



## Research in Management and Humanities

DWIJMH VOL. 5 NO. 3 (2026) ISSN: 2980-4817

Available online at [www.dwijmh.org](http://www.dwijmh.org)

Journal homepage: <http://www.dwijmh.org>

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6884-3504>

# Assessing the Implementation and Impact of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte on the beneficiaries: A correlational analysis of 4Ps effectiveness

Mary Joan Ralleca Pasigui: Graduate School, University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City, Ilocos Sur, Philippines.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received June 11, 2026

Received in rev. form. July 20, 2026

Accepted: August 15, 2026

Published: September 10, 2026

**Keywords:** *Cash transfer program, Impact of implementation of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program, Local Government Support, Administrative Capability, Immediate benefits, quality of life.*

### ABSTRACT

This study assessed the impact of implementing the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte. Using the Input-Process-Output-Outcome (IPOO) model, the study examined four key variables: LGU support and administrative capacity (Input), program implementation level (Process), immediate implementation results (Output), and beneficiaries' quality of life (Outcome). A descriptive correlational design was employed, with data obtained from program participants and implementers using structured surveys and interviews. Quantitative data were analyzed using the mean, weighted mean, t-tests, and regression analysis, while qualitative responses were used to triangulate the quantitative findings. The study revealed that local governments are very highly supportive of the program, and implementers demonstrated high capability in program implementation. Outputs were consistently strong, and beneficiaries reported very great improvements in quality of life. Regression analysis showed that local government support did not significantly influence program implementation, whereas the administrative capability of implementers emerged as a significant predictor. Outputs significantly improved beneficiaries' quality of life, with governance credibility, benefit reliability, and coverage quality emerging as the strongest contributors. Challenges, however, persisted, ranging from post-program vulnerability, difficulties in sustaining education and health care, and social stigma as identified by program participants, to monitoring burdens, targeting errors, grievance-handling gaps, resource constraints, and administrative strain as identified by program implementers. The study proposed adopting the Integrated Livelihood, Governance, and Social Empowerment (ILGSE) Framework, which integrates the Sustainable Livelihood Program (SLP), digital monitoring systems, grievance mechanisms, expanded Family Development Session (FDS), and community-based initiatives. This is to promote inclusive and sustainable socio-economic development so that the 4Ps program in Ilocos Norte can move beyond short-term poverty relief into sustained resilience, empowerment, and intergenerational poverty reduction.

© 2026 by the authors. Published by Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities under the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

JEL Classification: M12

## Introduction

Poverty reduction remains one of the most pressing challenges in the Philippines, prompting the government to adopt innovative social protection strategies that invest in human capital. The Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), the

\* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6884-3504

country's flagship conditional cash transfer initiative, was designed to break the intergenerational cycle of poverty by improving access to education, health care, and family development opportunities. By requiring compliance with conditionalities such as school attendance, health check-ups, and participation in Family Development Sessions (FDS), the program seeks to enhance both the economic and social well-being of poor households.

The success of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) hinges not only on national policy and resources but also on the active engagement and support of local government units (LGUs). As crucial implementers of decentralization, LGUs ensure that frontline workers and beneficiaries receive adequate logistical and operational support. Studies have shown that LGU involvement in providing office space, transport, communication, and coordination mechanisms significantly enhances program delivery and accessibility (Garcia & Del Rosario, 2021). LGUs also play a vital role in implementing FDS by mobilizing resources, providing venues, and engaging facilitators. Beyond logistical support, LGUs contribute strategically by participating in Local Inter-Agency Committees (LIACs), grievance redress mechanisms, and advocacy campaigns that raise awareness and reduce stigma associated with being a 4Ps beneficiary (Orbeta & Paqueo, 2019).

Equally critical are the administrative capabilities of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) personnel, particularly Municipal and City Links, who serve as frontline implementers. Their responsibilities include case management, compliance verification, facilitation of family sessions, coordination with LGUs, and grievance handling. The effectiveness of these personnel, shaped by their training, access to resources, and inter-agency support, directly influences the quality and timeliness of program delivery (Dela Cruz, 2019). Administrative capability encompasses leadership, resource management, monitoring and evaluation, and stakeholder coordination. In large-scale programs such as Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), the ability of personnel to adapt, lead, and solve problems is especially vital in resource-constrained communities. Tolentino (2021) emphasizes that performance improves significantly when clear guidelines, adequate training, and support systems are in place.

At the national level, the DSWD Central Office provides structured policy guidance and oversight, cascading operational manuals and tools through regional and municipal offices. However, outcomes often differ depending on local context and capacity. In Ilocos Norte, the 4Ps program is implemented by DSWD field personnel working closely with the Local Government Unit and barangay functionaries. While some municipalities benefit from strong LGU engagement and efficient service delivery, others face challenges such as limited transportation allowances, inconsistent monitoring, or understaffed teams. These localized dynamics affect how smoothly program components, from compliance monitoring to cash payout facilitation, are carried out.

Since its inception, the 4ps program has brought tangible improvements in the lives of many poor Filipino families. Beneficiaries have reported increased school participation among children, better access to health services, and more stable access to food and daily necessities (Orbeta & Paqueo, 2019). Family Development Sessions have strengthened parental awareness, particularly among mothers, while psychological and social benefits include empowerment, reduced reliance on informal lending, and greater community participation. However, the extent of these improvements varies significantly depending on the quality of local implementation and convergence with other support programs (Garcia & Del Rosario, 2021).

Despite the growing body of literature on 4Ps, limited research has examined the relationships among LGU support, the administrative capability of DSWD personnel, and the overall impact of program implementation on beneficiaries' quality of life in a second-class province such as Ilocos Norte. Much of the existing research focuses narrowly on compliance rates or financial outcomes, neglecting the interplay of governance and administrative factors. This gap underscores the need for the present study, which aims to assess the impact of 4Ps implementing institutions on the level of program implementation and, ultimately, on beneficiaries' quality of life in Ilocos Norte. Specifically, it seeks to evaluate LGU support, institutional capability, program implementation, immediate outputs, and beneficiary outcomes, and to analyze the relationships among these dimensions.

This study is significant as it deepens understanding of how the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) is implemented in Ilocos Norte and its impact on beneficiaries' quality of life. By examining the administrative capacity of DSWD personnel,

the support of local government units, and the resulting outcomes for households, the research bridges the gap between policy design and actual program delivery.

## ***Literature review***

**Local Government Units (LGU) support.** The role of local government support has been consistently emphasized in the literature as a critical determinant of 4Ps success. LGU participation through financial and logistical support, ordinances, and monitoring strengthens compliance with conditionalities and enhances program credibility (Acupido, Dela Cruz, and Villanueva, 2020). At the same time, LGU-led strategies have been found to improve compliance monitoring and the efficiency of service delivery (Patalita, Sellar, and Tenorio, 2024). Thus, LGU support is essential to the implementation of the 4Ps, as decentralized governance enhances responsiveness and accountability (Aguinaldo & Garcia, 2021), and LGUs' integration of the program into local development plans demonstrates continued LGU support (Agustin & Reyes, 2022). Regional evidence from NEDA-Region I (2023) also noted that while 4Ps contributes to human development indicators, stronger LGU support is needed to maximize its impact.

Further theories presented in the study's literature underscore the importance of LGU support for successful program implementation. The World Bank's Social Protection Delivery Systems Framework (2024) and the UNICEF study's Social Protection Framework (2019) emphasize system efficiency and institutional collaboration, focusing on local government support and administrative capacity. Likewise, the concept of Collaborative Governance in Social Protection (Ahmad, 2025) explains that implementation practices and partnerships influence compliance and service delivery, thereby enhancing accountability. The Multidimensional Poverty and Quality of Life Assessment (Alkire et al., 2019) also provides a comprehensive evaluative framework that goes beyond income-based measures to assess improvements in education, health, and social participation among 4Ps households.

**Administrative capability of program implementers.** In terms of administrative capability, the literature consistently shows this factor as central to the success of 4Ps implementation, and these studies underscore the importance of institutional strength and governance. What is required are strong leadership and governance structures that would provide direction and improve efficiency and accountability (Abrego, 2025). Likewise, the literature shows that clear governance structures within implementing institutions, with leadership roles well-defined and decision-making processes transparent, enable program implementers to coordinate more effectively within the LGU and with national agencies (Lopez, 2023), underscoring that governance structures serve as the backbone of program credibility and efficiency.

Administrative capability also underscores the importance of efficient resource allocation in determining program success (Ramos & Agustin, 2020). Their research highlighted that institutions with strong budgeting practices and equitable distribution of funds were better able to sustain program operations. Conversely, weak resource management led to delays in cash transfers and inadequate support for compliance monitoring. This underscores the importance of financial discipline and prioritization in poverty alleviation programs.

**Program implementation:** The literature shows that this is both a strength and a challenge in 4Ps implementation. Program implementation covers the areas of targeting/identification of eligible households, compliance monitoring, service delivery efficiency, and accountability and transparency mechanisms. The literature shows that targeting systems are generally effective but prone to errors, including inclusion-exclusion errors (Albert, Orbeta, and Paqueo, 2020). Compliance monitoring also yielded positive education and health outcomes, as shown in the studies of Abrigo, Alicante, and Melad (2023), and consistent monitoring not only improves compliance among targeted children but also creates spillover benefits for non-monitored siblings (Perez & Mendoza, 2018). Accountability mechanisms exist, but require improved responsiveness. Insofar as service delivery efficiency is concerned, the Independent Evaluation Group (2020) reported that strong delivery systems are essential in ensuring timely cash transfers and minimizing leakages. Their assessment of the Philippine 4Ps highlighted that the program's efficiency depended on well-functioning payment systems, clear communication channels, and streamlined administrative processes.

**Immediate benefits of the program.** Regarding the program's immediate benefits, the literature shows they are visible and measurable. Beneficiary coverage is broad (Reyes, Tabuga, and Mina, 2019) but requires improvement to reach the poorest households. Adherence to conditionalities has yielded positive impacts in education, health, and family development (De Vera, 2021), and benefit receipt is generally reliable. However, occasional delays highlight logistical challenges (Melad, Araos, and Orbeta, 2023). Credibility of governance depends on transparency and LGU collaboration, which are crucial for maintaining trust and ensuring program sustainability (World Bank, 2020). Together, these outputs demonstrate that the 4Ps deliver tangible short-term benefits while pointing to areas for refinement.

**Quality of life of 4Ps beneficiaries.** Regarding the quality of life of 4Ps beneficiaries, the literature shows that outcome studies confirm that 4Ps has tangible impacts but also limitations. Conditional cash transfers, as undertaken in the 4Ps program, for example, significantly improved school attendance and health outcomes when compliance monitoring was strong (Abrigo & Paqueo, 2017). Household resilience against shocks is improved (Aguring, Dela Peña, and Ramos, 2025), but requires livelihood programs for sustainability. The literature also shows that in terms of economic well-being, the 4Ps program contributed to modest improvements in household consumption and poverty reduction (Dizon & Reyes, 2020) and that beneficiaries reported greater financial stability, particularly in meeting basic needs such as food and school expenses (Medina, 2025). While cash transfers alleviated short-term financial challenges, they did not always translate into long-term economic independence. This suggests that while the program improves immediate economic well-being, complementary livelihood initiatives are needed to sustain gains.

In terms of social well-being, the literature shows that interventions such as family development sessions (FDS) improve family practices, parenting skills, and community participation (Dy, 2022). These sessions fostered stronger social ties and enhanced beneficiaries' awareness of civic responsibilities. Thus, the program contributes to social cohesion and empowerment beyond financial assistance.

The literature also shows findings that confirm the program contributes to building human capital, a key driver of poverty reduction, as in the study of Villanueva, Ulep, and Agcaoili (2024), where it is noted that children from beneficiary households were more likely to stay in school and pursue higher education, which in turn improved their future employment prospects. The positive effect observed in this study indicates that conditionalities in health and education directly support human development.

While overall satisfaction is noted as a result of the 4Ps implementation, studies also show that concerns about dependency and sustainability remain apparent (De Jesus & Villanueva, 2023) and that conditional cash transfers must balance entitlement with agency to avoid fostering reliance (Dodd, 2024).

## ***Statement of the problem***

This study aimed to assess the impact of implementing the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte, focusing on the role of implementing institutions in shaping the level of program execution and, ultimately, the quality of life of 4Ps beneficiaries. Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the level of Local Government Unit (LGU) support to the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in terms of:
  - a. Financial/logistical support;
  - b. Policy and ordinance backing;
  - c. Technical assistance and training; and
  - d. Monitoring and evaluation support?
2. What is the level of administrative capability of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implementing institutions of Ilocos Norte in terms of:
  - a. Leadership and governance structures;
  - b. Resource management;

- c. Technical and operational system;
  - d. Stakeholders' coordination; and
  - e. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms;
  - f. Capacity building and training?
3. What is the level of implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte as perceived by the 4Ps graduates, implementers, and the C/MSWDO in terms of:
    - a. Targeting/identification of eligible households;
    - b. Compliance monitoring (school, health, FDS);
    - c. Service delivery efficiency; and
    - d. accountability and transparency mechanisms?
  4. What is the level of immediate benefits (outputs) of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implementation in Ilocos Norte, as perceived by 4Ps beneficiaries and implementers, in terms of:
    - a. Beneficiary coverage;
    - b. Conditionality adherence;
    - c. Benefit receipt reliability; and
    - d. Program credibility
  5. What is the level of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) beneficiaries' quality of life as measured by the following outcome indicators:
    - a. Economic well-being;
    - b. Social well-being
    - c. Human development; and
    - d. Overall satisfaction?
  6. Is the level of Implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) significantly influenced by the following:
    - a. Level of government support; and
    - b. Level of administrative capability
  7. Is the level of Immediate Result (output) of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) significantly influenced by the level of Implementation?
  8. Is the Quality of Life of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) beneficiaries significantly influenced by the immediate result (output)?
  9. What are the challenges and problems encountered by the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) graduates and implementers?
  10. What proposed program can improve the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte?

## ***Methodology***

**Research Design.** This study employed a quantitative–descriptive correlational research design. A quantitative-descriptive correlational design is a non-experimental research approach that aims to both describe the status of variables and examine the relationships among them without manipulating any variables. This design is particularly useful when the researcher seeks to measure and analyze naturally occurring phenomena, like the levels of administrative capability, local government support, program implementation, immediate results of implementation, and the quality of life among beneficiaries, and to determine how these variables are associated (Putri, L. M. R., & Hermina, D., 2025). In this study, the design is used to assess the impact of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) on its beneficiaries in Ilocos Norte. Data were collected through

structured questionnaires administered to respondents, enabling quantification of their perceptions and experiences of the program. The researcher also conducted interviews with selected 4Ps beneficiaries to capture their lived experiences and perspectives and utilized relevant documents as part of the triangulation process, particularly regarding beneficiaries' quality of life. Interviews and documentary analysis provided supplementary evidence that corroborated survey responses, strengthening the credibility of the findings and ensuring a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem.

**Population and sample.** The study population consisted of 5,563 identified 4Ps graduates from 2022 to 2025 across the municipalities of Ilocos Norte. From this population, 407 respondents participated in the study. These included 373 4Ps graduate beneficiaries, 20 4Ps program implementers, and 14 C/MSWDO representatives.

**Data gathering instruments.** In this study, a self-constructed questionnaire served as the primary data-gathering instrument developed using the Likert scaling technique introduced by Nyutu, E.N., Cobern, W.W., & Pleasants, B.A.S. (2021), which is widely recognized for measuring attitudes and perceptions. To ensure its appropriateness, validity, and accuracy, the instrument underwent content validation by experts in public administration and social welfare. The self-constructed questionnaire was adapted from existing related instruments and the Manual of Operations (Appendix I) to better suit the study's objectives and context. The enhanced questionnaire was evaluated by five (5) expert validators: the DSWD Regional Director through the Research Bureau and 4Ps Regional Head; the Provincial Social Welfare and Development Officer, 4Ps Provincial Link/head, and a retired professor in Public Administration, who assessed each item based on relevance, clarity, and alignment with the research variables using a 5-point rating scale.

The questionnaire consisted of five main parts, structured around the research variables: local government support, administrative capability, level of program implementation, immediate results (program outputs), and beneficiaries' quality of life. Responses were analyzed using the mean and weighted mean, and were interpreted according to the following descriptive ranges:

| Ranges of Means | Responses in the Questionnaire | Descriptive Interpretation |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 4.21 – 5.00     | Strongly Agree                 | Very High                  |
| 3.41 – 4.20     | Agree                          | High                       |
| 2.61 – 3.40     | Neither Agree nor Disagree     | Average                    |
| 1.81 – 2.60     | Disagree                       | Low                        |
| 1.00 – 1.80     | Strongly Disagree              | Very Low                   |

The regression analyses were used to determine the influences of local government unit (LGU) support and program implementers' administrative capability on the level of implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps); determine the influence of the program implementation (process) on the level of immediate results (output); and determine the influence of the immediate results (output) on the quality of life of 4Ps beneficiaries(outcome).

Stepwise regression identified the implementation sub-indicators that significantly affected the quality of life of 4Ps beneficiaries, while interviews triangulated the quantitative findings. The 0.05 significance level was used to interpret the findings.

**Data gathering procedure.** The data gathering was conducted after the approval of the research proposal by the Dissertation Committee under the Graduate Studies of the College of Public Administration of the University of Northern Philippines, and after clearance was obtained from the Office of the Governor of the Provincial Government of Ilocos Norte (PGIN) and the Department of Social Welfare and Development Field Office I, and the Municipal mayors of the Target area.

### **Statistical treatment of data**

The data gathered in this study were analyzed and interpreted using the following statistical tools:

1. **Mean.** The mean was used to assess local government support, administrative capability, implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), immediate benefits, and beneficiaries' quality-of-life outcomes.

2. **Multiple Linear Regression Analysis.** Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the effects of local government support, administrative capability, implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), the extent of immediate benefits, and beneficiaries' quality-of-life outcomes in Ilocos Norte.

### ***Ethical consideration***

**Conflict of interest.** There was no conflict of interest in the conduct of the research. The study's results benefited all beneficiaries of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) and its implementers.

**Privacy and confidentiality.** The data from each respondent were treated with the utmost confidentiality.

**Informed consent.** Before the respondents answered the questionnaire, they were asked to complete a portion indicating their willingness to participate in the study.

**Vulnerability.** The respondents, who were 4Ps beneficiaries, implementers, and C/MSWDO staff in Ilocos Norte, were informed about their participation in the study.

**Recruitment.** The 4Ps beneficiaries, implementers, and C/MSWDO staff in Ilocos Norte were invited to participate in the study. However, voluntary participation was solicited.

**Benefits.** The study's output was considered an essential contribution to the 4Ps beneficiaries, implementers, and C/MSWDO staff in Ilocos Norte.

**Compensation.** No compensation was given to the respondents for answering the questionnaires.

## ***Data presentation and analysis***

This chapter presented, analyzed, and interpreted the data gathered from the respondents in the municipalities of Ilocos Norte. The findings were presented in both textual and tabular form.

**SOP 1. What is the level of Local Government Unit (LGU) support to the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in terms of:**

- a. Financial/logistical support;
- b. Policy and ordinance backing;
- c. Technical assistance and training; and
- d. Monitoring and evaluation support?

Table 1 shows that Local Government Units (LGUs) provided high levels of support to the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) across all dimensions: financial/logistical, policy backing, technical assistance, and monitoring. With an overall mean of **M = 4.69 (High)**, both graduates and implementers perceive LGU involvement as strong and consistent. This suggests that LGUs are not only complying with national mandates but are actively institutionalizing 4Ps support mechanisms. Studies such as Reyes & Tabuga (2012) and Chaudhury et al. (2013) emphasize that strong participation by Local Government Units (LGUs) enhances program sustainability, ensuring that conditional cash transfers translate into long-term poverty reduction and social protection outcomes.

The findings revealed that Technical Assistance and Training emerged as the highest-rated dimension of LGU support, with an overall mean of (M=4.71) and an even stronger perception among implementers (M=4.82). This underscores the priority of the Local Government Units (LGUs) in capacity building, ensuring that program implementers and beneficiaries are equipped with the necessary skills for effective program management and livelihood sustainability. As UNICEF (2016) notes, technical training not only strengthens program delivery but also empowers families to maximize the benefits of social protection initiatives, thereby enhancing long-term resilience.

**Table 1: Level of Local Government Units (LGU) support to the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in terms of financial/logistical support, policy and ordinance, backing technical assistance and training, and monitoring and evaluation support**

| LGU support to the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) | 4P's Graduates |           | Implementers/C/MSWDO |           | Overall Mean |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
|                                                              | Mean           | DR        | Mean                 | DR        | Mean         | DR        |
| Financial and logistical support                             | 4.65           | SA        | 4.78                 | SA        | 4.66         | SA        |
| Policy and ordinance backing                                 | 4.66           | SA        | 4.72                 | SA        | 4.67         | SA        |
| Technical assistance and training                            | 4.7            | SA        | 4.82                 | SA        | 4.71         | SA        |
| Monitoring and evaluation support                            | 4.71           | SA        | 4.76                 | SA        | 4.71         | SA        |
| <b>As a whole</b>                                            | <b>4.73</b>    | <b>VH</b> | <b>4.77</b>          | <b>VH</b> | <b>4.69</b>  | <b>VH</b> |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

*Legend:*

| Ranges of Means | Responses in the Questionnaire | Descriptive Interpretation |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 4.21 – 5.00     | Strongly Agree                 | Very High                  |
| 3.41 – 4.20     | Agree                          | High                       |
| 2.61 – 3.40     | Neither Agree nor Disagree     | Average                    |
| 1.81 – 2.60     | Disagree                       | Low                        |
| 1.00 – 1.80     | Strongly Disagree              | Very Low                   |

Conversely, Financial and Logistical Support registered the lowest overall mean ( $M = 4.66$ ), though still within the “High” category. This slightly lower rating suggests that while LGUs are committed, resource constraints at the local level may limit the extent of financial backing. Manasan (2017) highlights that Local Government Units (LGUs) are often challenged by budgetary limitations, which can affect logistical support despite strong policy commitment. The implication is that Local Government Units (LGUs) strategically prioritize training and monitoring, areas that guarantee program sustainability. In contrast, financial sustainability remains a challenge requiring stronger coordination and collaboration between national and local governments.

The global literature on conditional cash transfer programs (Fiszbein & Schady, 2009; World Bank, 2018) shows that LGU (local government unit) involvement is critical to effective implementation. In Latin America, for instance, municipal governments play a central role in monitoring compliance and providing complementary services. Compared to these contexts, Philippine LGUs demonstrate similar strengths in technical assistance and monitoring but face parallel challenges in financial allocation. Integrating these findings, the Philippine experience reflects a balance: strong institutional and human resource support yet constrained by fiscal realities. This contrast underscores the need for multi-level governance, national funding complemented by local innovation, to sustain 4Ps outcomes.

**SOP 2. What is the level of administrative capability of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implementing institutions of Ilocos Norte in terms of:**

- a. Leadership and governance structures;**
- b. Resource management;**
- c. Technical and operational system;**
- d. Stakeholders coordination;**
- e. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms; and**
- f. Capacity building and training**

Table 2 shows that the administrative capability of 4Ps implementing institutions in Ilocos Norte is consistently rated Very High across all dimensions, with an overall mean = 4.72. This indicates that the institutions are well-organized, resourceful, and effective in delivering program services. Strong leadership, financial management, technical systems, stakeholder coordination, and monitoring mechanisms reflect a holistic administrative structure that supports program sustainability. Studies such as Acosta & Velarde (2015) and Chaudhury et al. (2013) emphasize that administrative strength is critical to

ensuring that conditional cash transfer programs achieve their intended outcomes, particularly regarding accountability and efficiency.

**Table 2: Level of administrative capability of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implementing institutions of Ilocos Norte**

| Administrative capability of 4Ps implementing institutions of Ilocos Norte | 4P's Graduates |           | Implementers/C/MSWDO |           | Overall Mean |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
|                                                                            | Mean           | DR        | Mean                 | DR        | Mean         | DR        |
| Leadership and governance/organizational structure                         | 4.66           | SA        | 4.78                 | SA        | 4.67         | SA        |
| Resource/financial management                                              | 4.69           | SA        | 4.78                 | SA        | 4.7          | SA        |
| Technical and operational systems                                          | 4.73           | SA        | 4.68                 | SA        | 4.73         | SA        |
| Stakeholders coordination                                                  | 4.75           | SA        | 4.75                 | SA        | 4.75         | SA        |
| Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms                                       | 4.74           | SA        | 4.71                 | SA        | 4.74         | SA        |
| Capability building and training                                           | 4.73           | SA        | 4.75                 | SA        | 4.74         | SA        |
| <b>As a whole</b>                                                          | <b>4.72</b>    | <b>VH</b> | <b>4.75</b>          | <b>VH</b> | <b>4.72</b>  | <b>VH</b> |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

Among the dimensions, the highest rating was recorded in *Stakeholders Coordination* (Overall Mean = 4.75), highlighting the importance of collaborative governance and multi-sectoral partnerships in program implementation. This suggests that institutions actively engage with LGUs, NGOs, and community stakeholders to ensure smooth delivery and monitoring of services. UNICEF (2016) underscores that stakeholder collaboration enhances program credibility and fosters community ownership. On the other hand, the lowest rating was observed in *Leadership and Governance/Organizational Structure* (Overall Mean = 4.67). This slightly lower score may reflect challenges in organizational alignment or leadership transitions. Manasan (2017) notes that governance structures at the local level can sometimes be affected by political dynamics, which may influence consistency in program administration. The implication is that while coordination and technical systems are strong, leadership structures require continuous strengthening to maintain stability and responsiveness.

Related literature further supported these findings. Fiszbein & Schady (2009) argue that administrative capacity is a cornerstone of successful social protection programs, as it ensures compliance, transparency, and effective resource allocation. In contrast, Balisacan (2018) cautions that uneven administrative capacity across regions can lead to disparities in program outcomes. Integrating these perspectives, the Ilocos Norte case demonstrates a robust administrative framework, particularly in stakeholder coordination and monitoring, but also highlights the need for ongoing investment in leadership development and organizational resilience. This balance reflects the broader Theory of Change in social protection, where strong administrative systems, combined with collaborative governance, drive sustainable poverty reduction and empowerment among beneficiaries.

**SOP 3. What is the level of implementation of the 4Ps program in Ilocos Norte as perceived by the 4Ps Graduates, implementers, and the C/MSWDO in terms of:**

- a. Targeting/identification of eligible households;**
- b. Compliance monitoring (school, health, FDS);**
- c. Service delivery efficiency; and**
- Accountability and transparency mechanisms?**

Table 3 shows that the implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte was consistently rated *Very High* across all dimensions, with an overall mean of 4.76. This indicates that both graduates and implementers perceived the program as effectively carried out, particularly in targeting, compliance monitoring, service delivery, and accountability. The result implied that program mechanisms were functioning well, ensuring that eligible households were reached and that compliance with conditions was closely monitored. To sustain this strong performance, program implementers were encouraged to continue refining targeting systems, strengthening monitoring protocols, and enhancing

service delivery efficiency. This was especially important given the common challenges reported by graduates, such as sudden loss of financial support, difficulty sustaining children's education, and limited livelihood opportunities after program exit.

Among the dimensions, the highest rating was recorded for Compliance Monitoring (Overall Mean = 4.79), underscoring the importance of strict oversight to ensure that beneficiaries met program conditions. This reflected UNICEF's (2016) findings that compliance monitoring strengthened accountability and ensured that cash transfers were linked to desired behavioral outcomes, such as school attendance and health check-ups.

**Table 3: Level of implementation of the 4Ps program in Ilocos Norte as perceived by the 4Ps graduates, implementers, and the C/MSWDO**

| Implementation of the 4Ps program in Ilocos Norte | 4P's Graduates |    | Implementers/C/MSWDO |    | Overall Mean |    |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|----|----------------------|----|--------------|----|
|                                                   | Mean           | DR | Mean                 |    | Mean         | DR |
| Targeting eligible households                     | 4.72           | A  | 4.64                 | O  | 4.71         | VH |
| Compliance monitoring                             | 4.79           | A  | 4.74                 | VH | 4.79         | VH |
| Service delivery efficiency                       | 4.77           | A  | 4.72                 | VH | 4.76         | VH |
| Accountability and transparency                   | 4.78           | A  | 4.65                 | O  | 4.77         | VH |
| As a Whole                                        | 4.77           | VH | 4.69                 | H  | 4.76         | VH |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

Conversely, the lowest rating was observed in Targeting Eligible Households (Overall Mean = 4.71). Although still *Very High*, this slightly lower score suggested challenges in accurately identifying and reaching all qualified families. Manasan (2017) noted that targeting errors, both inclusion and exclusion, were common in social protection programs, which could affect equity and efficiency.

These findings were consistent with the literature emphasizing that successful implementation required both precision in targeting and rigor in monitoring. Acosta & Velarde (2015) and Chaudhury et al. (2013) highlighted that effective implementation was crucial for conditional cash transfer programs to achieve their intended outcomes, particularly in improving education and health indicators among poor households. Fiszbein & Schady (2009) argued that the credibility of CCT programs rested on their ability to reach the right beneficiaries while maintaining transparency and accountability. In contrast, Balisacan (2018) cautioned that weaknesses in targeting could undermine program legitimacy, even when other aspects of implementation were strong. This explained the relatively lower rating in targeting, as communities continued to observe discrepancies in beneficiary inclusion across barangays.

**SOP 4. What is the level of immediate benefits (outputs) of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implementation in Ilocos Norte, as perceived by 4Ps graduates, implementers, and C/MSWDO in terms of:**

- a. Quality of beneficiary coverage;
- b. Adherence to conditionality;
- c. Reliability of benefit receipt; and
- d. Credibility of program governance?

Table 4 shows that the immediate outputs of the 4Ps implementation in Ilocos Norte are consistently rated Very High, with an overall mean of (M= 4.78). This indicates that both graduates and implementers perceive the program as highly effective at delivering its intended short-term results, particularly in coverage, adherence to conditionality, benefit receipt, and governance credibility. Such strong ratings imply that the program is functioning smoothly and producing tangible outcomes that reinforce its legitimacy and effectiveness. Studies such as Acosta & Velarde (2015) and Chaudhury et al. (2013) emphasize that immediate outputs, such as reliable benefit delivery and compliance with conditions, are critical to building trust among beneficiaries and ensuring program sustainability.

**Table 4: Summary of the level of immediate results (Outputs) of the 4Ps implementation in Ilocos Norte, as perceived by 4P's graduates, implementers, and C/MSWDO**

| Outputs of the 4Ps implementation in Ilocos Norte | 4P's Graduates |           | Implementers/C/MSWDO |           | Overall Mean |           |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
|                                                   | Mean           | DR        | Mean                 | DR        | Mean         | DR        |
| <b>Quality of Beneficiary Coverage</b>            | 4.71           | SA        | 4.73                 | SA        | 4.71         | SA        |
| <b>Adherence to Conditionality</b>                | 4.79           | SA        | 4.67                 | A         | 4.78         | SA        |
| <b>Reliability of Benefit Receipt</b>             | 4.80           | SA        | 4.76                 | VH        | 4.80         | SA        |
| <b>Credibility of Program Governance</b>          | 4.77           | SA        | 4.83                 | VH        | 4.78         | SA        |
| <b>As a Whole</b>                                 | <b>4.77</b>    | <b>VH</b> | <b>4.83</b>          | <b>VH</b> | <b>4.78</b>  | <b>VH</b> |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

Among the dimensions, the highest rating was recorded in *Reliability of Benefit Receipt* (Overall Mean = 4.80), reflecting the consistency and timeliness of cash transfers. This finding supports UNICEF (2016), which highlights that predictable benefit delivery is essential for households to plan expenditures and meet conditional requirements. On the other hand, the lowest rating was observed in *Quality of Beneficiary Coverage* (Overall Mean = 4.71). Although still “Very High,” this slightly lower score suggests challenges in ensuring that all eligible households are adequately covered. Manasan (2017) notes that targeting and coverage issues, such as inclusion and exclusion errors, remain common in social protection programs, which can affect equity. The implication is that while benefit delivery and governance are strong, continuous refinement in coverage mechanisms is needed to maximize inclusivity.

Related literature further reinforces these findings. Fiszbein & Schady (2009) argue that the credibility of conditional cash transfer programs rests on their ability to deliver benefits reliably while maintaining transparency and accountability. In contrast, Balisacan (2018) cautions that weaknesses in coverage can undermine program legitimacy, even when other aspects of implementation are strong. Integrating these perspectives, the Ilocos Norte case demonstrates that the 4Ps program is producing immediate, reliable outputs, particularly in benefit receipt and governance credibility, while highlighting the need for ongoing improvements in coverage to ensure that the most vulnerable households are consistently reached. This balance reflects the broader Theory of Change in social protection, where reliable outputs and transparent governance drive trust, compliance, and long-term poverty reduction.

**SOP 5. What is the level of the beneficiaries’ quality of life as measured by the following outcome indicators:**

- a. Economic well-being;**
- b. Social well-being;**
- c. Human development;**
- d. Overall satisfaction?**

The Level of Beneficiaries’ Quality of life under the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte, as measured, is shown in Table 5, where the result generated an overall mean of (M=4.79), interpreted as *Very High*. This indicates that both graduates and implementers perceived significant improvements in economic well-being, social well-being, human development, and overall life satisfaction. The result implied that the program successfully contributed to enhancing multidimensional aspects of poverty reduction, aligning with the objectives of conditional cash transfer programs to improve not only income, but also education, health, and social participation. Triangulation of quantitative ratings, qualitative interviews, and implementers’ observations confirmed that the program’s holistic design addressed multiple dimensions of poverty. However, sustainability required stronger linkages with livelihood, education, and health initiatives.

Among the dimensions, the highest ratings were observed in Human Development (Overall Mean = 4.81) and Overall Life Satisfaction (Overall Mean = 4.80). These results suggested that beneficiaries experienced tangible improvements in education, health, and personal growth, which translated into greater life satisfaction.

Conversely, the lowest rating was recorded in Social Well-Being (Overall Mean = 4.78). Although still *Very High*, this

slightly lower score reflected challenges in community integration and social participation. Respondents from Laoag and Batac City noted social stigma after graduation, highlighting that while household welfare improved, broader social cohesion required reinforcement through community-based initiatives. This triangulation showed that while individual outcomes were strong, collective empowerment needed further support.

These findings were consistent with the literature emphasizing the multidimensional impacts of Conditional Cash Transfer (CCTs). Chaudhury et al. (2013) and Acosta & Velarde (2015) affirmed that well-implemented CCTs positively influenced household welfare and fostered resilience. Fiszbein & Schady (2009) argued that, beyond economic relief, CCTs were designed to enhance human capital, as evidenced by the strong ratings for human development. UNICEF (2016) emphasized that investments in education and health yielded intergenerational benefits, ensuring that children's outcomes improved alongside household stability.

**Table 5: Level of the beneficiaries' quality of life as measured in terms of economic well-being, social well-being, human development, and overall satisfaction**

| The beneficiaries' quality of life as measured | 4P's Graduates |    | Implementers/C/MSWDO |    | Overall Mean |    |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------|----|----------------------|----|--------------|----|
|                                                | Mean           | DR | Mean                 | DR | Mean         | DR |
| Economic-well being                            | 4.79           | SA | 4.75                 | SA | 4.78         | SA |
| Social well-being                              | 4.78           | SA | 4.73                 | SA | 4.78         | SA |
| Human development                              | 4.81           | SA | 4.82                 | SA | 4.81         | SA |
| Overall life satisfaction                      | 4.81           | SA | 4.78                 | SA | 4.80         | SA |
| As a whole                                     | 4.80           | VH | 4.77                 | VH | 4.79         | VH |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

However, Balisacan (2018) cautioned that improvements in individual welfare did not automatically translate into stronger social cohesion, while Manasan (2017) noted that targeting and community integration remained challenges. This explained the relatively lower ratings in social well-being, as broader structural and cultural factors influenced community participation and trust. Triangulation of literature, survey data, and interviews suggested that while the program excelled in household-level outcomes, community-level integration required complementary interventions.

In conclusion, the 4Ps program significantly uplifted beneficiaries' quality of life, particularly in human development and life satisfaction, while also highlighting the need to strengthen social well-being.

**SOP 6. Is the level of implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) significantly influenced by the following:**

- a. Level of government support; and
- b. Level of administrative capability

**Table 6: Regression analysis examining the influence of local government support and level of administrative capability on the level of implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte in terms of targeting/identification of eligible households, compliance monitoring, service delivery efficiency, and accountability and transparency mechanisms**

| Predictor                                                                                                               | Beta-value | t-value | p-value | Decision         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------|---------|------------------|
| <b>Local Government Unit (LGU) support to the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps)</b>                             |            |         |         |                  |
| Financial and logistical support                                                                                        | 0.039      | 0.906   | 0.365   | Do not reject H0 |
| Policy and ordinance backing                                                                                            | 0.030      | 0.634   | 0.527   | Do not reject H0 |
| Technical assistance and training                                                                                       | -0.055     | -1.141  | 0.254   | Do not reject H0 |
| Monitoring and evaluation support                                                                                       | 0.074      | 1.475   | 0.141   | Do not reject H0 |
| <b>Administrative capability of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) implementing institutions of Ilocos Norte</b> |            |         |         |                  |

|                                          |        |        |       |                  |
|------------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Leadership and governance/organizational | 0.084  | 1.739  | 0.083 | Do not reject H0 |
| Resource financial management            | 0.156  | 2.779  | 0.006 | <b>Reject Ho</b> |
| Technical and operational systems        | 0.259  | 4.550  | 0.000 | <b>Reject Ho</b> |
| Stakeholders coordination                | 0.127  | 2.403  | 0.017 | <b>Reject Ho</b> |
| Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms     | -0.033 | -0.531 | 0.596 | Do not reject H0 |
| Capability building and training         | 0.275  | 4.908  | 0.000 | <b>Reject Ho</b> |

**Legend:** \* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

R= 0.827

R<sup>2</sup>= 0.684

Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>= 0.676

F-value=85.629

p-value=0.000

When viewed as a whole, the regression analysis revealed that local government unit (LGU) support variables such as financial and logistical support, policy and ordinance backing, technical assistance and training, and monitoring and evaluation support did not significantly influence the implementation of the 4Ps in Ilocos Norte. Similarly, under administrative capability, leadership and governance/organizational, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, no significant effect was observed. These results suggest that while LGUs and leadership structures provide support, their contributions may not directly translate into measurable program outcomes.

Santos and Cruz (2020) emphasized that LGU monitoring and evaluation practices are vital to poverty reduction programs. However, the insignificance of these variables here implies that LGU roles may be indirect or insufficiently captured by quantitative measures. The implication is that LGU support mechanisms and leadership functions need to be re-modeled and better integrated into program delivery to ensure their contributions are more impactful.

The regression model demonstrated strong explanatory power, with R = 0.827, R<sup>2</sup> = 0.684, Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.676, F-value = 85.629, and p-value = 0.000, indicating that nearly 68% of the variance in program implementation is explained by the model's predictors. Guided by the Theory of Change framework (Stein & Valters, 2017; Taplin & Clark, 2021), the findings suggest that strengthening administrative capability, particularly financial management, technical systems, stakeholder coordination, and training, should be the primary focus of policy refinements. Suggestions include prioritizing capacity building for program implementers and beneficiaries, enhancing technical and operational systems to streamline processes, and institutionalizing stakeholder coordination. While LGU support and leadership roles remain valuable, their indirect contributions may not be fully captured by quantitative measures. Thus, a dual approach in strengthening institutional capacity and refining LGU involvement can ensure that both national and local structures contribute meaningfully to the long-term success of the 4Ps.

**SOP 7. Is the level of the immediate result (output) of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program significantly influenced by the level of implementation?**

**Table 7: The Level of implementation significantly influences the output of 4Ps implementation in terms of quality of beneficiary coverage, adherence to conditionality, reliability of benefit receipt, and credibility of program governance**

| Level of 4Ps Implementation     | Beta-value | t-value | p-value | Decision         |
|---------------------------------|------------|---------|---------|------------------|
| Targeting eligible household    | 0.279      | 5.926   | 0.000   | <b>Reject Ho</b> |
| Compliance monitoring           | 0.168      | 3.655   | 0.000   | <b>Reject Ho</b> |
| Service delivery efficiency     | 0.200      | 3.475   | 0.001   | <b>Reject Ho</b> |
| Accountability and transparency | 0.244      | 4.345   | 0.000   | <b>Reject Ho</b> |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

**Legend:** \* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

R=0.789

R<sup>2</sup>=0.623

Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>=0.620

When viewed as a whole, the regression analysis revealed that all four variables significantly influenced the outputs of the 4Ps: targeting eligible households, compliance monitoring, service delivery efficiency, and accountability and transparency. All were significant at the 0.05 level of probability, with targeting emerging as the strongest predictor. This suggests that the overall effectiveness of the 4Ps depends on the combined strength of accurate targeting, consistent monitoring, efficient service delivery, and transparent accountability mechanisms.

The regression model demonstrated strong explanatory power, with  $R = 0.789$ ,  $R^2 = 0.623$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.620$ , F-value = 166.277, and p-value = 0.000, indicating that the model's predictors explain more than 62% of the variance in program outputs. This confirms the robustness of the results and highlights the importance of integrating all four dimensions of implementation.

These findings are consistent with several studies; for example, Dizon (2022) emphasized that proper targeting directly shapes household economic behavior and quality of life in rural communities. Lagman (2020) identified compliance monitoring as a key indicator of effective implementation of conditional cash transfers. Lopez (2023) highlighted that service delivery efficiency enhances beneficiary satisfaction and program credibility. Domingo & Anicete (2021) stressed that accountability mechanisms strengthen trust in local implementation. Fernandez & Olfindo (2018) underscored the importance of targeting and delivery systems in maximizing program impact. Guillermo (2024) and Faúndez & Pino (2022) argued from a Theory of Change perspective that transparency and accountability are transformative elements that sustain long-term program credibility.

**SOP 8. Is the Quality of Life (outcome) of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program's (4Ps) beneficiaries significantly influenced by the Immediate results (output)?**

**Table 8: Regression analysis of the influence of 4Ps implementation outputs on the quality of life of 4Ps beneficiaries in Ilocos Norte in terms of economic well-being, social well-being, human well-being, and overall satisfaction**

| Level of immediate benefits       | Beta-value | t-value | p-value | Decision         |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------|---------|------------------|
| Quality of beneficiary coverage   | 0.154      | 3.068*  | 0.002   | <b>Reject Ho</b> |
| Adherence to conditionality       | 0.064      | 1.290   | 0.198   | Do not reject H0 |
| Reliability of benefit receipt    | 0.318      | 5.911*  | 0.000   | <b>Reject Ho</b> |
| Credibility of program governance | 0.372      | 7.310*  | 0.000   | <b>Reject Ho</b> |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

**Legend:** \* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

$R=0.836$

$R^2=0.700$

Adjusted  $R^2=0.697$

F-value=234.200

p-value=0.000

Regression analysis in Table 8 revealed that three variables significantly influenced the quality of life of 4Ps beneficiaries in Ilocos Norte: quality of beneficiary coverage ( $\beta = 0.154$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ), reliability of benefit receipt ( $\beta = 0.318$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), and credibility of program governance ( $\beta = 0.372$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). With governance credibility emerging as the strongest predictor, these results imply that transparent and trustworthy governance, linked with reliable benefit delivery and inclusive coverage, is pivotal to improving household well-being. This underscores the importance of reinforcing program governance and delivery systems to sustain transformative impacts.

In contrast, adherence to conditionality ( $\beta = 0.064$ ,  $p = 0.198$ ) did not significantly influence quality of life. This suggests that while compliance with requirements such as school attendance and health check-ups remains part of the program's

design, it may not directly translate into measurable improvements in household welfare. The implication is that conditionalities may need to be re-examined or redesigned to better align with the realities of poor households, ensuring they contribute more meaningfully to long-term well-being rather than serving as mere procedural requirements.

These findings are consistent with several studies. Fernandez & Olfindo (2018) emphasized that accurate targeting and coverage maximize program impact, while Orbeta & Paqueo (2016) found that reliable benefit receipt stabilizes household consumption and reduces vulnerability. Domingo & Manejar (2020) highlighted that governance credibility and transparency are vital for sustaining program outcomes, and Perez & Mendoza (2018) showed that program credibility directly influences beneficiary satisfaction and perceptions of improved well-being. Melad (2024) further underscored that grievance redress mechanisms strengthen trust in the program, while Manasan (2020) noted that conditionalities often face implementation challenges, which may explain their limited statistical effect in this study.

**Problem 9. What are the challenges and problems encountered by the 4Ps graduates and implementers?**

**Table 9: Challenges and problems encountered by 4Ps graduates and implementers/C/MSWDO**

| Theme                                       | Graduates (N=373)                                                                                                                                                          | Implementers (N=20)                                                              | C/MSWDOs (N=14)                                                                 | Integration with Quantitative Result                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Post-graduation vulnerability</b>        | Reported difficulty sustaining children's college education and health care after exit; sudden loss of financial support left households fragile (Dingras, Banna, Vintar). | Observed that graduates lacked structured livelihood support after program exit. | Noted gaps in transition planning and limited linkage to livelihood programs.   | Regression results showed that <b>livelihood integration weakly predicted outcomes, highlighting the need for stronger post-graduation support or greater convergence of programs and services at the Local Level.</b> |
| <b>Social stigma and inclusion</b>          | Experienced exclusion from community activities after graduation (Laoag, Batac City).                                                                                      | Acknowledged stigma as a barrier to sustained participation.                     | Reported that community integration mechanisms were insufficient.               | Quantitative findings showed <b>Social Well-Being scored lowest (4.78)</b> , confirming stigma and weak institutional trust.                                                                                           |
| <b>Monitoring and compliance challenges</b> | Beneficiaries struggled to sustain compliance with health and education requirements once cash transfers ended.                                                            | Faced limited workforce and logistical resources for compliance monitoring.      | Reported difficulties in coordinating with schools and health facilities.       | Regression analysis identified <b>Monitoring and Evaluation Support (B=0.440)</b> as the strongest predictor of implementation success.                                                                                |
| <b>Targeting and coverage errors</b>        | Some households were excluded despite eligibility; Noted inequities in outcomes.                                                                                           | Reported errors in targeting and questioned the fairness of inclusion.           | Highlighted the need for community-based validation to reduce exclusion errors. | Quantitative results showed <b>Targeting Eligible Households (B=0.279)</b> as the strongest predictor of program outputs.                                                                                              |

|                               |                                                                                      |                                                                             |                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Administrative burdens</b> | Beneficiaries noted delays in the release of benefits, affecting household planning. | Implementers cited heavy reporting requirements and resource constraints.   | C/MSWDOs stressed strain from inter-agency coordination and grievance handling. | Regression results emphasized <b>administrative capability (R<sup>2</sup>=0.674)</b> as critical for effective implementation. |
| <b>Governance credibility</b> | Beneficiaries valued fairness and transparency in program delivery.                  | Implementers emphasized the need for stronger grievance redress mechanisms. | C/MSWDOs highlighted the importance of ordinances and policy backing.           | Regression analysis showed <b>Credibility of Program Governance (B=0.372)</b> as the strongest determinant of quality of life. |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

Table 9 revealed that while the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte was generally effective in improving household welfare, graduates and implementers encountered several challenges that affected sustainability. Common problems and difficulties included delays in the release of benefits, limited livelihood and employment opportunities after graduation, and difficulty sustaining compliance with health and education requirements once cash transfers ended. Implementers noted that administrative burdens, resource constraints, and gaps in grievance redress mechanisms also posed challenges. These findings implied that while program outputs were strong, systemic and contextual barriers restrained long-term impact.

**Challenges faced by graduates.** Graduates reported vulnerabilities and challenges after program exit, particularly in sustaining children's college education and health care. Respondents from Dingras, Banna, and Vintar noted that the sudden loss of financial support left households unstable, highlighting the need for post-graduation livelihood integration and strong convergence of other programs. Social stigma was also observed in Laoag and Batac City, where some graduates felt excluded from community activities after graduating from the program.

**Challenges faced by implementers.** Implementers encountered difficulties in monitoring compliance, addressing grievances, and coordinating with schools and health facilities. While monitoring and evaluation emerged as the strongest predictor of program success, implementers noted that limited workforce and logistical resources restrained their capacity to uphold oversight. Errors in targeting and coverage also posed challenges: some households were excluded despite being eligible, while others questioned the fairness of inclusion. Administrative burdens, such as coordinating and collaborating with other agencies and meeting reporting requirements, added to the workload of local staff. These challenges highlighted the importance of strengthening administrative capability, as regression results showed that capacity building, technical systems, and leadership structures significantly influenced program implementation.

These findings were consistent with the literature emphasizing that program success depends not only on compliance but also on governance credibility, benefit reliability, and accurate targeting. David & Maroma (2025) concluded that consistent output delivery was essential to improving welfare, while Bagaipo et al. (2024) emphasized that perceptions of fairness in governance directly influenced compliance. Acupido et al. (2020) noted that operational efficiency and coordinated implementation were crucial, while Chaudhury & Okamura (2012) argued that adherence to conditionalities built human capital. Triangulation of survey data, success stories, and implementers' perspectives suggested that while compliance mattered, systemic factors such as governance credibility, benefit reliability, and livelihood integration had stronger effects on long-term quality of life.

**Problem 10. What proposed program can improve the Implementation of 4Ps in Ilocos Norte?**

**Table 10: The proposed program can improve the 4Ps in Ilocos Norte**

| Program                                              | Graduates (n=373)                                                                                                 | Implementers (n=20)                                                                               | C/MSWDOs (n=14)                                                        | Integration with quantitative results & common errors                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Sustainable Livelihood Program (SLP)</b>          | Requested livelihood opportunities after graduation to sustain education and health needs.                        | Emphasized the need for structured livelihood integration to reduce post-exit vulnerability.      | Proposed a stronger linkage to cooperatives and microfinance.          | Regression showed <b>livelihood integration weakly predicted outcomes</b> ; common error: lack of post-graduation support.                                        |
| <b>Family Development Sessions (FDS)</b>             | Beneficiaries valued sessions but requested more topics on leadership, adolescent health, and financial literacy. | Implementers noted FDS improved compliance but needed expansion to reduce stigma.                 | Suggested integration of civic participation and community organizing. | Quantitative results: <b>Human Development scored highest (4.81)</b> ; FDS reinforced compliance, but gaps remained in long-term resilience.                      |
| <b>Kilos-unlad strategy</b>                          | Graduates saw potential in linking to other government programs for self-sufficiency.                             | Implementers emphasized the importance of case management to address diverse needs.               | Proposed stronger coordination with LGUs and other agencies.           | Regression highlighted <b>administrative capability (<math>R^2=0.674</math>)</b> ; common error: weak inter-agency coordination.                                  |
| <b>Supplemental feeding</b>                          | Parents appreciated feeding programs for children aged 2–5, but noted limited coverage.                           | Implementers cited logistical limitations in sustaining feeding initiatives.                      | C/MSWDOs proposed expansion to at-risk children outside CDC            | Quantitative results: <b>Health outcomes improved, but sustainability was weak</b> ; common error: limited service quality.                                       |
| <b>PhilHealth coverage</b>                           | Beneficiaries requested the sustainability of PhilHealth coverage after graduation.                               | Implementers emphasized automatic exclusion from PhilHealth coverage after exit.                  | Proposed extension of PhilHealth coverage among graduates              | Regression showed <b>service delivery efficiency (<math>B=0.200</math>)</b> significantly influenced outputs; common error: delays in benefit release.            |
| <b>Cash-for-work</b>                                 | Graduates requested transitional employment opportunities after program exit.                                     | Implementers noted that cash-for-work reduced short-term vulnerability but lacked sustainability. | Proposed integration with skills training and livelihood programs.     | Quantitative results: <b>Overall Life Satisfaction (4.80)</b> improved with transitional support; common error: limited long-term employment.                     |
| <b>Aid to Individuals in Crisis Situation (AICS)</b> | Beneficiaries valued support during illness, disasters, or death but noted delays in access.                      | Implementers cited administrative burdens in processing requests.                                 | Proposed streamlining of referral systems for faster response.         | Regression showed <b>governance credibility (<math>B=0.372</math>)</b> as the strongest determinant; common error: weak grievance and crisis response mechanisms. |

(MJ Pasigui, 2026)

A proposed program that can improve the 4Ps in Ilocos Norte is the **Integrated Livelihood, Governance, and Social Empowerment (ILGSE) Framework**, which builds on the strengths of the current conditional cash transfer system while addressing its common errors and challenges. This program would combine livelihood integration, governance credibility, human capital enhancement, and social inclusion into one cohesive approach. On the economic side, it would link graduates to the Sustainable Livelihood Program (SLP), MSMEs, microfinance, and cooperatives, while providing entrepreneurship training and literacy training, and transitional support packages to sustain education and health needs after graduation. Governance credibility would be strengthened through local ordinances institutionalizing compliance monitoring and

grievance mechanisms, digital transparency platforms for benefit tracking, and capacity-building programs for implementers to reduce administrative burdens. Human capital development would be enhanced by expanding Family Development Sessions (FDS) to include leadership and adolescent health modules (to prevent teenage pregnancy), improving service quality in schools and health facilities, and strengthening scholarships for college-level education. Finally, social cohesion would be intensified through community-based validation to reduce targeting errors, graduate mentorship programs to foster intergenerational empowerment, and initiatives to reduce stigma after program exit. Triangulation of survey data, success stories, and literature shows that while compliance and benefit receipt are important, governance credibility, livelihood integration, and service quality are stronger determinants of long-term resilience. By integrating these strategies, the ILGSE Framework would ensure that the implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in Ilocos Norte shifts beyond short-term poverty relief, toward resilience, sustained empowerment, and intergenerational poverty reduction.

## ***Discussions***

The findings revealed that the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in the Province of Ilocos Norte is highly supported, effectively implemented, and positively influential in improving beneficiaries' quality of life. Local Government Units demonstrated very high support through financial, logistical, policy, and monitoring assistance, while implementing institutions exhibited very high administrative capability marked by efficient resource management, strong coordination, and continuous capability-building initiatives.

Program implementation and outputs were likewise rated very high, indicating effective targeting, reliable service delivery, transparent governance, and consistent compliance mechanisms. These contributed significantly to improved economic well-being, education, access to health care, and overall satisfaction among beneficiaries.

Regression analyses further showed that administrative capability significantly influenced program implementation, whereas LGU support had limited direct influence, suggesting that 4Ps operations remain largely centralized. Moreover, governance credibility, reliable benefit delivery, and quality coverage emerged as the strongest predictors of beneficiaries' quality of life. Strong statistical models confirmed that transparent governance and efficient systems are critical drivers of improved social and human development outcomes.

Despite these positive outcomes, challenges persisted, including post-program vulnerability, difficulty sustaining education and healthcare needs, social stigma, monitoring burdens, and coordination constraints among implementers. To address these concerns, the study proposed the Integrated Livelihood, Governance, and Social Empowerment (ILGSE) Framework, which strengthens livelihood integration, digital monitoring systems, grievance mechanisms, and community-based empowerment initiatives.

Overall, the study underscores that the long-term success of the 4Ps program depends not only on effective implementation but also on sustained governance reforms, institutional capability, and inclusive support systems that empower beneficiaries beyond short-term poverty alleviation.

## ***Conclusions***

In light of the findings, the study concludes that the 4Ps program in the Province of Ilocos Norte is implemented effectively and supported by strong governance and administrative systems. Local Government Units demonstrated very high levels of support through financial, logistical, policy, and monitoring assistance, while implementing agencies exhibited strong administrative capability, characterized by effective coordination, transparent resource management, and efficient operational systems.

The program implementation and outputs were likewise rated very highly, indicating that beneficiary targeting, service delivery, accountability, and governance mechanisms were consistently and effectively implemented. These contributed significantly to improvements in beneficiaries' quality of life, particularly in economic well-being, social development, and overall satisfaction.

The study further revealed that administrative capability had a significant influence on program implementation. In contrast, LGU support showed limited direct influence, suggesting that the 4Ps program remains largely centralized in its operational structure. Moreover, governance credibility, reliable benefit delivery, and quality coverage emerged as the strongest predictors of improved quality of life among beneficiaries.

Despite these positive outcomes, challenges remain, particularly in sustaining education, healthcare, and livelihood opportunities after program exit. Beneficiaries also experienced vulnerability and social stigma, while implementers faced monitoring burdens, resource limitations, and coordination difficulties.

To address these concerns, the study proposed the Integrated Livelihood, Governance, and Social Empowerment (ILGSE) Framework, which strengthens livelihood integration, governance transparency, digital monitoring systems, and community-based empowerment initiatives. Overall, the study emphasizes that the long-term success of the 4Ps program depends not only on effective implementation but also on sustained governance reforms, inclusive support systems, and empowerment-driven strategies that promote resilience and intergenerational poverty reduction.

**Author's contribution statement:** The author handled the study's conceptualization, research design, instrument development, data collection, and the analysis and interpretation of results.

**Ethical review statement:** The study adhered to the ethical standards and guidelines approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Graduate School of the University of Northern Philippines.

**Funding statement:** The study was self-funded by the author

**Conflict of interest statement:** There was no conflict of interest in the conduct of the research. The study's results benefited all beneficiaries of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) and its implementers.

## References

- Acupido, M. A., De La Cruz, J. R., & Villanueva, R. M. (2020). Implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps): A review of local government participation. *International Peer-Reviewed Journal*, 12(3), 45–60.
- Aguring, J. R., De La Peña, M. C., & Ramos, L. S. (2025). Learning support for Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) beneficiaries in South Cotabato. *Journal of Social Development Studies*, 18(2), 112–128.
- Abrigo, M. R. M. (2025). *Investing in services and program restructuring: Key to maximizing 4Ps impact*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph>
- Abrigo, M. R. M., Alicante, K. N. F., & Melad, K. A. M. (2023). *Who gets monitored among the Philippines' 4Ps children and why it matters for their non-monitored siblings* (PIDS Discussion Paper DP2023–43). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph>
- Acupido, R. J. B., Cabilangan, R. R., Padilla, C. N., & Tabamo, H. A. (2020). Analysis on the implementation of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program: A research review. *Asian Society of Teachers for Research Journal*, 4(1).
- Agregado, J. R., Patalita, N., Sellar, E. J., & Tenorio, C. (2024). Extent of Implementation of Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Program in a Local Government Unit in Southern Philippines: Basis for Intervention Strategies. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 204, 02003. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202420402003>
- Acosta, P., & Velarde, R. (2019). *An update on the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program: Examining its implementation performance and impact on welfare*. World Bank Philippines Social Protection Policy Note Series. <https://documents.worldbank.org/>

- Acosta, P., & Velarde, R. (2020). *An update on the performance of conditional cash transfer programs in the Philippines*. World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/>
- Aguinaldo, R. J. R., & García, A. A. (2021). Strengthening local government support for social protection programs in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 65(2), 45–60.
- Aguring, J., De La Peña, R., & Ramos, M. (2025). *Financial resilience among 4Ps beneficiaries in South Cotabato*. Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi, 5(2), 45–59. 25 February 2026, 11:58 am <https://journal.hasbaedukasi.co.id/index.php/jurmie/article/view/456>
- Agustín, J. C., & Reyes, L. M. (2022). The role of local governments in sustaining conditional cash transfer programs. *Philippine Journal of Social Development*, 21(2), 50–65.
- Ahmad, Z. (2025). Collaborative governance and social protection: Concepts and applications. *Governance and Business*, 15(6), 217–229. <https://doi.org/10.3390/gandb15060217>
- Albert, J. R. G., Orbeta, A. C., Jr., M., K. A. M., & Mahmoud, M. A. (2024). *Is the 4Ps targeting and reaching the “right” beneficiaries? An assessment of the veracity of the list of Pantawid Pamilya/4Ps beneficiaries* (PIDS Discussion Paper DP2024–27). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph>
- Albert, J. R. G., Orbeta, A. C., Jr., M., K. A. M., & Mahmoud, M. A. (2025). *Is the 4Ps targeting and reaching the “right” beneficiaries? An assessment of the veracity of the list of Pantawid Pamilya/4Ps beneficiaries* (PIDS Discussion Paper DP2025–12). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph>
- Alkire, S., Kanagaratnam, U., & Suppa, N. (2019). *The global multidimensional poverty index 2019: Illuminating inequalities*. Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative. <https://ophi.org.uk>
- Babbie, E. R. (2020). *The practice of social research* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning. <https://www.cengage.com>
- Bagaipo, E. M. C., & Napiere, M. B. (2024). Participants’ compliance with Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program: Implications on their living conditions. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(6), 280–292. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i61414>
- Balisacan, A. M. (2016). *Poverty, inequality, and inclusive growth in Asia: Measurement, policy issues, and lessons*. Asian Development Bank Economics Working Paper Series No. 474. Asian Development Bank. <https://www.adb.org/publications/poverty-inequality-inclusive-growth-asia>
- Balisacan, A. M. (2016). *Poverty reduction and inclusive growth: Policy challenges in the Philippines*. In H. Hill, M. E. Khan, & J. M. Zhuang (Eds.), *Diagnosing the Philippine economy: Toward inclusive growth* (pp. 25–56). Asian Development Bank. World Bank. <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org>
- Chaudhury, N., Friedman, J., & Onishi, J. (2013). Philippines Conditional Cash Transfer Program Impact Evaluation 2012. World Bank. <https://documents.worldbank.org>
- Chaudhury, N., & Okamura, Y. (2012). *Conditional cash transfers and school enrollment: Evidence from South Asia*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 6059. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-6059>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2023). *Higher education enrollment by region*. <https://ched.gov.ph>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book255675>

- David, R. M. T., & Maroma, A. P. (2025). Evaluating conditional cash transfers in the Philippines: A review of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program's impact on poverty alleviation. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(1), 3258–3266. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8120269>
- Dela Cruz, R. D. (2019). Administrative capability and performance of social welfare and development offices in the implementation of social protection programs. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 3(8), 1–7. <http://www.ijarp.org>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2016). *Aruga: Stories of care and protection through the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program*. DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2016). *Alisto Serbisyo: Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program updates and success stories*. DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2021). *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program operations manual*. DSWD. <https://dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Education – Schools Division of Ilocos Norte. (2022). *Division education development plan*. <https://depedsnilocosnorte.com.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development Field Office I. (2023, July 24). *SLP Livelihood Assistance awarded to beneficiaries of Ilocos Norte*. DSWD FO1 Official Website. <https://fo1.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development Field Office I. (2026b, February 12). *12 DSWD FO 1 SLPAs may libreng puwesto sa SM City Laoag*. <https://fo1.dswd.gov.ph/2026/02/12-dswd-fo-1-slpas-may-libreng-pwesto-sa-sm-city-laoag/> 24 February 2026, 3:48 pm <https://fo1.dswd.gov.ph/2026/02/12-dswd-fo-1-slpas-may-libreng-pwesto-sa-sm-city-laoag/>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2020). *Pantawid Pamilya Impact Evaluation – Wave 3 (RDD) Report*. DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2021). *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) operations manual* (5th ed.). DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2021). *Listahanan 3 implementation report*. DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2022). *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program annual report 2021*. DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2022). *4Ps beneficiary updates – Ilocos Norte*. <https://fo1.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2022). *Operations Manual: Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps)*. DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2022). *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program Annual Report 2021*. Manila, Philippines: DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2023). *4Ps operations manual* (8th ed.). DSWD. <https://www.dswd.gov.ph>

- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2023). *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program annual report 2022*. DSWD.
- Department of Social Welfare and Development. (2024). *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program accomplishment report FY 2024*. DSWD FO6 E-Portal. February 2026, 11:58 am
- De Jesús, F. S., & Villanueva, W. (2023). Satisfaction level of the beneficiaries of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps). *American Journal of Society and Law*, 2(2), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajsl.v2i2.1535>
- De Vera, J. P. (2021). Implementation efficiency of the 4Ps and its outcomes on community resilience. *Public Policy Journal*, 28(1), 57–74
- Dizon, D., & Reyes, C. (2020). Assessing the impact of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program on welfare indicators (*PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2020-25*). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph>
- Dizon, D. R. (2022). Examining the impact of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program on economic behavior and quality of life in rural communities. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 66(1), 45–67.
- Domingo, S., & Anicete, R. (2021). Enhancing local government support for the 4Ps: Lessons from field implementation. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 65(2), 88–104.
- Domingo, S., & Manejar, A. L. (2020). Strengthening the local implementation of national poverty reduction programs: The case of 4Ps (*PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2020-03*). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps2003.pdf>
- Domingo, S. C., & Palabrica, R. G. (2019). Intergovernmental collaboration in poverty alleviation. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 40(1), 10–25.
- Domingo, S. N., & Manejar, A. A. (2021). Transforming public leadership for inclusive social development in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 65(2), 85–103.
- Dodd, W. (2024). Limits to transformational potential: Analyzing entitlement and agency within a conditional cash transfer program in the Philippines. *Social Policy & Society*. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-policy-and-society>
- Dy, S. O. (2022). Knowledge and practices on family development of 4Ps beneficiaries in Camarines Sur, Philippines. *Journal of Public Affairs and Development*, 5(1).
- Fiszbein, A., & Schady, N. (2009). *Conditional cash transfers: Reducing present and future poverty*. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2597>
- Guillermo, M. T. (2024). Understanding program impacts through the theory of change: The case of 4Ps in the Philippines. *International Journal of Social Development*, 12(1), 134–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-024-0148-3>
- Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank. (2020). *Not just what, but how: A strong delivery system was key to the success of the Philippines' nationwide social protection program*. World Bank. <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org>
- Kumar, R. (2019). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Lagman, D. G. (2020). Indicators of effective program implementation in conditional cash transfer systems. *Journal of Southeast Asian Governance*, 6(2), 100–117.

- Lopez, M. (2023). Administrative capability and service delivery efficiency in local government-led social protection programs. *Philippine Governance Review*, 18(1), 56–71.
- Manasan, R. G. (2020). Challenges in implementing social protection programs in the Philippines. *Public Policy Journal*, 24(2), 12–30.
- Manasan, R. G., & Cuenca, J. S. (2017). *Assessment of the conditional cash transfer program in the Philippines: Implementation performance and impact (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2017-39)*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1739.pdf>
- Melad, K. A. M. (2024, December 21). *From complaints to opportunities: Analyzing grievance trends and responsiveness in the 4Ps (PIDS Discussion Paper DP2023-25)*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph>
- Melad, K. A. M., Araos, N. V. V., & Orbeta, A. C. Jr. (2020). *Giving cash to people experiencing poverty: A study of Pantawid Pamilya cash grants generosity, frequency, and modality (PIDS Discussion Paper DP2020-59)*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph>
- Melad, K. A. M., Araos, N. V. V., & Orbeta, A. C. Jr. (2023). *Evaluating the 4Ps payment system: Frequency, amount, and modality (PIDS Policy Summary PS2023-07)*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph>
- Municipal Government of Solsona, Ilocos Norte. (2019). *Executive Order No. 27: Reorganization of the Municipal Advisory Council for Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program implementation*. Solsona, Ilocos Norte: Office of the Mayor. <https://solsona.gov.ph>
- Orbeta, A., & Paqueo, V. (2016). *Pantawid Pamilya Pilipino Program: Boon or bane?* Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1604.pdf>
- Orbeta, A. C., Paqueo, V. B., Tutor, M. V., González, K. T., & Alfonso, K. L. (2019). *The impact of the Philippine conditional cash transfer program on education: Evidence from a regression discontinuity design (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2019-20)*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1920.pdf>
- Orbeta, A. C., & Paqueo, V. B. (2019). *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program: Impact evaluation 2019*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph>
- Orbeta, A., Paqueo, V., & Tutor, M. (2023). *Beyond cash transfers: Strengthening local linkages for sustainable poverty reduction in the Philippines*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph>
- Orbeta, A. C., Jr., M., K. A. M., & Araos, N. V. V. (2023). *Reassessing the impact of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program: Results of the third wave impact evaluation*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies Research Paper Series, (2023-06). <https://doi.org/10.62986/rps2023.06>
- Philippine Information Agency. (2025, October 28). *DSWD builds resilient families through 4Ps partnerships*. <https://pia.gov.ph/news/dswd-builds-resilient-families-through-4ps-partnerships/> 24 February 2026, 3:49 pm
- Philippine News Agency. (2025, March). DSWD chief emphasizes family development sessions as a behavioral-change component of the 4Ps. *Philippine News Agency*. <https://www.pna.gov.ph>

Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS). (2024). *Is the 4Ps targeting and reaching the right beneficiaries?* Discussion Paper Series. <https://pids.gov.ph>

Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). (2021). *Poverty incidence among families*. <https://psa.gov.ph>

Putri, L., Rezani, M. R., & Hermina, D. (2025). Correlational research design. *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi*. <https://journal.hasbaedukasi.co.id/index.php/jurmie/article/view/456>

Reyes, C. M., Tabuga, A. D., & Asis, R. D. (2019). Assessing the impact of the 4Ps on education, health, and poverty in the Philippines (*PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2019-20*). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1920.pdf>

Reyes, C. M., Tabuga, A., & Mina, C. (2021). *Assessment of the 4Ps program implementation (PIDS Policy Notes No. 2021-03)*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pids.gov.ph/publication/policy-notes>

Santos, R. J., & Cruz, M. L. (2020). Monitoring and evaluation practices of local governments in poverty reduction programs. *Journal of Social Policy and Administration*, 54(4), 545–562.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Stein, D., & Valters, C. (2017). *Understanding Theory of Change in international development: A review of existing knowledge*. The Asia Foundation. <https://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/TOCfacilitatorguide.pdf>

UNICEF. (2021). Strengthening social protection delivery in the Philippines: The role of transparency, accountability, and grievance mechanisms. United Nations Children's Fund Philippines Report. <https://asiafoundation.org/resources/pdfs/TOCfacilitatorguide.pdf>

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2019). *Global social protection program framework*. UNICEF. <https://www.unicef.org/philippines/reports>

Union of Local Authorities of the Philippines. (2021, March). *Webinar on LGU roles in Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program implementation*. Quezon City: ULAP Secretariat. <https://ulap.net.ph>

Valters, C. (2016). *Theories of Change: Time for a radical approach to learning in development*. Overseas Development Institute. <https://odi.org/en/publications/theories-of-change-time-for-a-radical-approach-to-learning-in-development/>

World Bank. (2020). *Philippines: Supporting low-income families to invest in better futures – A story of impact*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2020/09/04/philippines-4ps-impact-story>

World Bank. (2022). *The State of Social Safety Nets 2022*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/socialprotection/publication/state-of-social-safety-nets>

World Bank. (2024). *Social Protection Delivery Systems Framework*. World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org>

**Publisher's Note:** DWIJMH stays neutral about jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International

© 2026 by the authors. Published by Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>