



COMMUNITY EXTENSION SERVICES OF SUCs IN REGION IX: BASIS FOR A SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Clarita D. Bidad¹

Evelyn R. Campiseño²

¹ Faculty Member, JRMSC-Dipolog Campus, Dipolog City, Zambo. del Norte

² Vice President for Planning, Research, Extension and Special Concerns, JRMSC System

Abstract

This study aimed to assess SUCs community extension services in Region IX along education, livelihood generation, health and nutrition, good governance and environmental awareness during the School Year 2008-2009 as basis for sustainable community enhancement program.

The descriptive method was used with a questionnaire aided by an unstructured interview utilized in gathering data. The statistical tools used were mean, computation, percentage, frequency and t-test of difference. There were 90 implementers and 175 beneficiaries who were utilized as respondents in the study. The results of the study revealed that the extension program of SUCs was well implemented. And, faculty and students were well involved. There was no significant difference on the ratings of the implementers and beneficiaries along education, livelihood generation, health and nutrition, good governance and environmental awareness implementation. No significant difference also existed on the perceptions of the implementers and beneficiaries in their involvement of the extension programs on education, livelihood generation and good governance. However, there was significant difference in their involvement on the program on health and nutrition and environmental management.

Therefore, the extension programs should continue to move on and reach out for the sustainable development of the community.

Keywords : *Extension services, sustainable, enhancement program*

Introduction

Republic Act 7722, otherwise known as The Commission on Higher Education mandates institutions of higher learning like State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) to respond to the call for societal transformation. The aim is to serve the poorest of the poor, the less privileged, the deprived and the oppressed. (Elman1998)

Among SUCs most extension programs are demand driven and accreditation driven. Demand driven is community-based that encompass basic functional needs and demands designed to establish and promote the general well-being of the rural and urban populace. Usually this is requested by the Local Government Unit concerned upon identification of the specific needs of their constituents. On the other hand, the accreditation driven extension programs are implemented in response to the requirements by an accrediting body. Although, they emerged differently, yet the implementation complements the curricular offerings of the institution.



Both kinds of programs provide opportunities for the target clientele to improve their standard of living and uplift the quality of life of the clientele.

In order to serve and improve community life, SUCs offer a wide variety of extension programs and services. These are designed primarily to increase the security of livelihood, alleviate poverty, reduce illiteracy, improve health and nutrition, creates a system of governance that promotes supports and sustains human development and protecting and preserving the environment. For the poor to benefit, they must be empowered in mind, body and resources. To augment their voice and make government responsive to their needs and aspiration, good governance demands for their greater participation. Hence, good governance increases their opportunity to participate in decision making, institution building and social life.

As an extension coordinator of JRMSC-Dipolog Campus, this research study was undertaken to assess the extension programs and services of SUCs in Region IX covering formidable tasks such as poverty, illiteracy, health and nutrition, sustain programs and activities through its good governance, and achieving sustainable development among the marginalized people.

Conceptual Framework

The study is premised on the concept that State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines are mandated by law to serve the communities. This mandate is fulfilled by exercising the functions of the school. One of the functions is to meet social needs or to provide the social services needed to combat social and economic ills of society. Therefore, SUCs have to move ideas along the road to action, to develop knowledge needed, and to apply useful knowledge in the solution of society's major problems. This is carried on through the establishment of the extension programs and services.

In response to the mandate and the strong emphasis to sustain community development, SUCs of Region IX extended its programs and services to the different communities. These services are focused on capability building through education, the conduct of livelihood skills training to adults who are unemployed, underemployed or who wanted to upgrade their skills, out-of-school youth, technical assistance to support programs of government, and the transfer of technology to the depressed barangays where resources were available. In view of the mandate, SUCs extended the following programs and services to the community and which looked into this study namely: education, livelihood generation, health and nutrition, good governance, and environmental awareness.

Research Method

This study used the descriptive method of research with the aid of the questionnaire checklist and unstructured interview to assess SUCs extension services in Region IX along education, livelihood generation, health and nutrition, good governance and environmental .

Research Respondents

The respondents of the study were the implementers of the SUCs extension programs and services in Region IX composed of the extension directors, extension coordinators, faculty



members who extended their expertise, visiting lecturers and community organizers. The other group of respondents was the 20 beneficiaries of the extension programs and services of the College/University. They were the recipients of the five extended areas considered in this study. These beneficiaries were chosen based on the record of the extension workers who knew well on their participation, attendance as well as their performance during the conduct of the classes and trainings.

Research Instrument

The study employed questionnaires and unstructured interview as the instruments for data gathering. There were two sets of questionnaires: one for the implementers and the other for the beneficiaries. Questionnaires for the beneficiaries were stated in the vernacular or Cebuano for ease in understanding.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part 1 was the profile of the implementers and the beneficiaries such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, occupation, number of dependents and monthly family income. Part II, solicited the perceptions of the implementers and respondents on the implementation and involvement of the extension programs and services of SUCs .

The researcher used 5-point scale parameters and the data obtained were interpreted as to the extent of implementation and involvement of the implementers and beneficiaries on the extension programs and services of SUCs in Region 1X.

SCALE PARAMETERS:

A. Extent of implementation

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very well implemented	Priority is always shown and and is highly implemented
4	3.41 – 4.20	Well implemented	Priority is always shown and is always implemented
3	2.61 – 3.40	Implemented	Priority is often shown and is implemented
2	1.81 – 2.60	Less implemented	Priority is often shown but not implemented
1	1.00 – 1.80	Never implemented	Priority is seldom shown and not implemented

B. Extent of involvement

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	
5	4.21 – 5.00	Very well involved	Interest is always shown and is highly attended
4	3.41 – 4.20	Well involved	Interest is always shown and is always attended
3	2.61 – 3.40	Involved	Interest is often shown and is attended



2	1.81 – 2.60	Less involved	Interest is often shown but not attended
1	1.0 – 1.80	Never involved	Interest is seldom shown and not attended

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher asked permission from the President of each College/University to allow her to distribute the questionnaire to the respondents and to direct her to the in-charged of the extension programs of the school. In as much as the implementers and the beneficiaries were not yet available, the researcher requested the Director/Coordinator to distribute the questionnaires in her favor. In consideration of the distance between the school respondents and the researcher's home, further request was made to send the collected instruments through mail. However, some questionnaires were collected personally by the researcher a week after the distribution through the extension coordinator in the nearby schools, particularly in JRMSC system except Siocon Campus which is many kilometers from Dipolog City.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The statistical tools employed in the analyses of data were frequency count, percentage, mean, ranking and t-test. All statistical tests were set at 0.05 levels of significance.

Frequency Count, Percentage, and Mean – These were used to describe the profile variables, such as age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, occupation monthly family income and number of dependents.

Ranking – This was used to describe the predominant problems encountered by the implementers and beneficiaries on the implementation and their involvement of the extended services.

Weighted Mean – This was used to assess the extent of the implementation and involvement of implementers and beneficiaries.

t-Test– This was employed to determine the significant difference in the ratings of implementers and beneficiaries in the implementation and their involvement of SUCs extension programs.

Results and Discussions

Table 1 reflects the Summary Table of the extent of implementation of the extension programs and services of SUCs in Region IX. All indicators were rated by both respondents as “well-implemented”. This was supported by the computed general means of 3.674 and 3.694 respectively.

Table 1. Extent of Implementation of the Extension Programs and Services of SUCs in Region IX.

Indicators	Implementers	Beneficiaries
------------	--------------	---------------



	Mean	D	Mean	D
Education	3.82	WI	3.64	WI
Livelihood Generation	3.73	WI	3.74	WI
Health and Nutrition	3.73	WI	3.70	WI
Good Governance	3.68	WI	3.71	WI
Environmental Management	3.41	WI	3.68	WI
General Mean	3.674	WI	3.694	WI

Table 2 reflects the summary of the extent of involvement of the implementers and beneficiaries on the extension programs and services of SUCs in Region 1X. It can be gleaned in the table that only one indicator was rated by implementers as “involved” with the mean of 3.34. This means that the respondent implementers perceive good governance as one of the extension programs where they are obliged to be involved. The rest of the indicators were rated as well-involved.

The beneficiaries rated education and livelihood generation as well-involved while health and nutrition, good governance and environmental management were rated involved. However, the general mean of 3.42 falls on the well involved category.

Table 2. Extent of Involvement of the Implementers and Beneficiaries on the Extension Programs and Services of SUCs in Region IX.

Services/Programs	Implementers		Beneficiaries	
	AWV	D	AWV	D
Education	3.91	WI	3.82	WI
Livelihood generation	3.96	WI	3.73	WI
Health and nutrition	3.56	WI	3.26	I
Good governance	3.34	I	3.11	I
Environmental management	3.62	WI	3.16	I
General Mean	3.68	WI	3.42	WI

Legend:

4.21 – 5.00	-	Very well involved	1.81 _ 2.60	- Less involved
3.41 – 4.20	-	Well involved	1.00 _ 1.80	- Not involved
2.61 – 3.80	-	Involved		

Meanwhile, problems were met by both respondents in the implementation and their involvement of the extension programs and services of SUCs and data are presented in Table 3. The table shows that the two groups of respondents did not identify the same item as their top most encountered problems. The implementers considered item 5 which is “transportation is not available all the time” as their number one problem. Unanimously, the beneficiaries



claimed that the “period of classes is too short for the training” which is item number 6 as their first problem. However, other items ranked almost the same in both respondents.

It can be deduced that the extension workers/faculty are sincere enough in performing their responsibility as agent of change. In spite of the problems encountered during the conduct of the extension programs and services yet they manifest no indication of losing their enthusiasm to share their expertise to the clientele. Thus, the program is well implemented. Indeed, this is a respond to the mandate that SUCs must actively involve in the four-fold functions: instruction, research, extension and production. Geronimo (2001) stressed out that in the process of effecting community development, many difficulties arise as these are inevitable. Therefore, teachers who get involved in this endeavor must not only equip themselves with knowledge, skills, attitudes and technology but also the values of being patient, understanding and the sincere intention of sharing whatever resources they have to the constituents.

On the other hand, beneficiaries felt the needs of lengthening the period of time of the training. To them, the transfer and acquisition of knowledge and the development of skills cannot be done just within the span of few days, otherwise certificate of completion maybe awarded to half-baked trainees.

Table 3. Problems Met by the Implementers and Beneficiaries in the Implementation of the Extension Programs and Services.

Items	Implementers		Beneficiaries	
	Frequency	Rank	Frequency	Rank
There is no action program to guide the project.	24	8	78	9.5
There are no sufficient materials and tools for better learning process.	37	3	108	2.5
The extension workers are incompetent and unprepared.	13	11	22	12
Trainers are not coming regularly for the extension activities.	15	10	78	9.5
Transportation is not available all the time.	42	1	96	5
Period of classes is too short for the training.	27	7	133	1
Extension workers/faculty are not given incentives.	39	2	96	5
Training time coincides with work at home, sea or farm.	31	6	108	2.5
Participants are always absent from the class.	2	12	51	11
Participants use their own materials for the return demonstration.	32	5	87	7
Linkage partners are not doing their responsibilities as stipulated in the MOA.	35	4	80	8
There is no proper monitoring and evaluation of the services conducted.	17	9	96	5



Table 4. Significant Difference in the Ratings of Implementers and Beneficiaries on the Implementation of Extension Programs and Services of SUC's in Region IX.

Indicators	Implementers	Beneficiaries	\bar{X}_D	t-Value
Education	3.82	3.64	0.18	1.31ns
Livelihood Generation	3.73	3.74	0.01	0.014 ns
Health and Nutrition	3.73	3.70	0.03	0.23 ns
Good Governance	3.68	3.71	0.03	0.23 ns
Environmental Management	3.41	3.68	0.27	1.56 ns

Legend :

* - significant

T.V. - 1.96

df - 263

ns - not significant

α - 0.05

Tabular values reveal that the implementers and beneficiaries obtained almost similar ratings on the extent of implementation of SUCs extension programs and services. When the data were subjected to t-test, the computed t- result was less than the tabled value of 1.96 with 263 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of confidence. Hence, there is no significant difference in the ratings of both respondents on the implementation of extension services and programs of SUCs in Region IX.

Table 5 . Significant Difference in the Perceptions of the Implementers and Beneficiaries on their Involvement of the Extension Programs and Services of SUCs in Region IX.

Indicators	Implementers	Beneficiaries	\bar{X}_D	t- Value
Education	3.91	3.82	0.09	1.11 ns
Livelihood Generation	3.96	3.73	0.23	1.72 ns
Health and Nutrition	3.56	3.26	0.30	1.99 *
Good Governance	3.34	3.11	0.23	1.72 ns
Environmental Management	3.62	3.16	0.46	2.32 *

Legend:

* _ significant

α _ 0.05

t-v – 1.96

ns _ not significant

df _ 263

Table 5 reveals that there were two extension services perceived by both respondents as “well implemented” and the beneficiaries were also benefited. These were supported by the means of 3.56 and 3.62 for the implementers and 3.26 and 3.16 for beneficiaries. The mean differences of the two indicators were 0.30 and 0.46, it resulted to t-test values of 1.99 and 2.32 which exceeded the tabled value of 1.96 with 263 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance.



It is safe to say, that there is significant difference in the perceptions of both implementers and beneficiaries on their involvement in the extension services and programs on the health and nutrition services and environmental management.

However, in the interview conducted to the beneficiaries revealed that the barangay has mandated its constituents to maintain cleanliness as they believe would redound to better health. Planting vegetables or backyard gardening was also encouraged to increase food availability at the household level. Furthermore, it was emphasized that proper way of preparing nutritious foods and the application of the basics for keeping good health can dramatically reduce the risk for many common health problems.

Education, livelihood generation and good governance with the t-results of 1.11, 1.72 and 1.72 did not exceed the critical value of 1.96 with same degree of freedom and level of significance. The t-values indicated no significant difference in the perceptions of both implementers and beneficiaries on their involvement on extension services and programs. Therefore, both respondents have similar perceptions regarding the extension services on education, livelihood generation and good governance.

Conclusions

In view to the findings of this study, the following conclusions were derived:

1. The extension services along education, livelihood generation, health and nutrition, good governance and environmental management are perceived by both implementers and beneficiaries as well- implemented.
2. The implementers and the beneficiaries perceive the extended program on education, livelihood generation, health and nutrition, good governance and environmental management as well involved.
3. There is no significant difference in the ratings given by both respondents on the implementation of the extension programs and services of SUCs in Region IX along education, livelihood generation, health and nutrition, good governance and environmental management.
4. There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the implementers and beneficiaries on their involvement in the extension services along education, livelihood generation and good governance. However, there is significant difference in their perceptions on their involvement in the extension program on health and nutrition and environmental management.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are hereby offered:

1. Each SUC should exert more effort to get the people involve in the extension program.
2. A vehicle should be provided by each SUC to be used for the extension activities.



3. The school must provide incentives to faculty/teachers involved in the extension services in order to boost their morale.
4. Lengthen the period of time for the training on skills enhancement and development.
5. A regular schedule be made by the Extension Director for a dialogue reminding the linkage partner especially the LGU of its responsibility based on the MOA.
6. A study be made on the impact of extension programs and services of SUCs in Region IX.
7. Each SUC should conduct proper monitoring and evaluation of the extended program to identify the strengths and weaknesses and likewise the impact of the program to the community.

References

Campiseño, Salvador Y. (2004) “The Partnership Initiatives of Government and Non-Government Organizations In Zamboanga del Norte, Mindanao, Philippines: Basis For A Development Program”. Central Visayas Polytechnic College, Dumaguete City.

Geronimo, Marites C. (2006). “ The Involvement of Teacher Education Graduates in Community Development Activities”. Philippine Normal University, Alicia, Isabela.

Elman, Nichol.(1998). “The Commission on Higher Education State of Extension Service in Philippine Institutions of Higher Learning”.

[http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/sustainable dev.](http://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/sustainable_dev)

<http://www.unisctf.Or/huset/gg/governance>