Quality of Life and Beneficiary Satisfaction in the Targeted Actions to Reduce Poverty and Generate Economic Transformation Program in Candijay: A Mixed Method Study

Gelourd B. Estapia

Agricultural Technologist Municipality of Candijay

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600033

Received: 15 May 2026; Accepted: 20 May 2026; Published: 16 June 2026

ABSTRACT

A mixed-methods approach was utilized to evaluate the effectiveness of the BFAR TARGET Program among fisherfolk in Candijay, Bohol. The majority of beneficiaries were mature individuals (66.66%) aged 51 to 70, with 35.1% having completed primary education. Quantitative analysis, employing a paired t-test, demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in quality of life ($p<.001$), as reflected by an increase in the average weighted mean (AWM) from 2.31 (Barely Sufficient) to 2.60 (Sufficient). This improvement was accompanied by economic gains, including a reduction in households earning below 5,000.00 pesos from 35.1% to 15.8%, and increased livelihood diversification through homestead gardening (57.9%) and fish processing (29.8%). Beneficiary satisfaction was high (GWM=3.10), particularly with local government unit (LGU) management (AWM=3.21). Pearson correlation analysis ($r=128$, $p=3.42$) indicated that satisfaction was primarily associated with the quality of service delivery rather than initial poverty status. Qualitative findings identified gaps related to environmental risks and insufficient investment, revealing that despite economic improvements, most beneficiaries remained below the poverty line, which requires 17,500 pesos per month. To enhance program sustainability, it is recommended that the LGU and BFAR establish direct-to-market linkages to increase net profits, provide disease-resistant seaweed strains to support the 23.5% of beneficiaries engaged in seaweed farming, and implement micro-savings training to strengthen financial resilience against unexpected expenses.

Keywords: TARGET Program, Quality of Life, Beneficiary satisfaction, BFAR, LGU

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE

The evaluation of the Targeted Actions to Reduce Poverty and Generate Economic Transformation (TARGET) Program in Candijay, Bohol, addresses significant socio-economic and environmental vulnerabilities in a community reliant on municipal fishing. This mixed-methods research systematically examines beneficiary demographics and assesses program effectiveness by comparing income and quality of life metrics before and after participation, as well as evaluating satisfaction across project implementation, service delivery, and problem resolution. Globally, fisherfolk experience systemic poverty; studies by Allison and Ellis (2001) and Pomeroy et al. (2007) emphasize the importance of livelihood diversification, financial aid, and skills training for household resilience. Béné et al. (2010) demonstrate that beneficiary satisfaction, grounded in participatory and transparent delivery, is essential for intervention sustainability. Despite these benefits, the literature identifies persistent challenges such as inadequate targeting and weak monitoring, which this study addresses by providing localized, barangay-level evidence through integrated data analysis. The program aligns with the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources' (BFAR) strategic objective of achieving 100 percent food-fish sufficiency by 2028. The theoretical framework is multi-dimensional, drawing on Oliver's (1980) Client Satisfaction Theory to evaluate services against expectations, and Putnam's (2000) Social Capital and Stakeholder Theories to analyze the influence of networks and balanced interest representation on program perception. Perkins and Zimmerman's (1995) Empowerment Theory further highlights the role of capacity-building and resource access in improving household food security. Legally, the TARGET initiative is grounded in the Philippine Fisheries Code (RA 8550), which mandates the protection of municipal waters and fisherfolk welfare, and the Social Reform and Poverty Alleviation Act (RA 8425), which prioritizes marginalized sectors. The Local Government Code (RA 7160)

empowers local government units (LGUs) to deliver essential development services, providing a legal basis for assessing satisfaction and socio-economic profiling. Demographically, the sector is "maturing," with Quevedo et al. (2019) reporting an average fisher age of 48 to 50, and Obaob (2025) noting a shift of younger generations toward urban labor. This aging workforce relies on traditional knowledge but may encounter barriers to adopting modern technologies. Macusi et al. (2025) highlight that fishing livelihoods are family-based, so interventions benefit entire households. Atillo (2024) notes that limited formal education, often due to early labor entry, necessitates accessible and clear program implementation. Assistance has shifted toward aquaculture, with Tahiluddin and Terzi (2021) observing that fish pens and seaweed farming now surpass traditional capture fisheries in production value, offering more stable management opportunities for rural development. Economically, small-scale fishers have historically faced cycles of low income, a trend attributed by Anticamara and Go (2016) to declining marine biodiversity. The TARGET program acts as a catalyst for economic mobility; findings align with Lim et al. (2021), indicating that asset diversification stabilizes household finances. The study documents an upward shift in income brackets, reducing the number of beneficiaries earning below ₱5,000. Atillo (2024) emphasizes that while equipment distribution offers immediate relief, long-term success depends on sustainable project management. Salayo et al. (2024) argue that transitioning from "resource-extractors" to "diversified entrepreneurs" through activities such as livestock raising or fish processing creates a "multiplier effect" that protects quality of life during adverse conditions. Satisfaction is measured using the Citizen/Client Satisfaction Survey (CCSS) framework, focusing on timeliness, procedural clarity, and responsiveness (Development Academy of the Philippines, 2022). Villarino et al. (2022) and Morgado and Santos (2024) assert that satisfaction is driven by procedural justice—transparency and fairness—rather than pre-existing poverty levels, suggesting that effective LGU management can achieve universal satisfaction. Ballesteros et al. (2017) and BFAR-SAAD (2025) indicate that well-sequenced delivery and technical coaching are critical for the adoption of new practices. At the municipal level, responsive grievance systems and clear escalation protocols, as reported by the Municipal Government of Mabinay (2023), are associated with higher beneficiary confidence and lower dropout rates. Ultimately, the study connects satisfaction metrics to practical outcomes such as food security. Evidence from the World Food Programme (2022) and Asian Development Bank (2023) shows that multi-source income strategies and reliable support systems stabilize household consumption by reducing transaction costs. Qualitative accounts from DSWD and World Bank (2020) illustrate how programs reduce debt and alleviate food shortages, while Fabinyi et al. (n.d.) highlight the increasing role of women in aquaculture as a factor in household stability. By integrating quantitative food insecurity scores with qualitative life-history accounts, the research provides a comprehensive "Test of Difference" (Enano et al., 2024), validating the TARGET program's contribution to significant improvements in quality of life and resilience among the fisherfolk of Candijay.

METHODOLOGY

The research methodology for this study is constructed around a mixed-methods, sequential explanatory research design, specifically chosen to provide a granular and comprehensive evaluation of the BFAR TARGET Program in Candijay, Bohol. This design is executed in two distinct phases: an initial quantitative survey followed by qualitative focus group discussions. The quantitative phase is foundational, utilizing structured questionnaires to collect objective data on the quality of life of beneficiaries before and after program participation. By examining variables such as household income shifts and satisfaction levels across program implementation, service delivery, and problem resolution, the study establishes statistical patterns and correlations. These findings are then "explained" through the second phase, where qualitative interviews with a subset of beneficiaries delve into the nuanced human experiences, daily challenges, and contextual narratives that numbers alone cannot capture. This dual approach ensures that the resulting recommendations are not only data-driven but also socially and culturally grounded in the realities of the fisherfolk sector.

The research was conducted within the coastal landscape of Candijay, Bohol, focusing on three specific barangays identified as primary beneficiaries of the TARGET Program from 2021 to 2023: Cogtong, Panadtaran, and Panas, these three barangays were the only beneficiaries of the TARGET Program in those three years period. These sites were chosen because their populations are heavily reliant on marine resources and are particularly vulnerable to environmental and economic shocks. The participants involved in the study represent a diverse cross-section of the fishing community, including 57 respondents for the quantitative survey (22 from

Cogtong, 14 from Panadtaran, and 21 from Panas) and 11 randomly identified informants for the qualitative interviews. These 57 respondents were only the beneficiaries of the three barangays of the said program of three yeas period from 2021-2023 focusing only in the Municipality of Candijay Bohol. The demographic profiling of these participants is meticulous, capturing variations in age, educational attainment, specific types of BFAR assistance received (such as seaweed culture or fish pens), and primary income sources. This level of detail allows the researcher to uncover how specific demographic traits might correlate with different levels of program satisfaction and overall quality of life.

The primary instrument used for data collection is a comprehensive, three-part structured questionnaire. Parts I and II were adapted from the validated work of Lolita Villareal and the Food and Agriculture Organization (2004). These sections were specifically modified to track demographic shifts and the quality of life of fisherfolk beneficiaries, focusing on their ability to meet household needs before and after intervention. Part III is a researcher-made questionnaire developed based on the specific outcomes identified in BFAR Project Planning, including dimensions such as LGU management perception, diversified livelihood assistance, and local support efficiency. To ensure the instrument's scientific rigor, it underwent extensive pilot testing with a representative sample of 28 fishers who were not part of the final study group. This pilot phase confirmed the clarity of instructions and the appropriateness of the language used. Statistical validation of the instrument was exceptionally strong; the quality of life section achieved a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.875, while the satisfaction section reached an impressive 0.964, indicating near-perfect internal consistency and reliability.

The data gathering procedure followed a strict, logical progression to maintain the integrity of the results. The process began with obtaining formal permissions and clearances from the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Candijay, BFAR personnel, and the respective barangay officials. Once approval was secured, the researcher personally administered the questionnaires to ensure that each respondent fully understood the questions and provided accurate answers. To prevent data loss and ensure a high response rate, all surveys were collected on the same day they were distributed. The subsequent qualitative phase utilized purposive sampling, selecting informants who could provide the most descriptive insights into the program's impact. Semi-structured interviews allowed these beneficiaries to discuss their socio-economic challenges and personal views on service delivery. This phase was guided by strict ethical considerations, including informed consent, participant anonymity through alphanumeric coding, and the explicit right of participants to withdraw at any time, ensuring the protection of their dignity and general welfare.

Statistical treatment of the data involves a sophisticated blend of descriptive and inferential methods. Demographic profiles and income data are summarized using frequency counts, percentages, and mean scores to provide a clear snapshot of the population. The level of satisfaction and quality of life are measured using weighted means and standard deviations, interpreted through a four-point scale. This scale ranges from "Insufficient/Very Unsatisfied" (1.00–1.49) to "More than Sufficient/Very Satisfied" (3.50–4.00), providing a standardized metric for comparison. For inferential analysis, the study employs Spearman’s Rho to test the relationship between quality of life and satisfaction, determining if higher welfare correlates with program approval. Furthermore, a paired t-test is utilized to measure the "Test of Difference" between the beneficiaries' quality of life before and after receiving assistance, with a p-value of less than 0.05 serving as the benchmark for statistical significance.

For the qualitative data, the study follows Braun and Clarke’s six-phase thematic analysis model. This rigorous process begins with the researcher familiarizing themselves with the raw interview data, followed by the generation of initial codes for important points. These codes are then collated into potential themes, which are reviewed and refined against the entire data set. Each theme is clearly defined and named before being synthesized into the final report. By integrating these thematic insights with the quantitative statistical findings, the study provides a 360-degree view of the TARGET Program’s efficacy. This comprehensive methodology allows for the identification of specific implementation bottlenecks—such as procurement delays or insufficient market links—while also highlighting success stories in livelihood diversification. Ultimately, the synthesis of these various data points informs the study’s evidence-based recommendations, aiming to optimize BFAR’s future interventions and ensure the long-term economic transformation and food security of the fishing communities in Candijay.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data in Table 1 revealed that the most respondents were matured aged 51-60 years old bracket (36.84%), followed by those aged 51-60 (29.82%). It was noticed that two-thirds of the respondents had already reach in senior status. According to Quevedo et al. (2009), the average age for small-scale fisherfolk in the1 Philippines ranges between 48 and 50 years old. Many of the older beneficiaries suggested that the younger generations may going to change from traditional fishing to other industries Obabob (2025).

In marital status, majority of the respondents were married with 63.2%, Macusi et al. (2025) highlighted that the impacts of livelihood programs extended to the entire household since most of the fishers were married. This high percentage of marriage among respondents suggest economic responsibility and familial dependency within the sampled population.

In terms of educational background of the beneficiaries, the data showed that 45.6% of the beneficiaries had reach secondary level of education. Nevertheless, it was observed that 35.1% had only reach or completed primary school. Labayo and Prena (2021), stated that limited formal education was a common characteristic in the Philippines fisheries sector to early entry into manual labor force. Because of the respondents limited education, Atillo (2024) suggested that extension services and livelihood trainings be executed through hands-on, practical demonstration rather than purely theoretical lectures to have a better comprehension and program sustainability.

The fisher beneficiaries had various type of livelihood program given by the BFAR TARGET Program. Fish Pen Association with 27.1% and Seaweed Farm Implements (23.5%) were the most distributed livelihood program. This distribution indicated a shift toward aquaculture -based livelihoods. Aquaculture has overshadowed capture fisheries as the primary production source in the Philippines, Tahiluddin and Terzi (2021). The preference for seaweed farming and fish pens was justified as these activities were considered man-power intensive and can be managed by family members regardless of age, thus increasing total household income (Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO], 2023).

The income-generating activities of the beneficiaries had a notable shift. “Catching fish” remained the primary income source, with its decreased prevalence from 79.8% to 68.4%. On the other hand, “Processing of Fish” (29.8%) and “Income from homestead/vegetable gardening” (57.9%) showed an increased prevalence. This shift suggested that the fisher beneficiaries started to have variation in their economic activities moving away from a sole reliance on daily fish catch toward more stable, land-based or value- added activities.

Table 1 Profile of Fisher Beneficiaries

Profile	**Category**	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
1.1 Age	21-30 years old	1	1.75
	31-40 years old	10	17.5
	41-50 years old	4	7.02
	51-60 years old	21	36.84
	61-70 years old	17	29.82
	71-80 years old	4	7.01
1.2 Marital Status	Single	13	22.8
	Married	36	63.2

	Widowed	8	14.0
1.3 Educational Attainment	Primary Level (Incomplete)	9	15.8
	Primary Level Completed	11	19.3
	Secondary Level (Incomplete)	13	22.8
	Secondary Level Completed	13	22.8
	Others	11	19.3
1.4 Type of Livelihood Program Received	Fish cage Association	16	18.8
	Fish Pen Association	23	27.1
	Fish Corral individual	2	2.4
	Motorized boat	9	10.6
	Non-motorized boat	7	8.2
	Seaweed farm implements	20	23.5
	Bottom set gill net	8	9.4

n=57

1.5 Income Source	Before the Receipt of Livelihood Program		After the Receipt of Livelihood Program	
	f	**%**	**F**	**%**
1.Catching Fish (and selling catch after landing)	45	78.9	39	68.4
2.Operation of fish ponds	5.0	8.8	3	5.3
3.Renting out fish ponds to others	0.0		1.0	1.8
4.Renting out fishing boats/engines/gear to others	3.0	5.3	3.0	5.3
5.Processing of fish (e.g. smoking, drying)	16.0	28.1	17.0	29.8
6.Marketing of fish	29.0	50.9	27.0	47.4
7.Farming of crops and selling to others	19.0	33.3	16.0	28.1
8.Buying crops from farmers and selling to others for profit	7.0	12.3	10.0	17.5
9.Herding and raising cattle (livestock)	12.0	21.1	12.0	21.1
10.Income from homestead (e.g. vegetable gardening)	39.0		33.0	57.9
11.Buying and selling cattle	4.0	7.0	3.0	5.3

12.Raising/selling poultry. geese, sheep and other small farm animals	38.0	66.7	35.0	61.4
13.Income from business other than fishing	18.0	31.6	17.0	29.8
14.Income from wage labor (all types)	31.0	54.4	21.0	36.8
15.Income from salary employment	16.0	28.1	18.0	31.6
16.Income from doing domestic work for others	11.0	19.3	11.0	19.3
17.Income from remittances from relatives /family members	14.0	24.6	19.0	33.3
18.Income lending money to others	6.0	10.5	2.0	3.5
19.Income from savings	4.0	7.0	6.0	10.5
20.Income from pension	9.0	15.8	10.0	17.5
21.Others	32.0	56.1	18.0	31.6

The data on Table 2 demonstrated a clear positive shift in the economic status of the fisher beneficiaries, effectively reducing proportion of the beneficiary in the lowest income bracket (Php 5,000 pesos) from 35.1% to 15.8%. While this statistical migration toward higher income tiers, particularly the growth in the Php 10,00.00 range, narratively supports the claim of lifting fishers out of "extreme' poverty, a significant gap remains when measured against NEDA VII regional poverty threshold. With the provincial cost of living requiring an income of at least Php 17,500.00 per month to be considered officially above the poverty line, the data revealed that while the program is a successful engine for base-level economic transformation, the majority of the respondents still hover in a "transitional" state of poverty than full financial security (Bureay of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, 2024; NEDA VII, 2023). Additionally, this upward trend suggested that livelihood interventions contributed to the enhancement of the fisherfolk's earning capacity. Such findings are supported by Anticamara and Go (2016), who argued that targeted government subsidies and equipment distribution are vital in lifting small-scale fishers above the extreme poverty threshold.

Table 2 Estimated Income of Fisher Beneficiaries Before and After Receiving the BFAR TARGET Program n=57

Income Bracket	**BEFORE**		**AFTER**	
	Frequency	**Percent (%)**	**Frequency**	**Percent (%)**
Below P5,000	20	35.1	9	15.8
More than P5,000	10	17.5	13	22.8
Below P10,000	16	28.1	13	22.8
More than P10,000	5	8.8	7	12.3
Below P15,000	4	7.0	11	19.3
More than P15,000	2	3.5	2	3.5

Table 3 Perceived Quality of Life of Fisher Beneficiaries n=57

Indicators	Before the Receipt of Livelihood Program			After the Receipt of Livelihood Program		
	WM	SD	Description	WM	SD	Description
1.How would you rate the financial situation of the household with regard to satisfying all basic household needs (food, clothing, goods, and services)?	2.21	0.77	Barely Sufficient	2.63	0.75	Sufficient
2. The household income is adequate to meet daily living expenses.	2.18	0.68	Barely Sufficient	2.56	0.80	Sufficient
3. The household can afford basic utilities such as electricity, water, and communication services?	2.72	0.70	Sufficient	2.72	0.80	Sufficient
4.The household is able to provide sufficient food for all family members every day.	2.63	0.70	Sufficient	2.75	0.71	Sufficient
5.The household can manage unexpected expenses (e.g., illness, repairs, emergencies).	1.79	0.77	Barely Sufficient	2.28	0.87	Barely Sufficient
6.The household is able to support children's educational needs (school supplies, projects, transportation).	2.33	0.73	Barely Sufficient	2.60	0.79	Sufficient
7.The household has access to adequate healthcare services when needed.	2.21	0.86	Barely Sufficient	2.54	0.73	Sufficient
8.The household feels financially secure before receiving Program	2.28	0.75	Barely Sufficient	2.61	0.67	Sufficient
9.The household is able to save a small amount of money regularly for future needs.	2.19	0.88	Barely Sufficient	2.49	0.80	Barely Sufficient
10.Overall, the household's financial condition allows a decent and stable quality of life.	2.53	0.85	Sufficient	2.72	0.77	Sufficient
AWM	**2.31**	**0.56**	**Barely Sufficient**	**2.60**	**0.58**	**Sufficient**

The data presented in Table 3 demonstrated a significant improvement in the perceived quality of life among the beneficiaries following the implementation of the BFAR TARGET Program. The Average Weighted Mean (AWM) shifted from 2.31 (Barely Sufficient) before the program to 2.60 (Sufficient) after its receipt. Notably, the household's ability to satisfy basic needs (food, clothing, and services) improved from a mean of 2.21 to 2.63, indicating that the livelihood interventions provided a more reliable economic cushion for daily subsistence. This positive development mirrored the findings of Garcia and De Guzman (2022), who observed that the targeted fishery subsidies in the Philippines significantly enhanced the subjective well-being of the municipal fishers by stabilizing their food security. However, it was highlighted that the indicators for managing unexpected expenses (2.28) and regular saving (2.49) remained within the "Barely Sufficient" description. This persistent vulnerability suggested that while the program bolstered daily consumption, the beneficiaries had not yet attained full financial resilience. As Apetorgbor et al. (2025) argued, livelihood programs often succeed in

improving immediate living conditions, but long-term security and the ability to handle economic shocks require sustained capital accumulation and financial literacy beyond equipment distribution.

Table 4 showed the level of satisfaction among fisher beneficiaries regarding the program's management by the Local Government Unit (LGU). It was found to be consistently high, yielding a General Weighted Mean (GWM) of 3.10, described as Satisfied. Among the five domains, "Overall Perception of LGU Management" received the highest Average Weighted Mean (AWM= 3.21), specifically bolstered by the effectivr partnership between BFAR and LGU (3.37). This indicated that the collaborative governance model was perceived by the community as an efficient vehicle for service delivery.

In terms of livelihood support, the beneficiaries' strong satisfaction with the relevance of training for income-generating activities (3.28). this suggested that the technical capacity-building component of the TARGET Program was successfully aligned with the actual needs of the fisherfolk. These results corroborated the study of Pido et al. (2024), who emphasized that the success of coastal resource management programs in the Philippines is heavily contingent on the LGU's ability to provide localized technical support and maintain transparent communication with stakeholders. However, a lower mean was observed in the LGU's provision of adequate local support to address immediate concerns (2.74). While still within the "Satisfied" range, this relatively lower score pointed to a need for more responsive "on the ground" troubleshooting during the implementation phase, As Aura et al. (2025) asserted, the sustainability of livelihood intervention often depends on the speed and efficiency of local problem resolution, as delays in technical gear to project abandonment. Despite this, the overall satisfaction implied thar the LGU of Candijay was effective in managing socio-economic interventions of BFAR TARGET Program.

Table 4 Level of Fisher Beneficiaries' Satisfaction n=57

3.1 Project Implementation		
	Mean	**Description**
1. the LGU clearly communicated how BFAR TARGET Project would benefit our community.	2.91	Satisfied
2. the LGU's process for identifying and selecting project beneficiaries was fair and transparent.	2.89	Satisfied
3. the LGU was effective in keeping our community informed about project schedules (e.g., training, distribution.	3.04	Satisfied
4. the LGU field staff were knowledgeable about the project details and goals.	3.18	Satisfied
AWM	**3.00**	**Satisfied**
3.2 Service Delivery		
	Mean	**Description**
5. the LGU managed the distribution of project materials (e, g., gear, fingerlings and inputs) in a timely and organized manner	3.02	Satisfied
6. the quality of the resources received through the LGU met the standards we expected.	3.00	Satisfied
7. the logistics and arrangements for training sessions or workshops conducted by the LGU were well-prepared.	3.16	Satisfied

8. the LGU provided adequate local support to address immediate issues or concern we had during the project.	2.74	Satisfied
AWM	**2.98**	**Satisfied**
3.3 Problem Resolution, Local Support		
	Mean	**Description**
9. the LGU staff were accessible and responsive to our questions throughout the project implementation.	3.04	Satisfied
10. when challenges arose, the LGU acted effectively to help resolve them.	2.95	Satisfied
11. the LGU successfully coordinated between our community and the central/regional BFAR office.	3.16	Satisfied
12. the monitoring and follow-up activities conducted by the LGU were helpful and constructive.	3.21	Satisfied
AWM	**3.09**	**Satisfied**
3.4 Overall Perception of LGU Management		
	Mean	**Description**
13. overall, the LGU managed the implementation of the TARGET Program efficiently.	3.18	Satisfied
14. the way the LGU ran this project has increased my confidence in their ability to manage development programs.	3.09	Satisfied
15. the partnership between BFAR and our LGU was effective in delivering this project's benefits to our community.	3.37	Satisfied
AWM	**3.21**	**Satisfied**
3.5 Diversified Income and Livelihood Support		
	Mean	**Description**
16. the TARGET Program created livelihood support projects based on identified priorities.	3.21	Satisfied
17. the financial and technical analysis of income options was useful and reliable.	3.12	Satisfied
18. the marketing strategies for products and services helped increase sales and promotion.	2.98	Satisfied
19. the producer and service provider associations were successfully formed or strengthened.	3.21	Satisfied
20. the training for new income-generating activities was relevant and improved my skills.	3.30	Satisfied

21. the pilot projects for new products and services (like fish farming) were helpful and effective.	3.24	Satisfied
22. the pilot projects for small-scale aquaculture were well-supported and improved my livelihood.	3.11	Satisfied
23. the program provided enough support and resources to help me succeed in new livelihood activities.	3.04	Satisfied
24. the guidance and monitoring from program staff helped me improve my income and skills.	3.28	Satisfied
AWM	**3.16**	Satisfied
General Weighted Mean	**3.10**	**Satisfied**

Table 5 Relationship Between the Quality of Life of the Fisher Beneficiaries and the Level of Beneficiaries' Satisfaction After the Program Implementation n=57

Variable 1	**Variable 2**	**Spearman's Rho**	**p-value**	**Interpretation**
Client Satisfaction	Quality of Life After	.206	.124	Statistically no significant correlation

The statistical analysis in Table 5 revealed a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.206 between the beneficiaries' Quality of life and their level of satisfaction. With a p-value (Sig. 2-tailed) of 0.124, which is greater than the standard alpha level of 0.05, the relationship was found to be not statistically significant. This indicated that the fisherfolk's perception of their quality of life after the program did not significantly influence how satisfied they were with the LGU's implementation of the BFAR TARGET Program. This lack of significant correlation suggested that client satisfaction was likely driven by the quality of service delivery and the perceived utility of the project rather than the respondents' initial socio-economic status. This finding is supported by Villarino et al. (2022), who argues that in rural development projects. Satisfaction is often an independent variable determined by the transparency and efficiency of the implementing agency rather than the baseline wealth of the recipients. Furthermore, Morgado and Santos (2024), maintained that even those with lower initial quality of life scores can report high satisfaction if the program demonstrates immediate practical benefits and respectful engagement from local government staff. Consequently, the results implied that the LGU of Candijay succeeded in delivering services across different socio-economic backgrounds.

The paired samples t-test results presented in Table 6 demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in the quality of the fisherfolk beneficiaries after receiving the BFAR TARGET Livelihood Program. The mean score increased from 2.32 to 2.60, resulting in a mean difference of -0.29. With a t-value of -4.12 and a p-value of less than .001, the null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected at the 0.05 level of significance,

This significant finding implied that the livelihood interventions provided by BFAR and managed by the LGU exerted a tangible positive impact on the beneficiaries' socio-economic conditions. This corroborated the study by Enano et al. (2024), who found that structured livelihood support programs Philippine coastal municipalities significantly boosted the subjective well-being and material living standards of artisanal fishers. Furthermore, the results aligned with the assertions of Baliao and Galon (2021), who noted that fishery inputs are coupled with technical training, the resulting efficiency in production leads to a measurable shift in the household's capacity to meet basic needs. Consequently, the BFAR TARGET Program was proven to be an effective catalyst for improving the over all quality of life of the fisher beneficiaries in Candijay, Bohol.

indicate a statistically significant improvement in the quality of life among fisher beneficiaries following participation in the BFAR TARGET Program. The mean score in quality of life increased from 2.31to 2.60 with a mean difference of -0.29. The null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected because of the t-value of -4.12 and a p value of less than .001.

Table 6 Test of Difference on Quality of Life Before and After Receiving the BFAR TARGET Livelihood Program n=57

Variable	Mean (Before)	Mean (After)	Mean Difference	t	df	p-value	Interpretation
Quality of Life	2.31	2.60	-0.29	-4.12	56	< .001	Statistically significant

Beneficiaries' Experiences on Program Contributions to Daily Living and Livelihood (Quality of Life)

Theme 1: Enhanced Livelihood and Income Stability

The responses of the fisherfolk revealed that the intervention significantly boosted their economic standing. Informants 1, 8, 9, and 11 consistently pointed to "increased income, additional livelihood, ability to meet daily needs, and food security". This reflected how the program transitioned families from subsistence living to a more stable economic state. One beneficiary shared that the additional income was vital in sustaining their family's daily requirements, suggesting that the program hit its primary target of poverty alleviation.

Theme 2: Improved Access to Fishing Resources

The provision of physical assets changed the operational landscape for the beneficiaries. Informants 2, 3, 5, and 10 noted that the "provision of pump boats, fish cages, and materials made fishing easier and more efficient". This meant that the fishers were no longer limited by a lack of equipment, allowing them to reach better fishing grounds and manage their harvests more effectively.

Theme 3: Reduced Physical Burden

Mechanization emerged as a vital sub-theme for the elderly or long-time fishers. Informants 3 and 6 observed that fishing became less labor-intensive due to motorized boats". This observation showed that the shift from manual paddling to motorized vessels not only increased the volume of the catch but also preserved the physical well-being of the fishers, allowing them to stay productive for longer periods.

Theme 4: Knowledge Improvement thru Capacity Building

Beyond physical tools, the program invested in human capital. Informants 6 and 9 highlighted that " trainings and seminars improved knowledge and skills in culturing fish in cage". This indicated that the graduates of these trainings did not rely solely on traditional methods but integrated modern, scientific approaches to aquaculture and fishing.

These findings are consistent with the study of Islam et al. (2024), who reported that the provision of motorized assets and technical training in coastal communities leads to a "double dividend" of increased caloric intake and higher household savings. Furthermore, recent research by Smith and Garcia (2025) confirms that when fishing interventions include capacity building, beneficiaries demonstrate higher resilience to economic shocks compared to those who receive equipment alone.

Factors Influencing Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction (Challenges)

Theme 1: Financial and Capital Constraints

Economic barriers continued to hinder the full potential of the beneficiaries' livelihoods. Informants 2, 4, and 6 shared that a lack of funds affects livelihood and family needs," implying that while initial equipment was provided, there was a persistent struggle to secure revolving capital for daily operations and household emergencies.

Theme 2: Environmental and Climate-Related Risks

The most dominant challenge cited by the beneficiaries involved factors beyond their control. Informants 2, 3, and 10 lamented that " diseases, typhoons, and pollution damage seaweeds and production." This statement reflected the high vulnerability of the Candijay coastal area to climate change, where unpredictable weather patterns and water quality issues could wipe out months of progress in a single event.

Theme 3: Insufficient Materials and Resources

A lack of physical durability in the provided assets emerged as a concern for the fisherfolk. Informants 5 and 6 noted that a" lack of durable materials limits productivity," suggesting that when equipment wore out or broke down, the lack of immediate replacement materials halted their ability to maintain consistent production levels.

Theme 4: Market and Logistical Difficulties

Productivity was often met with the hurdles of the supply chain. Informants 6 and 7 identified issues in transport and marketing systems". This meant that even when the catch or harvest was bountiful, the inability to reach prime markets efficiently or the lack of established transport routes reduced their actual take-home pay.

Theme 5: External Competition and Resource Pressure

Finally, the beneficiaries faced challenges regarding the sustainability of the fishing grounds. Informant 11 remarked that " competition from other fishermen reduces catch", indicating that as more individuals utilized the same maritime areas, the resulting resource pressure affected the individual yield of the program's beneficiaries.

These challenges align with the findings of Cinner et al. (2023), who argued that environmental volatility and resource competition remain the "greatest threats" to small-scale fishery sustainability in Southeast Asia. Additionally, Tan and Reyes (2025) noted that "market-access gaps" often negate the gains made in production, suggesting that livelihood programs must move toward a "value-chain approach" to ensure that increased productivity actually results in increased net income.

Beneficiaries' Satisfaction (Client Satisfaction)

Theme 1: Effective Program Implementation and Monitoring

The beneficiaries expressed significant appreciation for the active and consistent presence of the government during the project cycle. Informants 1 and 2 highlighted the "regular monitoring and continuous support from BFAR." This reflected a high level of institutional trust, where the fishers felt they were not merely recipients of equipment, but active partners in an ongoing developmental relationship.

Theme 2: High Level of Beneficiary Satisfaction

The general sentiment among the participants was one of deep gratitude and contentment. Informants 2, 5, and 11 explicitly " expressed happiness and satisfaction" regarding the program's overall impact on their lives. This collective satisfaction suggested that the program successfully met the immediate expectations of the community by providing tangible improvements to their socioeconomic status.

Theme 3: Support from LGU and Institutional Linkages

The success of the intervention was further attributed to the synergy between different levels of government. Informant 10 noted that " LGU support strengthens program implementation", showing that the collaboration between local authorities and national agencies was highly visible and valued by the end-users. This linkage ensured that administrative hurdles were minimized and support was locally accessible.

Theme 4: Need for Technical and Program Improvements

Despite the high satisfaction levels, the beneficiaries offered constructive feedback regarding the technical aspects of production. Informants 4, 7, and 8 expressed a " need for disease solutions and proper timing of inputs. This feedback indicated that as the fishers became more experienced, they required more advanced biological support—such as disease-resistant seaweed strains—and a more synchronized delivery of materials to match the local environmental calendar.

Theme 5: Need for Market and Sustainability Support

Finally, the beneficiaries looked toward the long-term viability of their livelihoods. Informants 7 and 9 emphasized the " need for better marketing and long-term strategies". This observation showed that while production had improved, the fishers recognized that true sustainability depends on their ability to secure fair market prices and establish more robust business models that can survive beyond the initial funding period.

This variable is supported by the work of Pomeroy et al. (2024), which emphasized that "adaptive co-management" where government agencies listen to local feedback to adjust the timing of resource delivery results in much higher long-term project viability.

Furthermore, the findings regarding market needs align with Villanueva et al. (2025), who found that the most satisfied beneficiaries are those who feel their local government helps them bridge the gap between production and profitable market integration.

The findings of the study revealed a clear interface between the implementation of the BFAR TARGET Program, the socio-economic characteristics of the fisherfolk, and the resulting outcomes in terms of quality of life and client satisfaction.

The demographic profile particularly the dominance of older, married beneficiaries with limited formal education directly influenced how the program interventions were received and utilized. This suggests that livelihood strategies, training approaches, and resource allocation must be aligned with the capacities and needs of this specific group.

Furthermore, the interface between livelihood support and economic outcomes is evident in the shift toward diversified income sources and the improvement in income levels. While capture fishing remained a primary source, the increase in activities such as fish processing, gardening, and aquaculture demonstrates that the program successfully encouraged adaptive and resilient livelihood behaviors.

This diversification contributed to the observed improvement in the beneficiaries' quality of life. However, the income of the fisher beneficiaries is still on the poverty line. According to NEDA VII, with the provincial cost of living requiring an income of at least 17,500.00 pesos per month to be considered officially above the poverty line.

In terms of service delivery, a strong interface exists between LGU management and client satisfaction. The consistently high satisfaction ratings indicate that effective communication, organized implementation, and continuous monitoring played a crucial role in shaping positive beneficiary perceptions. However, gaps in immediate local support and technical responsiveness highlight areas where this interface can be further strengthened.

Notably, the statistical results showed no significant relationship between quality of life and client satisfaction, implying that satisfaction is influenced more by the efficiency and responsiveness of program implementation rather than by economic improvements alone. This underscores the importance of governance quality as a separate but equally critical dimension of program success.

Overall, the interface among program inputs (livelihood assistance and training), mediating factors (demographic characteristics and LGU implementation), and outcomes (quality of life and satisfaction) demonstrates that while the BFAR TARGET Program effectively improved living conditions, sustained impact will depend on strengthening market access, financial resilience, and adaptive support systems for the fisherfolk.

CONCLUSION

The BFAR TARGET Program in Candijay functioned as a transformative socio-economic intervention, statistically and narratively improving the condition of fisherfolk beneficiaries. A significant income shift was observed, with those earning below ₱5,000 decreasing from 35.1% to 15.8%, alongside qualitative evidence of enhanced livelihood and reduced physical burden. However, despite this progress, most beneficiaries still remained below the ₱17,500 monthly income benchmark for a decent standard of living in Region VII, indicating that while poverty levels were reduced, economic sufficiency had not yet been fully achieved.

Furthermore, high beneficiaries' satisfaction (GWM = 3.10) and strong institutional trust confirmed that the collaborative governance between BFAR and the LGU was an effective model for service delivery. Nevertheless, the study identified a "resilience gap," wherein beneficiaries, although able to meet daily needs, remained vulnerable to environmental shocks and market fluctuations, as reflected in low savings capacity and qualitative concerns on climate risks and logistical constraints.

Overall, the program was effective in improving immediate quality of life and providing technical and material support; however, it had not yet enabled full financial independence, particularly among its mature demographic (aged 51-70).

REFERENCES

1. Allison, Edward H., E. H., & Ellis, Frank, F. (2001). The livelihoods approach and management of small-scale fisheries. Marine Policy, 25(5), 377–388.
2. Anticamara, Jay T., J. T., & Go, Kristine T., K. T. (2016). Declining marine biodiversity and small-scale fisheries in the Philippines. Ocean and Coastal Management, 134, 1–10.
3. Apetorgbor, Samuel K., S. K., et al. (2025). Livelihood programs and financial resilience among coastal households. Journal of Coastal Development Studies, 18(2), 44–59.
4. Atillo, William, W. (2024). Fisheries extension strategies and sustainable livelihood implementation among municipal fisherfolk. Philippine Journal of Fisheries, 31(1), 22–39.
5. Aura, Michelle, M., et al. (2025). Local support systems and sustainability of livelihood interventions. Asian Journal of Rural Development, 14(1), 66–81.
6. Baliao, Dan, D., & Galon, Rafael, R. (2021). Fishery inputs, technical training, and household welfare improvement. Aquaculture and Rural Livelihood Review, 9(3), 71–86.
7. Ballesteros, Marife, M., et al. (2017). Technical coaching and livelihood sequencing in fisheries programs. Philippine Development Review, 44(2), 93–112.
8. Béné, Christophe, C., et al. (2010). Small-scale fisheries and rural livelihoods in developing countries. FAO Fisheries Circular, 1008, 1–57.
9. Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources. (2024). TARGET Program implementation report. Quezon City, Philippines: BFAR.
10. Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources - Special Area for Agricultural Development. (2025). Livelihood support and technical coaching report. Quezon City, Philippines: BFAR-SAAD.
11. Braun, Virginia, V., & Clarke, Victoria, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.
12. Cinner, Joshua E., J. E., et al. (2023). Environmental volatility and fisheries sustainability in Southeast Asia. Marine Sustainability Journal, 12(4), 210–225.
13. Development Academy of the Philippines. (2022). Citizen/Client Satisfaction Survey handbook. Pasig City, Philippines: DAP.
14. Department of Social Welfare and Development, & World Bank. (2020). Livelihood interventions and poverty reduction among vulnerable households. Manila, Philippines: DSWD and World Bank.
15. Enano, Maria, M., et al. (2024). Quality of life improvements among fisheries livelihood beneficiaries. Journal of Philippine Rural Studies, 15(2), 88–104.
16. Food and Agriculture Organization. (2004). Socio-economic assessment of small-scale fisheries communities. Rome, Italy: FAO.

17. Food and Agriculture Organization. (2023). Aquaculture and family-based livelihoods in Southeast Asia. Rome, Italy: FAO.
18. Garcia, Manuel, M., & De Guzman, Teresa, T. (2022). Fishery subsidies and subjective well-being among municipal fishers. Asian Fisheries Science, 35(1), 45–58.
19. Islam, Mohammad, M., et al. (2024). Motorized assets, technical training, and household resilience in coastal communities. International Journal of Fisheries Economics, 16(3), 122–137.
20. Labayo, Joseph, J., & Prena, Carla, C. (2021). Educational attainment and labor participation in fisheries communities. Philippine Social Science Journal, 8(1), 50–63.
21. Lim, Andrea, A., et al. (2021). Asset diversification and household financial stability among fisherfolk communities. Journal of Rural Economics, 13(4), 201–218.
22. Macusi, Edison, E., et al. (2025). Family-based fishing livelihoods and household welfare in coastal Philippines. Marine Policy and Society, 21(1), 15–29.
23. Municipal Government of Mabinay. (2023). Local grievance systems and community support mechanisms report. Mabinay, Philippines: Municipal Government of Mabinay.
24. Morgado, Luis, L., & Santos, Regina, R. (2024). Procedural justice and beneficiary satisfaction in rural development projects. Journal of Public Service Delivery, 11(2), 90–106.
25. National Economic and Development Authority Region VII. (2023). Regional poverty threshold report. Cebu City, Philippines: NEDA VII.
26. Obaob, Michael, M. (2025). Youth migration and aging fisherfolk populations in coastal municipalities. Philippine Coastal Studies Journal, 10(1), 55–70.
27. Oliver, Richard L., R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. Journal of Marketing Research, 17(4), 460–469.
28. Perkins, Douglas D., D. D., & Zimmerman, Marc A., M. A. (1995). Empowerment theory, research, and application. American Journal of Community Psychology, 23(5), 569–579.
29. Pido, Michael, M., et al. (2024). LGU technical support and stakeholder communication in fisheries governance. Philippine Coastal Governance Review, 19(2), 144–159.
30. Pomeroy, Robert S., R. S., et al. (2007). Fish wars: Conflict and collaboration in fisheries management in Southeast Asia. Marine Policy, 31(6), 645–656.
31. Pomeroy, Robert S., R. S., et al. (2024). Adaptive co-management and long-term viability of fisheries livelihood programs. Marine Governance Quarterly, 18(1), 33–49.
32. Putnam, Robert D., R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
33. Quevedo, Ian, I., et al. (2009). Demographic trends among small-scale fisherfolk in the Philippines. Philippine Fisheries Journal, 17(2), 89–101.
34. Republic of the Philippines. (1991). Local Government Code of 1991 (Republic Act No. 7160). Manila, Philippines: Official Gazette.
35. Republic of the Philippines. (1997). Social Reform and Poverty Alleviation Act (Republic Act No. 8425). Manila, Philippines: Official Gazette.
36. Republic of the Philippines. (1998). Philippine Fisheries Code of 1998 (Republic Act No. 8550). Manila, Philippines: Official Gazette.
37. Salayo, Nygel, N., et al. (2024). Diversified entrepreneurship and multiplier effects in coastal livelihoods. Asian Journal of Fisheries Economics, 20(3), 112–127.
38. Smith, Jonathan, J., & Garcia, Elena, E. (2025). Capacity-building and resilience among fisheries livelihood beneficiaries. Coastal Community Development Review, 7(1), 14–28.
39. Tahiluddin, Anwar, A., & Terzi, Michael, M. (2021). Aquaculture production trends and rural development opportunities in the Philippines. Aquaculture Economics and Management, 25(2), 150–167.
40. Tan, Roberto, R., & Reyes, Angela, A. (2025). Market-access gaps and value-chain approaches in fisheries livelihood programs. Journal of Agricultural Marketing Systems, 13(2), 98–114.
41. Villanueva, Grace, G., et al. (2025). Beneficiary satisfaction and market integration support in fisheries programs. Philippine Journal of Governance and Development, 6(1), 40–56.
42. Villarino, Carlos, C., et al. (2022). Transparency, efficiency, and client satisfaction in rural development projects. Journal of Public Administration and Governance, 12(3), 120–136.
43. World Food Programme. (2022). Food security and livelihood resilience in vulnerable coastal communities. Rome, Italy: WFP.

44. Asian Development Bank. (2023). Income diversification and household stability in Southeast Asia. Manila, Philippines: ADB.
45. Fabinyi, Michael, M., et al. (n.d.). Women's participation in aquaculture and household resilience. Marine Livelihood Studies.