

ALTERNATIVE EXTENSION STRATEGIES FOR NATIVE POPULATION IN THE UPLANDS: A CASE OF THE ATA IN CANGGUBHUB, MABINAY, NEGROS ORIENTAL

Rowe V. Cadelina *

Introduction

The unique cultural characteristics of the native upland tribal population requires a unique approach in bringing extension services to this particular population group. The usual Community Organization (CO) approach requiring local population's counterpart appears inappropriate for the natives. With the political organization of the natives, the CO approach will generally contradict with the philosophy of the indigenous political system of the native tribal population.

The requirement for local labor contribution runs counter to natives' daily process of food procurement. In the light of this, this paper asks an essential question, how can we bring extension services to the native upland population without necessarily running the risks of contradicting the natives' peculiar characteristics? Put in another way, what alternative strategy or approach in extension can we use in our attempt to reach the natives?

The alternative ideas proposed in this paper were derived from our experience with the Ata in Barangay Cangguhuh in the municipality of Mabinay, Negros Oriental. The site is around 87 kilometers northwest of Dumaguete City. The project in this site is part of the Silliman University Research Action Development Program in the Uplands (SURADPU). It is an experimental program designed to test various extension strategies and agroforestry models appropriate for agriculturally marginal upland communities. The project has been in the site for slightly over four years and our regular monitoring effort on the developmental progress now provides adequate data from which we can infer alternative approaches compared to present classical extension

The writer acknowledges the assistance of Danilo Sollesta and Jose Paracan for the field data collection.

CLASSICAL PARADIGM FOR EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Community development project has to be community based. As such, it is recommended that the evolution of community development project should take a bottom-up direction. There are a number of motivations why such process of evolution is preferred. It is argued that such condition will improve community participation since a strong sense of community ownership of project will be developed. In addition, members' participation will be long-lasting since the local members' involvement in the project is not artificially caused by an exogenous factor such as the presence of the project's technical men.

In order to anchor development project in the community, community organization approach has become the by-word of extension effort. In fact, it has become the panacea to all development activities. It is a must to all extension programs. Funding agencies always require the existence of community organization as pre-requisite for fund approval for fund request or at least forming it at the initial activity of a project after its fund support has been approved. Hence, community organization tends to be generally considered as a foolproof ingredient for development undertaking in the community.

Such perspective has led extension workers to believe that community organization is a requisite for all development programs. It has prevented the extension workers from critically analyzing such view in the context of a specific project and a specific group of clientele population.

Since the development technicians have already developed bias towards community organization, they tend to impose the requirement on the clientele population. The very essence of the process is already inconsistent with the philosophy of involving local population in planning to determine their own resolutions and processes of development. As a consequence, the local population has not been given adequate assessment concerning their own desire for community organization in the context of the local people's existing indigenous political system. Under the classical paradigm, the people's existing political system is taken for granted

in the interest of meeting the requirement, for community organization. Hence, the approach, in principle, becomes top-to-bottom. While this paradigm assumes the practice of a bottom-up process as an ideal approach to development, it has in fact indeed, fallen that ideal.

The classical paradigm denies the significance of the specificity of project and the specificity of people. It tends to lump all projects and people together without regard to the peculiar nature of a project and a people. Hence, the requirement of community organization is universally expected from all development efforts. It tends to unify development process and approach even under a condition of diverse potential clientele population and development projects. Such model is reductionistic hence it tends to disregard specific nature and qualities of a population and specific requirements of a specific project. Actual conditions, however, require strong need to adjust general development process and approach to specific conditions of people and of projects.

On the basis of input, the classical model strongly denounces the out, since it will only develop overdependence of people on the project. Hence, any inputs by the project in terms of goods or cash are always considered as dole outs. The classical model does not recognize technological input as legitimate contribution of development project to the local population. Under all circumstances, the model assumes that consumable inputs of project should be the people's counterpart. This universal demand on project is realistic since it does not recognize the context which particular input is required.

Project demands and requirements have to be situated contextually and under such consideration cash and good inputs may not necessarily constitute as dole outs. In short, the nature of the project and the nature of the clientele population have to be understood to properly identify whether cash and goods inputs are legitimate or not. The classical model does not require this kind of evaluation. Instead, on an priori basis, it universally assumes that all consumable inputs are dole outs. Cash should be provided only in a form of loan. Under this definition, subsidized contribution of farmers is not considered a legitimate input.

It is a dole out. Since the only counterpart that the local population can afford to contribute is labor, subsidized labor contribution should not be encouraged. It should totally come from the clientele population. The critical question that has to be asked is "is clientele population under all circumstance capable of providing the necessary labor for development efforts?" Put it in another way, the following questions have to be asked seriously:

1) Under what circumstance of clientele population when subsidized labor contribution of the people is legitimate?

2) Under what circumstance of a project when subsidized labor contribution of the people is legitimate?

There are questions that are never asked under the classical model of development process when specific strategies are identified for a particular project. As its philosophy, it is accepted without critically assessing the context under which subsidized labor takes place.

THE ATA: THEIR BACKGROUND

The discussion on the background of the Ata in the immediately preceding paper provides the context under which the project has been implemented. Hence, this discussion is no longer repeated in this paper. For reference purposes, the reader is advised to relate this paper to the preceding one.

THE ATA FARMING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

SURADPU involves two sites for testing farming systems development approach. One is in Lake Balinsasayao of the municipality of Sibulan and the other is in the Ata settlement at Cangguhub, Mabinay, Negros Oriental.

Since one of the concerns of SURADPU is to explore the reactions of various population groups under different ecological setting, the selection of the Lake Balinsasayao farmers and the Ata as the recipients of the program is appropriate. First, the Lake Balinsasayao farmers are culturally different from the Ata. The first group consists of lowland Malay Cebuano farmers

from the coastal areas of Negros Oriental, who migrated to the islands searching for farm and farm opportunities. On the other hand, the Ata are native Negrito tribal population who were born and grew up in the upland communities. The first group is largely known as Christians while the second, animists.

Second, the two sites are ecologically different. The Lake Balinsasayao area still has around 40 percent of its forest cover while the rest have been cultivated by the farmers through slash and burn technique. The farm lots are under different stages of ecological succession since farmers try to fallow their lots sequentially. The Ata site, on the other hand, is completely forested. Farm plots have been cultivated for a number of years without the benefit of fallow. As a result, vegetational cover of farms between cropping period largely consists of shallow rooted shrubs and ranked grasses. On the basis of altitude, the Lake Balinsasayao area is higher than that of the Ata site. The former is around 800 meters above sea level while the latter is between 300 to 500 meters.

Farming systems development were introduced to both sites around four years ago. While the farm inputs introduced in the two sites were generally the same, the approaches employed were different. In the Lake Balinsasayao area, a strong community organization was established. In fact, around one year was spent socially preparing the farmers for a community organization. Forming such organization among the farmers in Lake Balinsasayao had no competition with traditional social systems since the farmers have no such form of tradition. In a way such organization provided the farmers a vehicle for more social interactions during meetings. Through the organization, collective work and activities were undertaken.

Among the Ata, on the other hand, community organization was not introduced. This was followed since the Ata has a tradition of a loose sociopolitical system that maintains social order among the population. For possible competition with tradition, farm development proceeded without creating a new system of community organization. As a cultural group, we have to respect their tradition. Tradition should not be eroded by imposing on them a new sociopolitical structure.

Another methodological difference between the Lake Balinsasayao and the Ata farming systems development project is on the labor input of the farmers into the farms. The Lake Balinsasayao farmers provided all the labor requirements in the development of their farms without any subsidy from the project. Since they practice food storing, they do not have to face the problem of starvation when their labor is committed to the development of their farms which does not provide immediate production. In short, the Lake Balinsasayao farmers can afford to invest their labor on farm development for future return without facing the hazard of hunger. Under this context, full labor counterpart from the farmers can be appropriately expected.

On the other hand, the Ata do not store food since there is not much to store. As we saw earlier, their food production is low. Hence, food quest remains to be a daily activity of the Ata just like when they were still nomadic hunters, collectors and fishermen. Unlike the Lake Balinsasayao farmers, the Ata cannot afford to invest their labor on the farm that does not provide them immediate food reward. Labor inputs into the development of the farm for an extended period of time will surely compete with their daily food quest. Hence, subsidized labor for farm development among the Ata is most appropriate. The Ata context, therefore, requires that they should not be expected to fully shoulder the labor cost in farm development since they cannot afford.

The classical approach in extension program is employed for the Lake Balinsasayao farmers while an alternative method is employed for the Ata. The choice of these particular methods for the two groups of subjects is legitimated by the respective social context of the two groups of population.

The farming systems development of the Ata involves two phases. The first phase consists of the introduction of soil conservation measures. When the first phase is over, the teaching process moves to the second phase, cropping systems development. The unit of approach is the household farm. Since the decision making concerning farm use and development is largely handled by the household, the plan and the implementation

Farming systems development were targeted to the household and not to the community. This is based on the assumption that a household has a peculiar food need, labor capability and farm constraints and opportunities. Therefore, plans for farming development have to be seen on the basis of the household.

Soil conservation inputs include a number of techniques. These techniques are designed to achieve three results. *First*, to prevent the remaining top soil from eroding. *Second*, to restore the lost soil through decomposition of biomass derive from vegetations that are used to help keep the soil from erosion. *Third*, to maintain and improve soil fertility by trapping runoff and by nutrient cycling from various vegetations introduced to prevent soil from erosion.

On sloping farms where abundant rocks are available, the Ata are encouraged to introduce contour rock walling. Otherwise, contour farming or canal system is introduced. On a subsidized labor system the Ata is paid 50 percent of the usual wage labor charging to the community to construct these measures. The subsidy that the Ata get during their employment is used to provide them the necessary food.

Contoured rockwal's, terrace and canal systems are strengthened with the use of various plants along their sides. As feed support for livestocks, the Ata are encouraged to plant napier grasses as buffer plants together with *Leucaena leucocephala* and *Cordia sepium*. At a certain interval, fruit trees are also planted to keep the rock walls and canals intact. Planting activities of water vegetation are no longer subsidized by the project. It is to be the responsibility of the Ata.

On cropping systems development, the Ata are encouraged to introduce mixed cropping to reduce the risks or hazards of monocropping, to improve the utilization efficiency of soil nutrients to prevent the outbreak of certain diseases. Under this condition, it is assumed that the Ata will be able to improve their production success level. The cropping systems development also other multiple concerns. First, the introduction of ap-

appropriate cropping systems is assumed to also help reduce soil erosion. Second, it will improve soil fertility. And third, it will help restore the lost soil through its organic decomposition.

Contoured alley and strip planting utilizing leguminous crops together with non-leguminous ones are encouraged. Through the use of an agricultural worker, the Ata are taught the techniques of employing the practice. The technical agent stays at the site for 21 days a month directly relating with, and taking from, the Ata farmers.

Aside from the subsistence crops that are grown, the farmers are advised to plant trees on areas where subsistence crops do not grow well. This usually happens on steep rocky slopes where more intensive agricultural activities are difficult to implement. These trees will eventually provide the Ata building materials and fuelwood in the future. Considering that there are no more forests in the area, the planted trees can also restore the vegetation cover of the non-arable spots.

All these development activities are implemented on a household level. The field technician interacts with an individual farmer concerning the latter's plan of activities for his own farm development. The plan is designed on the basis of the farmer's constraints and opportunities. Likewise, the implementation of the plan is also done on a household level, not on the community. Such activities which are the major thrusts of the Ata project can be implemented without necessarily having a community organization support. This is very appropriate for the Ata where a traditional loose sociopolitical system exists.

Farming systems development for the Ata is a direct intervention on their progressively declining farm production. The entry point is food production through the introduction of appropriate soil management and cropping system. As an extension activity, it is intentionally implemented without the use of community organization. The deliberate exclusion of community organization from the thrust of the project has been justified by the following reasons. *First*, farming systems development

adequately implemented without having community organization since the activities and plans are operationalized on a household level as mentioned earlier. *Second*, as noted elsewhere in this paper, the Ata have a traditional loose sociopolitical system which provided them the freedom they need. Such sense of freedom should not be eroded by forcing them to form community organization. The bottom-up principle of extension planning requires that such tradition of the Ata should be respected.

The Ata project allows the farmers to have only 50 percent of their labor as their counterpart in the construction of measures to conserve the soil. The rest is subsidized by the project to allow them to survive at the time when the erosion control devices are constructed. This is justified by the fact that they do not store grain as we saw earlier. To help the Ata help themselves, we have to keep them alive first. This, I think, is an ethical responsibility of any extension program. People first is a just policy.

So, what has been achieved in the farms of the Ata using the approach we just have described? Let us first look into the soil conservation devices constructed. Four types of soil protection measures have been established on the Ata farms. These are contour hedgerows, contoured canal system, contoured rockwall and contoured terrace. Considering the strong character of the soil, contoured rockwalling became the prevalent measure of soil conservation put up. This is followed by the contoured canal sys-

The construction of these measures covers 18 hectares which amount 86 percent of the total land area of the Ata settlement. Eighty percent of the protected land from erosion (18 hectares) is provided with contoured rockwalls, 44% with contoured canal system, 5% with contoured hedgerows and 2% with contoured terrace.

Along the sides of these soil conservation measures are various buffer plants grown. These include napier grasses, *Leucaena* and fruit trees like jackfruit and mango. *Glerecedia* was tried but not one survived after one summer period.

For cropping systems, various leguminous plants have been introduced for mixed cropping with their staple crop, corn. These leguminous plants include peanut, mung bean, pignon, pea and bush beans. Mixed cropping is being practiced in almost all of the 18 hectares developed by the 18 families.

In addition, vegetable production has been introduced to improve their nutrition. Few farms have tried using compost and fertilizers. As part of the soil fertility improvement program, the Ata are taught on making compost and they have been involved in the process of constructing a compost site.

The accomplishment of the Ata project is comparable to that of the Lake Balinsasayao farmers. Just on soil conservation alone the Ata have covered 85 percent of the land area to be developed. In fact, this is bigger than what the Lake Balinsasayao project has accomplished. The latter has only covered slightly over 70 percent of its total target area.

The output of the Ata project suggests that its implementation was not hampered by the absence of community organization. The individual household approach proved to be just as effective as when the point of entry and implementation is made through the community organization as what we noted for the Lake Balinsasayao Project.

THE ALTERNATIVE EXTENSION APPROACH FOR UPLAND TRIBAL POPULATION

The Ata group of people is not necessarily a peculiar group of upland tribal population. It is one of the numerous groups of native population from the north, central and southern Philippines. While these native populations are at present in their different degrees of change, the conditions are the same. They have their own traditional sociopolitical system while they are all trying to make a living under the condition of rapid and extensive deforestation. Hence, the food production level of these people has declined tremendously affecting their daily food supply. For most upland tribal population therefore, food production for immediate consumption is a daily activity.

This is the context of upland tribal population under which upland development programs for the natives are implemented. In such context should be seriously considered in designing the approach for extension activity. Also, the thrust of extension program for the upland tribal population should address at the immediate food production problem of the upland native population.

Since the upland farms are generally marginal for agricultural purposes, and farms are the life support systems of the upland natives, extension program for these people should be directed towards the development of farming systems. This farming systems development should have at least two components as the Ata project suggests. First, it should have soil conservation development component. Second, cropping systems development should be introduced either simultaneously with soil conservation development or after it, as what had been experienced with the Ata. Of course, it is assumed that with this nature of development program, a provision for land tenure system for the natives is already provided for.

The extension approach for the upland tribal population should deemphasize the development of community organization since the natives have their own tradition which is either loose or highly structured. Such tradition should in fact, be supported and nourished to provide certain element of cultural continuity to the people in the face of massive sociocultural change. The absence of community organization in extension approach would continuously provide the desired freedom usually experienced in similar groups where loose sociopolitical system exist or a continuity of traditional structured sociopolitical systems such as those among the natives in Mountain Province or the Muslims in their south. The creation of community organization designed for extension program purposes will only create conflict with the tradition and generate confusion on the part of the local native and extension population.

The Ata experience demonstrated a case where extension program can still be implemented without necessarily having formed any community organization. Since development pro-

grams for upland tribal population need to be addressed at the development of appropriate upland farming technologies to make assistance programs relevant to the local upland condition. community organization becomes more unnecessary. As we saw earlier, farming systems development can become appropriate and effective approach on a household level. Hence, community organization should not be the *sine-qua-non* for the implementation of farming systems development for upland tribal population.

The other very important aspect of extension approach for the upland tribal population is on labor subsidy. The question that the classical extension approach will raise against labor subsidy will be on dole out. The alternative approach which we have employed for the Ata, on the other hand, argues that such support is not a dole out. Under the socioeconomic context of the upland tribal population, labor subsidy is an essential support to keep the natives alive while we are in the process of helping them help themselves. As stressed earlier, any extension program designed for the upland natives has the moral obligation to protect the lives of the subject. This is the underlying philosophy of labor subsidy for upland tribal population.

As we saw earlier, labor subsidy in farming systems development is not a doleout. For emphasis, the following reasons have to be noted:

- 1) The amount used to subsidize labor, produces inputs that are not consumable. Rockwalls, canal systems and terraces, just to mention a few are permanent inputs on farms which will have long term and lasting effect on farm production;
- 2) Any positive effect that these measures will bring in their farm production will have a multiplier effect towards expansion of farm lands installed with soil conservation measures and
- 3) The subsidized activity produces a farm lot where intensive cropping systems can be implemented to improve farm productivity.

A dole out assumes that whatever goods or cash extended to the farmers are considered as consumables. They do not generate opportunities for bigger return in the future. The labor subsidy provided to the Ata obviously does not belong to the category of a dole out. It is a positive investment for future generation of income bigger than the subsidy that the Ata received. It is therefore for self income-generating.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper has demonstrated that the alternative approach to extension work among the Ata is just as effective, if not more, compared to the classical approach employed for the Lake Bañsayao farmers. The alternative approach is basically designed for the native tribal population in the uplands whose traditions have established either a loose or a rigid sociopolitical system and whose economic system is generally characterized at present with low productivity. Under such circumstance, the approach has been found very appropriate as demonstrated by our own experience with the Ata project. This approach is characterized by the de-emphasis of community organization as a requisite for extension activities and the encouragement for the use of subsidized labor in implementing development activities in the farm. As discussed earlier, this labor subsidy is not a dole out since it has the capacity to generate more income from the farm in the long run. It is a form of investment designed for long-term payoff.

In the light of planning and implementing extension programs, the following are recommended:

- 1) Extension programs should be critically evaluated on the basis of the nature of the program and the culture of the people involved for appropriate approach identification;
- 2) This critical evaluation should look into the appropriate level of community organization and full labor counterpart from the target population as requirement for program implementation;

3) The concept of dole out has to be reevaluated in the context of the capability of goods or cash extended to either directly or indirectly generate income in the long run. This long-run dimension of payoff is very critical for programs that are designed to stabilize and sustain productivity. Any subsidy that produces this result should not be considered as a dole out.

REFERENCE CITED

Oracion, E. G. (1984). "Ecology and interethnic resources exchange: A spatio-temporal analysis of Negrito socioeconomic adaptation in southern Negros, Philippines." (M. A. thesis submitted to the Graduate School, Silliman University.)

FANRI (1980). "Food composition tables: Recommended for use in the Philippines." Manila: Food and Nutrition Research Institute.

Assumptions in the study of the impact of extension programs on the development of the rural sector are discussed. It is pointed out that the development of the rural sector is not a dole out since it is a long-term investment designed for long-term payoff.

The impact of extension programs on the development of the rural sector is discussed. It is pointed out that the development of the rural sector is not a dole out since it is a long-term investment designed for long-term payoff.

(1) Extension programs should be directed towards the people of the rural sector and the welfare of the people should be the primary concern of the extension program.

(2) Extension programs should be directed towards the people of the rural sector and the welfare of the people should be the primary concern of the extension program.

PRODUC
RESUL
DEM
The
gram in
the aspect
ers' crop
conserve
level of t
RADPU
22 farmin
nally; to
wanted in
called (i
er.); nu
number o
cultivated
communit
of person
Assum
same in v
find out
produce a
level
The i
operator
generally ac
Land
component
overall cro
The a
Mrs.
Angellit