

# COMPARISON BETWEEN ACTION PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTED BY THE INDIVIDUAL, INDIVIDUALS-GROUPED-AS-ONE, AND THE FAMILY

Henry Y. Goltiano

Chief Training Officer, Agricultural Training Institute-National Training Center, Visayas State College of Agriculture, Baybay, Leyte, Philippines.

---

## ABSTRACT

This study determined which action program grouping was more effective. Results showed that action programs formulated by families were implemented more successfully than those formulated by individuals or individuals-grouped-as-one. Respondents claimed that the family was the primary social group which could provide the most needed support in action program implementation. Moreover, the wife was an important pillar of farm activities because respondents cited that she provided the strongest support and encouragement.

*Ann. Trop. Res. 11: 72 - 81*

---

**KEY WORDS:** Action program. Degree of family involvement. Level of success. Socio-psychological benefits. Overall training benefit.

---

## INTRODUCTION

The action program is the ultimate test of training effectiveness. Through it, the farmer graduates show how much they have learned and their capability to actualize their learnings. Success in action program implementation means that the graduate learned and acquired the motivation to apply this training knowledge; failure could be

either lack of learning or motivation or both. Since PTC-RD started operations in 1978, the composition of commodity-based action program grouping changed from area-isolate grouping to barangay to individual-level and lastly, to community grouping. These changes were based on the assumption that new grouping provided bigger chances for successful action program implementation than the former. No

empirical study was done to determine which was more effective and the family was never considered a group.

In general, the study determined which of these action program groupings, i.e. individual level (IL), individuals-grouped-as-one (IGAO), or the family level (FL) was more effective. Specifically, it compared the differences between and among the action program groupings in terms of the degree of family involvement in action program implementation and the overall training benefit. The study also determined the relationship between the degree of family involvement in the action program implementation and the overall training benefit; the contribution of the family and family members in the implementation of the action pro-

gram; the influence of the family and its members on the respondents' socio-psychological propensities; and the reasons for the attainment or non-attainment of the action program goals, objectives and planned activities.

## METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted from November 18-19, 1987 in four Southern Leyte Settlement Program (SLSP) barangays in Hinunangan and San Juan, Southern Leyte. These barangays were covered by the July 5-16, 1987 APTECH PTC-RD training whose participants were distributed into three comparison action program groups (Table 1).

Table 1. Distribution of respondents in Hinunangan and San Juan, So. Leyte according to action program grouping.

Variable	Action Program Grouping			Total
	IL	IGAO	FL	
Hinunangan				
o Sto. Niño	3	1	1	5
o Libas	-	1	3	4
o Esperanza	3	-	2	5
San Juan				
o Somoje	3	1	-	4
Total	9	3	6	18

Respondents were the action program group leaders. Of the expected nine IL respondents, only eight were

around during the survey. Respondents from all three groups had to meet common requirements before being

served by SLSP and recruited to training. Since they were living under closely similar conditions, respondents were assumed homogeneous. The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance (Siegel, 1956) showed no significant difference in the respondents' personal, family and occupational characteristics. Therefore, differences in overall training benefits and other variables between and among groups were largely due to action program grouping.

Barangay Somoje was not considered a separate group. Farmers from the barangay were distributed in the different action program groupings. They acted as action program group representatives and not as barangay representatives.

The research instrument developed for this study was designed to gather quantitative data (through questions with scaled responses) and qualitative data (through probe questions incorporated in the instrument).

The degree of family involvement in action program implementation and the overall training benefit were assessed. The latter considered the level of success of action program implementation and the socio-psychological benefits.

The degree of family involvement (DFI) in action program implementation refers to the degree of support and encouragement provided by the family and its members in the implementation of action program. Responses to the questions in the instrument were scaled from 1 to 5 with 5 as highest.

The level of success of action program implementation (LSAPI) was determined by comparing planned action program goals, objectives and/or schedule of activities against actual field accomplishment. Under LSAPI, time, quality and quantity were considered.

Time (T) refers to the extent of fulfillment of planned action program goals, objectives and/or schedule of activities set until Dec. 31, 1987. Full fulfillment got 5 points; one month delay meant 3 points; 2 months, 1. Action programs which have merely started got a score of 0. A week of delay in the implementation of activities meant 0.25 subtraction from the score.

Quality (QI) refers to the extent by which recommended cultural practices for the particular crop were followed resulting in good plant growth. Quality was based on the researcher's own judgment and was scaled from 1 to 5 with 5 as highest.

Quantity (Qn) refers to the extent by which target amount or number to be planted or area to be cultivated was reached. For example, if the action program targeted planting of 30 coffee seedlings by October 31, 1987 and 30 were indeed planted, the action program was scored 5 for 100 percent accomplished. If only 15 were planted it was scored 3 for 50 percent accomplished. The same rating was used for area cultivated. Because groups differed in number of commodities they worked on, each group's score for quantity was the average of the scores it got for all commodities worked on.

*Socio-psychological Benefits (SB)*

This was measured through the modernity instrument adopted from Inkeles and Smith (1974). The following system of scoring in the SB instrument was adopted.

1. For two-choice items, the modern answer was scored 5; the traditional, 1.
2. In three-choice items, the most modern response got 5; the moderate, 3; and the most traditional, 1.
3. In four-choice items which offered no middle ground answer, the most modern response got 5; the second, 4; the most traditional, 1 and the next traditional, 2.
4. In five-choice items, the most modern response got 5 points; the second, 4; the third, 3; the fourth, 2 and the most traditional, 1.

*Overall Training Benefit (OTB)*

OTB is the group's average score (highest possible score of 5) for LSAPI and SB. OTB, therefore, is LSAPI plus SB over two.

*Tests Made and Statistical Tools Used*

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine the difference in means between groups in terms of DFI in action program implementation and OTB measured according to LSAPI

and SB to the respondents. The relationship between DFI in action program implementation and OTB through LSAPI and SB to the respondents was also tested using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION***Difference in Means**Degree of Family Involvement (DFI)*

Table 2 shows that IL got a DFI mean score of 3.33; IGAO, 4.47; and FL, 4.45. The Mann-Whitney U test showed significant difference in DFI means only between the IL and the FL. This is expected because it is only in FL that other family members are involved in formulation of action program. Hence, all family members should be involved even at the planning stage of a family endeavor to ensure its success.

*Overall Training Benefit (OTB)*

Although the groups differed in OTB mean scores, the Mann-Whitney U test revealed significant differences. The OTB and DFI mean scores of IL and IGAO did not differ probably because the farmers who formulated the action program as a group implemented it individually and not as a group. The group broke apart and individual members were left on their own, resulting in dislocation of intentions and activities. Individuals could not even get fair support from their family.

The story of a farmer from barangay Somoje substantiates this. He

**Table 2.** The Mann-Whitney U test of differences in means between the comparison groups.

Variable	Groups Compared	Group Mean Score	Computed U	Probability Computed with U
DFI	IL & FL	3.33 & 4.45	5	.006*
	IL & IGAO	3.33 & 4.47	6	.139 <sup>ns</sup>
	IGAO & FL	4.47 & 4.45	3	.083 <sup>ns</sup>
OTB	IL & FL	3.45 & 4.10	12	.071 <sup>ns</sup>
	IL & IGAO	3.45 & 3.45	10	.387 <sup>ns</sup>
	IGAO & FL	3.45 & 4.10	4	.131 <sup>ns</sup>
LSAPI	IL & FL	3.38 & 4.10	17	.207 <sup>ns</sup>
	IL & IGAO	3.38 & 3.50	11	.461 <sup>ns</sup>
Time	IL & FL	4.13 & 4.25	12	.071 <sup>ns</sup>
	IL & IGAO	4.13 & 3.70	18	.539 <sup>ns</sup>
	IGAO & FL	3.70 & 4.25	15	.548 <sup>ns</sup>
Quality	IL & FL	2.77 & 4.00	12	.071 <sup>ns</sup>
	IL & IGAO	2.77 & 3.42	10	.387 <sup>ns</sup>
	IGAO & FL	3.42 & 4.00	4	.131 <sup>ns</sup>
Quantity	IL & FL	2.91 & 4.10	9	.030*
	IL & IGAO	2.91 & 3.35	11	.461 <sup>ns</sup>
	IGAO & FL	3.35 & 4.10	5	.190 <sup>ns</sup>
SB A	IL & FL	3.51 & 4.10	7	.015*
	IL & IGAO	3.51 & 3.40	8	.248 <sup>ns</sup>
	IGAO & FL	3.40 & 4.10	2	.048*
B	IL & FL	3.88 & 4.83	24	.525 <sup>ns</sup>
	IL & IGAO	3.88 & 4.33	9	.048*
	IGAO & FL	4.33 & 4.83	2	.143 <sup>ns</sup>

ns - not significant

\* - significant at 5% level

IL - Individual Level Action Programming

FL - Family Level Action Programming

IGAO - Individuals-Grouped-As-One Action Programming

failed to implement the action program because he was alone. He thought his co-trainees who were grouped succeeded because they could get the support of local leaders particularly in seed acquisition. The researchers, however, found that those who were grouped also failed and even found it uncomfortable to suddenly stand on their own after big expectations from grouping themselves.

#### *Levels of Success of Action Program Implementation (LSAPI)*

The Mann-Whitney U test revealed that the groups did not differ significantly in LSAPI (Table 2). However among the three LSAPI aspects considered, a significant difference in means existed only in quantity between IL and FL. This implies that involvement of more family members in action program implementation; and more guidance, reminders, correction, encouragement and help from each family member are necessary to increase the extent by which recom-

mended cultural practices were followed.

#### *Socio-psychological Benefits (SB)*

FL got the highest SB mean score of 4.10 followed by IL with 3.51 and IGAO with 3.40 (Table 2). Only FL differed significantly from IL and IGAO. This suggests that exposure of more family members to progressive ideas positively influenced each other's attitudes.

#### *Relationships Between Variables*

##### *Degree of Family Involvement and Overall Training Benefit*

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient test disclosed a highly significant relationship between DFI in action program implementation and OTB derived by the respondents (Table 3). This denotes that success or failure of the farmer both in his own farm and in his own self is strongly dependent on the amount of cooperation and support provided by his family.

**Table 3.** The Spearman rank correlation coefficient between different variables used in the study.

Variable	Correlation Coefficient (r)
DFI and OTB	.71**
DFI and LSAPI	.77**
DFI and T	.45 <sup>ns</sup>
DFI and Qn	.73**
DFI and Ql	.74**
DFI and SB	.37 <sup>ns</sup>

ns - not significant

\*\* - significant at 1 % level

### *Degree of Family Involvement and Level of Success of Action Program Implementation*

Table 3 shows that DFI significantly affected the LSAPI. This is particularly true in terms of quantity and quality suggesting that involvement of the family in action program implementation affected the number of plants the farmer could plant and the extent by which he could follow recommended cultural practices. However, DFI did not significantly affect time.

### *Degree of Family Involvement and Socio-psychological Benefits*

No significant relationship was noted between DFI and SB (Table 3). This concurs with the result of the Mann-Whitney U test that FL significantly differed from IL and IGAO in SB mean scores (Table 2). In the test

of difference, the groups were compared with each other whereas in the test of relationship, all groups were combined with scores of each groups counteracting the others. These findings denote that family members of the respondents have traditional outlook in life and did not have modernizing influence on the respondents. The family members hindered the development of the respondents instead of reinforcing their modern values and attitudes inculcated in the training.

### *The Wife as the Power Behind Action Program Implementation*

To the respondents, the wife (or the mother) is an important pillar of farm activities. Findings show that 35.3 percent of the respondents first think of her when help was needed to implement the action program (Table 4). Forty-one percent of them cited

Table 4. The first person that came into respondents' mind when thinking of help in the implementation of action program.

Variable	IL-AP		IGAO-AP		FL-AP		Total	
	n=8	%	n=3	%	n=6	%	n=17	%
Wife/Mother	3	37.5	1	33.3	2	33.0	6	35.3
Husband/Father	2	25.0	-	-	1	16.7	3	17.6
Son/Brother	-	-	-	-	-	16.7	1	5.9
Daughter/Sister	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Technician	1	12.5	1	33.3	1	16.7	3	17.6
Co-farmer	1	12.5	-	-	-	-	1	5.9
PTC Staff	1	12.5	-	-	1	16.7	2	11.8
Mayor	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	1	5.9
Total	8	100	3	99.9*	6	99.8*	17	100

that the wife really provided the strongest support in the implementation (Table 5). According to 66.6 percent of the respondents, the wife provided the most needed encouragement in case of

doubts and hesitations in the implementation of the action program (Table 6) whereas 82.3 percent said the wife deserves gratitude and appreciation for her assistance (Table 7).

Table 5. The person who provided the strongest support in the implementation of the action program.

Variable	IL-AP		IGAO-AP		FL-AP		Total	
	n=8	%	n=3	%	n=6	%	n=17	%
Wife/Mother	3	37.5	1	33.3	3	50	7	41.2
Husband/Father	2	25	1	33.3	1	16.6	4	23.5
Son/Brother	-	-	-	-	1	16.6	1	5.9
Daughter/Sister	1	12.5	-	-	-	-	1	5.9
Technician	-	-	1	33.3	1	16.6	2	11.7
Co-Farmer	1	12.5	-	-	-	-	1	5.9
PTC Staff	1	12.5	-	-	-	-	1	5.9
Total	8	100	3	99.9*	6	99.8*	17	100

Table 6. The person who provided the most needed encouragement during moments of doubts and hesitations.

Variable	IL-AP		IGAO-AP		FL-AP		Total	
	n=8	%	n=3	%	n=6	%	n=17	%
Wife/Mother	2	66.7	-	-	2	100	4	66.6
Husband/Father	1	33.3	-	-	-	-	1	16.7
Technician	-	-	1	100	-	-	1	16.7
Total	3	100	1	100	2	100	6	100

Fifty-two percent of the respondents indicate that the family was the primary social group which could provide the most needed support in the

implementation of the program (Table 8). Government, particularly SLSP and its technicians, and PTC-RD trailed behind with 17 percent each.

**Table 7.** The three persons to thank most in the implementation of the action program.

Variable	Number of Times Mentioned							
	IL-AP		IGAO-AP		FL-AP		Total	
	n=8	%	n=3	%	n=6	%	n=17	%
Wife/Mother	8	1	3	1	3	50	14	82.3
Husband/Father	5	62.5	2	66.6	4	66.6	11	64.7
Son/Brother	2	25	1	33.3	-	-	3	17.6
Daughter	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	1	5.9
Technician	7	87.5	3	1	2	33.3	12	17
Co-farmer	1	12.5	2	66.6	-	-	3	17.6
Relative	-	-	-	-	1	16.7	1	5.9
PTC Staff	3	37.5	1	33.3	1	16.7	5	29.4
Brgy. Captain	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	1	5.9
God	1	12.5	-	-	-	-	1	5.9

Though not included as one of the choices in the questionnaire, the PTC-RD and its staff were insisted by the respondents to have helped them a lot.

### CONCLUSIONS

The findings indicate that action programs formulated and implemented

**Table 8.** What group respondents thought could provide the most needed support in the implementation of the action program.

Variable	IL-AP		IGAO-AP		FL-AP		Total	
	n=8	%	n=3	%	n=6	%	n=17	%
Family	4	50	1	33.3	4	66.6	9	52.9
Co-farmer trainee	-	-	2	66.6	-	-	2	11.8
Govt. (SLSP & Technician)	1	12.5	-	-	1	16.7	3	17.6
PTC Staff	3	37.5	-	-	1	16.7	3	17.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>99.9*</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>

\*The above and succeeding figures with asterisks did not total 100 due to rounding off.

by more family members have higher chances of success. Since an individual's goal is almost always synonymous with family goals, involvement of more family members brings more energy and purpose to a project. Findings also shattered the myth that commodity-based action programs formulated by a group of barangay residents yield better results.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

A similar study should be conducted in larger scale. After findings of this study are confirmed, recruitment for ATI farmers trainings should allow more members from a family to participate and operationalize training learnings. Another consideration is how to bring more family members into training without disrupting and dislocating family activities.

### **LITERATURE CITED**

- GOLTIANO, H.Y. 1987. The impact of training program of the Philippine Training Centers for Rural Development on farmer modernity. Unpublished M.S. Thesis. U.P. at Los Baños, College, Laguna. p. 74.
- INKELES, A. and SMITH, D.N. 1974. *Becoming Modern*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. pp. 9-20.
- PERSVELOU, C. and SPJERS-ZWART, S. 1976. The household, women and agricultural development. Proceedings of a symposium organized by the Department of Home Economics, Agricultural University of Wageningen, The Netherlands. 18-20 Jan., 1976.
- SIEGEL, S. 1965. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. pp. 116-127, 184-193.