direct distribution to the market because they have less volume of production. They are producing but buyers are the ones who control the prices of the products.

Table 13. Volume of products brought to the marketing outlet

Marketing outlet	Frequency	Percentage
Pick-up	54	58.69%
Pick-up road side	18	19.57%
Deliver to buyer	26	28.26%
Deliver to market	2	2.17%

*Multiple response

MODE OF TRANSPORTATION

Table 14 shows the mode of transportation. Most of the respondents 63.04% had walking as their mode of transportation, 23.91% through tricycle, while the least 13.04% through "habal-habal". This means that marketing of the product produced is through "lako"; it's a way selling product by kilogram and they sell the products around the place until these are sold-out.

Table 14. Mode of transporting the products

Mode of transportation	Frequency	Percentage
Tricycle	22	23.91%
Habal-habal	12	13.04%
Walking	58	63.05%

*Multiple response

MARKETING OF PRODUCT

Respondents sell their products through cash basis for the exchange of the product. This serves as additional cash from the product produce and serve as an income generating activities to be able them to survive and hope for the establishment for the household finances.

DISCOUNT OFFERED

The study reveals that the respondents sometimes give discount to the buyers of their products that are being sold. Respondents are so considerate to the buyers or to the consumers.

AGRICULTURAL INPUTS GIVEN BY THE GOVERNMENT

Table 15 shows the agricultural inputs given by the government. Most of the respondents 92.39% received seeds, however 80.43% received fertilizer, followed by 16.30% received farm machineries and equipment, and 10.87% received breeder, while only 1.09% received both are fishing boat and feeds. This indicates that the respondents received support from the

government for their agricultural production. These inputs will lead them to produce agricultural products that will enable to sustain the basic foods and engage in entrepreneurial activities.

Table 15. Agricultural inputs given by the government

Agricultural inputs	Frequency	Percentage
Seed	85	92.39%
Fertilizer	74	80.43%
Breeder	10	10.87%
Farm machineries and equipment	15	16.30%
Others: fishing boat	1	1.09%
Feeds	1	1.09%

*Multiple response

AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE GIVEN BY THE GOVERNMENT

Table 16 shows the agricultural assistance given by the government. Most of the respondents 92.39% received farm inputs, followed by 77.17% had training or seminar, and 76.09% avail crop insurance, while 67.39% receive production guide.

This means that the government is active in giving assistance to the 4Ps farmer beneficiaries. This indicates that they give knowledge and skills to the beneficiaries to able to improve and have ideas in production farming.

Table 16. Agricultural assistance given by the government

Agricultural assistance	Frequency	Percentage
Farm inputs	85	92.39%
Training/seminar	71	77.17%
Crop insurance	70	76.09%
Production guide	62	67.39%

*Multiple response

GOVERNMENT PROGRAM MUNICIPALITY HAS

Table 17 shows the government program that the municipality has. Most of the respondents or 94.56% stated that it was the DSWD (Department of Social Workers and Development) program; 78.26%, SAAD (Special Area for Agricultural Development) program; while the least was Agri-Pinoy program or 5.43%.

This means that DSWD conducts sessions and values formation and monitoring the progress of the 4Ps program and other programs mentioned. This aims at organizing individual supports to the 4Ps farmer beneficiaries into self-help group. This would serve as impacts and strategies of the program that bigger value for economic changes.

Table 17. Government programs of the municipality

Agricultural inputs	Frequency	Percentage
DSWD	87	94.56%
DA-SAAD	72	78.26%
DOLE	25	27.17%
Agrarian reform	10	10.87%
NGO	8	8.70%
Agri-pinoy	5	5.43%

*****Multiple response

Perception of 4Ps farmer beneficiaries on 4Ps program implementation in the agricultural production

PROMOTING AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH COMMUNAL GARDENING

Respondents claim that their life became a bit easier with the aid of the program because they are now exposed on the different activities like communal gardening, as such they can eat better or healthier foods. This also reveals that communal gardening is the one of the activities empowered by the program implementers. This helps address nutrition concerns by encouraging them to use organic fertilizer and even

indigenous seeds to grow vegetables within the household.

TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW IN BIO-INTENSIVE GARDENING THROUGH FAMILY DEVELOPMENT SESSION (FDS)

The beneficiaries believe that through the family development session the knowledge of technical know-how in bio-intensive gardening would help them establish agricultural production that leads to better income that somewhat uplift their status of living.

4PS PROGRAM HELP CHANGE THE ECONOMIC STATUS

4Ps beneficiaries' standard of living had changed for the better one, compared to the previous status of their lives.That majority of the respondents strongly agreed that 4Ps program of the government helped change their economic status.

ADDITIONAL CASH FOR THE SOURCE OF LIVELIHOOD

The beneficiaries strongly agreed to have additional cash not only for the education and health for their children but also as the source of livelihood. 4Ps program of the government is a big help for the poor citizens and serves as additional cash for them to satisfy the basic needs of their children to have a better life to live on.

IN FAVOR OF CONTINUOUS IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 4PS PROGRAM

The respondents strongly agreed that they are benefited and in favor of continuous implementation of the program that somehow helped to uplift their
way of life.

PARTICIPATION OF COMMUNAL GARDENING ACTIVITIES THAT PROMOTE AND STRENGTHEN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 4PS PROGRAM

The 4Ps beneficiaries strongly agreed that through their participation in the communal gardening practices, they support the program to strengthen and sustain the implementation of the 4Ps.

AGRICULTURAL TECHNIQUE ENGAGE DURING THE FAMILY DEVELOPMENT SESSION (FDS)

The beneficiaries preferred the agricultural production so as to suffice their love in farming and the main source of their livelihood. The beneficiaries are interested in the financial status especially the income they derived from agricultural production.

IMPLEMENTATION OF 4PS PROGRAM

The beneficiaries were in favor and contented of continuous implementation of the 4Ps program. For them it was a big contributing factor in terms of the monitoring and implementation the project.

MEANING OF 4PS PROGRAM TO THE BENEFICIARIES

For the 4Ps beneficiaries their main concept of the program is that it is a form of a dole out of the government to every family identified as recipient. For them it is a financial assistance to help the members of the family to be educated to go to school and for health purposes. The respondents also said that 4Ps program is to help alleviate poverty somewhat receive beneficiaries' additional source of income for the needs.

IV. CONCLUSION

The 4Ps programs have shown remarkable impact to its beneficiaries posting changes in their socio-economic, cultural, educational, health and nutrition conditions. We can therefore conclude that the PantawidPamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) brings a positive impact to the 4Ps farmer beneficiaries in the agricultural productivity.

Based on the data gathered from the 4P's farmer beneficiaries in Bobon, and Palapag, Northern

Samar, the researchers came up with following recommendations in the economic assessment of agricultural production. There should be a strong monitoring and evaluation of the 4P's program to see if the communal gardening activities are effective among those beneficiaries who are included in the farmer's organization. A livelihood component should be provided to the recipients in terms of livelihood trainings, educational journey, and expose to field of agriculture. A certain amount to production capital for sustainability and reduce dependency on the cash assistance given. Since sustainability was an issue to raise, it is recommended that future researchers should conduct research on agricultural production or other livelihood assets achieved of the 4Ps farmer beneficiaries in order to be able sustain through the cash assistance.

REFERENCES

[1] [ADB] Asian Development Bank. 2009. Annual Report. 2008. Manila: Asian Development Bank. Available from: http://www.adb.org/site/default/files/ institutionaldocument/31323/annual-report-2008-vo101.pdf

[2] Anuevo EB, Aunzo JT, Carias ED, Devora EC, Longcop RG. 2016. Implementation of 4Ps in selected barangay in the municipality of Bobon, Northern Samar unpublished undergraduate Thesis, UEP, Catarman, Northern Samar, 2016.

[3] Asinas MRG. 2012. Factors related to the perception of the professionals in Catubig, Northern Samar towards PantawidPamilyang Pilipino Program, unpublished Undergraduate Thesis 2012.

[4] Barahan EM. 2017. 4Ps Beneficiaries to get P600 more in rice subsidy, inquirer, March 16, 2017. Available from: http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/ 881345/4ps-beneficiaries-to-get-more-in-rice-subsidydswd. Interview with the OIC Division chief of PMED, DSWD, in Quezon City, March 22, 2017.

[5] Dadap EL. 2011. Political of Conditional Cash Transfers in the Philippines, Available from: website- Emman-s-RP-Final-Draft-Nov-2011.pdf

[6] [DA] Department of Agriculture to Department of Social Worker Development (DSWD) review cash-transfer program 2018. Available from: http:// www.BusinessMirror.com.ph

[7] [DSWD] Department of Social Welfare and Development. 2018. More PantawidPamilyang families continue to benefit from communal gardening, April 4,2018. Available from: http://www.dswd.gov.ph/news/2017 more-pantawid-pamilyang-families-continue-to-benefits-from-communal gardening/?iorg_domain_internal =google.com.ph%3BAfqovYGIFnVtlreZ

[8] Morales Y. 2017. Presidential Advisory: Reform CCT, Focus on Agriculture CNN Philippines, February 9, 2017. Available from http:// www.cnn philippines.com/news/2017/reform-CCT-focus-on-agriculture.html

[9] Palito BC, De Guia RD, Broto JM, Rebadulla SP. 2013. Implementation of PantawidPamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in selected barangays in the Municipality of Victoria Northern Samar; Its Oppurtunities and Threats, unpublished undergraduate Thesis, UEP, Catarman Northern Samar,2013.

[10] Siena JR. 2015.The effect of Conditional Cash Transfer Program on the Livelihood Assets of the Low-income Household Recipients in the Province of Apayao, Philippines: The Case of PantawidPamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) Available from: website -1-39297.pdf

[11] World Bank 2017, Agriculture, forestry, and fishing, value added (% of GDP) data of 1960-2017. Available from: http:// www.data-worldbank-org.com