



## Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management Collaborative Research Support Program

SANREM CRSP  
Office of International Research, Education and Development  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (0378)  
526 Price's Fork Road, Room 211  
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Phone: (540) 231-1230  
Fax: (540) 231-1402  
sanrem@vt.edu  
[www.oired.vt.edu/sanremcrsp](http://www.oired.vt.edu/sanremcrsp)

### **Trip Report: Philippines**

7-19 February 2012

Maria Elisa Christie, Gender Coordinator  
SANREM CRSP, PI for Gender CCRA

**Purpose of Trip:** To meet and work with the SE Asia LTRA team; test proposed methodology for intensive summer research; train team members on qualitative research methodology and gender integration; prepare logistics for upcoming graduate student research; identify translator and field assistant and develop budget; and determine criteria for and complete selection of 3 research sites for July-August 2012.

**Sites Visited:** Villages/Barangays of Población, Sta. Cruz, Rizal, Panampawan, Patrocinio in Claveria, Misamis Oriental, Mindanao  
SANREM demo sites in Bug-ong, Rizal, Claveria  
University of the Philippines-Los Baños (UPLB)

#### **Executive Summary:**

The visit consisted of 4 days in the Claveria site working with the International Center for Research on Agroforestry (ICRAF), Misamis Oriental State College of Agriculture and Engineering (MOSCAT) and UPLB research team to build capacity in qualitative, gender-sensitive research methods while testing the methodology proposed for the Gender CCRA intensive fieldwork this coming July-August. IRB requirements and procedures/the ethics of working with human subjects were amply discussed and implemented. Team members—including bio-physical scientists with no prior experience with Focus Groups or interviews—were trained in implementing social science participatory research, and in recording data in an organized manner, including recording their reflections as separate but complementary to the primary data. Three barangays were chosen for the upcoming student gender research and socio-economic and spatial data was collected for each of these. It was a very successful trip with an enthusiastic and competent crew that set the stage for intensive research in July-August.

In a fortunate and unexpected event, the visit coincided with that of a team from the Soil and Landscape Group of CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization) from Australia which was carrying out a soils survey and providing a training course; this was part of ongoing activities of a project funded by the Australian Centre for International

Agricultural Research (ACIAR) called “Watershed Evaluation of Sustainable Use of Sloping Lands in Southern Philippines.” It is contracted with CSIRO in collaboration with ICRAF and national (Bureau of Soils and Water Management/BSWM, Department of Environment and Natural Resources/DENR) and local (MOSCAT, Local Government Unit (LGU)-Claveria and LGU-Jasan) Philippines institutions. Discussions included soil sampling methodology, accessibility and safety of the region, and availability of spatial imagery; they are willing to share research results (will be at ICRAF) and any useful data, including GIS and soil sampling results. There is potential complementarity of the gender CCRA with this project and possibility of greater impact. This will be important particularly when that project is going to develop farming system suitability analysis.

### **Description of Activities:**

The Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was carried out in gender-segregated groups consisting of 13 men and 11 women and lasted for just under 3 hours, excluding lunch. It was followed by a visit to SANREM test plots. It consisted of the following exercises:

- 1: Opening Discussion Question: “What is soil?”
- 2: Soil Samples Discussion
- 3: Community Soils List
- 4: Community Soil Mapping on Satellite Image

The household interviews were carried out with the woman and the man of the household, separately. The woman’s took 90 minutes and included much richer information and detail, while the man’s interview lasted 30 minutes. These consisted of the following: photo interpretation, mapping of plots and soils, and short survey. The woman’s map included crops she no longer planted; the man said he no longer farmed but that his brother worked the land and he worked for money.

### **Findings**

After collecting basic socio-economic data on several “Barangays” or villages, three sites were selected using the following criteria: 1) safety; 2) accessibility; 3) availability of satellite imagery with little or no cloud cover; 4) relevance (small farmers), and 5) presence of Indigenous People (IP). Google Earth images were downloaded for each of three selected sites: Patrocinio, Rizal, and Panampawan and GPS points taken. See chart of comparative socio-economic data on chosen sites, below. It remains to select a sub-Barangay in the two larger Barangays of Rizal and Patrocinio.

Sample selection was discussed but criteria for selection of individual households was not finalized though it was agreed to obtain a list of all the residents’ names from the Barangay offices and select from there. Several possible criteria for selection from these were discussed. These were: 1) size of farm (under 1 ha.); 2) households with both adult woman and man; 3) include a woman-headed household per site; and 4) include indigenous people or farmers who had farmed the same land for more than one generation. Once the final criteria are agreed upon, a list of population will be obtained from the Claveria Municipal government and used to select participants. A larger number than the sample will be chosen as not all farmers will be willing to participate in the 3 required components for this study: 1) interview with exercises including

participatory mapping; 2) field visit to plots; and 3) soil sampling from both woman and man's "best" and "worst" plots.

The initial proposed criteria for selecting household includes that the final list include both IP and non-IP, with the goal of interviewing people with a long history of working the land that they currently work. However, there is a problem with the government categories of separating the population into IP and "migrant"—which presupposes that IP have not migrated. In the same way, "farmer" will have to be clearly defined, as many people work on land that is not theirs, or work on land that is theirs but for which they provide wage labor, or were farmers for years and are not currently farming. To exclude people who are working someone else's land for instance, may exclude the poorest of the poor who nonetheless have extensive knowledge of the soil. To exclude someone who is no longer farming may mean that someone who worked the land for 30 years but ceased to in the last year may not form part of the study. It was agreed upon, however, that the "farmers" would have to be "small farmers" defined as having no more than a hectare of land. This will facilitate comparisons across sites in the Gender CCRA.

An important issue that arose during this short visit was that land tenure and access of small farmers is tentative and changing and must be considered in CAPS: in Panampawan, for example, the Barangay Nutrition Scholar (BNS) who is gathering information to complete a village survey indicated that the majority of the farmers leased out their land to capitalists and worked on their own land as hired labor. Indeed, the farmers interviewed in the household visit in Patrocinio no longer worked their land. The man said his brother worked the farm. The woman farmer indicated that she had ceased to have animals and work on her farm because of new responsibilities required of participants in the Philippines's national governmental program "4Ps" that aims to increase access to education but requires families to provide nutritious food, attend meetings, and participate in community projects—all of which increase the burden on women's time given expectations as part of their "reproductive" responsibilities.

Findings and team reflections from the Focus Group Discussion and household interviews indicate that both men and women can benefit from training on soils, but that men have some technical knowledge and women do not. It should be noted, however, that men also had incorrect technical "knowledge" and presented this authoritatively. This access to technical knowledge is affected by the fact that men are usually the ones that attend technical trainings by government and NGOs which are usually 3 days or one week, but the women attend only the meeting (half-day); they are not able to be absent from the home for that long a period due to their so-called "domestic" or "reproductive" roles. "Men attend the trainings, women attend meetings"—was said, the difference between the two laying in part on their duration.

Men and women had different criteria and list of soils, and also drew boundaries around named soils differently than men on the satellite image. Men also named 9 soils, while women named 5, though women said the men repeated themselves. Men based description of soils on physical characteristics (color, texture) while women based them on landscape: slopes and topography. Women also referred to ease of weeding in two descriptions of soils. See below:

	<b>MEN</b>		<b>WOMEN</b>
1	Clay	1	Batoon (Rocky soil)
2	Pula nga yuta <i>(Red soil)</i>	2	Bakilid (sloping soil)
3	Brown na yuta <i>(Brown soil)</i>	3	Patag (plain) This also means slightly rolling landscape
4	Itom na yuta <i>(Black soil)</i>	4	Pughay (loose soil)
5	Pughay na yuta <i>(Porous soil)</i>	5	Pilit pilit (sticky soil)
6	Balason na yuta <i>(Sandy soil)</i>		
7	Tubigon na yuta <i>(Waterlogged soil/area)</i>		
8	White clay na yuta <i>(white clay soil)</i>		
9	Acidic na yuta <i>(acidic soil)</i>		

In response to “how would you describe the soil” men discussed it as a process (touch, etc) and also by vegetation in it: women described soil types based on production and ease of cultivation: “In the plains can produce more, there are fewer expenses. For rocky soil, for sloping soil it is good soil but hard to plow on. Loose soil is easy to cultivate and any crop can grow on it.” Women said that in a soil they referred to as “soil as mixed with rocks,” fertilizer will not be lost/absorbed in rocky soils. They said that on such soils one “cannot make use of animals, only humans” [to work the land].

Educational, age, and socio-economic hierarchies existed within each of the gender-segregated groups that affected levels of participation and results of group discussions presented by the FGD reported. For this reason, it was important that a note-taker from the research team noted discussions and not only the final presentation.

Research instruments were revised with team input. It was determined that holding FGDs at the Landcare facilities by the SANREM demonstration plots in Bug-ong, Rizal, and beginning with an introduction of SANREM and of CAPS biases the research results. That is to say, that introducing a project with the word “conservation” in its name, or in a place where caring for the land is central to its existence and to the training programs and meetings which preceded this one pre-disposes the farmers to talk of soil in terms of health and quality and to present themselves as “good farmers” or stewards of the land. While this affected how farmers presented themselves, it probably did not impact on the names of types of soils they presented as much as did the access to previous training about soils that appeared to have affected the men more than the women. The team suggested that farmers would have the same response even if the meeting was held

elsewhere in Claveria once they knew it was associated with ICRAF—which has a long-standing presence in the area—and which they are likely to associate with conservation and is thus bias participant response. In any case, an introduction to CAPS per se should be left to a closing discussion after farmers have finished presenting their own knowledge and exercises. (Note that in one individual interview the farmer said she was afraid she would have the “wrong answer” when the activities were introduced. Getting farmers to share their experiences requires researchers to create as non-intimidating an environment as possible.) To this end, it was clear that while a large team is required for FGD, a much smaller team for the individual interviews would be less intimidating to farmers. Finally, near gender parity was achieved in the FGD with 13 women and 11 men participating, but this was sorely lacking in the research team. While the initial day of training at ICRAF had 3 men and 6 women (excluding the trainer), the team for the FGD consisted of 7 women and one man. The team for the interviews consisted of 5 women. Nonetheless, the visit was very successful thanks to the skill and hard work of the team, and to the commitment of Dr. Mercado.

### **Suggestions, Recommendations, and/or Follow-up Items:**

Trainings should be modified to encourage more women to attend: the material otherwise covered in a one long stretch be broken down into shorter training periods which women are able to attend (the timing and duration of which may be consulted with them).

Trainings should also take into account women’s lesser access to technical information and be based on their existing knowledge of women, not based on men’s, i.e. the trainings should cater to women’s level of knowledge, since they are not in the same level.

Men’s and women’s perceptions and beliefs must be documented and addressed as necessary for improved soil management.

Language, translation, and note-taking: It proved essential to have excellent note takers on the team, for both men’s and women’s FGD, and for the household interview. It was impossible for the facilitator to also be the interpreter (and thus there was no interpreter in the interviews), and neither the Gender CCRA PI nor the gender researcher from UPLB spoke Bisaya. In the case of FGD, the note takers gathered information from the discussion among farmers that was not captured in what the farmers wrote in the flip charts.

The person assigned to be the interpreter for the interviews actually played the role of interviewer and was only able to partially interpret. Thus, there was no dedicated interpreter and the researcher needed to rely on team members’ written reports and discussion of findings and methods during the final team meeting. For this reason as well as because qualitative research requires careful writing up of research notes and reflections, more time is required for reporting. In future research, including that scheduled for July and August, two dedicated note takers should be included, and they should be scheduled to alternate one with the other in order to give ample time for writing up notes and reflections. The recommendation is to hire MOSCAT graduates. It is also recommended that the student researcher for the Gender CCRA (or any other non-Bisaya speaking researcher) take time at the end of each day to hold a meeting with the crew and collect their reflections and reports her/himself. This is particularly the case given

the challenge writing in English represents for non-native speakers. Nonetheless, the participating team should write their own reports as they have a privileged understanding of the cultural context and are more likely to have understood the majority of what was said. All materials should be presented to farmers in Bisaya, as was done on the flip chart during the FGD. In a similar manner, and also for consistency, the interview guide should be translated in advance. With these language issues in mind, a final team meeting with structured discussion of findings and reflections on process with PI taking notes is good way to share knowledge and get cultural context of findings as well as get information inaccessible to PI due to language barriers.

Tape recording is recommended, with interviewee consent.

Regarding IP, the researcher was left with conflicting ideas that need to be worked out before finalizing the criteria for selection of the households for field visits in July-August, and holding FGD during that time. It is recommended that Indigenous People participate in an IP-only FGD, given their status as disadvantaged and that they are less likely to speak in mixed groups. In this way, the idea of separating women and men into sex-disaggregated FG is extended to another category of “under-represented.” However, unlike the method of bringing men and women together and then splitting them into two groups, the IP-only FGD probably needs to be arranged in advance to consist only of IP. Because the Patrocinio FGD was all “migrant,” the Rizal or Panampawan should be all “IP.” However, it is also recommended that this category be handled carefully given its political nature and the lack of direct relationship it may have to working the land for generations. While one might presume working with IP means working with people who have worked the same land with their grandparents, this might not always be so. At the same time, a presumption that IP have a particular cosmovision or more nurturing relationship with the land is a bias that in any case is not something that a small-scale (small sample size) qualitative study can address.

Regarding soil sampling: The gender CCRA should coordinate for soil-sampling so as not to overlap but to use the skills related to other efforts. For instance, Vic Ella and his graduate student were about to sample SANREM fields this coming weekend and will be collecting samples from collaborating farmer fields this July. This begs the question, should the gender CCRA be including the same households and if so, do additional soil samples need to be taken or can the summer sampling by Vic’s graduate student come from some of the specific locations identified by women and men farmers during the gender CCRA research? And what of the Australian team’s soils findings? And the soils CCRA’s analysis of soils from gender CCRA research.

Comparative socio-economic data on 3 sites selected for Gender CCRA future research as per criteria above. (Note the inconsistencies in figures are as found in the source, but the information is illustrative nonetheless):

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Patrocinio</b>	<b>Rizal</b>	<b>Panampawan</b>
No. of sub-villages		4 – Bug-ong, Central Rizal, Nongnongan, and Limbusan	
Total village area	896.28 ha	502.47 ha	322.12 ha
Total pop	3,504 (2011) 3,246 (2008)	1,053 (2011) 1,064 (2008)	719 (2011) 685 (2008)
Gender (2008)	Female – 1,544 Male – 1,702	Female – 433 Male - 512	Female – 310 Male – 375
Total HH	746 (2011) 667 (2008)	220 (2011) 218 (2008)	146 (2011) 132 (2008)
Ave HH size (2008)	5	5	4.9
Ethnicity (HH) (2008)	Migrants – 254 Indigenous – [413 by implication]	Migrants – 116 Indigenous - 102	Migrants – 79 Indigenous – 53
Literacy rate (2008)	62%	63%	57%
Livelihood activities (HH) (2008)	Farming – 316 Business/Self-employed – 83 Employed – 47 Hired labor – 159 OFW – 9	Farming – 183 Business/Self-employed – 7 Hired labor – 28	Farming – 67 Business/Self-employed – 15 Hired labor – 42 OFW – 2
Livestock & poultry (2009)	Cattle – 629 Carabao – 30 Swine – 472 Goat – 787 Poultry – 278 Commercial Poultry – 32,000 breeders	Cattle – 93 Carabao – 6 Swine – 116 Goat – 70 Poultry – 629	Cattle – 58 Carabao – 2 Swine – 74 Goat – 44 Poultry – 400

2011 data from Municipal Nutrition Action Office, LGU-Claveria

2009 data from Municipal Agriculture's Office, LGU-Claveria

2008 data from Local Government Unit (LGU)-Claveria

### **Training Activities Conducted:**

Program type (workshop, seminar, field day, short course, etc.)	Date	Audience	Number of Participants		Training Provider (US university, host country institution, etc.)	Training Objective
			Men	Women		
Workshop on qualitative and gender sensitive methods in gendered knowledge and soils Training on IRB requirements	Feb 13	ICRAF and MOSCAT	3	6	Virginia Tech	Stress importance of gender equity and informed consent (IRB); test and provide tools for implementation of SANREM Gender CCRA
Focus Group with break-out activities	Feb 14	Farmers from the Barangay of Patrocinio, in Claveria	13	11	Virginia Tech	Train partners and collaborators in use of participatory techniques addressing gender issues; provide farmers (especially women) with opportunities and skills in map –making, self-reflection and presentations
Team debriefing and discussion of findings and reflections. Gender analysis using the Gender Dimensions Framework.	Feb 14	ICRAF and MOSCAT	1	7	Virginia Tech	Use of gender analysis and integration into soils research. Integration of social and bio-physical team elements in multi-disciplinary teamwork.

### **List of Contacts Made:**

Name	Title/Organization	Contact Info (address, phone, email)
Anthony Ringrose-Voase	Research group leader, Soil and Landscape Group. CSIRO, Land and Water (Australia)	anthony.ringrose-voase@csiro.au
Trevor Dowling	Research projects office. GIS/Terrain Analysis. CSIRO, Land and Water (Australia)	Trevor.dowling@csiro.au
Isidra Bagares (Sid)	ICRAF	
Apolinario B. Gonzaga, Jr. (Apol)	ICRAF/MOSCAT, faculty	apolgonzaga78@yahoo.com
Imelda Hebron (Em)	MOSCAT, faculty	<a href="mailto:dairysamoscat@yahoo.com">dairysamoscat@yahoo.com</a>
Katrina Costañós (Kathy)	ICRAF Research Assistant	
Mark Glover	CSIRO	
Gerard Grealish	Free-lance soils consultant, New Zealand	



Name	Title/Organization	Contact Info (address, phone, email)
Maria Jesusa (Susana) Rafañan	Administrative Assistant , ICRAF Mindanao/MOSCAT Campus	
Renante Taylaran	MOSCAT faculty	
Rubie Monera	ICRAF Research Assistant	
Jeanmil Capili	Panampawan Barangay Nutritional Scholar	09 05 172 4725
Angelita Docenas Cabrera	Tribal chieftain Higa-onon, Poblacion, Claveria and one of SANREM's first collaborators	

\*MOSCAT-Misamis Oriental State College of Agriculture and Engineering

### **Itinerary:**

- Saturday 11 Arrive Manila
- Sunday 12 Travel Manila to Cagayan de Oro; ICRAF driver takes Helen Dayo and I to Claveria; visit market and town of Población; interview indigenous leader and initial SANREM collaborating farmer, Sra. Angelita; settle in to "ICRAF guest house."
- Monday 13 Team meeting and training; presentations on 2010 visit and gender/soils research in Claveria in 2010 and on Gender CCRA including Bolivia research; agree on schedule and roles for the week. Distribute materials. Translate research instruments into Bisaya. Prepare flip charts and other materials for Focus Group Discussion (FGD) including satellite image of Patrocinio for community soils mapping exercise. Discussions with Australian team of scientists carrying out soils survey in Claveria and doing a training workshop for MOSCAT and government soils entity. Develop initial criteria for site selection. Collection of socio-economic data on several villages under consideration as research sites.
- Tuesday 14 FGD with 21 small-holder farmers from Patrocinio at the Landcare facilities and SANREM demo sites in Bug-ong, Rizal, Claveria. Farmers visit SANREM fields. Team meeting to review day's work and prepare for next day. Drive to Sta. Cruz to explore as potential research site. Meeting with Jun. Final site selection and collection of spatial imagery for three sites.
- Wednesday 15 Interview with man and woman from one household (woman and man separately) in Patrocinio; see village and surrounding fields

there and in Panampawan. Take GPS points of sites. Sign in at village council and meeting with Barangay Nutrition Scholar (BNS) Jeanmil Capili in Panampawan, collect socio-economic data there. Meeting with Jun.

Thursday 16

Team meeting and debriefing to discuss and report on findings and reflections of week. Collect final socio-economic data (chart) and partial reports from team. Travel to Cagayan de Oro with Helen Dayo.

Friday 16

Travel Cagayan de Oro—Manila—Los Baños.

Weekend

Write reports, rest

Monday 20

Meeting with Host Country PI, Dr. Victor Ella at UP Los Baños