

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A TABLES TO ACCOMPANY TEXT

**Table 1. Proportion of leader/member sample size to sample universe population size**

<b>Number of leaders/members in an organization</b>	<b>Sample size</b>
5 or less	Entire population
6-10	50 percent of entire population
11-30	33 percent of entire population
31-100	25 percent of entire population
Above 100	20 percent of entire population
Above 200	10 percent of entire population
Above 500	5 percent of entire population

Table 2. Summary of sampling results: barrio sites, organizations, and the sampling sizes for each type of respondent within each barrio (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)

Barrio site	Type of organization according to			Name of organization	Type of respondent			
	Sex of members	Sponsorship	Function		Leaders		Member	
					Popula- tion	Sample size	Popula- tion	Sample size
San Antonio (110 house- holds)	Male	Government	Barangay	Barangay	9	4	110	23
	Male Youth (male and female)	Government	Cooperative	Samahang Nayon	5	5	31	7
		Government	Peasant organization	Kabataang Barangay	10	5	44	11
	Female	Private	Delivery system (nutrition)	Christian Adop- tion Program	6	3	10	5
Subtotal					30	17	195	46
Sta. Rita (554 house- holds)	Male	Government	Barangay	Barangay	8	4	525	26
	Male	Government	Cooperative	Samahang Nayon	9	5	34	9
	Female	Private	Peasant organization	Protestant Women's Group	29	9	127	25
	Female	Private	Delivery system health)	Health Center	24	8	365	36
Subtotal					70	26	1051	96
Grand total					100	43	1246	142

Total respondents: 185

Table 3. Criteria for measuring autonomy

Criteria	Score of 1 (Presence of autonomy)	Score of 0 (Absence of autonomy)
1. Whether organization was supported	< 100% of R's said "Yes"	= 100% of R's said "Yes"
2. Whether leaders were elected or appointed	≤ 25% of leader R's were appointed	> 25% of leader R's were appointed
3. Whether or not non-member contributors ask help from organization	< 50% of R's said "Yes"	≥ 50% of R's said "Yes"
4. Whether or not there are others involved in budget decisions	No R said "Yes"	At least 1 R said "Yes"
5. Whether or not any agency/group helps organization	No R said "Yes"	At least 1 R said "Yes"

**Table 4. Autonomy scores of sample organizations (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Organization	Criteria*					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
<i>Government groups</i>						
Barangay, San Antonio	1	0	0	1	0	2
Samahang Nayon, San Antonio	0	1	1	0	1	3
Kabataang Barangay	1	1	1	1	0	4
Barangay, Sta. Rita	0	1	0	0	1	2
Samahang Nayon, Sta. Rita	1	0	0	0	1	2
Total	3	3	2	2	3	13
Mean						2.6
<i>Private groups</i>						
Christian Adoption Program	0	1	1	1	0	3
Protestant Women's Group	1	0	0	0	1	2
Health Center	1	0	0	1	1	3
Total	2	1	1	2	2	8
Mean						2.7

\*See Table 3 for descriptions of criteria.

Table 5. Criteria for measuring linkage

Criteria	Score of 1 (Presence of linkage)	Score of 0 (Absence of linkage)
1. Whether or not there are members of the organization who hold office in government	Presence of at least some "Yes" answers	complete absence of "Yes" answers
2. Whether or not there are organization members who are affiliated with other organizations	More than 50% of R's knew of some members affiliated with other organizations	50% or less knew of some members affiliated with other organizations
3. Number of members who are affiliated with other organizations	x number of members per organization > 1.0	x number of members $\leq$ 1.0
4. Whether or not R has relatives who held/hold office in government	> 75% of R's have relatives in government	$\leq$ 75% of R's have relatives in government
5. Number of relatives who held/hold office in government	x number of relatives in government $\leq$ 1.5	x number of relatives in government < 1.5
6. Whether or not R has relatives who held/hold position in any organization	> 25% of R's have relatives in other organizations	$\leq$ 25% of R's have relatives in other organizations
7. Number of relatives who held/hold position in any organization	x number of relatives > .275	x number of relatives $\leq$ .275
8. Whether or not R held position in any organization	> 10% of R's said "Yes"	$\leq$ 10% of R's said "Yes"
9. Number of organizations where R held position	x number of organizations > .1514	x number of organizations $\leq$ .1514
10. Frequency of organization's dealing with other organizations	Presence of at least some "Frequently" answers	Absence of any "Frequently" answers

**Table 6. Respondents by perceived motivation behind absence of organizational linkage with other local groups (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Reasons	Government groups	Private groups	Total
Lack of unity in other groups	4	0	4
Organization members have no time to deal with other groups	2	0	2
Organization is not active enough to deal with other groups	0	3	3
Organization lacks the leadership needed for linkage	0	2	2
Organization has enough resources/sponsor gives enough	0	8	8
Others	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>NAP (Rs who perceived linkage)</b>			<b>165</b>

**Table 7. Respondents by government agency to which they and/or their relatives are affiliated (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

<b>Government agency</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Relative</b>
Municipal bureaucracy	60% (6)*	23% (39)
Provincial bureaucracy	0 (0)	2 (3)
National bureaucracy	10 (1)	28 (47)
Military	10 (1)	38 (64)
Others	20 (2)	9 (15)
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(10)</b>	<b>100%</b> <b>(168)</b>
<b>NAP (no linkage with government agency)</b>	<b>(175)</b>	<b>(17)</b>

\*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

**Table 8. Respondents by government positions occupied by them and/or their relatives (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

<b>Government positions</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Relative</b>
Administrative	20% (2) *	14% (23)
Professional	0 (0)	13 (21)
Clerical	50 (5)	23 (39)
Military, official	10 (1)	19 (32)
Military, not official	0 (0)	24 (41)
Others	20 (2)	7 (12)
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b> (10)	<b>100%</b> (168)
<b>NAP (no linkage with government agency)</b>	<b>(175)</b>	<b>(17)</b>

Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.



Table 9. Criteria for measuring participation

Criteria	Score of 1 (Presence of participation)	Score of 0 (Absence of participation)
1. Persons involved in planning organization's activities	> 75% of R's said "organization members and officers"	$\leq$ 75% of R's said "Organization members and officers"
2. Whether majority of members are interested in organizations' activities	> 75% of R's said "Yes"	$\leq$ 75% of R's said "Yes"
3. Number of members who usually attend organization's meetings	> 30% of R's said "all"	$\leq$ 30% of R's said "all"
4. How frequently members express their opinions/ views freely during meetings	> 75% of R's said "Free all the time"	$\leq$ 75% of R's said "Free all the time"
5. Whether or not members usually obey organization's rules and regulations	> 50% of R's said "Yes"	$\leq$ 50% of R's said "Yes"
6. Whether or not members respect leaders' decisions	> 75% of R's said "Yes"	$\leq$ 75% of R's said "Yes"

Table 10. Participation scores of sample organizations (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)

Organization	Criteria*						Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
<b>Government groups</b>							
Barangay, San Antonio	0	1	0	1	1	1	4
Samahang Nayon, San Antonio	1	0	1	1	0	1	4
Kabataang Barangay	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Barangay, Sta. Rita	1	1	1	0	1	1	5
Samahang Nayon, Sta. Rita	1	1	0	1	1	1	5
Total							19
Mean							3.8
<b>Private groups</b>							
Christian Adoption Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Protestant Women's Group	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total							6
Mean							2

\*See Table 9 for descriptions of criteria.

**Table 11. Leader-respondents by perceived ways in which organization has affected them (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

<b>Ways affected</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Made R more sociable, increased his pakikisama skills	14	36%
Made R more mature, responsible	12	31
In general, helped R	4	10
Hampered R's work/study	4	10
Gave R economic benefits	2	5
Others	3	8
Total	39	100%
DK/NA	4	

**Table 12. Member-respondents by perceived ways in which organization has affected them (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

<b>Ways affected</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Made R more sociable, increased his pakikisama skills	64	53%
In general, helped R	25	21
Gave R economic benefits	12	10
Made R more mature, responsible	8	7
Hampered R's work/study	3	2
Others	9	7
Total	121	100%
DK/NA	21	

**Table 13. Criteria for assessing differences in socioeconomic status between leaders and members**

Criteria	Score of 1 (Leaders' status is higher than socioeconomic rank-and-file members)	Score of 0 (Leaders' socioeconomic status is lower than or equal to that of the rank-and-file members)
1. Educational attainment	Leaders have a significantly higher educational median than members (using the median test)	Leaders do not have a significantly higher educational median than members using the median test)
2. Current primary occupation	Proportion of leaders with no occupation whatsoever < proportion of members	Proportion of leaders with no occupation whatsoever $\geq$ proportion of members
3. Total family income	Leaders have $>$ mean family income than members	Leaders have $\geq$ mean family income than members
4. Total land size owned	Leaders have $>$ mean land size than members	Leaders have $\leq$ mean land size than members
5. Tenurial status	Proportion of leaders who own land $>$ proportion of members	Proportion of leaders who own land $\leq$ proportion of members

**Table 14. Scores of sample organizations on presence of better-off leaders in the group (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Organization	Criteria*					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
<i>Government groups</i>						
Barangay, San Antonio	1	0	1	1	1	4
Samahang Nayon, San Antonio	0	1	1	0	1	3
Kabataang Barangay	1	1	0	0	0	2
Barangay, Sta. Rita	1	0	1	1	1	4
Samahang Nayon, Sta. Rita	1	0	0	0	1	2
Total						15
Mean						3
<i>Private groups</i>						
Christian Adoption Program	0	0	1	0	0	1
Protestant Women's Group	0	1	0	0	1	2
Health Center	1	0	1	1	1	4
Total						7
Mean						2.3

\*See Table 13 for descriptions of criteria.

**Table 15. Proportion of leaders and members born within and outside of Nueva Ecija (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Position in organization	Place of birth				Total	
	Within N.E.		Outside of N.E.		Number	Percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Leaders	37	86%	6	14%	43	100%
Members	97	68	45	32	142	100
Total	134		51		185	

**Table 16. Proportion of government and private group leaders born within and outside of Nueva Ecija (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Group type of leaders	Place of birth				Total	
	Within N.E.		Outside of N.E.		Number	Percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Government- sponsored	23	100%	0		23	100%
Private- sponsored	14	70	6	30%	20	100
Total	37		6		43	

**Table 17. Respondents by perceived factors that block their organization's effectiveness (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Factors that hinder effectiveness	Number	Percent
Lack of internal unity and understanding	84	48%
Lack of funds	55	32
Nothing	27	16
Lack of participation	4	2
Others	4	2
Total	174	100%
DK	11	

**Table 18. Respondents by suggested steps that could be taken to make their organization effective (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Suggestions	Number	Percent
Increase internal unity and understanding	128	71%
Have funds	18	10
Make members comply with regulations and increase discipline	14	8
Increase participation	6	3
Change old leaders for younger ones	4	2
Others	9	5
None	2	1
Total	181	100%
DK	4	

**Table 19. Criteria for assessing the sample organizations' financial capability**

Criteria	Score of 1 (Presence of financial capability)	Score of 0 (Absence of financial capability)
1. Whether or not organization has money/equipment	> 75% of R's said "Yes"	≤ 75% of R's said "Yes"
2. Whether or not organization finds it difficult to obtain funds	≥ 50% of R's said "No"	< 50% of R's said "No"

**Table 20. Respondents by perceived causes of difficulties in obtaining funds (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Perceived causes of difficulties	Number	Percent
People are poor and cannot afford the membership fees		
'Tungro' pest destroyed the rice harvest	23	34%
Life, in general, is hard	22	33
No permanent source of income	5	8
Members suspect leaders may mismanage the money	7	10
Lack of organizational cooperation	5	8
Others	4	6
No answer		2
Total	67	101%
NAP (no perceived financial) difficulties	118	



**Table 21. Criteria for measuring degree of success in mobilizing support within the rural community**

Criteria	Score of 1 (Presence of mobilizing support function)	Score of 0 (Absence of mobilizing support function)
1. Whether organization has had any project in which barrio people were involved in planning	> 50% of R's said "Yes"	< 50% of R's said "Yes"
2. Whether organization has had any project in which barrio people were involved in implementation.	No "none" answer	At least 1 "None" answer
3. Whether organization has asked assistance from any government agency	> 60% of R's said "Yes"	< 60% of R's said "Yes"

**Table 22. Score of sample organizations on success in mobilizing support within the rural community (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Organization	Criteria*			Total
	1	2	3	
<i>Government-sponsored groups</i>				
Barangay, San Anton	0	1	1	2
Samahang Nayon, San Antonio	0	1	1	2
Kabataang Barangay	0	1	0	1
Barangay, Sta. Rita	1	1	1	3
Samahang Nayon, Sta. Rita	0	1	0	1
Total				9
Mean				1.8
<i>Private groups</i>				
Christian Adoption Program	1	1	0	2
Protestant Women's Group	1	0	1	2
Health Center	1	0	1	2
Total				6
Mean				2

\*See Table 21 for descriptions of criteria.

**Table 23. Respondents by perceived types of organizational projects where the barrio people participated as co-implementors (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Projects	Number	Percent
Repairing of barrio facilities/buildings, e.g., barrio center	38	50%
Cleaning and beautifying the barrio	32	42
Others	6	8
Total	76	100%
DK/NAP (no perceived projects)	109	

**Table 24. Respondents by perceived types of organizational favors received from local government offices (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

<b>Type of favors</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Agriculture-related aid (technical assistance, credit, farm implements, insecticides)	45	44%
Physical-improvement aid (cleanliness and beautification materials, building repair implements)	44	43
Medical aid	11	11
Others	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>101%</b>
DK/NAP (no perceived favors)	82	

**Table 25. Criteria for measuring degree of success in articulating and processing local needs and demands**

Criteria	Score of 1 (Presence of articulating/processing needs function)	Score of 0 (Absence of articulating/processing needs function)
1. Organization's principal activities	<50% of R's answered "cleaning the environment"	≥ 50 % of R's answered – "cleaning the environment"
2. Major barrio problem	>70% of R's answered "Tungro"	≤70% of R's answered "Tungro"
3. What the people want the organization to do regarding barrio problem	>25% of R's said "Take direct and concrete steps to solve the problem"	≤25% of R's said "Take direct and concrete steps to solve the problem"
4. Whether the organization can do something to eliminate the problem	>75% of R's said "Yes"	≤75% of R's said "Yes"

**Table 26. Scores of sample organizations on success in articulating and processing local needs and demands (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Organization	Criteria*				Total
	1	2	3	4	
<i>Government groups</i>					
Barangay, San Antonio	0	0	1	1	2
Samahang Nayon, San Antonio	1	0	1	1	3
Kabataang Barangay	0	1	0	0	1
Barangay, Sta. Rita	1	1	1	1	4
Samahang Nayon, Sta Rita	1	0	0	1	2
Total					12
Mean					2.4
<i>Private groups</i>					
Christian Adoption Program	0	0	0	0	0
Protestant Women's Group	0	1	1	0	2
Health Center	1	0	0	1	2
Total					4
Mean					1.3

\*See Table 25 for descriptions of criteria.

**Table 27. Respondents by perceived major barrio problems (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Perceived barrio problems	Number	Percent
Tungro; destruction of crops; no harvest	126	68%
No permanent source of income	20	11
Lack of medical facilities	11	6
Lack of capital/money	7	4
Lack of farming implements/ facilities	6	3
Others	13	7
Total	183	99%
NA/DK	2	

**Table 28. Respondents by perception of what the barrio people wanted the organization to do about local problems (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Perceived solution to local problems	Number	Percent
Don't know	81	44%
Present problem to the proper authorities; ask authorities to solve problem	44	24
Take direct steps toward solving the problem	28	15
Give out food/money	12	7
Give people jobs	5	3
Others	12	7
Total	182	100%
NA		

**Table 29. Respondents by perceived function of their organization within the community (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

Perceived function	Number	Percent
Cleanliness and beautification/ repairing (church) building	80	43%
Don't know	29	16
Medical aid	24	13
Economic help	23	12
Peace and order	15	8
Others	14	8
Total	185	100%

**Table 30. Criteria for measuring the degree of success in developing two-way communications within the barrio**

Criteria	Score of 1 (Presence of developing communication function)	Score of 0 (Absence of developing communication function)
1. Whether barrio people ask help from organization	$\geq 75\%$ of R's said "Yes"	$< 75\%$ of R's said "Yes"
2. Whether there was an instance when the organization presented any matter to authorities	$\geq 50\%$ of R's said "Yes"	$< 50\%$ of R's said "Yes"

**Table 31. Criteria for measuring the success of the organization in facilitating delivery of services**

Criteria	Score of 1 (Presence of facilitating services function)	Score of 0 (Absence of facilitating services function)
1. Whether services of authorities are brought to barrio people through organization	$> 75\%$ of R's said "Yes"	$\leq 75\%$ of R's said "Yes"
2. Whether organization has been approached by government extension worker	approached by at least one of the 9 government workers interviewed	not approached by a single government worker interviewed

**Table 32. Correlations between characteristics and development-function variables, N=8 (Nueva Ecija, January-February 1977)**

<b>Developmental functions</b>	<b>Mobilizing support within the community</b>	<b>Articulating and processing local needs</b>	<b>Developing two-way communication</b>	<b>Facilitating the provision of services</b>
<b>Characteristics</b>				
Autonomy	-.41	-.48	-.76*	-.37
Linkages	.37	.29	0	.83*
Participation	.20	.05	.23	.63
Socioeconomic difference between leaders and members	.53	.72*	.49	.62
Administrative capability	.27	0	.37	.45
Financial capability	.60	0	0	.28

\*Significant at .05 level



**APPENDIX B  
PROJECT STAFF**

**Project Director:** Cristina Montiel

**Consultant:** Patricia Licuanan

**Field Supervisor:** Milagros Tolentino

**Field Staff:** Yolanda N. Bermundo, Rosario N. Pablo, Danilo N. Rosete, Mari-lou B. Songco

**Interviewers:** Lerma B. Ibarra, Amelia P. Israel, Fe S. Pascual, Delia C. Pastor, Lucita Salamanca, Sofia P. Salvatierra

**Research Assistants/Coders:** Alice M. Aguilar, Beatriz C. Descallar, Maria Lina A. Diona, Danilo N. Rosete, Romulo A. Sandoval, Marilou B. Songco

**Data Processors:** Cynthia C. Feranil, Alma C. Resquites, Moises S. Roxas, Jr.

**Editorial Staff:** Cynthia C. Veneracion, Vida S. Flor, Rebecca M. Sawyer, Jessica A. Perez, Evangeline N. Tandaguen

**Library Staff:** Teresa B. Cruz, Ramon R. Martin, Susan P. Intal

**Accounting Staff:** Eva C. Bustamante, Marita M. Valdehuesa, Rebecca C. de Vera, Luzviminda D. Monge

**Secretarial Staff:**

Fermina T. Dumauual, Purificacion I. Roca, Emma Rosario A. Agan, Marilou T. Abejar

**Supplies and Transportation:**

Rolando C. Ibañez, Allen M. Aguilar, Jose C. Lucas, Jr., Ricardo E. Caguioa, Cresente M. Llarrena