

1988 JOURNAL Vol. 22 No. 1
AFTER SURADPU: LIFESTYLE OF THE LAKE
BALINSASAYAO FARMERS

Cornelia P. Cadelina

Introduction

The population in the upland is an important segment of the country's population. The problem of poverty in the upland is a problem of national importance which must be shared by all. Such problem as illiteracy and ignorance may affect people's lifestyles in the upland communities. This condition holds true among the upland farmers of Lake Balinsasayao.

Silliman University as a Christian Institution of higher learning has responded to the call of the less fortunate communities, specifically in the areas along Lake Balinsasayao. The university introduced forest conservation and farming systems development through its program known as Silliman University Research Action Development Program in the Uplands (SURADPU). Like other development projects, its effects are being monitored. This paper intends to present the changes in the lifestyle clientele population after four years of implementation of the development program.

FIELD METHOD

BANAGBANAG*, an association of the Lake Balinsasayao farmers has 63 household members. Of these, 31 are within the project site and 32 are outside the project site.

Originally, the plan was to interview the total population using a survey method, but the peace and order situation in the area did not allow a population census. Instead, a twenty-five

*

BANAGBANAG is an acronym for Balinsasayao Naghiusang Balangay nga Nag-baul. Banagbanag is a Cebuano term for "dawn," the coming of a new day.

percent sample was utilized. Sixteen household heads were randomly selected. In the absence of some of the household heads (generally husbands), wives were taken as substitutes. Aside from the survey method, in depth study was employed to supplement survey data.

The data gathering phase started in March 1988 and ended in July of the same year. It was done mostly during week-ends. To compare the living condition of the Balinsasayao farmers before and after SURADPU, simple recall and reporting systems on the following information were made: farm production, savings, consumption (on their products), material acquisition, expenses for services, utilization and distribution of goods and services, and social and cultural involvement.

DATA AND DISCUSSION

In this portion, the following data will be presented: (1) farm production; (2) consumption; (3) savings; (4) expenditures; (5) material acquisition (the quantity of furniture acquired before and after, e. g. cabinet, aparador, dresser, etc.; bedroom paraphernalia, e. g. bed, blanket, mosquito net, etc.; kitchen utensils, e. g. kettles, chinaware, silverware, etc.; personal effects, e. g. towel, jewelry, bags, etc.; wardrobes, e.g. dresses, pants, shirts, etc.; farm implements, e. g. spray can, plow, etc.); (6) utilization and distribution of goods and services; (7) social and cultural involvement.

Farm Production

Farm productivity in marginal upland areas generally fluctuates seasonally in one agricultural year (see Colson 1979). On the whole, farmers claimed that agricultural production had improved after the implementation of the program. Nevertheless, they claimed that the increase is not yet sufficient to allow them to meet their needs until the next harvest.

The increase in production has been reported for crops, such as corn, vegetables and root crops (see Tables 1-3). Tree crops like coffee, cacao, jackfruit, bananas, avocado, star apple, guavas, pomelo, mango, *camansi* and *sereguelas* were usually found in home gardens. Most of these are planted recently, one of the activities introduced by SURADPU. Hence, the data on fruit production level between the two periods do not show any difference yet (see Table 4). The data (see Table 5) show that not all of the 16 respondents raised livestock and poultry. Of the 16 respondents, only 69% raised hogs after the implementation of SURADPU, a decrease of 13%. The same table shows that for other livestock excepting hogs, production level is approximately equal. A respondent revealed that he had more than ten heads of cows before but most of them were stolen. Another one reported that recently he had two heads of horses. Unfortunately, one was borrowed by an armed group and the group never returned it. Table 6 shows that more respondents raised chicken before the intervention, rather than after.

Consumption of Farm Crops

With regard to consumption of corn, there is no difference between before and after implementation of SURADPU. Corn is largely for domestic consumption. Vegetables, on the other hand, are their cash crops. Although they derive their cash income mainly from vegetable sale, a portion of their vegetable production is consumed domestically. This is also true before and after the presence of the program.

Although root crops are also consumed in the household as sources of carbohydrate, the amount sold for cash purposes is greater than what is consumed in the household. This is true even if we include those that are used to feed the hogs with household consumption. Such pattern of consumption has been found to be similar before and after the implementation of SURADPU.

A 50-50 split has been reported on fruit between household consumption and their sale for cash. This pattern is known to be true before and after the implementation of SURADPU.

Savings

Savings are necessary for emergency needs of the households. When the 16 respondents were asked if they acquired savings before the implementation of SURADPU, only 13% answered positively. To determine change in saving habits after the implementation of SURADPU, this question was asked, "Did you make any savings after SURADPU was implemented?" Twenty-five percent answered "Yes" an increase of around 100% to that of the "before period" of SURADPU. However, savings have been reported to be very limited. These are easily exhausted when one agency needs, (like hospitalization of household members).

Pattern of Expenses

In general, household expenses for protein food have relatively increased after SURADPU has been implemented compared to the time before SURADPU. This is evident by purchases of fish, 56%; meat, 37.5%; and sardines, 25%. The increase in the protein purchase indicates an increase in income. Another study by Fontelo and Lim in this volume also revealed similar increase in protein consumption by the Lake Balinsasayao farmers.

Similar trend of increase has been noted in other items such as clothing of household members after the implementation of SURADPU. This pattern is also expected for other items.

Material Acquisition

Before the introduction of SURADPU, only four mention that they have eating tables. After the introduction of SURADPU, seven mention an increase of 75 percent. However, there was a decrease on the possession of wooden trunk after the introduction of SURADPU in contrast to the possession of mosquito nets. The possession of mosquito nets has tremendously increased after the introduction of SURADPU.

Plastic sack has been reported to have been used for mats before and after the introduction of SURADPU. It has not changed. The same thing is true with the use of plastic plates.

A few have purchased porcelain plates after the introduction of SURADPU, but these are kept for use during special occasions, not for daily use. Porcelain cups have been reported to be recently bought but these are likewise kept for special household events.

Concerning personal effects (clothing, bags, handbags, jewelry, etc.), the data disclosed a favorable change (see Table 10). For carpentry tools (see Table 12) the data suggest a progressive change in frequency. Their acquisition of farm implements like plow, trowel, bolo, etc. remains the same (see Table 13), but three respondents claimed to have acquired spray can, while one respondent disclosed to have purchased a weighing scale. These information still imply change considering that nobody owned these materials before the program.

Utilization and Distribution

Intra-Household Distribution: It is assumed that when food is scarce, food consumption among household members is controlled. This is usually done by sharing food equally among members. When food is abundant, no restriction can be theoretically expected on the consumption of food by the household members is imposed. Before and after the introduction of SURADPU, consumption of root crops by household members has not been restricted (see Table 14). This is not true for corn. Before the introduction of SURADPU, 63% control corn consumption by equally dividing corn among household members. After SURADPU, this percentage has gone down to 41%. A relaxation on consumption control has been observed. This is probably because of the increase in corn production after the SURADPU program.

Similar pattern is observed for protein food. Eighty-eight percent of the households have controlled the distribution of protein food among household members before the implementation of SURADPU, while 69% have controlled the distribution of protein food among household members after the implementation of SURADPU. The decline in the incidence of households controlling the distribution among household members of protein food suggests an increase in household protein production.

Inter-Household Utilization Distribution of Goods: Do the respondents give part of their products, and to whom? Table 16 shows equally similar pattern of behavior of respondents before and after the implementation of SURADPU. Relatives are the most common recipients of farm goods given by the respondents. This may be explained by the saying which goes "blood is thicker than water"

Social and Cultural Involvement

All of the respondents are members of the organization BANAGBANAG. After the intervention, a number of groups were established, like Mohter's Club and labor groups, just to mention two. Respondents said that the presence of SURADPU has contributed much to the community socially. The place becomes lively especially that formal and nonformal education have been introduced. Children do not have to walk for kilometers to earn Grade I and Grade II trainings. Informal education/functional literacy has also added life and interest to learning especially English language. Both young and old, male and female, married or single participated in the functional literacy program. For practical consideration, key adult respondents want to learn arithmetic. They claim that they need the skill very badly during the marketing of their products.

The usual form of recreation among men is volleyball, cock-fighting and other forms of gambling. Women do not play volleyball; they just witness the game. Some respondents (both men and women) go to fiesta. Another respondent says he goes to the movie once a month. The pattern of recreation before and after is practically the same.

Respondents' participation in organizational meetings/activities gave a hundred percent positive response. Four respondents (25%) are officers of BANAGBANAG.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

In general, the program SURADPU has brought a number of improvements in the life of the Balinsasayao community. It did not only increase most of their farm yields (as shown by their farm production) but also their social and cultural involvement.

Briefly, the following factors were responsible for the acceptance of the project by the Lake Balinsasayao farmers: a) appropriateness of the innovation itself including the strategy; b) the people's favorable image of the change agents (Silliman University and the project staff; and c) the people's high benefit expectation from the project.

The intervention has contributed much to the improvements of the farm production especially during the first three years. However, the active operation of the armed groups had affected much on their farm activities, thereby adversely affecting their productivity. Several times, the farmers were forced to abandon their farm lots. Consequently, crops were poorly maintained bringing low production.

The peace and order situation in the area has even affected the relationship between and among the farmer cooperators, an issue discussed in one of the papers in this volume. Seemingly, the group has been divided. One group (from Kabalin-an, Danao and Kabatu-an) appears to be under the control of the rebels (a kind of a "forced" loyalty) while the Mahilum group is under the control of the military.

REFERENCES CITED

Colson, E. (1979). "In Good and in Bad: Food Strategies of Self Reliant Societies." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 35: 18-29.

Fontelo, C. (1985). "Assessment of Nutritional Status of Residents in Lake Balinsasayao." *Silliman Journal* 32:1-4.

SUMMARY CONCLUSION

In general, the program SURADIP has brought a number of improvements in the life of the Balinsasayao community. It did not only increase their farm yields (as shown by their farm production) but also their social and economic involvement.

Pro

Cor
Rice

Prod

Squa
Sayo
Eggl
Pecha
Bagui
beans
Pepper
Tomato
Kadios
Ampala
Tahore
String
Lima be
Upo

Not plan

Table 1. Rice and Corn Production (In Percentage)
Before Intervention After Intervention

Product	N	Less	More	Same	Less	More
Corn	16	87.50		12.5	12.5	68.75
Rice	2	100				100

Table 2. Vegetable Production (%)
Before Intervention After Intervention

Products	N	Less	More	Same	Less	More
Squash	15	26.66	33.33	40	13.33	46.66
Sayote	16	6.25	6.25	87.50	6.25	6.25
Eggplant	3	100	50			100
Pechay	2	50	50		50	50
Baguio beans	10	50	10	40	10	50
Pepper	6	66.66	33.33		33.33	66.66
Tomatoes	4	75	25		25	75
Kadios	1		100		100	
Ampalaya	3	66.66		33.33		66.66
Tahore	2			50		50
String beans	2					100
Lima beans	2			100		
Opo	1			100		

Not planted before: Cucumber and Singkamas

Table 3. Root Crop Production (%)

Products	N	Before Intervention			After Intervention	
		Less	More	Same	Less	More
Camote	16		6.25	50		43.75
Gabi	16		12.50	37.5		50
Ubi	10		10	30		60
Bişul	16		6.25	62.5		31.25
Balanghai	6		16.66	16.66		66.66

Table 4. Fruit Production (%)

Products	N	Before Intervention			After Intervention	
		Less	More	Same	Less	More
Bananas	13		23.46	38.46		38.46
Jackfruit	14		14.28	50		35.71
Avocado	5		20	60		20
Buongon	1					100
Kape	1					100
Sereguylas	1					
Bayabas	1		100			

Table 5. Livestock Production (%)

Products	N	Before Intervention			After Intervention	
		Less	More	Same	Less	More
Hogs	9	27.27	72.72		72.72	27.27
Goats	4	50	25	25	25	50
Cow	4	25	25	50	25	25
Carabao	5	40	60			
Horse	3	33	33	33	33	33

Table 6. Poultry Raising (%)

Game	N	Before Intervention			After Intervention	
		Less	More	Same	Less	More
Chicken	10	10	90	50	40	10
Gamecock		Of the 16 R's only one raised gamecock				

Table 7. Material Acquisition

A. Furniture and Other Household Paraphernalia

	Before Intervention	After Intervention
Aparador	1	0
Table	4	7
Bench	5	8
Sala set	1	1
Chair	0	1
Suit case	1	3
Kaban (wooden trunk)	5	2
Sewing machine	1	2
Transistor radio: with record player radio amplifier	4 0	7 1
Wall clock	0	1
Flat iron	3	5
Flashlight	4	4
Pressure lamp	1	2
Scissors	1	7

B. Bedroom Paraphernalia

	Before Intervention	After Intervention
Beds	2	2
Chamber pan	0	4
Mosquito nets	3	10

C. Other Bedroom Paraphernalia (%)

Products	N	Before Intervention			After Intervention	
		Less	More	Same	Less	More
Blankets	16	62.5	18.75	18.75	18.75	62.5
Pillows	16	37.5	18.75	43.75	18.75	37.5
Pillow cases	16	31.25	25	43.75	25	31.25
Mats	16	18.75	12.5	68.75	12.5	18.75

Table 8. Kitchen Utensils

Items (In Dozen)	1/4	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	More than 2	1/4	1/2	1	1 1/2	2	More than 2
Chinaware:												
Plastic	1	4	7	3			1	1	5	3	3	1
Enamel	1	4	7	3					2	2		
Porcelain		2	2		3	1						
Coco Shell (paya)										7 pieces		
Platter								3				
Big bowl:												
Plastic	1				1		4	1	2			
Enamel	1		1									
Small bowl:												
Plastic	2						1	1	1			
Enamel												
Porcelain												
Saucers:												
Plastic									1			
Porcelain					1							
Silverware:												
Spoon		4	2			1		3	6	1	3	
Fork		1	2					1	5		3	
Cups:												
Plastic								2				
Porcelain					1	1			3		1	
Glassware:												
Plastic	1		3	2			2	3	2			
Porcelain			1	3		1	1	1		2	3	
Empty mobil oil container						2 pieces						

Table 9. Other Kitchen Paraphernalia

Items	Before Intervention							After Intervention						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Earthen jar	2	1						4	2					
Pail	1		1					3	1					
Water Containers:														
Plastic Can(taro)	2							3	3	3	1			
	1							3	3					
Basin	3							5	4	1				
Thermos bottle	1								1					
Earthen pot	4							3	4					
Pot (kaldero)	2	3	2	3	1		1	1	4	1	1	2	2	1
Frying pan	1	2						2	1					
Vat								1						
Bolo	4	8	3	1				3	7	5			1	
Knife	1	2						3		2				
Ax	4							5	1	2				
Ladle	6	10						2	7	6				

Table 10. Personal Effects (%)

Items	N	Before Intervention			After Intervention	
		Less	More	Same	Less	More
Dresses, Shirts, pants, undershirts, Underwear	16	68.75		31.25		68.75
Footwear: Shoes Slippers	16			18.75		81.25
Bags: Handbag, Shoulder bag, Children's bag, Travel bag	16			12.5		87.50
Purse: Men/Women	15			66.66		33.33

Table 11. Other Personal Effects

	Before Intervention					After Intervention				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Jewelry:										
a) Ring										
Fancy					1	2				
Real						1	1			
Bronze						1				
PBMA	2									
b) Necklace										
Real						2				
c) Earring										
Real						1				
Fancy						1				
d) Wrist watch						5				
Travel bag						4				
Belt						1				
Hat	3									
Mirror						1				
Umbrella	3					4	2			
Guitar	2	R's have guitars but were given								

Table 12. Carpentry Tools

Items	Before Intervention					After Intervention				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Tigib	1					2	1	1		
Martilyo	2					4				
Gabas	2					4				
Serotso	2					3				
Wasay						2				
Eskwala						2				
Marik						1				
Pulgadera	1					1				
Sepilya						1				
Kigi blade						3				
Galingan (rock)						2				

Table 13. Farm Implements

Items	Before Intervention						After Intervention						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bugas	2	1					3						
Bunlay	2	10	4				1	4	2	2	2	4	1
Sundang	5	10	1				1	8	5	2			
Sanggot	3	2	1				3	5	2				
Alat/bukag	2	7	5	2			2	5	7	2			
Nigo	5	2					10	3		1			
Spray Can							3						
Weighing scale								1					

Table 14. Intra-household Utilization/Distribution of Food (%)
Before Intervention

Food	Before Intervention		After Intervention	
	Equal	Depends on Individual's Desire to Eat	Equal	Depends on Individual's Desire to Eat
Corn/Rice	62.5	37.5	43.75	56.25
Viand/ Protein source	87.5	12.5	68.75	31.25
Root crops		100	6.25	93.75
Vegetables		100		100
Fruits	56.25	43.75	37.5	62.5

N = 16

Table 15. Intra-household Clothing Distribution (%)

Household Members	Before Intervention	After Intervention
Parents	6.25	12.5
Father	6.25	6.5
Mother	12.50	12.5
Elder Children	25	37.5
Middle Children	6.25	
Younger (est)	12.5	6.25
Equal among children	31.25	25

N = 16

Table 16. Inter-household Distribution/Utilization of Goods

A. To whom do R's give/share their products

Products	Before Intervention	After Intervention
Root crops & vegetables	1. friends, relatives 2. parents 3. brothers/sisters	1. friends 2. parents, brothers/ sisters 3. relatives
Protein source (when R butchers a pig)	1. parents, brothers & sisters 2. neighbors 3. relatives 4. friends	1. parents, brothers/ sisters 2. relatives 3. neighbors 4. in-laws 5. friends
Corn	1. parents, brothers & sisters 2. neighbors, relatives 3. friends 4. in-laws	1. parents, brothers & sisters 2. neighbors, relatives 3. friends 4. in-laws

B. From Whom Do R's Ask When Need Arises

1. Brothers/sisters	1. Brothers/sisters/parents
2. Parents	2. Relatives
3. Neighbors	3. Neighbors
4. Friends, relatives	4. In-laws
5. In-laws	5. Friends

/mfd

impo
a gi
farm
tain
an in
rities

A
innov
or ob
newn
not a
since
1962;
a pers

In
planne
failed
digeno
what a
the agr
thern I
iables,
aspirati
fect on
logy (C
fact tha

* The
initial sta
collection
Gay Pinc