

# The Dole Integrated Livelihood Program, Implementation, Challenges, and Impact on the Beneficiaries in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro

Vanessa M. Gonda<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Occidental Mindoro State College

Publication Date: 2026/04/21

**Abstract:** This study examined the implementation, challenges, and impact of the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP) in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro. Using a mixed-methods approach, data were gathered from 123 beneficiaries through surveys, interviews, group discussions, and document review.

Findings revealed that the program was generally well implemented, particularly in fund release, training, and monitoring. However, challenges were noted in beneficiary participation, financial management, and compliance with reporting requirements. Despite these issues, the program had a positive impact on project management, income generation, community participation, and beneficiary satisfaction.

The study concludes that while effective implementation improves livelihoods, sustaining outcomes requires stronger financial management training, better feedback mechanisms, increased beneficiary involvement, and improved market linkages. These findings may help enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of government livelihood programs.

**Keywords:** DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program; Program Implementation; Program Impact; Challenges; Beneficiaries; Income Generation; Community Participation; Financial Management; Monitoring and Evaluation; Sustainability.

**How to Cite:** Vanessa M. Gonda (2026) The Dole Integrated Livelihood Program, Implementation, Challenges, and Impact on the Beneficiaries in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(4), 1336-1345. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26apr1146>

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Integrated Livelihood Program is a flagship program of the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) that gives livelihood grants in terms of raw materials which aims to help and uplift the living and social status of the poor, vulnerable, and marginalized workers, such as seasonal workers, displaced, Indigenous people, persons with disability, people deprived of liberty, youth, elderly, landless farmers, fisheries, and parents of child laborer who are 18 years old and above. A livelihood program is an initiative of the government to support individuals and communities in starting, improving, and restoring their livelihood activities to have a sufficient source of income.

As per Department Order 239 of 2023, the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP), also known as the Kabuhayan Program, is the department's contribution to inclusive growth through job creation and poverty reduction. It seeks to reduce the risk vulnerability of disadvantaged

workers and augment their income by providing opportunities for entrepreneurship. It helps the beneficiary to grow into a viable and sustainable business or community enterprise, enabling them to engage in self-employment. The program is a major component of the social protection system as it links disaster and climate risk management with social securities and labor market policies (ILO, 2009). It facilitates entrepreneurship for people affected by natural calamities and economic shocks, as well as enrolls beneficiaries in social insurance. It responds to the President's social contract with the Filipino people, which calls for veering away "from anti-poverty government programs to well-considered programs that build capacity and create opportunities among the poor and marginalized." DILP was implemented in the wake of Typhoon Haiyan and benefited 79,655 affected workers. Moreover, a livelihood is sustainable, which can cope with and recover from stress and shock, maintain and enhance capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable opportunities that contribute to the benefits of other livelihoods at the local and global levels in the long term. It ensures that the resources

are used in an accountable manner while still meeting the requirements of future generations. Moreover, it is responsible for making individuals resilient in the event of any difficulties relating to economics, environment, or society, and encourages inclusive development through equitable access to various resources. Sustainable livelihoods are essential for sustainable development.

This study aims to evaluate the implementation, challenges, and impact of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP) on the beneficiaries and community development in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro. Specifically, it aims to:

➤ *Determine the Extent of Implementation of the DILP in Terms of:*

- Release of funds;
- Training provided; and
- Monitoring.

➤ *Assess the Degree of Challenges Encountered in the Implementation in Terms of:*

- Beneficiary engagement;
- Financial literacy; and
- Reporting compliance and documentation.

➤ *Analyze the impact of the Program in Terms of*

- Project status;
- Income generation;
- Community involvement and participation; and
- Beneficiary satisfaction.

➤ Test if there is a significant relationship between the implementation and impact of the DILP.

➤ Test if there is a significant relationship between the challenges encountered and the impact of the DILP on the beneficiaries.

## II. METHODOLOGY

### A. Study Design

This study employed the mixed method approach, strategically combining both qualitative and quantitative research methods to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the relationship of the extent of DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program implementation, challenges, and impact on the beneficiaries of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro.

### B. Study Setting

The study was conducted from August to December 2025 in the municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro. The study intends to ensure that both measurable outcomes and lived experiences are captured, allowing for a more comprehensive evaluation of the DILP in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro. This research aimed to provide insights into how to contribute to more effective service delivery and resource management.

### C. Unit of Analysis and Sampling

The unit of analysis for this study was the individual beneficiaries and a member of the association of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP) in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro. This included self-employed workers, landless farmers, unpaid family workers, displaced workers, parents of child laborers, and low-wage seasonal workers who have participated in the program. There is a total of 179 individual beneficiaries as of December 2024 in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro, a sample size of approximately 123 individual beneficiaries. Ethical considerations were strictly adhered to, ensuring informed consent, confidentiality, and adherence to ethical guidelines in research.

### D. Research Instrument

The primary data gathering instrument was a survey questionnaire developed to gather qualitative methods aim to explore participants' experiences, perceptions, and challenges related to the program. The insights gathered will inform the development of the survey questionnaire used in the quantitative phase.

The survey will captured data on demographic profiles, program implementation, challenges encountered, program impact, and satisfaction levels of the beneficiaries of DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro.

### E. Data Collection Procedure

The data processing and analysis that were involve on this study has several key steps. Data collection will include surveys from 123 sampled beneficiaries, transcriptions of interviews and focus group discussions, and the gathering of relevant program documents.

The data collected from both qualitative and quantitative sources will underwent systematic processing and analysis to ensure accuracy, reliability, and meaningful interpretation. For the quantitative data, responses from the survey questionnaires were encoded, cleaned, and analyzed using statistical software such as SPSS or Microsoft Excel. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the demographic profile of the respondents and their responses to key variables. Inferential statistics, including correlation and regression analysis, were employed to examine relationships between independent and dependent variables, and to identify predictors of program impact and beneficiary satisfaction.

The integration of both data types during the interpretation phase will provided a comprehensive understanding of the implementation and outcomes of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program in San Jose, Occidental Mindoro.

### F. Ethical Consideration

The researcher asked permission from the Department of Labor and Employment Occidental Mindoro Provincial Office for the list of Beneficiaries in the Municipality of San Jose, Occidental Mindoro to gather the data. All participants provided informed consent, understanding the study's

purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits, and knowing that their participation is voluntary. Confidentiality must be maintained by anonymizing data and securely storing it, with access limited to authorized personnel. The research sought to maximize benefits for participants and the community, using findings to improve the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program. Participants should be treated with respect and dignity, considering their cultural, social, and economic backgrounds, and ensuring inclusivity. Transparency about the research process, including methods, data analysis, and findings, is essential, allowing participants to ask questions and receive honest answers.. It was guaranteed that all the data and results gathered was exclusively used for the purpose of the study.

The content of this study is an original paper and is not copied from any existing study. The researcher used the American Psychological Association (APA) style to give credit to the other research studies used as references. Previous studies and resources used as bases of this study was properly cited and acknowledged. This study only intends to contribute to the advancement of education and does not cause any harm to anyone involved during the conduct of the study.

*G. Data Processing and Analysis*

The data processing and analysis that were involved on this study has several key steps. Data collection will include

surveys from 123 sampled beneficiaries, transcriptions of interviews and focus group discussions, and the gathering of relevant program documents. Responses from the survey questionnaires were encoded, cleaned, and analyzed using statistical software such as SPSS or Microsoft Excel.

The integration of both data types during the interpretation phase will provided a comprehensive understanding of the implementation and outcomes of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program in San Jose, Occidental Mindoro.

**III. RESULTS**

*A. The Extent of Implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program in Terms of Release of Funds*

Releasing of the funds is the important part of the program so that the beneficiaries will be able to buy the materials and supplies they need for their livelihood project.

Table 1 shows that the release of fund was highly implemented (mean = 3.83 ; sd = 0.21), and this is evidenced by timely fund release as per project schedule and approved budget. The beneficiaries were informed in the release of fund, and they strongly believed that there is a transparency in the disbursement. Most of them experienced the timely released of fund, but they believed that delays negatively affect the project implementation.

Table 1 Extent of implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program in terms of release of funds

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Funds were released on time according to the project schedule.	3.87	.33	High
The amount of funds released matched the approved budget.	3.87	.33	High
There was transparency in the disbursement of project funds.	3.83	.38	High
I was informed promptly about the release of funds.	3.78	.45	High
Delays in fund release negatively affected project implementation.	3.77	.45	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>.21</b>	<b>High</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Low; 1.51-2.50 Low; 2.51-3.50 Moderate; 3.51-4.00 High

*B. Training Provided*

Training of the beneficiaries was necessary for the successful implementation of the livelihood program.

The beneficiaries claimed that training was provided and highly implemented (mean = 3.79; sd = 0.25) with knowledge and effects frames.

Table 2. Show that the training was considered effective as new skills were gained, and materials were clean and easy to understand. The activity was well-organized and conducted at a convenient time.

Table 2. Extent of implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program in terms of training provided.

Table 2 The Extent of Inventory System Implementation in Terms of Data Accuracy.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The trainers were knowledgeable and effective.	3.83	.38	High
I gained new skills from the training provided.	3.78	.41	High
Training materials were clear and easy to understand.	3.78	.41	High
The training schedule was convenient and well-organized.	3.78	.41	High
The training sessions were relevant to the project goals.	3.75	.43	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>.25</b>	<b>High</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Low; 1.51-2.50 Low; 2.51-3.50 Moderate; 3.51-4.00 High

**C. Monitoring**

Monitoring refers to the activities conducted by DOLE to determine whether the beneficiaries are doing well with their projects or not. This includes submission of reports and documentation, and on-site visits. This will help to determine if beneficiaries have problems with their project and whether they are doing what is expected of them.

Table 3 presents that the extent of implementation of the DILP in terms of monitoring is great, with a mean of  $3.77 \pm$

0.21. This means that the DOLE conducts follow-ups and looks into possible problems of the beneficiaries with their livelihood projects. The low standard deviation indicates that responses are homogeneous among the beneficiaries.

Monitoring is highest in beneficiaries who felt that monitoring was fair and objective, with a mean of  $3.92 \pm 0.27$ . Monitoring is lowest in feedback from monitoring, which was used to make improvements, with a mean of  $3.65 \pm 0.51$ .

**Table 3 Extent of Implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program in Terms of Monitoring.**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
I felt that monitoring was fair and objective.	3.92	.27	High
Monitoring reports were shared with stakeholders.	3.77	.42	High
Project activities were regularly monitored by the implementing team.	3.76	.43	High
Monitoring visits helped improve project performance.	3.74	.46	High
Feedback from monitoring was used to make improvements.	3.65	.51	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>.21</b>	<b>High</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Low; 1.51-2.50 Low; 2.51-3.50 Moderate; 3.51-4.00 High

**D. Extent of Implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program**

Table 4 shows that the extent of implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program is high with a mean of  $3.80 \pm 0.14$ . This means that the DOLE is implementing the program well and properly. Implementation is highest in the release of funds with a mean of  $3.83 \pm 0.21$ , followed by training provided with a mean of  $3.79 \pm 0.25$ , and last is monitoring with a mean of  $3.77 \pm 0.21$ .

**Table 4 Summary of the Extent of Implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program.**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Release of Funds	3.83	.21	High
Training Provided	3.79	.25	High
Monitoring	3.77	.21	High
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>High</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Low; 1.51-2.50 Low; 2.51-3.50 Moderate; 3.51-4.00 High

**E. The Extent of Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program**

Challenges are inherently present in conducting any programs and activities of any agency or organization. Identifying the challenges encountered in the implementation of DILP makes the implementers and the beneficiaries become proactive with their actions and remedies. Actions directed to the challenges can facilitate success in the livelihood projects. The dimension of challenges encountered in the implementation of DILP includes beneficiary engagement, financial literacy, reporting compliance, and documentation.

**F. Beneficiary Engagement**

Beneficiary engagement is important for the success of the program and its livelihood projects. Beneficiaries need to cooperate and collaborate with the implementer so that the latter can take appropriate actions and recommendations.

Apparently, beneficiary engagement is not an issue in the implementation of DILP. With the overall mean of 3.81 and an SD of 0.19, the beneficiaries are highly engaged.

In the implementation, the issues and concerns of the beneficiaries are heard because the project team is listening during the sharing of ideas during the meeting. They are involved in project planning and in the inclusive and respectful engagement activities.

**Table 5. Degree of Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of DILP in Terms of Beneficiary Engagement.**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The project team listened to beneficiary concerns.	3.85	.36	High
I had opportunities to share my views during project meetings.	3.83	.38	High
Engagement activities were inclusive and respectful.	3.80	.40	High
Beneficiaries were actively involved in project planning.	3.75	.43	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>.19</b>	<b>High</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Low; 1.51-2.50 Low; 2.51-3.50 Moderate; 3.51-4.00 High

**G. Financial Literacy**

Financial literacy is the knowledge and skills of the beneficiaries in planning, budgeting, investing, and spending money. Beneficiaries with good financial literacy have higher possibility in becoming successful with their livelihood projects.

Table 6 presents that financial literacy among beneficiaries is increase not an issue and did not lose a challenge in the implementation of DILP. The beneficiaries

favorably respond to the item in Table 6 and obtained the overall mean of 3.81, with the standard deviation of 0.22.

The financial management training which a component of the program seems effective as they claimed the improved knowledge in savings and managing (mean = 3.85). Impliedly, almost all of the respondents receive the relevant training that capacitate them on proper management of funds and on creating and implementing the budget. This made them comfortable and confident in making financial decisions.

Table 6 Degree of Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of DILP in Terms of Financial Literacy.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The project improved my knowledge of saving and investing.	3.85	.36	High
I received training on how to manage project funds.	3.80	.40	High
I understand how to create and follow a budget.	3.80	.40	High
I feel confident in making financial decisions.	3.80	.40	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>.22</b>	<b>High</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Low; 1.51-2.50 Low; 2.51-3.50 Moderate; 3.51-4.00 High

**H. Reporting Compliance and Documentation**

Reporting compliance and documents is not a challenge, as is similarly observed in financial literacy and beneficiary engagement. The mean 3.80, and the standard deviation is 0.18 (Table 7), confirming this observation in DILP implementation. The beneficiaries recognized their responsibility to submit progress reports on their projects. The projects submitted are accurate reports. They were involved in preparing and reviewing project reports. Hence, they can prepare reports that are clear and easy to understand.

Table 7 Degree of Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of DILP in Terms of Reporting Compliance and Documentation.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Project reports were shared regularly with stakeholders.	3.83	.38	High
Reports accurately reflected project progress.	3.82	.39	High
I was involved in preparing or reviewing project reports.	3.79	.41	High
Reporting formats were clear and easy to understand.	3.75	.43	High
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>High</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Low; 1.51-2.50 Low; 2.51-3.50 Moderate; 3.51-4.00 High

**I. Summary of the Degree of Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program**

It can be gleaned in Table 8 that the degree of challenges encountered in the implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program is high with mean of  $3.81 \pm 0.16$ . This means that the implementation of the program has significant challenges that has to be properly addressed. Challenges encountered is highest in Beneficiary Engagement with mean of  $3.81 \pm 0.19$ , followed by Financial Literacy with mean of  $3.81 \pm 0.22$ , and last is Reporting compliance and documentation with mean of  $3.80 \pm 0.18$ .

Table 8 Summary of the Degree of Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Beneficiary Engagement	3.81	.19	High
Financial Literacy	3.81	.22	High
Reporting compliance and documentation	3.80	.18	High
<b>Challenges</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>High</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Low; 1.51-2.50 Low; 2.51-3.50 Moderate; 3.51-4.00 High

**J. Impact of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program**

The impact of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program refers to the outcomes brought about by the livelihood programs of the beneficiaries assisted by the agency. This includes project status, income generation, participation, and satisfaction.

project is expected to have progressed and have provided benefits to the recipients of DILP.

Table 9 presents that the impact of the DILP in terms of project status is strong with mean of  $3.92 \pm 0.10$ . This means that the livelihood projects of the beneficiaries are doing well and good. The low standard deviation indicates that responses are similar among the respondents of the study.

**K. Project Status**

Project status refers to the condition of the livelihood undertaking of beneficiaries supported by the program. The

DILP has strong impact to the beneficiaries (mean = 3.92 ; SD = 0.10), and the livelihood supported by the program have progressed and resulted to benefits that the respondents had gained.

Project status is highest in the beneficiaries satisfied with the current status of the project with mean of  $3.99 \pm 0.12$ . Project status is lowest in most project activities have been completed successfully with mean of  $3.96 \pm 0.18$ .

Table 9 This Made Them Satisfied with the Current States of Their Livelihood Project That Progresses as per Timeline, and is Completed Successfully.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
I am satisfied with the current status of the project.	3.99	.12	Strong
The project is progressing according to the planned timeline.	3.98	.14	Strong
There are clear indicators to measure project success.	3.98	.14	Strong
Most project activities have been completed successfully.	3.96	.18	Strong
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>.10</b>	<b>Strong</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Weak; 1.51-2.50 Weak; 2.51-3.50 Fair; 3.51-4.00 Strong

*L. Income Generation*

Income generation refers to the amount of money the beneficiaries gained from the livelihood undertakings they are doing assisted by the DOLE through the program. The projects are expected to have uplifted the earnings of the beneficiaries.

providing them with monetary benefits and have improve their economic status. The low standard deviation indicates that responses are homogenous among the respondents of the study.

Table 10 presents that the impact of the DILP in terms of income generation is strong with mean of  $3.80 \pm 0.19$ . This means that the livelihood projects of the beneficiaries are

Income generation is highest in the beneficiaries have started a new income-generating activity because of the project with mean of  $3.82 \pm 0.39$ . Income generation is lowest in the project has helped the beneficiaries increase income with mean of  $3.75 \pm 0.44$ .

Table 10 Impact of the DILP in Terms of Income Generation.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
I have started a new income-generating activity because of the project.	3.82	.39	Strong
The income-generating activities are sustainable.	3.78	.41	Strong
I received support to market my products or services.	3.75	.43	Strong
The project has helped me increase my income.	3.75	.44	Strong
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>.19</b>	<b>Strong</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Weak; 1.51-2.50 Weak; 2.51-3.50 Fair; 3.51-4.00 Strong

*M. Participation*

Community Involvement and Participation refer to the cooperation of the local community in the implementation of the program. It also means that the community leaders, such as the barangay officials, assisted the DOLE, such as in providing documentation and recommendations for the program.

a mean of  $3.81 \pm 0.23$ . This means that the leaders and residents in the community are cooperative with the relevant aspects of the program. The low standard deviation indicates that responses are clustered in the middle of the data range.

Table 11 presents that the impact of the DILP in terms of Community Involvement and Participation is strong, with

Community Involvement and Participation is highest in the local leaders who support the project with a mean of  $3.87 \pm 0.33$ . Community Involvement and Participation is lowest in the community members actively participating in project activities, with a mean of  $3.70 \pm 0.49$ .

Table 11 Impact of the DILP in Terms of Community Involvement and Participation.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Local leaders support the project.	3.87	.33	Strong
The community was consulted during project planning.	3.82	.41	Strong
The project has strengthened community relationships.	3.82	.38	Strong
Community members actively participate in project activities.	3.70	.49	Strong
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>Strong</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Weak; 1.51-2.50 Weak; 2.51-3.50 Fair; 3.51-4.00 Strong

*N. Beneficiary Satisfaction*

Beneficiary Satisfaction refers to the fulfillment of the expectations from the program. This includes the happiness felt by the beneficiaries in view of the benefits and pleasure they earned from the program of DOLE.

Table 12 presents that the impact of the DILP in terms of Beneficiary Satisfaction is strong with mean of  $3.75 \pm 0.23$ . This means that the beneficiaries are happy and experienced fulfillment with their livelihood projects as financially assisted by the program. The low standard deviation indicates that responses are clustered in the center of the data range.

Beneficiary Satisfaction is highest in the project has helped the beneficiaries increase their income with mean of  $3.77 \pm 0.42$ . Beneficiary Satisfaction is lowest in the

beneficiaries have started a new income generating activity because of the project with mean of  $3.70 \pm 0.46$ .

Table 12 Impact of the DILP in Terms of Beneficiary Satisfaction.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
The project has helped me increase my income	3.77	.42	Strong
The income generating activities are sustainable.	3.75	.44	Strong
I am satisfied with the current status of the project.	3.72	.45	Strong
I have started a new income generating activity because of the project.	3.70	.46	Strong
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>Strong</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Weak; 1.51-2.50 Weak; 2.51-3.50 Fair; 3.51-4.00 Strong

*O. Summary of Impact of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program*

Table 13 shows that the impact of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program is strong with mean of  $3.82 \pm 0.13$ . This means that the DILP has brought positive benefits to the recipients. Impact is highest in Project Status with mean of  $3.92 \pm 0.10$ , followed by Community Involvement and Participation with mean of  $3.81 \pm 0.23$ , next is Income Generation with mean of  $3.80 \pm 0.19$ , and last is Beneficiary Satisfaction with mean of  $3.75 \pm 0.23$ .

Table 13 Summary of Impact of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program.

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
Project Status	3.92	.10	Strong
Community Involvement and Participation	3.81	.23	Strong
Income Generation	3.80	.19	Strong
Beneficiary Satisfaction	3.75	.23	Strong
<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>Strong</b>

Scale: 1.00-1.50 Very Weak; 1.51-2.50 Weak; 2.51-3.50 Fair; 3.51-4.00 Strong

*P. Relationship Between the Implementation and impact of the DILP*

The correlation analysis in Table 14 shows that the implementation of DILP has a weak positive relationship with the impact of the program, as manifested by the coefficient of .333 and supported by the p-value less than .05. This indicates that the relationship is not reliable. This also means that there could be other variables that play an important role in the dependent variable.

Table 14 Relationship Between the Implementation and impact of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program.

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Relationship
implementation Impact	.333	.000	Weak Positive

Scale: .000-.150 Negligible; .151-.400 Weak; .401-.650 Moderate; .651-.900 Strong; .901-1.000 Perfect

*Q. The Relationship Between the Challenges Encountered and the Impact of the DILP to the Benegiciaries*

The correlation analysis in Table 15 reveals that the challenges encountered have a moderate positive relationship with the impact of the program as manifested by the coefficient of .527 and supported by the p-value less than .05. This indicates that there is a noticeable trend in the relationship. The increase in the challenges encountered in the implementation of the program tends to increase the impact of the project.

Table 15 Relationship Between the Challenges Encountered and the Impact of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program.

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Relationship
Challenges Encountered Impact of the DILP on the Beneficiaries	.527	.000	Moderate Positive

Scale: .000-.150 Negligible; .151-.400 Weak; .401-.650 Moderate; .651-.900 Strong; .901-1.000 Perfect

**IV. DISCUSSION**

The extent of implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP) in San Jose, Occidental Mindoro, was **high (M = 3.80, SD = 0.14)**, with the release of funds rated highest (M = 3.83). This result indicates that DOLE has been effective in ensuring timely financial support, transparent disbursement, and adequate training for beneficiaries. Beneficiaries perceived the program as well-

managed, particularly in terms of financial assistance and training delivery.

Proper fund release and capacity-building are critical in sustaining livelihood projects, as they directly influence beneficiaries' ability to start and maintain income-generating activities (Reyes, 2019). This finding is consistent with Malapit et al. (2022), who emphasized that integrated approaches combining financial support with skills training yield more sustainable outcomes compared to single-

intervention methods. Similarly, the International Labour Organization (2020) highlighted that livelihood programs succeed when financial support is coupled with training and monitoring mechanisms. The World Bank (2022) also reported that programs using a combination of asset transfers, skills training, and coaching led participants to achieve higher income and asset growth than control groups.

Overall, the high implementation rating suggests that DILP in San Jose follows international best practices by providing not only financial capital but also training and monitoring support. This integrated approach strengthens the sustainability of livelihood projects and enhances the beneficiaries' capacity to manage their enterprises effectively.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

### A. Conclusion

The Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP) is generally effective in supporting beneficiaries, as reflected in the high ratings for fund release, training provided, and monitoring. These findings indicate that DOLE consistently delivers the essential components needed for the successful implementation of livelihood projects. Despite this, beneficiaries continue to experience challenges related to financial literacy, documentation, and active engagement, which limit their ability to fully maximize the program's support and affect overall project performance. Nevertheless, the program has demonstrated a strong impact on beneficiaries by improving project status, increasing income opportunities, and enhancing community involvement and satisfaction. The results further revealed a weak but significant positive relationship between program implementation and its impact, suggesting that while effective implementation contributes to better outcomes, other factors such as beneficiary capability, monitoring follow-through, and external conditions also influence project success. Therefore, strengthening support mechanisms, including enhanced financial literacy training, simplified reporting requirements, improved coaching and monitoring, and stronger market linkages, is necessary to sustain and further improve the long-term impact of the program on beneficiaries' livelihoods.

### B. Recommendation

After the study was completed, it was recommended that the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) should strengthen coaching and monitoring support, as beneficiaries reported limited follow-up guidance and lower ratings for monitoring feedback. Regular coaching sessions should be conducted, monitoring results should be communicated effectively, and beneficiaries should be guided in addressing issues in their livelihood projects. Additionally, DOLE should enhance financial literacy training by providing deeper and more practical sessions to help beneficiaries improve budgeting, record-keeping, and financial decision-making skills. Reporting requirements should also be simplified by developing clearer templates, offering step-by-step instructions, and providing assistance to ensure accurate and timely submission of reports.

Furthermore, DOLE should increase beneficiary engagement in project planning by actively involving them in decision-making and identifying livelihood needs to strengthen ownership and improve program outcomes. Strengthening market linkages is also essential; DOLE should collaborate with local government units, private partners, and local businesses to create better marketing opportunities, product fairs, and buyer connections to support livelihood sustainability. Continuous mentoring should likewise be provided to address ongoing challenges such as low financial literacy and inadequate reporting, ensuring beneficiaries receive sustained support rather than one-time assistance. Moreover, DOLE may conduct follow-up studies to identify additional factors influencing beneficiaries' satisfaction with the DILP, including the quality of coaching and monitoring, level of support during implementation, usefulness of training, and satisfaction with livelihood outcomes such as income gains and business sustainability. Future studies may also involve a broader range of beneficiaries from different sectors or regions, including rural and urban areas, various livelihood categories, and differing levels of market access, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the program's effectiveness across diverse contexts nationwide.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Artajo, M. I. D., Castillo, F. R. S., & Mones, M. J. O. (2018). Bringing Sustainable Livelihood Framework to Life: A Study on the Possible Determinants of Sustainability of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP). Institute for Labor Studies, Department of Labor and Employment, Philippines. <https://ils.dole.gov.ph/socialprotection/2018sp/bringing-sustainable-livelihood-framework-to-life-a-study-on-the-possible-determinants-of-sustainability-of-the-dole-integrated-livelihood-program-dilp>
- [2]. Artajo, M. I. D., Castillo, F. R. S., & Mones, M. J. O. (2021). Bringing sustainable livelihood framework to life: A study on the possible determinants of sustainability of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP). Department of Labor and Employment – Institute for Labor Studies. <https://ils.dole.gov.ph/social-protection/2018-sp/bringing-sustainable-livelihood-framework-to-life-a-study-on-the-possible-determinants-of-sustainability-of-the-dole-integrated-livelihood-program-dilp>
- [3]. Asian Development Bank. (2023). Effective livelihood interventions in Southeast Asia: Lessons and policy implications (ADB Southeast Asia Working Paper Series No. 96). Manila: ADB.
- [4]. Asian Development Bank. (2023). Integrating the graduation approach into a sustainable livelihood program (ADB Brief No. 258). <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/912991/adb-brief-248-graduation-approach-livelihood-program.pdf>
- [5]. Assistance.PH. (n.d.). DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP) or Kabuhayan Program. <https://assistance.ph/dole-integrated-livelihood-program-dilp/>

- [6]. Ballesteros, M. M., Orbeta, A. C., Corpus, J. P. P., & Ancheta, J. A. (2017). Assessment of livelihood success and implementation issues on the Sustainable Livelihood Program of the DSWD (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2017-54). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. [http://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1754\\_rev.pdf](http://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1754_rev.pdf)
- [7]. Bautista, M., & Lim, R. (2024). Intergenerational impacts of livelihood programs on educational outcomes in the Philippines. *Journal of Development Economics*, 58(3), 234–256.
- [8]. Bossuroy, T., Goldstein, M., Premand, P., Vaillant, J., Karimou, B., Karlan, D., Kazianga, H., Pariente, W., Thomas, C., Udry, C., & Wright, K. (2022, May 4). Yes we can! Unbundling poverty graduation programs for cost-effective impact. *World Bank Development Impact Blog*. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/en/impacetevaluations/yes-we-can-unbundling-poverty-graduation-programs-cost-effective-impact>
- [9]. Castro, L., & Mendoza, R. (2023). Social capital formation in community-based livelihood programs: Evidence from DOLE-DILP implementation sites. *Philippine Journal of Development*, 46(2), 112–135.
- [10]. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). <https://study.sagepub.com/creswell3e>
- [11]. Department for International Development. (1999). Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets. DFID.
- [12]. Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE). (2017). Department Order No. 173-17: Revised Guidelines in the Implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood and Emergency Employment Programs (DILEEP). <https://www.dole9portal.com/qms/references/QP-OO3-25/DO%20173-17.pdf>
- [13]. Department of Labor and Employment. (2023). Department Order No. 173-23: Revised Guidelines on the Implementation of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program.
- [14]. Davis III, R. D. (2025). Evaluating the effectiveness of DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP) to group beneficiaries of livelihood funds from 2020 to 2021 in Cebu Province. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(3), 1343–1359. <https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=26231>
- [15]. Dizon, R., Santos, E., & Villanueva, M. (2023). Capital requirements for sustainable microenterprises: Evidence-based assessment of livelihood grant adequacy in the Philippines. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 42(3), 182–197.
- [16]. DOLE Occidental Mindoro. (2024, October 27). A story of hardwork towards a sustainable livelihood wins DOLE MIMAROPA's Best DOLEkabuhayan Story Award. <https://www.facebook.com/doleoksi/posts/a-story-of-hardwork-towards-a-sustainable-livelihood-wins-dole-mimaropas-best-do/157635966766850/>
- [17]. Frechtling, J. A. (2007). Logic modeling methods in program evaluation. John Wiley & Sons.
- [18]. Institute for Labor Studies. (2014). 2014 Employment Publications. Department of Labor and Employment, Philippines. <https://ils.dole.gov.ph/employment/2014-employment>
- [19]. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2009). Social protection and climate change. ILO.
- [20]. International Labour Organization (ILO). (n.d.). Bringing Sustainable Livelihood Framework to Life: A Study on the Possible Determinants of Sustainability of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP). <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/Media.action?id=14868>
- [21]. International Labour Organization. (2015). Philippines: DOLE's Integrated Livelihood and Emergency Employment Program (DILEEP). <https://www.social-protection.org/gii/RessourcePDF.action?id=51497>
- [22]. International Labour Organization. (2023). Value chain integration for livelihood program sustainability in Southeast Asia. ILO.
- [23]. Junio, M. O. (2017). Evaluation of DOLE Integrated Livelihood and Emergency Employment Program (DILEEP) in the adopted community of the University of the Assumption. *Ad Meliora*, 2016–2017, 46–56. <https://rpo.ua.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Ad-Meliora-2016-2017-4.-DILEEP-46-56.pdf>
- [24]. Kellogg, W. K. (2004). Using logic models to bring together planning, evaluation, and action: Logic model development guide. W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
- [25]. Malapit, H., Quisumbing, A., & Santos, V. (2022). Impact assessment of the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program: Evidence from a quasi-experimental study. *Philippine Journal of Labor Studies*, 30(1), 1–25.
- [26]. Maranan, R. (2024). Mixed methods research in livelihood program evaluation. [*Publication details needed*]
- [27]. Mendoza, J., & Cruz, A. (2024). Early effects of revised DILP guidelines: A comparative regional analysis. *Philippine Review of Labor and Employment*, 12(1), 45–67.
- [28]. Philippine Information Agency (PIA). (2025, February 14). DOLE 'Kabuhayan' Program: Boosting productivity and empowering vulnerable sectors. <https://pia.gov.ph/dole-kabuhayan-program-boosting-productivity-and-empowering-vulnerable-sectors/>
- [29]. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2024). Cost-benefit analysis of government livelihood interventions (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2024-12). <https://pids.gov.ph>
- [30]. Reyes, A., & Galang, M. (2024). Post-pandemic transformation of livelihood programs in the Philippines: Resilience and adaptation strategies. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 52(2), 178–201.
- [31]. Ramos, M., & Santos, L. (2023). Gender dimensions of livelihood programs in the Philippines: Constraints and opportunities. *Gender and Development Studies*, 35(4), 289–312.

- [32]. San Jose, Occidental Mindoro. (2025, May 4). In *Wikipedia*.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/San\\_Jose,\\_Occidental\\_Mindoro](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/San_Jose,_Occidental_Mindoro)
- [33]. Soriano, E., Reyes, L., & Santos, M. (2023). The role of mentorship in livelihood program outcomes: An experimental study. *Philippine Development Review*, 41(4), 289–315.
- [34]. Sy-Gorembalem, D. F. (2024, January 18). DOLE helps parents of former child laborers put up bakery in Occidental Mindoro. *Philippine Information Agency*.  
<https://mirror.pia.gov.ph/news/2024/01/18/dole-helps-parents-of-former-child-laborers-put-up-bakery-in-occidental-mindoro>
- [35]. Sy-Gorembalem, D. F. (2024, March 14). DOLE awards ₱2.3M livelihood grant in Occidental Mindoro. *Philippine Information Agency*.  
<https://pia.gov.ph/dole-awards-%E2%82%B12-3m-livelihood-grant-in-occidental-mindoro/>
- [36]. Torres, R., Garcia, S., & Mendoza, L. (2024). Digital integration in modern livelihood programs: Comparative analysis of traditional and technology-enhanced implementations. *Technology and Development Quarterly*, 15(2), 87–109.
- [37]. Villanueva, P., & Cruz, J. (2023). Financial literacy and livelihood program success in the Philippine context. *Journal of Microfinance and Development*, 28(3), 156–178.
- [38]. Zhang, G., Zeller, N., Griffith, R., Metcalf, D., Williams, J., Shea, C., & Misulis, K. (2011). Using the Context, Input, Process, and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP) as a comprehensive framework to guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of service-learning programs. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 15(4), 57–83.