
**IMPACT STUDY ON THE CPU INTEGRATED OUTREACH
ACTIVITY FOR BARANGAY ILongbukid,
SAN RAFAEL, ILOILO**

Aries Roda D. Romallosa, Hope G. Patricio and Margen A. Java

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the impact of Central Philippine University (CPU) outreach interventions and activities for Brgy. Ilongbukid and adjacent communities in San Rafael, Iloilo based on recently obtained cross-sectional data vis-à-vis the 2006 and 2012 baseline results. The “post-test” or the “one shot” survey design and focus group discussion with key stakeholders were done to measure the qualitative and quantitative changes brought about by outreach implementation. Results showed that the awareness level on the CPU outreach activities was high but availment of the services among the respondents was low (18.0%) since only households with children enrolled at Ilongbukid National High School were reportedly prioritized. Those who benefited from the outreach activities claimed definite satisfaction or satisfaction. Most of the respondents (90.6%) considered the outreach activities to be important. The great majority of the respondents (94.6%) believed that the CPU outreach activities had positive impact in their barangays. Specifically, the residual earnings from the swine chain dispersal project helped finance the children’s education, contributed to house improvement, provided basic needs, and increased household income.

INTRODUCTION

Background and Rationale

Ilongbukid National High School (INHS) is a newly opened barangay secondary school located at Brgy. Ilongbukid, San Rafael, Iloilo. The school also covers the surrounding barangays of San Florentino, Aripdip, and Poscolon. As a newly opened barangay high school, the school realized that it is wanting in many aspects of its operation like school facilities and needs to establish a good relationship with the parents and the covered communities. Hence, a partnership with an academe, namely, Central Philippine University was established through its outreach arm, the University Outreach Center with the then College of Agriculture (now College of Agriculture, Resources and Environmental Sciences or CARES) acting as the lead unit (Dusaran, 2006).

As a starting point, an ocular survey of the area and initial talks with the school personnel, students and the community were conducted to ascertain the needs of the stakeholders. This was followed by the signing of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) on December 20, 2004 between INHS and the University Outreach Center.

Literatures cited by Dusaran (2006) and Java (2010) pointed out that outreach programs should be based on the needs of the people and are decided upon by the people. "A Baseline Survey of the Ilongbukid National High School and its Serviced Areas" was conducted in 2006 by Dusaran to assess the present needs and problems of the barangays

serviced by Ilongbukid National High School located at Brgy. Ilongbukid, San Rafael, Iloilo. Results of the study revealed that the two highest problems as perceived by the respondents of the barangay in relation to their respective households were financial/lack of regular/employment/income (83.3%) and food shortage (47.7%). And that, given their major problems, the respondents verbalized their major needs as regular work or income (79.9%) and food (64.8%). A series of extension activities had been introduced in the extension area in a span of 9 years.

Many studies have proved that there is really a need to conduct baseline surveys before the implementation of a program as well as an evaluation of the said program once it has been established. Rebori (2002) iterated that extension/outreach workers are increasingly required to develop programs based on assessed needs and evaluate its impact. This was the reason why the baseline survey conducted in 2006 and the re-assessment conducted in the latter part of 2012 and early part of 2013 served as basis for interventions. However, no impact studies had been conducted yet, hence, the need to conduct this study.

This study was conducted to review the baseline survey that has been performed in 2006 and 2012, respectively, and evaluate the impact of the interventions and activities introduced in Brgy. Ilongbukid and its surrounding communities in San Rafael, Iloilo. Specifically, this impact survey aimed to determine the present: 1) personal profile of the respondents in terms of their age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, occupation and monthly

income; 2) socio-cultural profile of the household members; 3) economic profile of the household members; 4) organization and political involvements of the household members; 5) housing characteristics of the households and community infrastructures of the barangays; 6) health and sanitation practices of the households; 7) priority needs and problems of the barangays; 8) personal, socio-cultural and economic profiles of the respondents and compare them with the previous data; organization and political involvements of the household members, housing characteristics of the households and community infrastructures of the barangays, health and sanitation practices of the households; and 9) impact of the services of CPU to the community, specifically the Swine Chain/Dispersal Project.

METHODOLOGY

The “post-test only” or the “one shot survey” design, supplemented by a focus group discussion and in-depth interview with the school personnel, beneficiaries and barangay officials were employed in this study.

The target areas were the four (4) barangays surrounding INHS, namely: Ilongbukid, San Florentino, Aripdip and Poscolon. Arrangements for the conduct of the interviews such as permission, schedule and participants were done through the barangay captains or key leaders of each barangay prior to visiting the homes of the randomly selected respondents. The respondents were the household heads or mothers, or any responsible adult who was

knowledgeable about the personal, socio-cultural and economic profiles of the households and other related data.

The sample size was determined using the sampling formula cited in Parel, et al. (1985) with a 0.05 sampling error. Given the total number of households of 1,195, the computed sample size was 291, which constituted 24.35% of the total number of households. The sample size was allocated proportionately in the four barangays covered by the study as shown in Table 1. To identify the target households, a list of households in each barangay or a spot map was requested from the barangay secretary.

$$n = \frac{N \cdot Z^2 \cdot p(1-p)}{N(d^2) + Z^2 \cdot p(1-p)}$$

Where n = Sample size

N = Total household population of the four barangays (1195)

d = Sampling error (.05)

Z = Confidence level (95 percent = 1.96)

p = The estimated proportion of the population to be studied (.50)

Table 1. Number of Households and Sample Size per Barangay Covered by the Study

Barangay	Population*	No. of Households*	Percent	Sample Size
Ilongbukid	1,590	375	24.35	91
San Florentino	1,638	405	24.35	99
Aripdip	880	208	24.35	51
Poscolon	971	207	24.35	50
TOTAL	5,079	1,195		291

* Based on the 2015 Barangay Profile Report of the Barangay Secretary

The data were collected through personal interview using the impact study instrument adapted from Form No. CPU-UOC Form-02 made by the University Outreach Center. Interviewers were oriented and trained by the researchers and were closely supervised by them. Interviews were conducted in the homes of the respondents. The FGD was conducted last September 24, 2015 while personal interviews were accomplished in five months starting in September as well.

The data were computer-processed using the SPSS PC + Version 11 and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools such as frequency count and percentage distribution. Qualitative information on matters such as client satisfaction were summarized and tabulated for convenience of analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Respondents' Profile

The data presented in Tables 2 and 3 show that most of them were between 41 and 50 years old with a mean age of 45.59 years; generally, females, married, high school educated, dependent on farming with an average income of Php4,609.62 from both major and other sources of income.

Socio-Cultural Profile of the Household Members

Table 4 shows that most of the respondents had 3 to 4 household members. The average household size was 4.12 with means of 1.938 and 2.065 for number of male and female members, respectively. These figures were lower than the baseline data in 2006 (5.47, 2.80 and 2.67, respectively). As indicated in Table 5, the household members are still relatively young just like during the baseline survey in 2006 (Dusaran, 2006). The average age of the household members was 19.98 years and was much lower than the 2006 figure of 26.6 years. As to the sex of the household members aside from the respondent, there are almost the same number of male and female members, but slightly in favor of the male members. The majority of the other members of the household had no income because most of them were still young and, therefore, unemployed. For those with income, however, almost one-fifth earned between Php1,001.00 and Php5,000.00 with mean income of Php4,745.93 per month.

Table 2. Distribution of the Respondents According to Their Age, Sex, Civil Status, Educational Attainment and Primary Occupation.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Age		
30 and below	35	11.7
31 to 40	65	21.8
41 to 50	91	30.5
51 to 60	72	24.2
>60	35	11.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 45.59		
Sex		
Male	117	39.3
Female	181	60.7
Total	298	100.0
Civil Status		
Single	6	2.0
Married	253	84.9
Widowed	23	7.7
Separated	6	2.0
Live-in	10	3.4
Total	298	100.0
Educational Attainment		
Primary (Grades 1-4)	16	5.4
Elementary (Grades 5-6)	74	24.8
Secondary (HS 1-4)	157	52.7
College level	28	9.4
Voc/Tech graduate	8	2.7
College graduate	15	5.0
Total	298	100.0
Primary Occupation		
None	23	7.7
Farming	124	41.6
Laborer	111	37.2
Business (buy & sell)	6	2.0
Transport Driver	13	4.4
Carpenter	6	2.0
Others	15	5.0
Total	298	100.0

Table 3. Distribution of the Respondents According to Their Other Sources of Income and Occupation.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Other Sources of Income		
None	145	48.7
Farming	27	9.1
Laborer	80	26.8
Business (Buy & Sell)	15	5.0
Transport Driver	10	3.4
Carpenter	12	4.0
Others	9	3.0
Total	298	100.0
Monthly Income from Major Occupation		
None	10	3.4
Less than 1,000	25	8.6
1,000 to 2,000	81	27.7
2,001 to 3,000	82	28.1
3,001 to 4,000	27	9.2
4,001 to 5000	38	13.0
More than 5,000	29	9.9
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 3,680.37		
Monthly Income from Other Sources		
None	184	61.7
Less than 1,000	29	9.7
1,000 to 2,000	52	17.4
2,001 to 3,000	9	3.0
3,001 to 4,000	6	2.0
4,001 to 5,000	4	1.3
More than 5,000	14	4.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 3,057.02		
Total Monthly Income from Major Occupation and Other Sources		
None	2	0.7
Less than 1,000	20	6.7
1,000 to 2,000	66	22.1
2,001 to 3,000	60	20.1
3,001 to 4,000	35	11.7
4,001 to 5,000	47	15.8
More than 5,000	68	22.8
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 4,609.62		

Table 4. Distribution of Respondents According to Their Household Size and Number of Male and Female Household Members.

Number of Members	Total Household		Males		Females	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
None	2	0.7	0	0.0	3	1.7
1-2	61	20.5	27	23.1	33	18.2
3-4	120	40.3	52	44.4	68	37.6
5-6	82	27.5	25	21.4	57	31.5
7-8	30	10.1	12	10.3	18	9.9
Over 8	3	1.0	1	0.9	2	1.1
Total	298	100.0	117	100.0	181	100.0
Mean	4.12		1.938		2.065	

As shown in Table 6, the number of children who were in school was still lower than the number of school age children just like in 2006. Notably, there was a decrease in the proportion of households with 3 or more children presently in school compared with the number of school age children and the increase in the distribution of households with 2 or no children presently in school compared with the number of children of school age. This was further indicated by the very slight decrease in the mean number of children of school age (2.20 at present vs. 2.4 in 2006) and the mean number of children who were presently in school (2.09 at present vs. 2.1 in 2006). The majority of the households seen in Table 7 did not have children in school across the different levels of education. Many households had no children either in the pre-school and college. The bulk of the

children of the households were in the elementary and high school, respectively. The mean numbers for different school levels indicate that they were a little bit lower compared with the 2006 data. The result for the college children was, however, 0.01 higher which implied that there was a very slight increase in the number of college-bound students among the children of the households.

Table 5. Distribution of the Household Members' Profile Aside from the Respondent.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Age		
2 years old and below	67	5.4
3 to 6 years old	140	11.4
7 to 12 years old	271	22.0
13 to 16 years old	187	15.2
17 to 21 years old	174	14.1
22 to 40 years old	230	18.7
41 to 60 years old	132	10.7
Above 60 years old	30	2.4
Total	1231	100.0
Mean = 19.98		
Sex		
No other household member	2	0.2
Male	634	51.5
Female	595	48.3
Total	1231	100.0
Educational Attainment of Persons Living with the Respondents		
No Formal Schooling/NA	183	14.9
Primary (Grades 1-4)	214	17.4
Elementary (Grades 5-6)	186	15.1
Secondary (HS 1-4)	435	35.3
College Level	128	10.4
Voc/Tech Graduate	31	2.5
College Graduate	54	4.4
Total	1231	100.0

Table 5 continued

Occupation of Persons Living with the Respondents		
None	896	72.8
Farming	71	5.8
Fishing	1	0.1
Laborer	139	11.3
Business (Buy & Sell)	3	0.2
Transport Driver	13	1.1
Carpenter	4	0.3
Others	104	8.4
Total	1231	100.0
Monthly Income of Persons Living with the Respondents		
None	910	73.9
Less than 500	4	0.3
501 to 1000	18	1.5
1001 to 5000	231	18.8
More than 5000	74	24.8
Total	1231	100.0
Mean = 4,745.93		

Table 6. Distribution of Respondents According to Their Number of School Age Children and Children Presently in School.

Profile/Categories	Number of School Age Children		Number of Children Presently in School	
	f	%	f	%
None	63	21.1	70	23.5
1-2 children	104	34.9	106	35.6
3-4 children	103	34.6	99	33.2
5-6 children	24	8.0	21	7.1
7 or more children	4	1.3	2	0.7
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0
Mean	2.20		2.09	

Table 8 presents the variety of food the people in the area are consuming. Likewise, almost all of the respondents

were aware of their cultural activities (Table 9) like barangay annual fiesta, Christmas party, rice harvest festival and Flores de Mayo. However, a very small proportion of the respondents could not mention any of these cultural activities.

Economic Profile of the Household Members

The data show that some of the respondents’ family or household owned a sari-sari store or engaged in buy and sell. Their mean capital outlay was Php7,122.58 while their profit from business averaged Php2,174.19 per month (Table 10). Table 11 shows the households’ monthly and yearly expenses on necessities. There was least spending on leisure due to the remote location of the barangays from either the town center or city. It constrained their access to urban centers and thereby limiting their expenditures on recreation.

Table 7. Distribution of Respondents According to Their Number of Children Who are Presently in the Pre-school, Elementary, High School and College.

Number of Children Presently in School	Pre-School		Elementary		High School		College	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
None	220	73.8	131	44.0	161	54.0	234	78.5
1 child	67	22.5	78	26.2	85	28.5	54	18.1
2 children	9	3.0	62	20.8	44	14.8	10	3.4
3 children	0	0.0	21	7.0	7	2.3	0	0.0
4 children	2	0.7	6	2.0	1	0.3	0	0.0
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0
Mean	0.31		0.97		0.66		0.25	

As shown in Table 12, 69.5% of the households were involved in farming with rice and corn farms having mean sizes of 0.4011 ha and 0.0789 ha, respectively. These were the only suitable crops grown in their farm lands because of the hilly topography of the barangays.

Table 13 indicated that most of the household members used inorganic fertilizer; chemicals such as insecticides and fungicides to control pests and diseases in their crops; and herbicides to control farm weeds. Rain was the source of water for their farms with excess water drained to the neighboring farm. The table further reveal that the households do not produce wastewater in their livestock production.

Table 8. Distribution of Respondent According to Food Frequently Eaten.

Food Frequently Eaten	Breakfast		Lunch		Dinner	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Carbohydrates (rice, banana, etc.)						
Yes	298	100.0	297	99.7	297	99.7
No	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0
Protein (meat, fish, eggs, etc)						
Yes	293	98.3	294	98.7	282	94.6
No	5	1.7	4	1.3	16	5.4
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0
Vegetables						
Yes	230	77.2	288	96.6	185	62.1
No	68	22.8	10	3.4	113	37.9
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0
Fruits						
Yes	289	97.0	229	76.8	167	56.0
No	9	3.0	69	23.2	131	44.0
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0
Beverage						
Yes	287	96.3	6	2.0	6	2.0
No	11	3.7	292	98.0	292	98.0
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0
Others						
Yes	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
No	297	99.7	298	100.0	298	100.0
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0

Table 9. Distribution of Respondents According to Their Awareness of Presence of Cultural Activities in the Community.

Knowledge of Presence of Cultural Activity	Frequency	Percent
Yes	295	99.0
No	3	1.0
Total	298	100.0
Type of Cultural Activities		
None	3	1.0
Annual Brgy. Fiesta	175	58.7
Christmas Party	2	0.7
Rice Harvest Festival	6	2.0
Combination of Annual Brgy. Fiesta, Christmas Party, Rice Harvest Festival & Flores De Mayo	112	37.6
Total	298	100.0
Purpose of the Cultural Activities		
None	3	1.0
Thanksgiving	65	21.8
Celebrating Jesus' Birth	2	0.7
Unity	92	30.9
Companionship	23	7.7
Combination of Thanksgiving, Celebrating	113	37.9
Total	298	100.0

Table 10. Distribution of the Economic Profile of the Households (Engagement in Business, Nature of Business, Capital of Business and Monthly Profit).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
If the Respondent's Family is Engaged in any Business		
Yes	31	10.4
No	267	89.6
Total	298	100.0
Nature of Business		
None	267	89.6
Sari-Sari Store	26	8.7
Buy and Sell	5	1.7
Total	298	100.0
Business Capital		
None	267	89.6
1,000 and below	1	0.3
1,001 to 10,000	23	7.7
10,001 and above	7	2.3
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 7,122.58		
Monthly Profit		
None	267	89.6
1 to 500	5	1.7
501 to 1,000	10	3.4
1,001 to 2,000	8	2.7
2,001 and above	8	2.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 2,174.19		

Table 11. Distribution of the Economic Profile of the Households (Monthly and Yearly Expenses for the Education of Children, Medical Expenses, Food, Clothing, Recreation, Utilities and Other Expenses).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Monthly Expenditures for the Education of Children		
None	56	18.8
1 to 500	37	12.4
501 to 1,000	71	23.8
1,001 to 5,000	125	41.9
5001 and above	9	3.0
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 2,096.69		
Yearly Expenditures for the Education of Children		
None	56	18.8
1 to 2,500	2	0.7
2,501 to 5,000	13	4.4
5,001 to 10,000	47	15.8
10,001 and above	180	60.4
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 26,519.83		
Monthly Expenditures for the Medical Expenses		
None	38	12.8
1 to 500	90	30.2
501 to 1,000	75	25.2
1,001 to 5,000	91	30.5
5,001 and above	4	1.3
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 1,286.89		
Yearly Expenditures for the Medical Expenses		
None	38	12.8
1 to 2,500	30	10.1
2,501 to 5,000	17	5.7
5,001 to 10,000	47	15.8
10,001 and above	166	55.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 13,549.92		
Monthly Expenditures for the Food		
1 to 500	1	0.3
501 to 1,000	10	3.4
1,001 to 5,000	268	89.9
5,001 and above	19	6.4
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 3,734.00		

Table 11 continued

Yearly Expenditures for the Food

5,001 to 10,000	1	0.3
10,001 and above	297	99.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 35,536.70		

Monthly Expenditures for Clothing

None		45
1 to 500		134
501 to 1,000		76
1,001 to 5,000		40
5,001 and above		3
Total		298
Mean = 1,053.76		

Yearly Expenditures for Clothing

None		45
1 to 2,500		22
2,501 to 5,000		26
5,001 to 10,000		100
10,001 and above		105
Total		298
Mean = 10,091.70		

Monthly Expenditures for Recreation

None	156	52.3
1 to 500	118	39.6
501 to 1,000	17	5.7
1,001 to 5,000	6	2.0
5,001 and above	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 508.80		

Yearly Expenditures for Recreation

None	156	52.3
1 to 2,500	50	16.8
2,501 to 5,000	13	4.4
5,001 to 10,000	53	17.8
10,001 and above	26	8.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 6,054.93		

Monthly Expenditures for Utilities

None	16	5.4
1 to 500	233	78.2
501 to 1,000	37	12.4
1,001 to 5,000	10	3.4
5,001 and above	2	0.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 476.03		

Table 11 continued

Yearly Expenditures for Utilities

None	16	5.4
1 to 2,500	134	45.0
2,501 to 5,000	72	24.2
5,001 to 10,000	40	13.4
10,001 and above	36	12.1
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 4,816.78		

Monthly Expenditures for Other Expenses

None	297	99.7
5,001 and above	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 1,000.00		

Yearly Expenditures for Other Expenses

None	297	99.7
10,001 and above	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 12,000.00		

Total Monthly Expenditures

1,000 and below	2	0.7
1,001 to 5,000	106	35.6
5,001 to 10,000	129	43.3
10,001 to 15,000	47	15.8
15,001 to 20,000	11	3.7
20,001 and above	3	1.0
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 6,999.33		

Total Yearly Expenditures

10,000 and below	3	1.0
10,001 to 20,000	8	2.7
20,001 to 50,000	66	22.1
50,001 and above	221	74.2
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 82,864.91		

Table 12. Distribution of the Household Members' Farming Activities (Household Members' Engagement in Crops and Livestock Farming).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Member of Household Engaged into Farming		
Yes	207	69.5
No	91	30.5
Total	298	100.0
CROPS		
Rice Farming		
None	152	51.0
.01 to 1 hectare	124	41.6
1.01 to 2 hectares	13	4.4
2.01 hectares and above	9	3.0
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 0.4011		
Corn Farming		
None	271	90.9
.01 to 1 hectare	24	8.1
1.01 to 2 hectares	2	0.7
2.01 hectares and above	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 0.0789		
LIVESTOCK		
Piggery		
None	232	77.9
1 to 2 heads	57	19.1
3 to 10 heads	8	2.7
11 heads and above	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 0.36		
Poultry		
None	249	83.6
1 to 2 heads	6	2.0
3 to 10 heads	35	11.7
11 heads and above	8	2.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 1.59		

Table 12 continued**Goats**

None	292	98.0
1 to 2 heads	4	1.3
3 to 10 heads	2	0.7
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 0.05		

Ducks

None	269	90.3
1 to 2 heads	5	1.7
3 to 10 heads	21	7.0
11 heads and above	3	1.0
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 0.56		

Other Animals (cow, carabao)

None	293	98.3
1 to 2 heads	4	1.3
3 to 10 heads	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0
Mean = 0.04		

Table 13. Distribution of Household Members' Farming-Related Activities.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Plant Nutrients Used in Crops		
None	128	43.0
Organic Fertilizer	46	15.4
Inorganic Fertilizer	120	40.3
Foliar Fertilizer	1	0.3
Combination	3	1.0
Total	298	100.0
Used to Control Pests and Disease in Crops		
None	128	43.0
Chemicals (Pesticides/Fungicides)	167	56.0
Biological Control	2	0.7
Combination	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0
Method Used to Control Weeds		
None	128	43.0
Herbicides	163	54.7
Handpulling	3	1.0
Combination	4	1.3
Total	298	100.0
Source of Irrigation Water		
None	128	43.0
Rainwater	136	45.6
NIA Irrigation	13	4.4
Communal Irrigation System	10	3.4
Tube Well Pump	5	1.7
River	1	0.3
Combination	5	1.7
Total	298	100.0
Drainage of Excess Field Water		
None	137	46.0
Neighboring Farm	158	53.0
Own Farmer Reservoir	3	1.0
Total	298	100.0

Table 13 continued

If the Household Produce Wastewater in Livestock Production		
N/A	202	67.8
Yes	7	2.3
No	89	29.9
Total	298	100.0
Drainage of Wastewater		
N/A	290	97.3
Neighboring Farm	3	1.0
Own Farmer Reservoir	4	1.3
Nearby River	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0
Manner of Animal Waste/Manure Disposal		
N/A	270	90.6
Compose Pit	23	7.7
Septic Tank	4	1.3
Collected by Neighbors	1	0.3
Total	298	100.0

Table 14 presents that the majority of the respondents were aware of the presence of organizations in their barangays. However, only a little over one-third were members of these organizations with the majority having only membership. Most of them were members of the 4P's. All of the respondents were reportedly active but the majority was just members with only few as officers. As for political participation, 96.0% of the respondents had voted in the last election. Some respondents had been a candidate for any elective position and mostly in the barangay level.

Respondents' Housing Characteristics

It could be seen from the data in Tables 15 to 23 that the majority of households had semi-permanent materials such as wood/plywood and galvanized iron (GI) roofing for

their housing materials; electricity as lighting source and firewood for cooking is used. These fuel was home-sourced. The respondents believe that there is a functional road in their barangays and these functional roads are composed of plain sand and gravel only. However, there is no functional drainage facility in their barangays and if there is, it is an open drainage system. All the respondents had observed the presence of pre-collegiate schools that included pre-, elementary, and high schools in their barangays. The majority of them were aware of their functional health center that is accessible either daily or once a week. All of them believe in the presence of a recreational facility in their barangays such as a basketball court.

Majority of the households sourced water for drinking and cooking from the pump/artesian well. Most of them had a water-sealed kind of toilet and mostly relied on an open drainage for their waste/used water disposal and garbage pit for their solid waste disposal (Table 17). Majority of them had a combination of common illnesses such as cough, colds, flu and fever while others have fatty liver and high blood pressure.

Table 14. Distribution of Respondents According to Their Knowledge of Presence of Organizations Existing in Their Barangay and Their Membership in these Organizations.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Knowledge of Presence		
Yes	223	74.8
No	75	25.2
Total	298	100.0
Membership		
Member	106	35.6
Non-member	192	64.4
Total	298	100.0
Number of Organizations		
1	107	87.7
2	14	11.5
3	1	0.8
Total	122	100.0
Organizations in the Barangay		
Barangay Officials	8	6.5
Barangay Tanod	15	12.3
BHW	14	11.5
Women's	28	23.0
Farmers' Organization	1	0.8
4 P's	52	42.6
Barangay Lupon	3	2.5
Commando Brotherhood	1	0.8
Total	122	100.0
Position		
Officer	11	9.0
Member	111	91.0
Total	122	100.0
Involvement		
Active	122	100.0
Inactive	0	0
Total	122	100.0

Table 14 continued

Has Voted in the Last Election		
Yes	286	96.0
No	12	4.0
Total	298	100.0
Has Been a Candidate for Any Elective Position		
Yes	34	11.4
No	264	88.6
Total	298	100.0
Level of Candidacy of the Respondent		
None	264	88.6
Barangay	31	10.4
Municipal	3	1.0
Total	298	100.0
Regular Assembly Meeting		
Yes	298	100.0
Total	298	100.0
Frequency Barangay Assembly Meeting		
Monthly	283	95.0
Quarterly	2	0.7
Twice a Year	8	2.7
Once a Year	5	1.7
Total	298	100.0
Barangay Ordinances Passed		
Yes	229	76.8
No	69	23.2
Total	298	100.0
Barangay Ordinances Passed		
No Answer	69	23.2
Curfew	167	56.0
Proper Waste Disposal	9	3.0
Illegal Logging	1	0.3
Anti-Drug	3	1.0
Combination of these answers	49	16.4
Total	298	100.0

Table 15. Distribution of the Housing Characteristics of the Households.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Housing Materials		
Permanent (concrete walls/GI roofing)	49	16.4
Semi-Permanent (wood/plywood/GI roofing)	212	71.2
Temporary (bamboo/nipa)	37	12.4
Total	298	100.0
Source/Mean of Lighting		
Electricity	272	91.3
Air Pressure (petromax/LPG)	4	1.3
Kerosene lamp	19	6.4
Others (chargeable flashlight; solar panel)	3	1.0
Total	298	100.0
Fuel Used for Cooking		
Firewood	242	81.2
Charcoal	24	8.1
LPG	1	0.3
Combination	31	10.4
Total	298	100.0
Source of Firewood/Charcoal		
Homegrown	265	88.9
Bought	25	8.4
Others (bukid)	8	2.7
Total	298	100.0

As can be seen from the data in Table 18, the top three major problems perceived by the respondents in relation to their households needs included financial or lack of income (86.6% vs. 83.3% in 2006), food shortage (49.3% vs. 47.7% in 2006), and sickness and lack of medicine

(30.9% vs. 8.3% in 2006). Given their major problems, the respondents had verbalized the following major needs: regular work/income (78.5% vs. 79.9% in 2006), food (69.8% vs. 64.8% in 2006), and medicine and health care (35.2% vs. 19.3% in 2006).

Table 16. Distribution of the Community Infrastructures of the Barangays.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Presence of a Functional Road		
Yes	298	100.0
Total	298	100.0
Type of Road in the Barangay		
Plain sand and gravel only	290	97.3
Concrete	8	2.7
Total	298	100.0
Presence of a Functional Drainage Facility		
Yes	19	6.4
No	279	93.6
Total	298	100.0
Type of Drainage System		
None	275	92.3
Open drainage	23	7.7
Total	298	100.0
Presence of a School		
Yes	298	100.0
Total	298	100.0
Type of School/s		
Pre-collegiate	298	100.0
Total	298	100.0
Presence of a Functional Health Center		
Yes	249	83.6
No	49	16.4
Total	298	100.0

Table 16 continued**Availability of the Health Center**

None	48	16.1
Daily	124	41.6
Twice a week	8	2.7
Once a week	99	33.2
Others (depending upon availability of health workers)	19	6.4
Total	298	100.0

Presence of a Recreational Facility

Yes	298	100.0
Total	298	100.0

Type of Recreational Facilities

Basketball Court	294	98.7
Volleyball Court	1	0.3
Both	3	1.0
Total	298	100.0

Table 17. Distribution of the Health and Sanitation Practices of the Households.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Source of Water for Drinking/Cooking		
Piped-in water	48	16.1
Pump/artesian well	216	72.5
Open well	19	6.4
Combination	15	5.0
Total	298	100.0
Kind of Toilet		
Water sealed	244	81.9
Antipolo	41	13.8
Open Pit	13	4.4
Total	298	100.0
Manner of Waste/Used Water Disposal		
Open drainage	232	77.9
Septic tanks	56	18.8
Blind drainage	10	3.4
Total	298	100.0
Manner of Solid Wastes Disposal		
Garbage pit	221	74.2
Burning	59	19.8
Thrown away	9	3.0
Combination	9	3.0
Total	298	100.0
Common Illness Experienced by the Household Members		
Cough	13	4.4
Colds	6	2.0
Flu/influenza	5	1.7
Fever	6	2.0
Others (fatty liver; high blood)	3	1.0
Combination of these illnesses	265	88.9
Total	298	100.0

Based on comparative results of the recent perceived major problems and needs of the households vis-a-vis those of 2006, it could be observed that they were qualitatively similar although the degree of incidence was slightly higher for the recent year.

Table 18. Distribution of Respondents According to the Major Problems and Needs of the Households in the Barangay (Multiple Responses, N = 298).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Problems		
Financial/lack of income	258	86.6
Food shortage	147	49.3
Lack of medicine/sickness	92	30.9
Inadequate household facilities	13	4.4
Inadequate water supply	5	1.7
Educational support for children	4	1.3
Relationship conflicts	4	1.3
No electricity	2	0.7
Needs		
Regular income/livelihood	234	78.5
Food	208	69.8
Medicine/health care	105	35.2
Household facilities	7	2.3
Water supply	6	0.2
Electricity	3	0.1
Clothing	3	0.1

The three major problems and needs of the barangays listed in Table 19 were damaged barangay hall and stage, lack of unity and cooperation and lack of water supply. The major needs were water supply, livelihood, and repair of barangay hall and stage. For men (Table 20), the major problems were: drinking liquors which led to other problems, quarreling among themselves and gambling. It could be deduced from these data that these problems stemmed from lack of stable jobs that led the men to imbibe

liquor and forget their problems and also because the CVOs were not active in maintaining peace and order in the barangays. On the other hand, the verbalized major needs of the men were stable job and presence of active government officials/CVO.

Table 19. Distribution of Respondents According to the Major Problems and Needs of the Barangay (Multiple Responses, N = 298).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Problems		
Damaged barangay hall and stage	22	7.4
Lack of water supply	10	3.3
Lack of unity/cooperation	18	6.0
Street light	7	2.3
Vices/gambling	8	2.7
Flood	3	1.0
No livelihood/poverty	3	1.0
Loud music of some neighbors	2	0.7
Needs		
Water supply	22	7.4
Livelihood	9	3.0
Repair of barangay hall/stage	8	2.7
Street light	6	2.0
Active CVO	3	1.0
Medicine facilities/equipment	2	0.7
Mutual aid	1	0.3
Limit the selling of liquors	1	0.3
Unity	1	0.3

Table 20. Distribution of Respondents According to the Major Problems and Needs of Men in the Barangay (Multiple Responses, N = 298).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Problems		
Drinking liquors which leads to other problems	53	17.8
Men's quarrel	48	16.1
Gambling	4	1.3
No livelihood	2	0.7
No unity	2	0.7
Needs		
Stable job	38	12.8
Active gov't. officials/CVO	11	3.7

The problems that beset the women in the barangay (Table 21) were no livelihood and no family planning and gambling. Moreover, their needs as perceived by the respondents were somewhat related to their problems such as having a stable job and eliminating gambling in their respective areas.

Table 21. Distribution of Respondents According to the Major Problems and Needs of Women in the Barangay (Multiple Responses, N = 298).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Problems		
No livelihood	4	1.3
No family planning	2	0.7
Gambling	2	0.7
No unity	1	0.3
Needs		
Stable job	31	10.4
Stop gambling	1	0.3

For the youth (Table 22), the perceived common problems were being out of school youth or not schooling, vices including cellphone addiction and early pregnancy/marriage. Moreover, their needs included education and scholarship programs, stable job and recreational activities. This implied that if their needs were met, their problems could be minimized. If they had work or recreational activities that could occupy their time, these could preclude them from engaging in premarital sex and avoid early pregnancy or marriage. For the children (Table 23), these major problems were health-related such as lack of medicines/ vitamins/ food, being out of school, lack of clothing, and being undisciplined. Their needs included books, playground, and food.

Table 22. Distribution of Respondents According to the Major Problems and Needs of Youth in the Barangay (Multiple Responses, N=298).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Problems		
Out of school/not schooling	52	17.4
Vices/cellphone addiction	6	2.0
Early pregnancy/marriage	3	1.0
No livelihood	1	0.3
Fraternities	1	0.3
Robbery	1	0.3
Needs		
Education/scholarship programs	7	2.3
Stable job	6	2.0
Recreational activities	5	1.7
Trainings/discipline	4	1.3
Food	1	0.3
Shelter	1	0.3

Table 23. Distribution of Respondents According to the Major Problems and Needs of Children in the Barangay (Multiple Responses, N = 298).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Problems		
Health/lack of medicines/vitamins/food	9	3.0
Out of school	4	1.3
Lack of clothing	4	1.3
Undisciplined	4	1.3
Child labor	1	0.3
Needs		
Books	42	14.1
Playground	39	13.1
Food	15	5.0
Medicine supply	10	3.3
Clothing	4	1.3
Education	1	0.3
Parents' attention	1	0.3

Respondents' Housing Characteristics

Table 24 shows that the majority of the respondents were aware of the outreach activities done by CPU in their barangay or neighboring barangays. However, only 6% were able to avail of these outreach activities. Non-availment had to do with limited CPU outreach in the barangay and that households with children enrolled at INHS were the ones first notified on the upcoming activity in the area. Those who had availed were either definitely satisfied (55.6%) or satisfied (44.4%). However, when all the respondents were asked about the importance of these outreach activities in

their barangays, a great majority (90.6%) perceived them to be important while 9.1% considered them to be definitely important.

The majority of respondents were aware of the swine chain/dispersal program of CPU (Table 25). All the other outreach activities were known by only about a quarter of them. Examples of these activities were seminars on lacatan production and on social accountability. The lacatan production seminar was held more than five years ago with some residents able to avail of banana plantlets for propagation and production. The seminar on social accountability, on the other hand, was conducted in Brgy. Ilongbukid two years ago and was mostly attended by local officials. This information was affirmed by the FGD results from all the FGD participants who stated their awareness of the outreach activities conducted by CPU in their respective barangays. Moreover, the participants enumerated the following CPU outreach activities: Swine Chain Dispersal, Organic Farming, Waste Management, Lacatan Production, Seed Distribution, Composting and FAITH Gardening. Teachers from INHS who were also FGD participants added that they also availed of the Book and Chair Donations from the CPU College of Education.

Table 24. Distribution of the Respondents' Awareness, Availment, Assessment and Importance of Outreach Activities in Their Barangays Conducted by CPU.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Awareness		
Yes	221	74.2
No	77	25.8
Total	298	100.0
Availment		
Yes	18	6.0
No	280	94.0
Total	298	100.0
Reasons of Not Availing the Outreach Activities		
None	18	6.0
Did not reach the household yet in the Barangay	256	85.9
Only with kids at INHS are being prioritized	21	7.0
No idea of the program	1	0.3
Not chosen as a recipient	2	0.7
Total	298	100.0
Assessment of Outreach Activities		
Satisfied	8	44.4
Definitely Satisfied	10	55.6
Total	18	100.0
Importance of Outreach Activities		
Undecided	1	0.3
Important	270	90.6
Definitely Important	27	9.1
Total	298	100.0

Table 25. Distribution of the Respondents' Awareness of the Different Outreach Activities.

Aware-ness	Swine Chain/Disper-sal		Lacatan Product-ion/		Composting		Organic Farming		Vegeta-ble Product-ion		Seed Distribu-tion		Communal Gardening		Social Accounta-bility		Waste Management	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	219	73.5	77	25.8	73	24.5	66	22.1	63	21.1	70	23.5	64	21.5	60	20.1	63	21.1
No	79	26.5	221	74.2	225	75.5	232	77.9	235	78.9	228	76.5	234	78.5	238	79.9	235	78.9
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0

Only few respondents had availed of the outreach activities out of the nine implemented by CPU in the surrounding barangays of INHS (Table 26). These were the Swine Chain/Dispersal Project, Lacatan Production Seminar and Seed Distribution activity.

Table 26. Distribution of the Respondents' Availment of the Different Outreach Activities

Availmen-t	Swine Chain/Dispersal		Lacatan Produc-tion		Compostin-g		Organic Farming		Vegeta-ble Produc-tion		Seed Distribu-tion		Communal Gardening		Social Accou-nta-bility		Waste Manage-ment	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	18	8.2	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
No	201	91.8	76	98.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	98.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	219	100.0	77	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Respondents who had availed of the outreach activities were either definitely satisfied or satisfied (Table 27). For example, among the beneficiaries of the Swine Chain/Dispersal, more were definitely satisfied than just satisfied. The only recipient of the Seed Distribution and

Seminar on Waste Management was definitely satisfied with it. The one who attended the Lacatan Production Seminar, however, was undecided on its benefit to him.

Table 28 shows that a great majority of the respondents believed that the different CPU outreach activities in the surrounding barangays of INHS were important. Only a minimal proportion of the respondents believed that all these outreach activities except for the Swine Chain/Dispersal Project were not important.

Table 27. Distribution of the Respondents' Assessment of the Different Outreach Activities.

Assessment/ Satisfaction	Swine Chain/ Dispersal		Lacatan Produc- tion/		Composting		Organic Farming		Vegetable Production		Seed Distributi on		Communal Garden ing		Social Account a-bility		Waste Management	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Undecided	1	5.6	1	100.0														
Satisfied	6	33.3																
Definitely Satisfied	11	61.1									1	100.0						
Total	18	100.0	1	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 28. Distribution of the Respondents' Importance of the Different Outreach Activities

Importance	Swine Chain/ Dispersal		Lacatan Production/		Composting		Organic Farming		Vegetable Production		Seed Distribution		Communal Gardening		Social Accountability		Waste Management	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not Important			2	0.7	2	0.7	2	0.7	2	0.7	2	0.7	2	0.7	2	0.7	2	0.7
Important	274	91.9	27	91.3	273	91.6	273	91.6	273	91.6	265	88.9	273	91.6	273	91.6	273	91.6
Definitely Important	24	8.1	24	8.1	23	7.7	23	7.7	23	7.7	31	10.4	23	7.7	23	7.7	23	7.7
Total	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0	298	100.0

These results were affirmed by the FGD participants who all believed that the CPU outreach activities were undoubtedly important to the lives of the people in the neighboring barangays of Ilongbukid National High School.

The distribution of the changes in the life of the respondents brought about by the outreach activities are presented in Tables 29 and 30 while the list of persons responsible for these changes in their lives is found in Table 31.

Table 29. Distribution of the Changes in the Life of the Respondents Brought About by the Outreach Activities.

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	100.0
No	0	0
Total	18	100.0

Table 30. Specific Changes Brought About by the Outreach Activities (Multiple Responses, N = 19).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
Helped the recipients' children in their schooling/finishing their degree and now working already	15	83.3
Helped the recipients to buy basic needs and other materials inside the house and construction of house	15	83.3
Helped neighbors to avail of the swine dispersal project	15	83.3
Provided additional income for the family	4	22.2
Cannot verbalize the change/impact in their life	3	1.6

Table 31. Persons who Contributed to the Change/Improvement in Their Lives (Multiple Answers, N = 19).

Profile/Categories	Frequency	Percent
CPU Personnel	15	83.3
Ilongbukid NHS Faculty & Staff	15	83.3
Cannot specify the persons who were of help	3	1.6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The respondents were middle-aged, married, female-farmers with meager sources of income.
2. The respondents had 3-4 member-households with almost the same number of young male and female high school or elementary educated members who were dependent to the family, and had rice, banana, meat, fish, vegetables, and for breakfast, lunch and supper.
3. The respondents were aware that their barangay annual fiesta was the cultural activity in their community meant for uniting them.
4. The expenses of the households were very meager, whether for education, medical, clothing, recreation, utilities and other expenses.

5. Farming was the main source of income with a small farm to till and few livestock to meet their expenses. They use inorganic fertilizer, insecticides, fungicides, herbicides and rainwater in their farming activities.
6. The respondents were aware of the presence of organizations in their barangays and are active members of them; had voted in the last election.
7. Most the respondents had semi-permanent housing materials such as wood/plywood and GI for roofing; had electricity as lighting source; used firewood as fuel for cooking and used home-sourced firewood/charcoal.
8. They had a functional plain sand and gravel road in the barangays but only had an open drainage system. They also had a school, health center and a basketball court.
9. Pump/artesian well was the main source of water for drinking and cooking. They had a water-sealed toilet, an open drainage for waste/used water disposal, garbage pit for solid waste disposal, and had a combination of common illnesses such as cough, colds, flu and fever.
10. It can be deduced from the stated problems and needs of the barangays, households, men, women, youth and children that if the income of the family could be increased through regular work, most of the major problems in the barangays such as gambling, drinking, health problems and other social ills could be mitigated if not fully addressed.
11. The respondents were aware of the outreach activities done by Central Philippine University in their barangay or neighboring barangays and perceived them to be important. Although only a few had availed of these

outreach activities, they were definitely satisfied or satisfied with them.

12. The respondents believed that there were positive changes brought about by the CPU outreach activities in their barangays. Specifically, it had helped finance the education of their children especially through the swine chain dispersal project; helped them construct/renovate/build their houses, provided their basic needs and augmented their income among others.

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following are recommended:

1. Since the respondents and their households were primarily dependent on farming for their income, it is recommended that their farming activities and practices should be improved so that their income could increase.
2. Since the respondents who had availed of the outreach activities done by CPU had attested that their lives had been changed, it is recommended that these outreach activities be extended to other barangay residents.
3. The identified major problems and needs of the respondents' households, their barangays in general, and the men, women, youth and children in their barangays should be considered when planning for outreach activities in these barangays.

REFERENCES

- Dusaran, R.N. (2006). *A baseline survey of the Ilongbukid national high school and its serviced areas*. Iloilo City: The University Research Center, Central Philippine University.
- Dusaran, R.N. and Pabulayan, R.A.V. (2002). *Impact Study of the Rural Microfinance Project of Taytay Sa Kauswagan, Inc. (TKSI) in the Province of Antique*. Iloilo City: The University Research Center, Central Philippine University.
- Household Profile. (2015). *Barangay Profile Report of the Barangay Secretary*.
- Java, M.A. (2010) *A baseline survey of barangays covered by the Bulabog Puti-an National Park*. Iloilo City: The University Research Center, Central Philippine University.
- Parel, C.P., Caldito, G.C., Ferrer, P.L., de Guzman G.G., Sinaio, C.S. and Tan, R.H. (1985). *Social survey research design (PSSC Social Survey Series 1)* (Third printing). Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council, Inc.
- Reboredo, M.K. (2001). *Learning how to connect the dots: An assessment of a community development*. *Journal of Extension*, 39(4).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors express their sincerest gratitude to the following:

Central Philippine University and its University Research and Outreach Centers, their technical partners and staff, the people and barangay officials of Brgy. Ilongbukid and nearby communities of San Rafael, and the faculty and staff of Ilongbukid National High School. To all the respondents and FGD participants for their willingness and honesty in sharing valuable information to validate the efforts/services that were delivered by CPU during the recent years.

Above all, to God Almighty for His wisdom, guidance, and sustaining grace toward the completion of this work.