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Abstract—This study was able assessed the extent of the level of awareness on poverty alleviation programs in Isabela. Specifically, it determined the economic, social and infrastructure development of poverty alleviation programs of Isabela, Philippines. The test of difference is important so that decisions can be made on different programs in considering different perceptions of respondents and its profile. The study used descriptive research wherein it used survey instrument for the assessment that was validated carefully by the group of experts. The respondents were dominated by males with ages 51 and above with two children, high school graduates, earning an income below minimum wage level per day and working as farm laborers or engaged in agriculture-related activities. On the analysis of the findings, among the three (3) poverty alleviation programs, respondents were “Aware” on the programs/projects of 4Ps and on Infrastructure Development and “Moderately Aware” on Social Housing. Generally, the 4Ps, Social Housing and Farm-to-Market Roads has been “Implemented”. In addition, assessment whether there was a significant difference in the perception of the respondents on the level of implementation of economic, social and infrastructure development programs in terms of their profile, results revealed in some indicators of the different areas of the three (3) programs that there is statistically significant differences in their perception when they were grouped according to their profile leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis in some of the indicators. The study recommended that there should be proper information dissemination on the alleviation programs for more familiarization on the advantages of the programs.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Many nations, especially the developing and developed countries are struggling for economic growth and development because of the persistence of poverty brought about by many interrelated factors. Poverty renders powerlessness in many ways to the people going through it because they cannot fully develop their potentials as a human beings and as members of the society; it limits their capabilities due to limited or lack of opportunities and choices.

Poverty has been a persistent world issue many years ago according to books and literatures due to different interconnected factors [1], these factors keep the poor state of the people and trapping them in a vicious cycle [2], thereby cause inability to meet basic human needs, such as food, water, clothing, shelter, education and medicalization [3]. One of the recurring problems of all administration in the Philippines is poverty [4], which is characterized by economic, demographic, cultural, social and political factors [5].

Like many developing nations, Philippines continues to experience several problems brought about by natural calamities, economic, insurgencies, political and other social issues which contributed to worsening poverty, thus, hampering national development and economic growth. Despite many efforts of the government, poverty still persisted and becoming the root of other societal problems. In order to help those people suffering from poverty to meet their fundamental basic human needs and to reach full human development, the government crafted and implemented policies and programs along poverty alleviation and social reforms in accordance with the international frameworks such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (IECSCR), Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the most recent is the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) formulated by the member nations of the United Nations (UN) organization. These frameworks intended to address fundamental human rights of the people such as education, health and nutrition, housing as well as physical development/infrastructure and among others which are all playing an integral part of economic growth and development of the nation.

The Philippines has been implementing various poverty alleviation programs for all sectors of the society. One of those and the biggest so far is the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) which has been a flagship program for poverty alleviation under President Benigno Simeon C. Aquino, III. The 4Ps is a poverty reduction strategy that provides cash grants to extremely poor households to allow the members of the families to meet certain human development goals. The focus is on building human capital of poorest families (health/nutrition and education) given the observation that low schooling, ill health and high malnutrition are strongly associated with the poverty cycle in the Philippines. Aside from this, it also helps fulfill the country’s commitment to meet the MDGs, now SDGs.

Another important program of the government is on
housing. According to former President Corazon C. Aquino, “Shelter is a basic and indispensable need for society to be productive and stable. The provision of adequate shelter will enhance and support national economic and social development. Housing serves as a catalyst for overall economic activity”. The international community recognized the need for adequate housing as part of the right to standard of living because homelessness and inadequate housing is a manifestation of poverty according to the UN. Housing or shelter provides safety and security to its dwellers because it gave a sense of protection, belongingness and convenience which is also associated to health risks and wellness.

Also, one of the essential programs in on infrastructure development, it plays significant role to the economic growth and development, specifically in the rural areas where most of the disadvantaged groups resides whose source of living is mainly on agriculture. It brings life to the rural community because it provides better mobilization of people, goods and services like easier access to high quality education, healthcare and other government social services. It also promotes tourism, opens employment opportunities, business and economic ventures along with technological advancement. Thus, breaking isolation barrier that contributes greater productivity, enhances life, expands choices, capabilities and opportunities redounding to people’s empowerment, poverty alleviation and social integration.

The RA 8425 or Social Reform and Poverty Alleviation Act of 1997 provided the Local Government Units (LGUs) the frontline role in the fight against poverty. Hence, LGUs as frontline responsible institutions in responding to the increasing service delivery requirements of their constituents have the primary responsibility of providing basic services for improvement of quality life as mandated by the law. They are responsible in the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Anti-Poverty Reduction Agenda within their areas of jurisdiction.

As such, LGUs in Isabela in partnership and cooperation with the different government agencies, non-government organizations and private individuals were able to uplift the lives of many people through the implementation of 4Ps, social housing and infrastructure development programs. These harmonized interventions certainly made a difference in the lives of the people.

On social housing, many poor Isabeleños were awarded a home/shelter of their own through the collaborative efforts of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), LGUs, Gawad Kalinga (GK), UN-Habitat, benevolent private individuals and other partner agencies. The GK communities, Habitat Villages and Core Shelters were built in the different municipalities of the province. Likewise, emergency shelter assistance was given to the victims of natural calamities.

On infrastructure development, through the provincial implementing arm, had accomplished a total of P101,264,081.76 and P189,463,028.09 as a continuing infrastructure activities of the province (Isabela Provincial Website). Along with this effort, a road construction had already started cutting a path of more than 50 miles through the Sierra Madre, from Ilagan City to Divilacan, with plans to continue up to Palanan and nearby villages.

The Region’s poverty incidence among households declined to 16.5 percent in the first semester of 2015 from 22 percent in the same period in 2006. This means that 1 out of 6 families in the region had an income lower than the poverty threshold or the minimum income to meet the basic food and non-food necessities [6]. The province of Isabela poverty incidence of families was 19.0, magnitude of poor families was 68,106 and a per capita poverty threshold of 19,400.1 (PSA, 2012). Among the five (5) provinces in Region II, Isabela had the biggest population in 2015 with 1.59 million (PSA PopCen, 2015) with a total household of 372,950 (Isabela Provincial website).

Amidst countrysides struggle for economic growth and development, Isabela had continuously grown economically as evidenced of its standing as a 1st class province and recognized as corn and rice champion of the country being the number one corn producer, second rice producer and considered the “Corn Capital of the Philippines” and “Rice Granary of the North”. Also, its good housekeeping and governance receiving various types of awards had greatly contributed to its fame placing on the forefront of economic stability. Likewise, many of its municipalities had an emerging economy bagging various awards in different categories set as form of measurement of its growth and development (Isabela Provincial website). Despite of its provincial good standing, there are also municipalities that are still struggling due to financial limitations.

Given the above-cited facts, this study was conducted to assess the implementation of poverty alleviation programs in the province, hence, appropriate recommendations and actions to improve the program that may uplift the quality of living of its constituents which may eventually contribute to the economic growth and development were offered.

Policy Framework

The following provides the legal basis on the implementation of poverty alleviation programs in the Philippines.

The Sustainable Development Agenda

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development designed to replace the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), is the United Nations (UN) central platform for attaining ‘integrated and indivisible’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) across social, environmental and economic dimensions that started in January 2016 aimed at posing a broad and inclusive framework for ending poverty worldwide in the next 15 years. It is generally recognized that successful achievement of this agenda, which is comprised of 17 SDGs and 169 targets, require national, regional and local efforts across all sectors of society.

The 10-point Socio-Economic Agenda

The 10-point socio-economic agenda of the Duterte Administration aims to address various issues that negatively affect the development and growth of the country which focuses on the three main aspects: reduction of government bureaucracy, infrastructural development, and investment in human capital through continues and maintenance of current macroeconomic policies, institution of progressive tax reform,
increasing competitiveness and the ease of doing business, accelerating annual infrastructure spending, promoting rural and value chain development, ensuring security of land tenure, investing in human capital development, promoting science, technology, and the creative arts, improving social protection programs and strengthening the implementation of the Responsible Parenthood and Reproductive Health Law.

Ambisyon Natin 2040

Another important policy is the “Ambisyon Natin 2040” which was adopted through the Executive Order No. 5 signed by the President on Oct. 11, 2016 as the 25-year long-term vision for the Philippines. It is the collective long-term vision and aspirations of the Filipino people for themselves and for the country in the next 25 years which will cover four administrations. This vision is also the answer to the clamor for a long-term perspective in development planning to sustain efforts, to provide a matatag, maginhawa, at panatag na buhay para sa lahat (strongly-rooted, comfortable, and secure life for all).

The Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2017-2022

This is the outline for the country’s development, the first medium-term plan anchored on the 0-10 point Socioeconomic Agenda geared towards the Ambisyon Natin 2040 which enunciates the Filipino people’s combined vision of a MATATAG, MAGINHAWA, AT PANATAG NA BUHAY PARA SA LAHAT. This PDP 2017-2022 consisted of seven parts. Part I offers the overall background for the Plan. Part II is about improving the social fabric to build the basics for a high-trust society. Part III stresses the significance of decreasing disparities in economic development opportunities. Part IV emphasizes on increasing possible growth. Part V calls for a supportive economic environment that will enable the economy to sustain growth, and Part VI is about foundations for inclusive and sustainable development. Finally, Part VII describes the institutional arrangements for implementation and monitoring—making sure that what is planned is implemented and that timely adjustments are done (NEDA 2016). It also takes into account the country’s international commitments such as the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals.

The Cagayan Valley Regional Development Plan

At the regional level, the Cagayan Valley Regional Development Plan (CRVDP) 2017-2022 was made along the development agenda of PDP 2017-2022 which highlights the role of the region in attaining the national development goals and objectives. It describes the region's development path in the next six years. This medium-term development plan has twenty one (21) chapters and seven (7) parts broadly discussed the strategies that were clustered under the three pillars Malasakit or enhancing the social fabric, Pagbabago or reducing inequality, and Patuloy na Pag-unlad or increasing growth potential.

Today, Isabela is the corn (top producer) and rice (second top producer) champion of the country and home of the mongojo capital municipality, hence, agriculture is the main source of income.

The study assessed the programs to alleviate the poverty in Isabela, Philippines.

2 Research Process

Generally, this study assessed the awareness of poverty alleviation programs in Isabela. It determined the respondent’s profile, level of awareness on the poverty alleviation programs. It also determined the significant difference on the perception of respondents on economic, social and infrastructure development. The study focused and was limited on the assessment on awareness of poverty alleviation programs in the province of Isabela, covering economic (4Ps), social (housing) and infrastructure development (Farm-to-Market Roads) as perceived by the respondents. The respondents came from the two (2) congressional districts in Isabela with the lowest Income Revenue Allotment (IRA), of which two (2) municipalities/LGUs each district with lowest income classification (Appendix H) were purposely picked. Peace and order situation, geographic location and cost of time in data gathering/collection were also considered in the selection of LGUs. As a general approach, this study developed a conceptual framework which consisted of the Input Variables, Process Variables and the Output as the model. The Input Variable includes the status of implementation of 4Ps, housing and infrastructure development as poverty alleviation programs in Isabela as well as the profile of respondents with focus on gender, age, civil status, number of children, educational attainment, income per day, occupation/other source of income and poverty alleviation programs received, which was likewise studied and analyzed in the Process Variable of the research that requires analysis and interpretation of the data gathered through survey. In turn the policy’s Output improved the implementation of poverty alleviation programs in Isabela Province.

The study envisioned to put into reality this framework as a guide for effective and efficient implementation of Poverty Alleviation Programs in Isabela. According to [7], evaluations can be done in order to determine effectiveness and to make sure that the aim of a program is being attained efficiently. Since almost all government programs are designed to improve the lives of its people, the program to be evaluated must be assessed in order to discern its extent and possibilities of finding effective ways of addressing the same problem for a different cost. Likewise, [8] cited that the benefits of development assistance, investment in human capital and the provision of safety nets for the poor is evident but the actual impact is very little, thus, should be evaluated.

The paradigm showed the coverage and direction of this study. The input variables consisted of the profile of the respondents and the implementation of the 4Ps, housing and infrastructure development/farm-to-market roads. Problems encountered were determined to point out areas of concern.

The process involved the implementation and assessment of 4Ps, housing and infrastructure development by the respondents which are the beneficiaries/grantees of the 4Ps. The data was analyzed using frequency and percentage to determine the profile. Mean rating was used to measure the different services and the problems encountered. One-way
Analysis of Variance (F-test) was used at 5 percent level of significance to determine if there were significant differences among the mean ratings of the respondents on the level of implementation of basic services and good governance. The study of [14] also used assessment tools on the quality assurance model of educational institution and implied statistical tools to come up with a mathematical model for the assessment.

Finally, the outcome is the improvement of the implementation of 4Ps, housing and infrastructure development that can serve as basis of policy, institutional or financial analyses, reforms and recommendations to improve the poverty alleviation programs in the province and the delivery of basic services in accordance to the need of the citizens and eventually may improve the quality of life of the people.

3 Result and Analysis

3.1 Profile of Respondents

This study used a set of personal characteristics (age, civil status, number of children, educational attainment, income per day, occupation/source of income and the poverty alleviation program/s received and/or benefitted) of the 250 respondents that had been analyzed and presented. The data revealed that from the 250 respondents, majority were males with 207 or 82.8% and the remaining 43 or 17.2% were females. The result was dominated by male, basically because the respondents of the study being interviewed were the heads of the family/household. Wherein, the male is considered as the head of the family.

In terms of age, majority of the respondents’ age ranged from age bracket 51 and above consisting of 91 (36.4%) of the total population followed by 36-40 (48 or 19.2%) and the remaining was distributed from age brackets of 46-50 (44 or 17.6%), 41-45 (31 or 12.4%), 31-35 (24 or 9.6%) and 26-30 (8 or 3.2%). The youngest respondents having the age bracket ranged from 20-25 had the least number (4 or 1.6%). These data revealed that most of the respondents’ age group belonged to older adult and middle-age due to the fact that the study purposely chose the heads of household as respondents and it may also be accounted for by the Filipino culture of close family ties wherein extended family was valued and they often lived together, thus, the family was headed by the elderly.

With regards to civil status, a very significant proportion was married (190 or 76%) while the least number was still single (1 or 0.4%). Meanwhile, the widower had 37 (14.8%), separated/annulled had 14 (5.6%) and the common law/live-in had 8 (3.2%). The result was dominated by married status, basically because the respondents of the study being interviewed were purposely picked the heads of the household with at least 2 children.

On family size, majority of the respondents had small number of children, 2 being the highest with 100 or 40% while 6 and above with 18 or 7.2% was the lowest. The next highest family size had an ideal number of children who had 3 with 68 or 27.2% then 4 with 42 or 16.8% and 5 with 22 or 8.8%) respectively. The results were dominated by a household who had 2 children only which due to the fact those respondents of the study were the heads of the household with at least 2 children.

The educational attainment results showed on average that there are relatively more respondents who were high school graduates comprising of 71 or 28.4% of the total population and closely followed by at least high school level with 60 or 24%. It also showed that there were respondents who graduated college with 31 or 12.4% while respondents who reached college level had 18 or 7.2% and the lowest result had no formal education with 2 or 0.8% of the total population. Others had reached elementary level with 36 or 14.4% then elementary graduate with 29 or 11.6% and vocational learner with 3 or 1.2% respectively.

The result showed that there was a very low percentage of college graduates which was an implication that there is really a need to improve the educational attainment of the people, especially the poor. The implementation of programs such as the 4Ps is very important, one of its focus is on education which is associated with people’s social and economic prosperity which redounds to community’s growth and development.

As of the income per day, data revealed that majority of the respondents were below minimum wage earners with a significantly high score of 154 or 61.6% of the population followed by minimum wage level (Php 340.00 for Non-Agriculture and Retail/Service Establishments with more than 10 employees, Php 320.00 for Agriculture and Php 300.00 for Retail/Service Establishments with less than 10 employees based from Wage Rates Under W.O. No. RTWPB-02-18) with 70 or 28% and the lowest were above minimum wage level with 25 or 10%. It was revealed that very few had an income above minimum wage while majority were below minimum wage earners. Accordingly, most of them had no daily/regular income since their work is seasonal which might have been affected by the economic profile of their locality of which justified the qualification of most of them as 4Ps beneficiaries/grantees/recipients. However, the LGUs in partnership with the different government agencies/NGOs have implemented and conducted technical assistance, financial assistance/livelihood programs and other capacity building strategies to empower their constituents that may address poverty and poverty-related concerns (LGUs ELA 2016-2019).

As revealed from the findings, the proportion of working members as farm laborers which served as their occupation/source of income scored the highest with 74 or 29.6% of the total population. Farmers were the next highest with 39 or 15.6% followed by tricycle drivers with 15 or 6%, laborers with 13 or 5.2%, helpers with 12 or 4.8%, carpenters and vendors scored the same with 9 or 3.6%, tenants with 8 or 3.22%, laundrywomen with 6 or 2.4%, drivers and sari-sari store owners got the same with 5 or 2%, welders with 4 or 1.6%, cooks, employees, household helpers, OFWs, panciteria owners and teachers had the same score with 3 or 1.2%, businessmen, foremen, retired government employees,
security guards and tailors garnered the same score with 2 or 0.8% and the least with the same score with 1 or 0.4% were the agent, barter, caterer, chainsaw, day care teacher, dressmaker, family driver, fisherman, hog raiser, janitor, mason, merchandiser, operator, retired AFP, sales representative, salesboy, saleslady, truck driver, utility, vulcanizer, waiter and waitress respectively.

It can be observed that most of the respondents indicated that they were engaged in agriculture and agriculture-related type of work. Basically because agriculture is the main source of income in Isabela being hailed as the corn (top producer) and rice (2nd top producer) champion of the country and home of the monggo capital municipality, Southeast Asia’s biggest Hydroelectric Dam and the Asia’s largest corn processing facility (Isabela Province Official Website). It was also reflected in the ELA 2016-2019 of LGUs of Gamu, Luna, Naguillian and San Guillermo that most of the lands were dedicated to agriculture and agriculture-related activities that certainly dictated their occupation.

Consequently, most of them had no regular job since the type of their work is seasonal as dictated by the economic activities in their municipalities and may be as affected also by their educational qualification. Hence, most of them were 4Ps recipients. It is worthy to mention that the government had implemented the K-12 Basic Education to equip the graduates with basic skills and knowledge that may give them better chance in landing to a better job, especially to those who could no longer pursue higher education.

The three (3) poverty alleviation programs identified and being used in the study are the 4Ps, Social Housing and Infrastructure Development/FMRs. The programs received and/or benefitted by the respondents revealed that all of them indicated that they benefitted from the infrastructure development/FMRs with 250 or 100% while 104 or 41.6% were benefitted from 4Ps and 9 or 3.6% were benefitted from the social housing program.

A perfect score garnered by Infrastructure Development/FMRs, basically because the program is for the use and the benefit of all sectors, but the foremost was beneficial to the residents who directly impacted by the projects. The good results was affected by the continuous efforts of the local and national government towards infrastructure development such as the repair/construction of roads, bridges, irrigation canals, and among others. Locally, these efforts are reflected in the LGUs ELA 2016-2019 and are in consonance with the poverty alleviation efforts of the national government such as the AFMA of 1997 and PRDP.

As per Barangay records of the different identified location of the study, there were 175 households who were 4Ps recipients (District 1, Gamu 16; Centro 2, Luna 39; Magsaysay, Naguillian with 36 and Centro 1, San Guillermo with 84), of which 104 or 41.6% were respondents. The recipients/granetess were objectively and carefully chosen through the National Household Targeting System, also known as Listahanan.

A very low score garnered by Social Housing basically because none of the respondents was a recipient of social housing since the site of the core shelters were located outside the targeted place of study, the targeted place are the barangays where the Municipal Hall is located (Gamu at District 1, Luna at Centro 2, Naguillian at Magsaysay and san Guillermo at Centro 1). According to the LGUs’ MSWDOs, there was no core shelter in Luna but they gave financial emergency shelter assistance to families affected by typhoon Lawin since the place was declared under state of calamity; while Gamu had 50 units at Barangay Linglingay; Naguillian had 40 units at barangay San Manuel; and San Guillermo had 30 units at Barangay Nakar. However, all the respondents had their own house as revealed during the survey and interview but some of them had relatives and friends who were beneficiaries of social housing, hence they are aware of the program.

3.2 Respondents’ Awareness on the Programs

The following table presented the summary of the assessment of the level of awareness on the programs to alleviate poverty.

![Table 1: Level of Awareness on the Programs](image-url)
2. Community Mortgage Program (CMP) 2.96 Moderately Aware
3. Regular Low-Cost Housing Projects 2.92 Moderately Aware
4. Medium Rise Housing (MRH) & Rental Housing 2.45 Slightly Aware
5. Core Shelter Housing Assistance 3.46 Moderately Aware
Sub-Mean 2.96 Moderately Aware

c. Infrastructure Development
1. Farm-to-Market Roads (FMRs) 4.59 Fully Aware
2. Bridges 4.57 Fully Aware
3. Communal Irrigation System 4.26 Aware
4. Potable Water System 4.37 Aware
Sub-Mean 4.45 Aware
Grand Mean 3.91 Aware

Table 1 presents the respondents' perception on the level of “Awareness” on the implementation of poverty alleviation programs, of which the 4Ps and Infrastructure Development got a qualitative description of “Aware” while Social Housing garnered “Moderately Aware” with mean values of 4.33, 4.45 and 2.96 respectively. The result was being pulled down by the Social Housing as the lowest. The computed grand mean value is 3.91 having a qualitative description of “Aware” which implies that the respondents were aware of the 4Ps and Infrastructure Development as poverty alleviation programs of the government but less aware on Social Housing. Social Housing posted low awareness is may be due to the fact that the different types of scheme of the program targets depend on the needs and financial capacities of the beneficiaries (LGUs Guidebook for Local Housing Project/Program).

3.2.1 Awareness on the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps)

As seen on the table, all the indicators under 4Ps had an overall qualitative description of “Aware” as perceived by the respondents having a very close high mean results ranged from 4.41 to 4.23. The highest was indicator 3 with a mean of 4.41 while the lowest was indicator 6 with a mean of 4.23. Indicator 2 is the next highest with 4.38 followed by indicator 1 with 4.37 then indicator 4 with 4.35 and indicator 5 with 4.29 accordingly.

These denote that all the indicators of 4Ps’ health services, education and family development was generally known by the public. It signifies that the packaged services of the program was socially accepted and that good governance was observed by the implementers (LGUs and partner agencies) leading to the awareness of both 4Ps recipients (comprised of 104 or 41.6%) and non-4Ps recipients (comprised of 146 or 58.4). Good governance is necessary in ensuring efficient services to the poor, supporting the development process, increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the public investment, and mobilizing and regulating the private sector resources [9], the efficiency and failure of traditional social assistance programs in reaching the poor is also due to governance and accountability (Orbeta and Paqueo, 2016).

3.2.2 Awareness on the Social Housing Program

All the indicators under the social housing scored a relatively low mean values ranged from 3.46 to 2.45 having a qualitative description of “Moderately Aware”. Among the five indicators, four (4) got a qualitative description of “Moderately Aware” which includes: “Core Shelter Housing Assistance”, “Resettlement Projects”, “Community Mortgage Program” and “Regular Low-Cost Housing Projects” with mean values of 3.46 (the highest), 3.00, 2.96 and 2.92. While “Medium Rise Housing and Rental Housing” is the lowest with a mean value of 2.45 and with qualitative description of “Slightly Aware” which pulled down the overall mean of the program. This means that the housing program of the government was not very much known to many Isabelinos, specifically the “Medium Rise/Rental Housing” which is the lowest, basically due to the fact that its design and purpose were not fitted for the rural areas where population was not condensed, hence, it was only implemented in urban areas like Metro Manila. “Community Mortgage Program and Regular Low-Cost Housing” Projects posted a very close low mean values because this scheme is for the working-class and gainfully employed persons only, hence, affected the ratings of the respondents where most of them were daily income earners. Core Shelter Housing Assistance ranked the highest may be due to the fact that it was intended for the less capable public and being implemented by most of the LGUs in Isabela. Furthermore, Isabela has an abundant land being the second largest province in the country and the largest in Luzon (Isabela Province official website) wherein homelessness is not a big problem, specifically in the smaller municipalities like Gamu, Luna, Naguilian and San Guillermo with a lesser population among the LGUs in the province (Appendix H) as per PSA 2015. However, natural calamities whipped the province several times for the past years damaging many houses and other properties which contributed to homelessness and displacement of families. Hence, prompted some of the LGUs to implement Core Shelter Housing Assistance and catch attention of some private organizations like GK Foundation and UN Habitat wherein GK Villages and UN Habitat has been built in some of the LGUs of Isabela.

It was also worthy to mention that the different types of scheme under this program depends on the needs and paying capacities of the beneficiaries (LGUs Guidebook for Local housing Project/Program), hence, the results was affected. Nevertheless, the LGUs of Gamu, Naguilian and San Guillermo had a provision to improve the housing needs of their constituents through information drive, consultation with concerned families, identification of sites, inventory of families living in danger zones, communicate with private companies regarding provision of low cost housing, and other strategies (LGUs ELA 2016-2019).
3.2.3 Awareness on the Infrastructure Development Program

The level of awareness of infrastructure development as perceived by the respondents scored relatively high mean values in all its indicators scoring a mean value of 4.45 with a qualitative description of “Aware” wherein two (2) got a qualitative description of “Fully Aware” and the other two (2) got “Aware”. Indicator 1 posted the highest with 4.57 followed by indicator 2 with 4.57 then indicator 4 with 4.37 and the indicator 3 with 4.26 as the lowest. The data revealed that respondents were fully aware with regards to the FMRs and Bridges projects but also aware with the CIS and Potable Water System which imply that the projects are generally known by the public. This supports the claim of [10] that the role of community participation is important because of their knowledge/understanding of the environment as well as the asymmetries of information among the households and the fact that the community members are directly affected by the outcomes. Furthermore, [11] mentioned that the program planners and implementers are encouraged to intensify awareness creation among rural dwellers and adopt the use of community driven development approach (CDD) in the execution of rural development projects with poverty alleviation thrust. It denoted that the objectives of the LGUs (LGUS ELA 2016-2019) and national government (AFMA and PRDP) towards Infrastructure Development had been met and the strategies/thrusts were effective that somehow alleviate the lives of the people redounding to economic growth and development. This was in consonance with the studies of: [10] that completed irrigation development projects had an impact on the increase of farm production and household income; [12] there was an increase in the net income of project beneficiaries after the implementation of development projects, [13] among the project interventions, farm-to-market roads showed to have the most significant impact on the communities.

3.3 Significant Difference on the Perception of Respondents on Economic, Social and Infrastructure Development Using ANOVA

Table 2 revealed that significant differences on the respondents’ perception on the level of awareness in Social Housing (t = -2.791, p = .006) and Infrastructure Development (t = -2.791, p = .006) both had p values lower than 1 percent level of significance when grouped according to gender. The difference of perception when grouped according to gender which might be affected by the more number of male respondents than female. It is also revealed that there was statistically difference on the respondents’ perception on the level of awareness when grouped according to their age. There was statistically difference in Social Housing (f = 2.60, p = .018) with p value lower than 5 percent level of significance. The difference of perception when grouped according to age may be accounted for by the study’s respondents, the heads of household, wherein household was headed by the elderly. It is also revealed that there was no statistically difference on the respondents’ perception on the level of awareness on 4Ps, Social Housing and Infrastructure Development when grouped according to their civil status. This implied that the respondents perceived the same regardless of their civil status. The above table revealed that there was statistically difference in respondents’ perception on awareness when grouped according to their number of children. There was statistically difference in Social Housing (f = 3.140, p = .015) with p values lower than 5 percent level of significance. The difference of perception when grouped according to number of children might be accounted to the fact that the study purposely chose the heads of the household with at least two children, hence it revealed to be the highest. The number of children might dictate priorities and spending as it affected the direction of their plans. The table showed that the respondents’ perception on Awareness differed when grouped according to their educational attainment. There was statistically difference on Social Housing (f = 5.647, p = .000) having a significant difference lower than 1 percent level of significance. This indicates that respondents’ education affected their views and opinions, their level of perception and values because some of them found to have no formal education while some were college graduates and most of them finished high school. The

Table 2 presented the Difference in the Perception of Respondents on the Awareness in Economic, Social and Infrastructure Development.
above table showed that the respondents’ perception on Awareness differed in terms of income. 4Ps ($f = 4.216, p = .016$) with $p$ value lower than 5 percent level of significance and Social Housing ($f = 20.263, p = .000$) had lower than 1 percent level of significance. This implies that the respondents’ perception in the awareness on 4Ps and Social Housing varied based on their income. The results could be associated with the financial capabilities or income earned by the respondents where most of them found to earn an income per day below minimum wage (154 or 61.4% of the total population) and not regular/daily or seasonal only, hence, 104 out 250 respondents were 4Ps recipients. The low income earner’s view differed from the high earner’s view, certainly, their appreciation and spending were dictated by their income or earnings. This was similar with the findings of Domingo (2017) that there was significant difference on the perception of respondents when grouped according to their Income.

It can be observed that there was a varied perception on awareness among the programs in terms of respondents’ occupation/source of income. Significant differences were found on Social Housing ($f = 2.765, p = .000$) and Infrastructure Development ($f = 1.941, p = .001$), both have $p$ values which was lower than 1 percent level of significance. The findings suggest that the respondents’ occupation could give a good contrasting perception and differing views and opinions where most of them were engaged in agriculture and agriculture-related work within their locality while others were employed in a monthly basis salary and some are farm/business owners that dictated their exposure to other type of environment, experiences and peers. This means that the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the perception of respondents on the awareness in Economic, Social and Infrastructure Development was rejected because some of the profile revealed significant differences found on some of the profile of 4Ps, on Social and on Infrastructure Development. This was related with the findings of [11] that the awareness in the rural development programs was noticeably high.

### 4 Conclusion

The assessment noted that the awareness on the poverty alleviation programs like Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), Social Housing Program and Farm-to-Market Roads (FMRs) in Isabela was generally effective in terms on how the project is carried out particularly on 4Ps and FMRs. In addition, the assessment whether there was a significant difference in the perception of the respondents on the level of implementation of economic, social and infrastructure development programs in terms of their profile, results revealed in some indicators of the different areas of the three (3) programs that there is statistically significant differences in their perception when they were grouped according to their profile leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis in some of the indicators. As regards to awareness, the respondents from the four (4) Local Government Units had fair level of awareness, hence, considerable efforts must be done to increase awareness of their constituents, especially on Social Housing programs of the government. This can be done through public forum, dissemination and distribution of flyers and other information and communication technology (ICT) materials and the use of social media like Facebook can be helpful in informing the citizens about their programs which can also serve as feedback mechanism.
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