****

**Non-User Survey Final Report Template**

**General instructions for completing this report:**

1. Please answer all questions
2. Do not combine the answers to questions. Provide your answers to each question in the space provided.
3. All tables should be submitted as different worksheets within the Excel file accompanying this document.

**Country: Philippines**

**Date Prepared: April 10, 2011**

**Prepared By: Ideacorp Inc**

**Survey Start Date: February 2011**

**Survey End Date: March 2011**

**Methods**

1. Final household selection strategy (attach the final sampling strategy that was approved by George).

The Philippine proposed sampling for the non-user survey followed the sampling guidelines of the TASCHA non-user survey and shall be based with the recently concluded GIS venue operators and user survey. The Country Research Team (CRT) will still group the Philippines in 5 "regions" to represent the country’s geographical distribution. The detailed sampling method is attached.

* 1. Provide the areas initially selected for the sample and the number of households to sample in each area

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION/METRO MANILA** | |  |  |
| **City** | **Areas** | **Number of Households** | **Total Households** |
| *Quezon City* | Loyola Heights – PAV dense | 23 | 55 |
| Valencia – PAV light | 22 |
| Cardona, Rizal – PAV rural | 10 |
| *City of Manila* | Sta. Mesa – PAV dense | 23 | 55 |
| Ermita – PAV light | 22 |
| Liliw, Laguna – PAV rural | 10 |
| **LUZON** | |  |  |
| **City** | **Areas** | **Number of Households** | **Total Households** |
| *Angeles City* | Balibago | 23 | 55 |
| Tabun | 22 |
| Masantol | 10 |
| *Lipa City* | Mataas na Lupa | 23 | 55 |
| Barangay 1 | 22 |
| Mataas na Kahoy | 10 |
| **VISAYAS** | |  |  |
| **City** | **Areas** | **Number of Households** | **Total Households** |
| *Cebu City* | Guadalupe | 23 | 45 |
| Pari-an | 22 |
| Rural area | 0 |
| *Iloilo City* | Jaro | 23 | 45 |
| Iloilo City Central | 22 |
| Rural area | 0 |
| **MINDANAO** | |  |  |
| **City** | **Areas** | **Number of Households** | **Total Households** |
| *Davao City* | Toril | 23 | 45 |
| Cabantian | 22 |
| Rural area | 0 |
| *Cagayan de Oro City* | Nazareth | 23 | 45 |
| Tomas Saco | 22 |
| Rural area | 0 |
| **Total Number of Questionnaires** | | | **400** |

* 1. Briefly discuss what sources were utilized to select venue-dense and venue-light areas for the sample (e.g. inventory, maps from the user/venue surveys). Also include the basis on which areas were defined as “venue-dense” or “venue-light.”

The research team used data from the inventory and maps from the user/venue surveys as well as the experience on the field of the enumerators were the basis selecting the PAV-dense and PAV-light areas.

The criteria used to define venue-dense and venue light areas were:

* Proximity of PAVs from one another
* Number of PAVs in a selected area

Per the guidelines given in stratifying the PAV areas, a PAV-dense area is one with three (3) or more venues and a PAV-light area has one to two venues.

1. Areas visited
   1. Provide a description of the areas visited and the geographic distribution of the households sampled using the following table. For the venue distribution, although estimates are acceptable, please be as exact as possible.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Area type** | **Venue Distribution** | | | | **# of households in the sampling strategy** | **# of households in surveys completed** |
| Approximate number of cybercafés in this area | Approximate number of telecenters in this area | Approximate number of libraries in this area | Approximate number of other PA venues in this area |
| Quezon City | Loyola Heights –PAV dense | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 23 |
| Valencia –PAV light | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 22 |
| Cardona – PAV rural | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 10 |
| Manila | Sta Mesa – PAV dense | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 23 |
| Ermita – PAV light | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 22 |
| Liliw Laguna – PAV Rural | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 10 |
| Luzon I - Pampanga | Balibago – PAV dense | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 23 |
| Tabun – PAV light | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 22 |
| Masantol - PAV Rural | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 10 |
| Luzon II – Lipa City | Mataas na Lupa – PAV dense | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 365 | 23 |
| Barangay 1 –PAV light | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 296 | 22 |
| Mataas na Kahoy - PAV Rural | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 10 |
| Cebu City | Guadalupe – PAV dense | 25 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 23 |
| Pari-an – PAV light | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 22 |
| Rural area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iloilo City | Jaro - – PAV dense | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 23 |
| Iloilo City Central – PAV light | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 58 | 22 |
| Rural area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Davao City | Toril – PAV dense | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 23 |
| Cabantian – PAV light | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 22 |
| Rural area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cagayan de Oro City | Nazareth – PAV dense | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 23 |
| Tomas Saco –PAV light | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 22 |
| Rural area |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. For the areas in 2a, provide a summary of the survey experience at each household visited

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **City** | **Area type** | **Number of households visited** | **Number of households that had non-users** | **Number of individuals (non-users) asked to participate in the survey** | **Number of individuals (non-users) who refused to be surveyed** | **Number of surveys that were stopped because it was determined that the individual was a user** | **Number of individuals (non-users) who were to be surveyed but were not home** | **Number of non-users surveyed** | **Notes** |
|
| Quezon City | Loyola Heights –PAV dense | 105 | 88 | 88 | 65 | 17 | 0 | 23 |  |
| Valencia –PAV light | 48 | 35 | 48 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 22 |  |
| Cardona – PAV rural | 21 | 10 | 21 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 10 |  |
| Manila | Sta Mesa – PAV dense | 35 | 23 | 23 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |
| Ermita – PAV light | 35 | 22 | 22 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 22 |  |
| Liliw Laguna – PAV Rural | 50 | 30 | 30 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 10 |  |
| Luzon I - Pampanga | Balibago – PAV dense | 30 | 30 | 23 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |
| Tabun – PAV light | 28 | 28 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 22 |  |
| Masantol - PAV Rural | 14 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  |
| Luzon II – Lipa City | Mataas na Lupa – PAV dense | 365 | 164 | 164 | 65 | 11 | 65 | 23 |  |
| Barangay 1 – PAV light | 296 | 157 | 157 | 75 | 10 | 50 | 22 |  |
| Mataas na Kahoy - PAV Rural | 78 | 41 | 41 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 10 |  |
| Cebu City | Guadalupe – PAV dense | 29 | 23 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |
| Pari-an – PAV light | 27 | 22 | 27 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 22 |  |
| Rural area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iloilo City | Jaro - – PAV dense | 45 | 23 | 45 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 23 |  |
| Iloilo City Central – PAV light | 58 | 49 | 58 | 22 | 10 | 0 | 22 |  |
| Rural area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Davao City | Toril – PAV dense | 27 | 23 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |
| Cabantian – PAV light | 35 | 35 | 35 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 22 |  |
| Rural area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cagayan de Oro City | Nazareth – PAV dense | 28 | 28 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |
| Tomas Saco –PAV light | 33 | 33 | 33 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 22 |  |
| Rural area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Describe the non-user selection strategies employed.
   1. How were households selected? Were any of the strategies that you tried unsuccessful? If so please describe the strategies and explain why they did not work. What strategies did you ultimately settle upon?

The proposed household selection was presented to the local enumerator teams. This allows the surfacing of issues that may be faced on the field and address them at the onset and lessens the ambiguity for the enumerators. During these briefing sessions, the locations of the public access venues were clarified and area boundaries were identified with the use of local maps. The local teams approximated the 10 x 10 block radius in considering the boundaries of their areas. They will be interviewing every 10th household within the initial 10-block radius, going beyond it as needed to complete the required number of respondents.

In the event that the every 10th house count lands on mid-rise or high-rise housing, the team will ascertain the number of units in the building where each unit will be treated as houses and very 10th unit in the building will be selected.

* 1. How were individuals selected to be surveyed? Were any of the strategies that you tried unsuccessful? If so please describe the strategies and explain why they did not work. What strategies did you ultimately settle upon?

The respondent selection pattern was: youngest male – youngest female – oldest male – oldest female. The enumerators were also instructed to ensure equal distribution in gender and that the ages of the respondents be distributed across the set age brackets.

The enumerators had a difficult time finding young non-PAV users - those belonging to the 12-15 and 16-18 age groups. In one area (Lipa City) where there was a lack of non-users, particularly young PAV non-users, the enumerator was asked to expand the sampling area beyond the 10 x 10 block radius and was asked to interview the youngest PAV non-user in the household regardless of age and to make a note of it in the bi-weekly report.

1. Provide a summary of non-users sampled using the table below

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Age** | | | | | | | **Total** |
| **12-15** | **16-19** | **20-24** | **25-34** | **35-49** | **50-65** | **>65** |
| **Male** | 32 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 33 | 53 | 19 | 202 |
| **Female** | 22 | 16 | 28 | 35 | 54 | 33 | 10 | 198 |
| **Total** | 54 | 32 | 44 | 68 | 87 | 86 | 29 | 400 |

**Survey Implementation**

1. Enumerators for each region
   1. Number of enumerators

* Nationwide Total – eighteen (18) enumerators
* Per region
  + NCR/Metro Manila – five (5)
  + Luzon – three (3)
  + Visayas – five (5)
  + Mindanao – five (5)
  1. What organizations did they come from and what prior training and experience do they have?

The Enumerators for the Non-User Survey are all professionals, graduates of four-year courses and are attached to particular agencies, as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Enumerators for the following areas:** | **Affiliations and/or Attachments** |
| * NCR/Metro Manila | – Concordia College/City Social Welfare and Development, M.A. student of Makati University, and ideacorp |
| * Luzon | – Psychosocial Support and Children’s Rights Resource Center, freelance researchers (M.A. students of Batangas State University) |
| * Visayas | – St. Theresa’s College, Kahublagan Sang Panimalay (KSP), a freelance researcher |
| * Mindanao | – Child Alert Mindanao |

Prior to the non-user survey, the enumerators were trained for the user and venue survey of the GIS project. Outside of the GIS project, the enumerators have conducted various surveys and researches for their respective organizations or have received grants to conduct their own research studies.

1. Training for enumerators
   1. When were the training sessions held? Who was present and what was covered?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10 February/  Thursday |  | Briefing – NCR/Luzon |
| Participants | 1. Caludine Atienza (Luzon II/NCR-Rural) 2. Razzel Morona (NCR – Rural) |
| 12 February/  Saturday |  | Briefing – NCR/Luzon |
| Participants | 1. Alma Mendez (NCR – Urban) 2. Bernard Pollero (NCR – Urban) 3. Jeffrey Horca (NCR – Urban) 4. Amy Baldoz (NCR – Urban) 5. Mike Quilala (Luzon) 6. Decerie Manalastas (Luzon) |
| 15 February/  Tuesday |  | Briefing – Mindanao |
| Participants | 1. Bernardo Mondragon 2. Almira Andong 3. Wilmelyn Gambong 4. Jeanette Ampog 5. Florie Mae Tacang |
| 17 February/  Thursday |  | Briefing/Training - Iloilo |
| Participant | 1. Cynthia Espinoza |
| 19 February/  Saturday |  | Briefing/Training - Cebu |
| Participants | 1. Noreen Tormis 2. Eric Bernabe 3. Malou Gallarde 4. Janylyn Moreno 5. Elisarie Arong |
| Materials Used |  | 1. TOR of Enumerators 2. Vouchers 3. Workshop kit    1. Reminders from UW    2. Reminders from Ideacorp    3. Consent form (English/Tagalog/Pampango/Cebuano, Ilonggo)    4. Codebook    5. Certification    6. Letters of Introduction (Ideacorp)    7. Letter from UW    8. CD with softcopies of codebook, data template, translated survey 4. Photocopied survey instruments |

The topics discussed during the briefing were:

* Responsibilities of enumerators, expected outputs;
* Survey workplan;
* Sampling - area, household and respondent;
* Survey protocol – certification from Ideacorp, introduction to local government officials, consent form;
* Survey proper - different sections, the survey questions,
* Data encoding.

1. General discussion on implementation methods, including the following:
   1. Were gifts given to respondents? If yes, what were the gifts and what was the approximate value?

The respondents were given PhP 50.00 for answering the survey. The barangay officials that accompanied the enumerators during their survey interviews were also given meals.

* 1. How long did it take to recruit respondents? Include a discussion of any issues getting participants and the approximate number of households enumerators needed to visit before recruiting one respondent.

Prior to the actual interviews, the enumerators visited the barangay (village) officials in the sampling areas. The village officials were helpful in facilitating the introduction about the survey, in finding the location of the household and in the recruitment of interviewees.

Generally, there were no pertinent issues raised in terms of difficulty getting participants maybe because the mindset from the start was that it was not going to be easy getting respondents since it involves going directly to households in areas where the enumerators are not familiar to the people. It was expected that there would rejections from the selected households/potential respondents. However, most of the respondents in the selected households allowed themselves to be interviewed. On the average, the lengths of the interviews were between 35 to 45 minutes.

**Challenges**

1. Discuss any challenges faced in the following areas
   1. Sample design. Discuss your experience developing the sample based on the guidelines provided.

The initial guidelines provided were clear in stating what was needed in terms of identifying area, household and respondent sampling selection.

A revised household selection strategy was sent which gave the research team the option to select from four (4) of the eight (8) rural areas of the cities chosen and double the sample for these rural areas. The country team was able to not send the enumerators in the Visayas and Mindanao to their respective rural areas. There were concerns regarding their safety since they were strangers in those towns and some areas had issues on peace and order. The travel time to these areas from the city center is quite considerable.

During the various enumerators’ briefings, the survey sampling was one of the topics discussed. The enumerators gave their input regarding their observations in these areas in terms of locating households with respect to PAVs and the establishments surrounding them. Adjustments were made to the sampling design after the input of the enumerators was received.

It helped that the country team was given guidance in refining the sampling design.

* 1. Provide a discussion of challenges in the survey implementation in the following areas:
     1. Determining areas with low and high PAV density

There was not much difficulty in determining areas with low and high PAV density. At the start of the user/venue survey, the list obtained from the Bureau of Internal Revenue was used at the onset to determine which areas in the various cities selected had more than three or more PAVs or one or two PAVs. From these identified areas, the research team randomly selected two places that had three or more PAVs and one area that only had one or two PAVs.

* + 1. Locating households with non-users

The areas covered by Quezon City and Lipa City had exclusive subdivisions that did not allow the enumerators to conduct the survey in their premises. This left the enumerators with a limited number of households available for interview within the initial 10 x 10 block radius.

In the remaining areas, locating non-users in a household was not difficult. It was in finding the non-users within the 12-25 year old age range. One respondent, a mother, said that “kids as young as five years old are already using the Internet for games and other leisure purposes.”

In Lipa City, the problem of locating households with non-users was compounded by three (3) elementary schools and one (1) high school in the area that gave students assignments for which they needed to access the Internet to complete. The students used the PAVs for this reason and made it difficult to find PAV non-users in the younger age brackets.

Most of the non-users you will find are the older members. There are respondents belonging to the 30 – 50 year old range who are too busy with work to visit PAVs or use the Internet.

* + 1. Getting non-users to participate

The usual responses of potential respondents who refuse to answer the survey are: (1) they are busy, (2) the survey is long, and (3) that their answers would not be helpful. The respondents’ willingness to participate also depends on the culture of the area where the survey is being conducted. In the experience of the Mindanao team, Davao City respondents are more welcoming and cooperative while those in Cagayan de Oro City are more cautious and suspicious.

* + 1. Finding private spaces in households to conduct interviews

The places where the interviews are conducted depend on the respondents. The enumerators are rarely invited inside the homes so the surveys are conducted outside like the porch, in the yard while the respondent tends to the plants or while they are doing their laundry, or just at the fence/gate of the house. If the respondent needs to mind their store, the interview will be conducted within the store’s vicinity.

* + 1. Length of the survey

The respondents felt that the survey was long and that the questions were repetitive. The length of the survey made it difficult to keep the interest of respondents from the older age brackets (50 and above) or those whose level of education was elementary or secondary found the survey lengthy and found some questions difficult to answer or understand because they really are not exposed to using the computer or the Internet and/or because they don’t see the need for either in their lives. Those who have used the computer or the Internet before had a noticeably easier time in answering the questions.

* + 1. Other implementation challenges

Some of the respondents did not appreciate being asked questions that are too personal like their personal and total household income, contact details and information about the household in general.

* 1. How did you address the above challenges, to what extents were they resolved, and what recommendations would you give for future surveys?

**Locating non-PAV users.** The enumerator was asked to go beyond the 10 x 10 block radius to find non-PAV users.

**Data**

1. Summarize the results for each of the demographics questions using frequency tables. Please comment on any interesting findings, in particular those that stand out as contrary to your expectations or the literature or known demographic distributions in your country. You are also encouraged to provide a discussion on results that seemed to follow traditional literature.

| **GENDER** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Male | 200 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Female | 200 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **AGE\_GROUPED** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 12 – 15 | 54 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 13.5 |
| 16 – 18 | 28 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 20.5 |
| 19 – 24 | 48 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 32.5 |
| 25 – 34 | 68 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 49.5 |
| 35 – 49 | 87 | 21.8 | 21.8 | 71.3 |
| 50 – 65 | 86 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 92.8 |
| 66 – UP | 29 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The most number of respondents belonged to the age groups 35-49 and 50-65. The least number of respondents belonged to the age groups 16-18 and 66 and older.

| **5\_1x: NATIONALITY** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | FILIPINO | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

| **5\_2: EDUCATION** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | NO FORMAL SCHOOLING | 5 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| GRADE SCHOOL | 51 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 14.0 |
| HIGH SCHOOL | 176 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 58.0 |
| VOCATIONAL SCHOOL | 41 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 68.3 |
| COLLEGE | 126 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 99.8 |
| DON'T KNOW | 1 | .3 | .3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Most of the respondents (343) received at least secondary education.

| **5\_3: PHYSICAL\_DISABILITY** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | YES | 37 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| NO | 359 | 89.8 | 89.8 | 99.0 |
| DON'T KNOW | 3 | .8 | .8 | 99.8 |
| NO RESPONSE | 1 | .3 | .3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_4\_1: DISABILITY\_SEEING** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | .00 | 388 | 97.0 | 97.0 | 97.0 |
| 1.00 | 12 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_4\_2: DISABILITY\_HEARING** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | .00 | 398 | 99.5 | 99.5 | 99.5 |
| 1.00 | 2 | .5 | .5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_4\_3: DISABILITY\_ARMS** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | .00 | 385 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 96.3 |
| 1.00 | 15 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_4\_4: DISABILITY\_LEGS** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | .00 | 380 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 |
| 1.00 | 20 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_4\_5: DISABILITY\_COMBO** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | .00 | 389 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 97.3 |
| 1.00 | 11 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_4\_6: DISABILITY\_OTHER** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | .00 | 396 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 99.0 |
| 1.00 | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_4\_6x: DISABILITY\_OTHER\_SPEC** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 396 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 99.0 |
| Paralyzed | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Some of the respondents had disabilities (37). Some of the disabilities are associated with the age of the respondents. There were seven (7) respondents who did not go to PAVs due to age-related disabilities, while five (5) respondents reported having these disabilities as the main reason why they do not use PAVs.

| **5\_5: HOME** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | OWNED BY MEMBER OF HH | 251 | 62.7 | 62.7 | 62.7 |
| RENTED | 88 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 84.8 |
| NO RENT | 59 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 99.5 |
| NO HOME | 1 | .3 | .3 | 99.8 |
| DON'T KNOW | 1 | .3 | .3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_6: WATER** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | PRIVATE WELL | 40 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| PUBLIC WELL | 15 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 13.8 |
| PIPED IN | 345 | 86.3 | 86.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_7: PRIMARY\_LANGUAGE** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | TAGALOG | 182 | 45.5 | 45.5 | 45.5 |
| CEBUANO | 119 | 29.8 | 29.8 | 75.3 |
| ENGLISH | 3 | .8 | .8 | 76.0 |
| OTHER | 96 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Other languages identified include: Capampangan, Hiligaynon, Waray-waray, Ilocano, Maranao, and Tausug.

| **5\_8: READING\_PRIMARY\_LANGUAGE** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | NONE | 6 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| POOR | 61 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 16.8 |
| FAIR | 184 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 62.7 |
| GOOD | 127 | 31.8 | 31.8 | 94.5 |
| VERY GOOD | 22 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_9: WRITING\_PRIMARY\_LANGUAGE** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | NONE | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| POOR | 50 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 13.5 |
| FAIR | 186 | 46.5 | 46.5 | 60.0 |
| GOOD | 139 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 94.8 |
| VERY GOOD | 21 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_10: READING\_NATIONAL\_LANGUAGE** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | POOR | 13 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| FAIR | 114 | 28.5 | 28.5 | 31.8 |
| GOOD | 81 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 52.0 |
| VERY GOOD | 10 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 54.5 |
| NA | 182 | 45.5 | 45.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_11: WRITING\_NATIONAL\_LANGUAGE** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | POOR | 14 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| FAIR | 96 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 27.5 |
| GOOD | 95 | 23.8 | 23.8 | 51.2 |
| VERY GOOD | 13 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 54.5 |
| NA | 182 | 45.5 | 45.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_12: ENGLISH\_PROFICIENCY** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | NONE | 16 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| POOR | 108 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 31.0 |
| FAIR | 172 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 74.0 |
| GOOD | 93 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 97.3 |
| VERY GOOD | 8 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 99.3 |
| NA | 3 | .8 | .8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_13: OCCUPATION\_STATUS** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | SELF-EMPLOYED | 93 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 23.3 |
| EMPLOYED PART TIME | 37 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 32.5 |
| EMPLOYED FULL TIME | 87 | 21.8 | 21.8 | 54.3 |
| UNEMPLOYED NOT LOOKING | 32 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 62.3 |
| UNEMPLOYED LOOKING | 13 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 65.5 |
| RETIRED | 17 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 69.8 |
| STUDENT | 79 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 89.5 |
| HOMEMAKER | 39 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 99.3 |
| OTHER | 3 | .8 | .8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_13x: OCCUPATION\_STATUS\_SPEC** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 397 | 99.3 | 99.3 | 99.3 |
| Volunteer nurse | 3 | .8 | .8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

The top three respondent occupations are: self-employed individuals (93), employed – full time (87), and students (79).(A little over half of the interviews were conducted during weekends (216) and the rest were conducted during weekdays.)

| **5\_14: OCCUPATION\_SECTOR** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | STUDENT | 79 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 19.8 |
| GOVT | 18 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 24.3 |
| AGRICULTURE | 3 | .8 | .8 | 25.0 |
| EDUCATION | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 26.0 |
| HEALTH | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 27.0 |
| CONSTRUCTION | 11 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 29.8 |
| MANUFACTURING | 16 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 33.8 |
| TRANSPORTATION | 25 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 40.0 |
| WHOLESALE, RETAIL | 43 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 50.7 |
| FINANCIAL SERVICES | 11 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 53.5 |
| BUSINESS SERVICES | 47 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 65.3 |
| PERSONAL SERVICES | 21 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 70.5 |
| OTHER TRADES | 9 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 72.8 |
| OTHER | 109 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_14x: SECTOR\_SPEC** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 291 | 72.8 | 72.8 | 72.8 |
| Entertainment | 1 | .3 | .3 | 73.0 |
| Food industry | 1 | .3 | .3 | 73.3 |
| Non-government organization | 1 | .3 | .3 | 73.5 |
| None | 101 | 25.3 | 25.3 | 98.8 |
| Refused to answer | 1 | .3 | .3 | 99.0 |
| Telecommunications | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_15: PERSONAL\_MONTHLY\_INCOME** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | .00 | 3 | .8 | .8 | .8 |
| 0 | 171 | 42.8 | 42.8 | 43.5 |
| <5000 | 107 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 70.3 |
| 5000 – 10000 | 55 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 84.0 |
| 10000 – 15000 | 32 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 92.0 |
| 15000 – 20000 | 18 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 96.5 |
| 20000 – 25000 | 7 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 98.3 |
| 25000 – 30000 | 1 | .3 | .3 | 98.5 |
| 30000 – 35000 | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 99.5 |
| 50000 – 55000 | 1 | .3 | .3 | 99.8 |
| 55000 < | 1 | .3 | .3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

| **5\_16: HH\_MONTHLY\_INCOME** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | .00 | 28 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| 0 | 1 | .3 | .3 | 7.2 |
| <5000 | 86 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 28.7 |
| 5000 - 10000 | 73 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 47.0 |
| 10000 - 15000 | 62 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 62.5 |
| 15000 - 20000 | 56 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 76.5 |
| 20000 - 25000 | 31 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 84.3 |
| 25000 - 30000 | 19 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 89.0 |
| 30000 - 35000 | 16 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 93.0 |
| 35000 - 40000 | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 94.0 |
| 40000 - 45000 | 4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 95.0 |
| 50000 - 55000 | 6 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 96.5 |
| 55000 < | 14 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 400 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |