

The Effectiveness of the Implementation of the May-Ogob Agrarian Reform Community Development Plan (ARCDP) of the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) in the Municipality of Ocampo Province of Camarines Sur

Sarah N. Pentecostes¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026	The study evaluated the implementation and perceived effectiveness of the May-Ogob Agrarian Reform Community Development Plan (ARCDP) of the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) in Ocampo, Camarines Sur. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design involved farmers, local government officials, stakeholders, and nongovernmental organization representatives from six barangays. Data were gathered through a semi-structured questionnaire. Weighted means described implementation across beneficiary, DAR, and local government domains and perceived effectiveness across nine development domains. Kendall's coefficient of concordance and chi-square statistics were reported for three respondent clusters. Overall implementation was rated Much Implemented (3.91), while overall perceived effectiveness was rated Much Effective (4.02). The beneficiary domain had the highest implementation mean (4.04); expanded economic opportunities had the highest reported effectiveness mean (4.09). Monitoring and evaluation had the lowest reported effectiveness mean (3.97), including a comparatively lower rating for tracking differentiated impacts on women, youth, and marginalized groups (3.57). Conflicting statistical statements, an invalid reported concordance entry, and an unresolved summary label prevent a definitive conclusion about significant rank agreement. The findings favor continued support services, infrastructure, livelihood development, formal coordination, and more inclusive monitoring. They describe perceptions rather than measured causal effects. Missing participant counts, measurement specifications, and procedural documentation limit reproducibility and generalization.
Keywords: Agrarian Reform Community Development Implementation Perceived Effectiveness Support Services Ocampo	

1. Introduction

Agrarian reform community development connects land-related interventions with the organizational, financial, technical, and physical support needed to sustain rural livelihoods. Evaluating such a program requires attention to both delivery arrangements and the outcomes that beneficiaries and implementing partners perceive. A favorable assessment of service provision can identify institutional strengths, but it does not establish that household income, farm output, or welfare changed because of the program. This distinction is central to interpreting the effectiveness of a local development plan.

The May-Ogob Agrarian Reform Community Development Plan (ARCDP) provides the local focus of the study in the Municipality of Ocampo, Province of Camarines Sur. The study considered the roles of Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs), the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), and the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Ocampo. Its development concerns included infrastructure, production support, capacity building, enterprise development, access to finance, and market linkages. These activities involve several institutions, making coordination and community ownership relevant to implementation as well as to its perceived benefits. Earlier agrarian reform research indicates why implementation ratings should be interpreted alongside the type of evidence collected. Gordoncillo (2015) found that conclusions from simpler comparisons were not validated through a double-difference approach and emphasized stronger evaluation designs. Talatagod et al. (2022) examined beneficiaries' socioeconomic conditions through interviews in agrarian reform communities in Mindanao. Their focus on livelihood, income, health, and education illustrates the breadth of outcomes relevant to beneficiary development, without establishing that findings from those communities apply to Ocampo. Stakeholder position also matters when evaluating institutional services. Frufonga and Sulleza (2018) examined the experiences of five landowners in Iloilo through a multiple case study. Their findings concerned landowners' adjustment and information needs. That perspective differs from the beneficiary and implementing-partner assessments examined here, suggesting that the identity of participants and the questions asked should remain explicit when comparing agrarian reform studies.

The study addressed five questions: the extent of implementation along the ARB, DAR, and LGU domains; significant agreement on the rank orders of implementation indicators; the extent of perceived effectiveness across nine development domains; significant agreement on effectiveness rankings among respondent groups; and policy recommendations based on the findings. The nine effectiveness domains were increased agricultural productivity, improved infrastructure, enhanced market access, expanded economic opportunities, adequate funding and resources, community participation and ownership, effective policy and program implementation, strong partnerships and coordination, and monitoring and evaluation.

The study contributes a local descriptive profile of perceived implementation and effectiveness. Indicator-level findings can identify priorities obscured by favorable overall ratings, while rank agreement concerns similarity in ordering rather than the size or cause of an economic benefit.

2. Methods

2.1 Research design and setting

The study employed a descriptive-evaluative-correlational research design in Ocampo, Camarines Sur. The descriptive component summarized questionnaire ratings, while the evaluative component concerned the reported extent of implementation and effectiveness. The inferential findings addressed agreement on rank orders. No separate participant-level correlation or regression between implementation and effectiveness was reported. No random assignment, comparison intervention, baseline measurement, or repeated outcome assessment was described.

The setting comprised six barangays: May-Ogob, Sta. Cruz, Old Moriones, New Moriones, San Roque Communal, and Hanawan. Participants were described as farmers, local government officials, stakeholders, and nongovernmental organization representatives. The participant total, eligible population, sampling method, recruitment process, response rate, and demographic distribution were not reported. Consequently, the study cannot be characterized as a probability sample or a complete enumeration. The date on the title page does not establish the period of fieldwork, which was not specified.

2.2 Instrument and measures

Data were gathered through a semi-structured questionnaire. Implementation was organized around ARBs, DAR, and the LGU of Ocampo. Effectiveness was organized around the nine development domains identified in the research questions. The reported statements cover organizational support, credit, infrastructure, skills, market access, livelihood opportunities, policy coordination, participation, and monitoring. Some statements combine multiple activities or outcomes; their mean values therefore apply to the statements as written rather than to independently measured components.

The complete questionnaire, response anchors, interpretation intervals, validation procedure, pilot sample, and reliability coefficients were not reported. The labels Much Implemented and Much Effective are retained for the corresponding reported domain means. Some passages instead use Much Evident or other classifications; these inconsistencies are not treated as evidence of an additional measurement scale. The tabular presentation retains the numerical indicator statements without assigning new item-level interpretation categories or numerical ranks. Implementation findings include complete numerical lists for the ARB and DAR domains but only selected LGU indicators. The effectiveness findings include lists for all nine domains. The community participation and ownership domain has an indicator list but no unambiguous domain mean. The effectiveness summary repeats the funding label and does not identify participation separately. This prevents assignment of an inferred participation mean. Repeated monitoring statements are retained as separate entries because their intended status cannot be established from the reported aggregates.

2.3 Data collection and ethical reporting

Questionnaire administration mode, distribution and retrieval procedures, dates, missing-response handling, and data-quality checks were not specified. Documentation of individual consent, confidentiality safeguards, ethics approval or exemption, and data retention was also not reported. These details cannot be reconstructed from the aggregate findings. The study is presented without participant identifiers, and no unreported ethical or administrative procedure is presumed to have occurred.

The analysis is limited to reported aggregate numerical findings. No independently measured farm yields, household incomes, poverty status, hectares redistributed, storage losses, travel costs, or service-utilization records were reported. References to these outcomes are treated as questionnaire content and perceptions.

2.4 Statistical analysis and reporting

Weighted means summarized the reported implementation and effectiveness ratings. Kendall's coefficient of concordance, W , and associated chi-square values were named in the rank-agreement analyses, using a stated significance level of 0.05. The inferential account referred to Cluster 1, Cluster 2, and Cluster 3. Cluster definitions, membership, sample sizes, ranking matrices, handling of ties, degrees of freedom, exact p values, and statistical software were not reported. Respondent clusters are not assumed to correspond to the three implementation domains.

Tables retain reported numerical values and probability inequalities. The first implementation statistic is reproduced as 2.86, although W must fall between 0 and 1; its interpretation is unresolved. The accompanying chi-square entry is retained as 10.286. Enhanced market access is reported with $p > 0.05$, despite a blanket claim of rejection across effectiveness domains. Later passages also contradict the principal numerical test accounts. These conflicts preclude a verified inference about significant agreement, and no corrected probability or replacement statistic has been calculated.

Reported domain and overall means are retained without recalculation from rounded item values. Indicator order, partial data, and repeated entries are preserved. No unreported standard deviations, confidence intervals, subgroup means, or demographic associations are inferred.

3. Results

The findings describe perceived implementation and effectiveness. Each indicator mean refers to its corresponding statement; descriptive differences do not establish statistically significant differences between indicators or domains.

3.1 Implementation along agrarian reform beneficiaries

Table 1. Implementation along Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries

Indicator	Weighted mean
Promote sustainable development and resource mobilization	4.20
Provide a comprehensive approach to supporting ARBs, equip ARB organizations and their leaders with the skills needed to manage	4.19

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Focus on empowering Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs) through various development initiatives	4.15
Emphasize increasing the resilience of ARB households to climate change risks and other challenges through the development of resilient agricultural infrastructure and climate-responsive food production systems	4.12
Equip ARB organizations and their leaders with the skills needed to manage	4.09
Sustain viable rural enterprises, and to effectively establish partnerships with other organizations, according to the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)	4.08
Strengthen ARB organizations, improve household incomes, and enhance their resilience	4.03
Build ARB organizations as hubs for support services, enabling them to better serve the community	4.03
Encourage collaboration between ARB organizations, government agencies, civil societies and the business sector	4.01
Foster partnerships with other organizations	4.00
Achieve through various support services, including credit programs and training initiatives	3.94
Inclusivity in program planning and decision-making; timeliness of support services delivery	3.85
Economic support services aim to raise incomes and improve the livelihoods of ARBs	3.83
Reported domain weighted mean	4.04

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Implemented.

Table 1 shows greater reported emphasis on sustainable development, resource mobilization, and organizational capability than on economic support for livelihoods. The relatively lower economic-support rating identifies a service concern within an otherwise favorable domain assessment. It does not demonstrate that incomes failed to increase, because no income series or household comparison was reported. The close relationship between organizational leadership, partnerships, and support-service statements also suggests that the domain combines institutional capacity with livelihood objectives. Program review should examine whether organizational activities are accompanied by accessible credit, timely services, and livelihood assistance, while retaining separate records of actual household outcomes.

3.2 Implementation along the Department of Agrarian Reform

Table 2. Implementation along the Department of Agrarian Reform

Indicator	Weighted mean
Provide support services to ARB organizations to increase their income and improve their overall well-being	4.02
Provide credit support to ARB organizations and farmers' organizations to help them with crop production	3.99
Increase ARB household incomes and improve their resilience	3.99
Focus on strengthening Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs) by establishing them as hubs of support services within their communities	3.95
Targets specific areas for development, ensuring that resources are allocated effectively and efficiently	3.95
Empower ARBs by providing them with the resources and support necessary to thrive in their communities	3.91
Promote climate-resilient farming practices and adaptation measures among ARBs, in coordination with the Department of Agriculture and other stakeholders	3.87
Encourage partnerships between government agencies, private sector entities, and civil society organizations to promote sustainable development in agrarian reform areas	3.84
Focus on improving the financial well-being and resilience of ARB households through various support services and initiatives	3.83
Aligns with the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) and the Agriculture sector's goals of improving food security, increasing income, and enhancing resilience	3.81
Provide comprehensive support and development initiatives to empower ARBs and promote sustainable rural development	3.81
Prioritize specific areas to maximize resource allocation and impact	3.75
Enhance productivity and income of ARBs	3.75
Provide various support services including access to credit, training and infrastructure development	3.67
Reported domain weighted mean	3.87

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Implemented. The narrative also calls the average Much Evident; that classification remains unresolved.

Table 2 places support for ARB organizations above the combined provision of credit, training, and infrastructure. This pattern suggests that respondents recognized DAR's organizational mandate while assigning comparatively less favorable ratings to the delivery of several practical services. The lowest statement bundles three forms of support, so its score cannot identify which service accounts for the assessment. The ratings support examining access and delivery arrangements rather than attributing a failure to a particular agency function. Separate information on service eligibility, application completion, delivery dates, and beneficiary reach would be needed to determine whether the perceived gap concerns coverage, timing, or adequacy.

3.3 Implementation along the Local Government Unit of Ocampo

Table 3. Selected reported implementation indicators for the Local Government Unit of Ocampo

Indicator	Weighted mean
Initiate local programs that support ARBs in developing off-farm income generating activities such as food processing, eco-tourism, or agri-business	4.00

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
Prioritize areas with higher Agrarian Reform Community (ARC) Level of Development Assessment (ALDA) ratings, making them nucleus areas for development	3.97
Develop specific areas with high ALDA ratings, making them central to the development process	3.93
Demonstrate genuine necessity for the acquisition of private property	3.59
Reported domain weighted mean	3.82

Note. Only four selected indicators have reported values. The domain mean is Much Implemented in the implementation summary and Much Evident in the detailed narrative. The literal entry 3.97 is retained; it has not been converted to 3.97.

Table 3 identifies off-farm livelihood initiatives as the most favorably rated of the selected LGU statements. The comparatively lower assessment of the necessity for acquiring private property concerns a different administrative function and should not be treated as a direct measure of livelihood delivery. Because the complete LGU indicator list is unavailable, the selected rows cannot represent the full content of this domain or be used to reconstruct its mean. The findings support clearer communication of local development priorities and responsibilities, but they do not establish whether any acquisition was lawful, necessary, or completed. Such determinations require evidence beyond a perception score.

3.4 Summary of implementation

Table 4. Reported implementation summary

Domain	Weighted mean	Reported interpretation
Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs)	4.04	Much Implemented
Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)	3.87	Much Implemented
Local Government Unit-Ocampo	3.82	Much Implemented
Overall mean	3.91	Much Implemented

Note. Reported averages are retained without recalculation or reassignment to respondent clusters.

Table 4 indicates a favorable overall assessment, with the beneficiary domain ranked above the DAR and LGU domains. This ordering identifies a potential priority for reviewing institutional service delivery alongside beneficiary organization. It cannot establish that beneficiaries performed better than government personnel: the domains consist of different statements and are not respondent performance tests. The absence of group-specific means and dispersion measures also prevents assessment of how evenly these views were shared. The overall mean should therefore be read as a descriptive summary of the reported ratings rather than as an independently validated measure of implementation quality across the municipality.

3.5 Reported agreement on implementation rankings

Table 5. Reported statistics for agreement on implementation rank orders

Domain	Reported entry	W	Reported χ^2	Reported p	Stated decision
Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries	2.86		10.286	< 0.05	H ₀ rejected
Department of Agrarian Reform	0.285		11.124	< 0.05	H ₀ rejected
Local Government Unit	0.327		10.795	< 0.05	H ₀ rejected

Note. The numerical sequence is presented under W and χ^2 as named in the test discussion. The entry 2.86 is outside the allowable W range. Subsequent statements instead describe $p > 0.05$ and nonsignificance; decisions remain unverified.

Table 5 preserves the principal numerical account and its stated rejection decisions. The ARB entry prevents an ordinary concordance interpretation, while later contradictory statements prevent confirmation of the reported significance classifications. These issues cannot be resolved by replacing 2.86 with a guessed decimal or by selecting whichever paragraph appears more plausible. Even a valid concordance result would concern similarity in indicator ordering, rather than a relationship between demographic characteristics and perceptions. Claims about land size, education, or location are not supported by a demographic association analysis. The implementation findings consequently support descriptive priorities while the inferential conclusion remains unresolved.

3.6 Perceived effectiveness in increasing agricultural productivity

Table 6. Perceived effectiveness in increased agricultural productivity

Indicator	Weighted mean
DAR's broader programs, like ARCESS and the Agrarian Production Credit Program	4.31
Support services, as well as effective land tenure and ownership arrangements	4.28
Access to affordable credit to invest in inputs like fertilizers, seeds, and equipment	4.12
Increase agricultural productivity and products in the local market	4.09
Provide ARBs with secure land tenure, which can encourage investment and increase productivity	4.08
Monitor and evaluate are crucial to assess the effectiveness of agrarian reform programs and identify areas for improvement	4.05
Utilize mobile phones and digital platforms to disseminate crop advisories, weather updates, and market trends to ARBs)	4.02
Provide credit to ARBs, enabling them to invest in their farms and potentially increase production	3.98
Improve productivity and income for agrarian reform beneficiaries	3.94
Access to improved agricultural technologies and extension services can significantly increase productivity	3.90

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
Strengthen Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs) by providing them with access to support services, potentially leading to increased productivity	3.88
Provide technical assistance, extension services, and infrastructure development to support agricultural productivity	3.88
Reported domain weighted mean	4.04

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Effective.

Table 6 shows relatively stronger ratings for broad DAR programs and the combination of support services with land-tenure arrangements. Technical assistance and the strengthening of ARBs through service access share the lowest reported mean. The pattern directs attention to how broad program recognition is translated into practical assistance. However, the statements include access, administrative activity, and anticipated production benefits, so their combined assessment is broader than a measure of crop output. The study supports reviewing extension contact, training relevance, and access to farm support. It does not establish a measured productivity increase or identify technical assistance as the cause of any change in production.

3.7 Perceived effectiveness in improving infrastructure

Table 7. Perceived effectiveness in improved infrastructure

Indicator	Weighted mean
Incorporate infrastructure development as a key strategy to enhance agricultural productivity and connectivity	4.20
Connect farms to markets, facilitating the transport of produce and increasing access to markets, thus improving farm income	4.17
Suggests that infrastructure projects, such as farm-to-market roads and irrigation systems, have been impactful in improving ARB livelihoods	4.12
Improve the lives of agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs) through various initiatives, including infrastructure development	4.10
Seek to address rural poverty and improve the quality of life for ARBs	4.06
Provide credit support, training, and other support services to help ARBs improve their livelihoods and strengthen their organization	4.06
Focus on strengthening ARB organizations and providing support services to boost their income and resilience	4.03
Positive impacted farmer income and production	3.93
Ensure that infrastructure projects (roads, bridges, irrigation) are disaster-resilient and adaptable to climate-related risks	3.92
Boost agricultural production, especially in areas with limited water resources	3.87
Strengthen the lives of agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs)	3.71
Reported domain weighted mean	4.02

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Effective. Some item descriptions use Much Evident; a later passage calls the 3.71 entry moderately effective. No item-level categories are inferred.

Table 7 places infrastructure's strategic role and farm-to-market connectivity above the broadly worded statement about strengthening beneficiaries' lives. This difference suggests a distinction between recognition of infrastructure activity and perceptions of its wider welfare implications. It does not document road condition, irrigation reliability, transport savings, or realized income effects. Several indicators also refer to credit and organizational support, which extend beyond physical infrastructure and complicate interpretation of the domain mean. Infrastructure review should therefore connect project records with accessibility and maintenance information, while household outcomes should be assessed separately. The relatively lower welfare statement is a priority for inquiry rather than evidence that infrastructure lacked value.

3.8 Perceived effectiveness in enhancing market access

Table 8. Perceived effectiveness in enhanced market access

Indicator	Weighted mean
Enhance market access in the barrio	4.21
Facilitate access to credit and financing for ARBs, enabling them to invest in their farms and businesses	4.17
Encourage to diversify their crops and explore alternative farming systems, expanding their market options	4.11
Improve agricultural productivity, provide access to basic services	4.06
Encourage the adoption of improved farming techniques and technologies, leading to higher agricultural yields	4.05
Increase the productivity of agricultural lands and allow for the Cultivation of a wider range of crops, potentially increasing market options	4.04
Facilitate infrastructure development within Agrarian Reform Communities	4.01
Focus on these areas, the program seeks to empower ARBs and boost their economic opportunities	3.97
Facilitate ARB participation in local and regional trade fairs and expos to promote their products and build buyer networks	3.96
Supports the development of small-scale enterprises and value-added processing of agricultural products, allowing ARBs to earn higher incomes	3.94

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
Invest in the construction and improvement of farm-to-market roads, facilitating the transportation of produce to markets and reducing transport costs	3.88
Support the establishment of storage facilities to help ARBs manage their harvest and avoid post-harvest losses	3.78
Reported domain weighted mean	4.02

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Effective.

Table 8 shows a favorable overall assessment of market access alongside a relatively lower rating for storage facilities. Market linkage and post-harvest management are related but distinct: access to buyers does not establish that farmers can safely retain produce or choose the timing of sales. The pattern supports examining storage availability and beneficiary access as part of market-support planning. No storage inventory, loss estimates, sale prices, or marketing-cost records were reported, so the findings do not quantify post-harvest losses or verify that better access increased bargaining power. The practical implication is to investigate the lower-rated operational component while maintaining the broader market-linkage activities respondents viewed favorably.

3.9 Perceived effectiveness in expanding economic opportunities

Table 9. Perceived effectiveness in expanded economic opportunities

Indicator	Weighted mean
Expand economic opportunities for agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs) by focusing on community development and improving access to infrastructure	4.34
Positive impact on some key areas like income and poverty reduction, the overall effectiveness in achieving widespread, sustained economic opportunities is complex and multifaceted	4.33
Support ARB cooperatives with shared post-harvest, transport, and marketing facilities to reduce costs and increase income	4.17
Aim to raise household income and reduce poverty depth	4.14
Provide support services like credit programs (e.g., Agrarian Production Credit Program), technical assistance, and training to help ARBs increase production and diversify their livelihoods	4.09
Emphasize investments in infrastructure, such as farm-to-market roads, which are crucial for connecting ARBs to markets and increasing their economic opportunities	4.05
Suggest that agrarian reform initiatives, including those like May-Ogob, have led to higher per capita incomes	4.03
Reduce poverty Incidence among ARBs	4.01
Demonstrate a positive potential for expanding economic opportunities for ARBs, particularly in terms of income generation, poverty reduction	3.97
Economic opportunities needs to be continuously monitored and assessed to ensure that the benefits are sustained and that the most vulnerable ARBs are effectively reached	3.94
Sustain and effective implementation of the program requires ongoing efforts to address policy and implementation challenges	3.87
Reported domain weighted mean	4.09

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Effective. The numerical list is retained. A later interpretation repeats a different value for the second statement and elsewhere uses Very Effective for the domain; these discrepancies remain unresolved.

Table 9 indicates that respondents rated the expansion of economic opportunities favorably, particularly statements linking community development with access to infrastructure. The comparatively lower rating concerns the continuing work needed to sustain implementation and address policy challenges. This suggests that the perceived availability of opportunities and their institutional durability should be examined separately. The results do not enumerate enterprises, jobs, earnings, or business survival. Their policy relevance lies in identifying livelihood and enterprise support as valued activities while recognizing that continued coordination and service access may require attention. Economic opportunity ratings should not be converted into estimates of employment growth or poverty reduction.

3.10 Perceived effectiveness in funding and resource provision

Table 10. Perceived effectiveness in adequate funding and resources

Indicator	Weighted mean
Adequate funding allows for the provision of inputs like seeds, fertilizers, and equipment	4.20
Provide alternative farming systems and creating employment opportunities	4.11
Improve living conditions	4.10
Achieve intended outcomes such as increased agricultural production	4.08
Generate income for the people	4.03
Promote sustainable agricultural practices	4.03
Improve the lives of ARBs by increasing agricultural productivity	3.97
Enhance their overall capabilities	3.97
Secure adequate funding from government and other sources, particularly in times of economic down turn or competing priorities	3.94
Support the development of livelihood programs including microfinance, training in value-added processing and market access to markets	3.89

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Weighted mean
Develop livelihood opportunities	3.87
Reported domain weighted mean	4.02

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Effective.

Table 10 places the provision of agricultural inputs above livelihood development. This distinction suggests that respondents may recognize resources supporting current farming activities more readily than resources for broader livelihood opportunities. A rating of funding adequacy is not a budget execution rate, and the findings do not identify the amount, release schedule, or distribution of financial resources. The lowest statement also concerns an outcome rather than a financing process, limiting any direct diagnosis of a funding shortage. Review of resource allocation should therefore combine beneficiary feedback with expenditure and access records. The descriptive pattern supports examining whether assistance covers both production inputs and livelihood development needs.

3.11 Perceived effectiveness in community participation and ownership

Table 11. Perceived effectiveness in community participation and ownership

Indicator	Weighted mean
Provide Opportunities for ARBs to learn and develop skills	4.20
Ensure that projects are sustainable and continue to benefit the community long after external support is withdrawn	4.16
Ensure that women, youth, and marginalized groups have active roles in planning and decision making process	4.11
Reinforces their sense of ownership and motivates them to continue participating	4.09
Active participation in projects can strengthen community organizations and their capacity to address local issues	4.07
Builds their capacity to manage and maintain the project effectively	4.06
Leads to better project outcome	4.03
Address community needs can lead to better health, education, and over-all well-being	4.01
Ensure that projects activities align with community needs and priorities	3.96
Empower communities to take ownership of the project and its outcomes	3.94
Encourage the contribution of local resources (labor, materials and expertise)	3.87
Promotes accountability and ensures that the project serves the community needs	3.75

Note. A domain weighted mean is not unambiguously reported. The participation mean cannot be inferred from the duplicated funding entry in the effectiveness summary. Indicator wording is retained.

Table 11 distinguishes opportunities to learn and develop skills from accountability and responsiveness to community needs. The latter receives the lowest rating, suggesting that capacity-building opportunities should be considered alongside mechanisms through which beneficiaries influence decisions and review performance. Attendance or training access alone cannot establish ownership of a development process. Wasilwa (2015), in a web-published discussion of community-based development, also identifies the participation-sustainability relationship as a question requiring evaluation rather than an automatic benefit. The study's findings support attention to feedback, representation, and accountability, but no domain average or causal conclusion about participation is warranted from the reported data.

3.12 Perceived effectiveness in policy and program implementation

Table 12. Perceived effectiveness in effective policy and program implementation

Indicator	Weighted mean
Ensure sustainability of the development intervention	4.29
Promote community-based initiatives that enhance the quality of life of ARBs and their families, such as improved infrastructure, education, and healthcare access	4.26
Establish various policies and programs to support ARCD, including the ARC Development Strategy	4.18
Align DAR policies with those of DA, DENR, DILG, and LGUs to avoid duplication and enhance coordinated service delivery to ARBs)	4.04
Contribute to broader development goals like rural poverty reduction	4.09
Resolve land disputes and ensuring that ARBs receive fair treatment in legal matters	4.02
Better economic and social conditions compared to non-ARBs, including higher income, improved access to education and healthcare, and increased ownership of assets	4.01
Focus on creating sustainable solutions that empower ARBs to self-manage their communities and build their long-term resilience	4.00
Improve the economic and social conditions of ARBs and their communities	4.00
Provide various support services to ARBs, including technical assistance, access to credit, and training programs to enhance their agricultural productivity and income generation	3.97
Adequate financial resources are essential for implementing ARCDP activities, including infrastructure development, technical assistance, and support service	3.93
Made significant progress in land distribution, with a large number of hectares redistributed to ARBs	3.83
Reported domain weighted mean	4.05

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Effective. Reported order is retained, including 4.04 before 4.09; the list is not strictly descending.

Table 12 assigns higher ratings to sustainability and quality-of-life objectives than to reported progress in land distribution. The pattern suggests favorable recognition of broad policy aims alongside a comparatively less favorable assessment of a specific delivery concern. However, the indicator on redistributed hectares contains no area measurement and cannot establish the volume

or pace of redistribution. Similarly, the comparison with non-ARBs is a rated statement rather than a measured control-group comparison. The appropriate implication is to align policy objectives with documented service and tenure-related outputs. Differences among these statements should not be interpreted as verified differences in actual legal, economic, or social outcomes.

3.13 Perceived effectiveness in partnerships and coordination

Table 13. Perceived effectiveness in strong partnerships and coordination

Indicator	Weighted mean
Play a vital role in coordinating and implementing programs within their local areas	4.36
Increase ownership and participation of ARBs in the development process	4.20
Provide valuable insights and support for its implementation	4.10
Help in providing additional support to ARBs, such as access to agricultural extension services, credit facilities, and employment opportunities	4.07
Improve access to resources and support for ARBs	4.01
Acts as a facilitator and coordinator, bringing together different stakeholders	3.99
Promote collaboration to ensure that the program is effectively implemented and that the needs of ARBs are met	3.95
Ensure that resources are effectively utilized and that the needs of the communities are addressed	3.93
Greater sustainability of development efforts	3.91
Promote social equity and new economic opportunities towards lasting peace and sustainable rural development	3.86
Encourage stakeholders to formalize roles and commitments through memoranda of understanding (MOUs) or co-implementation agreements	3.70
Reported domain weighted mean	4.01

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Effective.

Table 13 indicates stronger ratings for local coordination roles than for formal agreements specifying stakeholder commitments. This suggests that recognized cooperation may coexist with comparatively less visible formal arrangements. It does not establish that memoranda are absent or that informal collaboration is ineffective. The lower-rated item supports reviewing whether responsibilities, contributions, and implementation commitments are documented and understood by partners. Such clarification may help protect continuity when personnel or priorities change, although the study did not test that mechanism. The results favor maintaining working relationships while examining the institutional arrangements that make coordination traceable and accountable to beneficiaries.

3.14 Perceived effectiveness in monitoring and evaluation

Table 14. Perceived effectiveness in monitoring and evaluation

Indicator	Weighted mean
Achieve its objectives, with positive impacts on the socioeconomic status of ARBs	4.21
Monitor outcome indicators, which assess the overall impact of the program ment it. on ARBs' lives	4.17
Increase incomes and an improved quality of life	4.16
Expand employment opportunities, and enhancing infrastructure	4.15
Increase agricultural productivity, access to services, and improved quality of life	4.07
Focus on project-level performance monitoring, providing detailed information on physical progress, financial performance, and implementation concerns	4.04
Use to track progress towards program goals and identify areas where improvement is needed	3.99
Provide valuable feedback on program implementation and helps identify areas where improvement is needed	3.95
Improve agricultural productivity, introducing alternative farming systems	3.91
Review of the overall accomplishments, results, and impact of the program, which feeds into DAR's overall accomplishment reports	3.85
Comply the environment and social safeguards is generally good; there are weaknesses in the monitoring and reporting of their implementation	3.86
Review of the overall accomplishments, results and impact of the program, which feeds into DAR's overall accomplishment reports	3.85
Ensure that resources are being used effectively and efficiently to achieve program goals	3.81
Suggests that the program has largely met its goal of increasing opportunities for ARBs	3.79
Track differentiated impacts of the ARCDP on women, youth, and marginalized groups	3.57
Reported domain weighted mean	3.97

Note. Reported domain interpretation: Much Effective. Fifteen numerical entries are listed although the narrative states fourteen. Two accomplishment-review statements are substantively repeated at 3.85; both are retained. Reported order includes 3.85 before 3.86.

Table 14 shows a comparatively lower rating for tracking differentiated impacts on women, youth, and marginalized groups than for broad program objectives and socioeconomic improvement. This is a substantive monitoring priority: an overall favorable assessment may conceal differences in access and experience within the community. Nevertheless, the findings contain no disaggregated outcomes and therefore cannot establish who benefited least. The repeated review statement and inconsistent item count also limit confidence in the domain's measurement structure. Evaluation should clarify the indicator inventory and examine beneficiary coverage before drawing distributional conclusions. Monitoring activity, perceived achievement, and verified effects should be distinguished in subsequent reporting.

3.15 Summary of perceived effectiveness

Table 15. Reported summary of perceived implementation effectiveness

Reported domain label	Weighted mean
Expanded Economic Opportunities	4.09
Effective Policy and Program Implementation	4.05
Increased Agricultural Productivity	4.04
Improved Infrastructure	4.02
Enhanced Market Access	4.02
Adequate Funding and Resources	4.02
Adequate Funding and Resources	4.02
Strong Partnerships and Coordination	4.01
Monitoring and Evaluation	3.97
Overall mean	4.02

Note. All summary entries are described as Much Effective. The funding label is repeated exactly as reported; community participation and ownership is not separately identified. The repeated row has not been relabeled or removed, and the overall mean has not been recalculated. Table 15 identifies expanded economic opportunities as the highest-rated named domain and monitoring and evaluation as the lowest. The profile suggests that visible development opportunities may attract more favorable perceptions than the systems used to document and assess them. The overall rating remains a reported descriptive value, not a validated average of nine uniquely identified domains, because participation is absent and funding is duplicated. The narrow numerical spread among several named domains should not be interpreted as evidence of meaningful or statistically significant differences. The summary is useful for locating reported priorities, but comparison across all nine intended domains requires resolution of the missing label and domain mean.

3.16 Reported agreement on effectiveness rankings

Table 16. Reported statistics for agreement on effectiveness rank orders

Domain	Reported W	Reported χ^2	Reported p
Increased Agricultural Productivity	0.470	15.500	< 0.05
Improved Infrastructure	0.425	12.742	< 0.05
Enhanced Market Access	0.428	12.833	> 0.05
Expanded Economic Opportunities	0.428	12.833	< 0.05
Adequate Funding and Resources	0.265	7.955	< 0.05
Community Participation and Ownership	0.540	17.833	< 0.05
Effective Policy and Program Implementation	0.224	7.397	< 0.05
Strong Partnerships and Coordination	0.441	13.242	< 0.05
Monitoring and Evaluation	0.509	19.8848	< 0.05

Note. The principal narrative states H_0 rejected for all domains, including enhanced market access despite its $p > 0.05$ entry. Later statements instead report nonsignificance and incompatible statistics. No corrected decision is substituted.

Table 16 contains higher reported W values for participation and monitoring than for policy implementation and funding. These values would describe relative consistency of rankings if the underlying calculations were verified. They do not indicate that participation generated a larger benefit or that monitoring improved incomes. The identical W and chi-square pair for market access and economic opportunities is accompanied by opposing probability inequalities, requiring clarification. The later account of universal nonsignificance adds a further contradiction. Accordingly, the study cannot establish which domains show significant agreement, and the blanket assertion of a significant positive program impact is not supported by this rank-agreement analysis.

4. Discussion

4.1 Implementation and perceived effectiveness

The study's descriptive findings support a favorable assessment of implementation and perceived effectiveness while identifying operational concerns. The beneficiary implementation profile emphasizes sustainable development and organizational support. The DAR and selected LGU findings direct attention to practical service delivery, livelihood assistance, and local responsibilities. Across effectiveness domains, respondents rated broad development opportunities favorably, while several lower-rated statements concerned delivery mechanisms, accountability, formal commitments, and monitoring. This pattern suggests that maintaining recognized program activities should be accompanied by closer attention to the arrangements that sustain and document them.

Implementation and effectiveness are related in the study's conceptual focus, but the reported analysis does not estimate their empirical association. A higher domain mean in one set of ratings cannot explain a higher mean in the other. The statements also overlap: credit, infrastructure, capacity building, income, and resilience appear in multiple domains. Such overlap can reflect the integrated nature of community development, but it also means that domain scores may not represent distinct constructs. Without instrument specifications and participant-level data, the study cannot determine the independence of these measures or identify the contribution of individual services.

The socioeconomic concerns examined by Talatagod et al. (2022) provide relevant context for considering livelihood support alongside access to health and education. The Ocampo ratings similarly extend beyond production to wider living conditions. However, the settings and evidence differ, and perceived effectiveness cannot be treated as replication of economic outcomes elsewhere. Frufonga and Sulleza (2018) likewise illustrate that agrarian reform experiences depend on whose perspective is examined. Clear documentation of farmer, official, and nongovernmental participant roles would strengthen interpretation of the study's local assessment.

4.2 Rank agreement and the limits of impact claims

The inferential research questions concern agreement on the ordering of indicators. They do not test whether an intervention improved an outcome over time, whether recipients performed better than a comparison group, or whether demographic characteristics predict an assessment. Consequently, even a fully verified significant concordance result would not demonstrate causal effectiveness. The contradictory statistics and probability statements impose an additional limitation: the direction of the significance conclusion itself remains unresolved. The descriptive profiles can be discussed, but they cannot be strengthened by selecting an unsupported inferential conclusion.

Gordoncillo's (2015) methodological findings reinforce the need to distinguish favorable patterns from identified program effects. The study has no documented counterfactual, baseline, or independent economic outcome assessment. Claims that ARCDP increased income, reduced losses, or alleviated poverty therefore exceed the evidence presented. These remain development objectives and possible subjects for future evaluation. A subsequent assessment could connect beneficiary perceptions with documented delivery and outcome measures, provided its design addresses the alternative explanations relevant to those outcomes.

4.3 Policy and management implications

The policy direction of the study is to sustain economic support services, improve access to credit and technical assistance, strengthen rural infrastructure, support livelihood opportunities, and coordinate DAR and LGU responsibilities. These recommendations follow the concerns represented by comparatively lower-rated statements. They are proposals for implementation review, not interventions whose effectiveness was tested. Priority setting should consider the beneficiaries reached, the services requested, and the institutional capacity needed to deliver them, rather than interpreting a small difference between means as a complete resource-allocation rule.

Formal commitments deserve attention because the partnerships domain distinguishes recognized coordination from documented roles. The study's recommendation for a multi-stakeholder council involving cooperative leaders, municipal agrarian reform personnel, and the Municipal Agriculture Office offers a possible forum for aligning local needs and service plans. Quarterly coordination was proposed. Its value would depend on defined responsibilities, beneficiary representation, and follow-through; none of these proposed arrangements is reported as an evaluated intervention. Integration of local development planning and agrarian reform support should therefore be assessed through documented implementation commitments.

Monitoring should include differentiated information on women, youth, and marginalized groups, consistent with the lowest-rated monitoring statement. Such information could identify whether favorable averages conceal uneven service reach. The ratings do not justify assuming exclusion of any particular group, and disaggregation should be based on an appropriate and documented data process. Community feedback and accountability mechanisms should accompany capacity-building opportunities so that participation can inform decisions. These priorities give substantive meaning to the findings without converting perceived effectiveness into a claim of demonstrated welfare improvement.

5. Conclusion

The study reported overall implementation as Much Implemented (3.91) and perceived effectiveness as Much Effective (4.02). Beneficiary-related implementation received the highest implementation mean, while expanded economic opportunities received the highest named effectiveness mean. Comparatively lower assessments identified concerns involving practical support services, livelihood development, accountability, formal coordination, and differentiated monitoring. The study supports continued economic and organizational support, coordinated infrastructure and technical assistance, and more inclusive monitoring. Conflicting inferential statements prevent a definitive conclusion about significant rank agreement. The findings describe stakeholder perceptions and do not establish causal improvements in productivity, income, or poverty. Resolution of the reporting inconsistencies and completion of methodological documentation are necessary before stronger conclusions can be drawn.

References

- [1] Frufonga, R. F., & Sulleza, V. S. (2018). Making a difference: A case study on the lives of landowners under the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program in Iloilo, Philippines. *WVSU Research Journal*, 7(2), 40–54. <https://doi.org/10.59460/wvsurjvol7iss2pp40-54>
- [2] Gordoncillo, P. U. (2015). Double difference approach to impact evaluation: Case of the effects of the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) on poverty. *Journal of Public Affairs and Development*, 2(1), Article 4. <https://www.ukdr.uplb.edu.ph/jpad/vol2/iss1/4/>
- [3] Talatagod, F. D., Gumapac, S. A., Samarca, K. T., & Pardillo, J. S. (2022). Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program and socio-economic conditions of its beneficiaries in Region X and XI in Mindanao, Philippines. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, 10(4), 15–28. <https://www.idpublications.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Full-Paper-COMPREHENSIVE-AGRARIAN-REFORM-PROGRAM-AND-SOCIO-ECONOMIC-CONDITIONS-OF-ITS-BENEFICIARIES-IN-REGION.pdf>
- [4] Wasilwa, C. W. (2015, May 26). Effect of community participation on sustainability of community based devt. projects in Kenya. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/effect-community-participation-sustainability-based-calebwasilwa>