

BIBLIOGRAPHY

KITONGAN, DAPHNE L. APRIL 2012. Management practices of backyard swine raisers in Barangay Poliwes, Baguio City. Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet.

Adviser: Erlinda B. Alupias, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

The study aimed to determine the socio-demographic profile of the backyard swine raisers; to determine the management practices of the backyard swine raisers; determine the problems encountered by the respondents in backyard swine raising.

The data were gathered from 50 swine raisers through a survey using guide questionnaire, ocular survey and photo documentation, the data were tabulated, analyzed using mean and percentage.

Findings show that most of the swine raisers are above middle age and females. They were mostly married. They learned swine raising from their parents/relatives, most of them were engaged in both breeding and fattening production.

The most common breeds were largewhite, berkshire and landrace, the raisers get their stocks from their neighbours/friends and relatives. The types of swine housing used are conventional/all purpose housing, located under their residential houses. The pens were made of concrete walling and slotted flooring. The type of feeds used was mostly kitchen left-over and vegetable waste/rejects (“*ubak*”). Some used *camote* leaves, *galiang*/taro, and banana trunk.



The most common health and sanitation practices that they always do are: cleaning of pens and drainage canals, immunization or vaccination of swine against diseases, maintenance of the environment. Disinfecting the pens, walkways, tools and equipment, quarantine or isolation of animals that were just bought and feeding their swine with balance diet were occasionally practiced. There were no restrictions of visitors to their pens. They always consult a veterinarian when their swine is sick. Though sometimes they consult other animal raisers, they cure the swine themselves or slaughter the animal for good. The most common diseases they encountered are swine dysentery, Mastiti-Agalactia and hog cholera or swine fever.

They sell their swine individually either by live weight, dressed weight, or per head since they have very limited volume of production and they don't have common production cycle.

The serious common problems encountered by the backyard swine raisers are: high cost of feeds. Lack of capital, air pollution in the community, clogging and pollution of drainage canals, and unpleasant environment.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-demographic Profile

Age. Table 1 shows the age level of swine raisers. The oldest swine raiser is 63 years old and the youngest is 26 years old. In the 50 swine raisers 38% fall within the age bracket of 41- 50 years old and 32% of them belonged to ages 51-60 years old.

The finding shows that most of the swine raisers belonged to the ages of 41-60 years old and they belong to middle ages.

Gender. Majority of the respondents who are engaged in swine raisers are females (78%), while 22% were males.

This is similar with the findings of Maddul (1991) that females took a foremost role in swine raising while male did other jobs than taking care of animals.

Civil status. As presented in the table 70% of the respondents were married, which implies that those who engaged in swine production were mostly married (70%) because they needed additional income to support their family. Those who were widowed and singles were only 18% and 12% respectively.

This corroborates the findings of Wagang (1984) and Maddul (1991) that in the Cordillera, more married couples are engaged in swine raising than single individuals.

Educational attainment. Majority of the swine raisers reached high school level (38%), about 22% were at the college level, only few had elementary and vocational education, 12% and 6% respectively.

The data implies that majority of the respondents had secondary and college education.



Table 1. Socio-demographic profile of the backyard swine raisers

CHARACTERISTICS	NO. OF RESPONDENT	PERCENTAGE (%)
Age		
Below 30 years old	5	10
31 – 40 years old	8	16
41 – 50 years old	19	38
51 – 60 years old	16	32
Above 60 years old	2	4
TOTAL	50	100
Gender		
Female	39	78
Male	11	22
TOTAL	50	100
Civil Status		
Single	6	12
Married	35	70
Widow	9	18
TOTAL	50	100
Educational Attainment		
Elementary	6	12
High School	22	44
College	19	38
Vocational	3	6
TOTAL	50	100



Years in swine raising. Table 2 shows that majority of the respondents had been engaged in swine raising for about more than 9 years (36%), and 6-9 years (32%). This means that swine raising is not a new livelihood for them.

Number of swine heads raised. Majority of the swine raiser kept 5 – 10 heads of swine at a time (40%). About 38% raised 1-5 heads of swine and only 22% raised more than 10 heads of swine (Table 3).

Table 2. Years in swine raising

YEARS IN SWINE RAISING	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Less than a year	1	2
1 – 3 years	5	10
3 – 6 years	10	20
6 – 9 years	16	32
More than 9 years	18	36
TOTAL	50	100

Table 3. Number of swine heads raised

NO. OF SWINE RAISED	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 – 5 heads	19	38
5 – 10 heads	20	40
More than 10 heads	11	22
TOTAL	50	100



Source of knowledge on swine raising. Ninety (90%) percent of the respondents claimed that they had learned swine raising from their parents and relatives, only 10% said that they acquired the knowledge from seminars and training and no one of them said that they learned from school (Table 4). The finding implies that parents and relatives have influenced the respondents to engage in swine raising. It also shows that swine raising may be part of their culture and the practices is passed on to the children.

Type of operation. Majority of the respondents preferred the combination of breeding and fattening (42%) as a swine raising system. Only 12% were involved in purely fattening and in breeding and piglet production (17%) (Table 4) as shown in Figures 2 and 3.

Table 4. Source of knowledge on swine raising

CHARACTERISTICS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Parents and relatives	45	90
Seminar and training	5	10
TOTAL	50	100

Table 5. Type of operation practiced by the respondents

CHARACTERISTICS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Breeding and fattening	21	42
Breeding or piglet production	17	34
Fattening	12	24
TOTAL	50	100





Figure 2. Swine raised under breeding and fattening. The swine raisers is involved in raising purebreds, cross breed or high breed to as parent stock for the swine industry.



Figure 3. Swine raised for breeding or piglet production. Raising feeder swine or weanling.

Management Practices

Breed Selection. In selecting breeds, the swine raisers should consider the following based on physical appearance of the swine: body size, mammary development, body length, width and depth of the body, feet and legs and the presence of abnormalities, based on the performance: growth rate, feed efficiency, carcass quality and sow production (Swine Raising Booklet, 1999).

Kind of breed raised. Results show that the respondents raised difficult kinds of breeds (Table 6). In descending order the breeds raised were: Large white (34%), Pietrain (24%), Landrace (20%), native (6%) are black in color, small ears and long snout, and Duroc (4%). The other breeds were mixed that were not identified (20%) as shown in the Figure 4 to Figure 7.

This implies that the swine raisers preferred high breed swine for their stocks for meat type purposes.

Table 6. Kind of breed raised

BREEDS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)	RANK
Largewhite	17	34	1
Pietrain	12	24	2
Landrace	10	20	3
Mixed-cannot identified	10	20	3
Native	3	6	4
Duroc	2	4	5

*Multiple Responses

Breeds of Swine Raised by the Respondents



Figure 4. Landrace. This breed are white, have short legs and medium to large drooping ears. The sows are excellence in mothering ability and litter size. The country or origin is Denmark.



Figure 5. Large white. This breeds has entirely white with medium erect ears. Sows have superior mothering ability, wean large litters and are excellent milkers. The country of origin is England.





Figure 6. Pietrain. This breed is a very meaty type of swine with spotted black and white color. It has well-shaped hams, loin and shoulders. Ears are erect. The country of origin is Pietrain, Belgium.



Figure 7. Native. This breed is prolific. Black in color has small ears and long snout. The country of origin is Philippines.



Figure 8. Mixed breeds

Source of animal stock. Table 7 shows that majority of the respondents got stock supply from their neighbours, friends or relatives (42%), from company suppliers (7%) and none from big farms. The finding implies that swine raisers are unaware of the possibility of inbreeding since their stocks are purchased from within the neighbourhood.

Swine Housing Management. Table 8 shows the swine housing management. Housing is considered an important factor in swine raising. Swine need to be confined to protect against any adverse weather conditions and also against thieves (Swine Raising Booklet, 1999).

Type of housing. Majority of the respondents placed their swine in a conventional/all purpose housing (62%) described as fairly sized unit consisting usually several pens arranged in a single or double rows, and about 38 % in a centralized/life cycle housing composed of pre-gestation and boar unit, farrowing and gestation unit, and growing finishing unit.

The finding shows that conventional housing is more preferred by the swine raisers because this system combines several operations in one building than centralized housing.

Table 7. Source of animal stock

CHARACTERISTICS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Neighbours/friends/relatives	42	84
Company supplies	7	14
TOTAL	50	100



Table 8. Description of swine used by the respondents

DESCRIPTION	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Type of housing		
Conventional/all-purpose housing	31	62
Centralized housing	19	38
TOTAL	50	100
Location of housing units		
Under residential houses	29	58
Separate from the residential houses	21	42
TOTAL	50	100
Description of housing		
Concrete flooring	45	90
Elevated slat flooring	3	6
Cogon and wood	2	4
TOTAL	50	100

Location of housing units. Most of the swine raisers built their swine pens under residential houses (58%) and 42% located separate from the residential houses.

Description of housing. Most of the swine raisers have pens made of concrete walling and slotted flooring (90%). Some have elevated slat flooring (6%) and cogon and wood (4%), while no one used stone walling and no flooring. This conform the recommendation of the Swine Raising Booklet (1999) that permanent hog houses should have concrete floors for easy cleaning and to minimize the occurrence of parasites and diseases. As mentioned by Eusebio (1978) concrete walling and slotted floorings are not only practical but economical.



Structures that are present in the swine pens. Table 9 shows that all of the swine pens had feeding trough (100%), watering trough (100%), food cart (100%), most pens had lightning system (70%) particularly for those who used for breeding, septic tank (52%) and drainage canal (20%).

Finding shows that their practices is similar with the recommendations of Swine Raising Booklet (1999) that equipment such as feeders and water troughs are best made of concrete although other materials may be used. Feeding trough should have a U-shaped bottom because the swine can pick all the feeds in it. It can be also used as watering trough especially with wet feeding system if self feeders are used, or if solid and water are offered separately, a drinking trough should be provided. Some swine raisers use discarded automobile or truck tires cut in halves.

Table 9. Structures available at the swine pen

EQUIPMENT	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Feeding trough	50	100
Watering trough	50	100
Food cart	50	100
Lightning system	35	70
Septic tank	26	52
Drainage canal	20	40

*Multiple Responses



Assessment of swine pen. As shown in Table 10, the swine raisers were asked to rate their own swine pens. Honestly, most of them rated that their swine pens have very good ventilation and concrete flooring having a mean of 2.36 and 2.50, respectively. They claimed that they have at least good elevation, drainage, lightning and size of their pens, with mean of 2.14, 1.86, 1.82 and 2.30, respectively. They admitted that they have a fair provision of sewerage/septic tank. This shows that the swine raisers perceived that they have at least generally good structures of swine pens. Except for the provision of sewerage/septic tank for the swine.

Finding conforms with the recommendations of Dagon and Diaz (1990) as cited by Soliweg (1995) that swine houses must be well ventilated during summer.

Table 10. Assessment of swine pen

CHARACTERISTICS	F (1)	G (2)	VG (3)	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE EQUIVALENT
Ventilation	2	28	20	2.36	Very Good
Elevation	7	29	14	2.14	Good
Drainage	12	33	5	1.86	Good
Provision of sewerage	22	25	3	1.62	Fair
Lightning	17	25	8	1.82	Good
Size of pen	5	25	20	2.30	Good
Concrete floor	3	19	28	2.50	Very Good

*Multiple Responses

Legend:

Fair = F	1.00 – 1.66 = Fair
Good = G	1.67 – 2.33 = Good
Very Good = VG	2.34 – 3.00 = Very Good



Feeding Practices. Table 11 shows the kinds of feeds used by the interviewed swine raisers. Majority of the swine raisers commonly used kitchen left-over (82%), vegetable waste/rejects (“*ubak*”) (78%), *camote* leaves (40%), *galiang* or taro (26%), commercial feeds (12%), and banana trunk (14%).

The findings imply that most of the swine raisers used kitchen left-over and vegetable waste/rejects (“*ubak*”) this are locally available as feeds supplement because it is cheaper than using pure commercial feeds. Feeding of swine is given two times a day, morning and afternoon, chopping is necessary and cooking of these feeds is necessary combined with rice bran.

This result is similar with the findings of Col-iteng (2003) that indigenous feeds are locally available in Banao, Bauko Mt. Province and fed to the animals, where cooking is necessary before feeding combined with the swine raisers own kitchen left-over.

Table 11. Type of feeds used by the respondents

TYPE OF FEEDS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Kitchen left-over	41	82
Vegetable waste/rejects (“ <i>Ubak</i> ”)	39	78
<i>Camote</i> leaves	20	40
<i>Galiang</i> /Taro	13	26
Commercial feeds	12	24
Banana Trunk	7	14

*Multiple Responses



Health and sanitation practices of the respondents. The data in Table 12 show the cleaning practices of the backyard swine raisers. The cleaning practices that are always done by the swine raisers are: cleaning the canals going to the drainage canals (2.40); immunization of their swine against prevalent diseases (2.38); vaccination of animals with available vaccines (2.56); and maintaining the environment (2.52). The cleaning practices that they only practice sometimes are: disinfecting the building, runways, pens and equipment/tools (2.19); quarantine or isolation of animals recently bought from other sources were indicated as always (2.46); and provided the animals with adequate and well balanced diet (2.2).

The finding implies that the respondents maintain cleanliness and sanitation practices to protect their swine from diseases and parasites infestation, they were also aware of the health maintenance of their stocks as shown in their practices.

Findings shows that the health and sanitation practices is similar to the recommendations of Swine Raising Booklet (1999) keep buildings, run-ways, pen and equipment clean always. Sanitize and disinfect regularly, and for buying breeder stock for replacement, make certain that the swine have been immunized against diseases. Always seek the advice/services of the nearest veterinarian and/or government technician.

This affirms the statement of Gadd (1990) that vaccination reduces morbidity and completely protects animals from death, Miguel (2002) that strict implementation of sanitation program would reduce disease incidence and to maintain the health of swine to make them resistant to microbial and parasitic attacks and Ambona (2002) that implementation of sanitation program should be maintained to reduces disease incidence



and transfer, when sanitation is neglected, there is high disease incidence resulting to high mortality rate.

As mentioned by Gadd (1990) that the kinds of sanitation program implemented is based on the location of residence of the area to keep diseases away from the swine units, animals should immunized against prevalent diseases in the area.

Table 12. Health and sanitation practices of the respondents

PRACTICES	N (1)	S (2)	A (3)	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE EQUIVALENT
Disinfection of building, runways, pens and equipments stocks	4	30	13	2.19	Sometimes
Cleaning of canals going to the drainage canals	0	30	20	2.40	Always
Maintenance of environment	0	24	26	2.52	Always
Quarantine or isolate animals recently brought from other resources	12	27	11	1.98	Sometimes
Vaccination of animals with available vaccines	0	22	28	2.56	Always
Restricting entry of visitors	27	22	1	1.48	Never
Provided the animals with adequate and well balanced diet	0	24	6	2.2	Sometimes

*Multiple Responses

Legend:

Never = N	1.00 – 1.66 = Never
Sometimes = S	1.67 – 2.33 = Sometimes
Always = A	2.34 – 3.00 = Always



Medical care for sick animals. The respondents were asked if what do they do when their animals are sick as shown in Table 13. Most of them claimed that they always consult a veterinarian (2.36), sometimes they consult another experienced animal raisers (2.22), treat the animal by themselves (1.88) or slaughter it for good (1.82).

This shows that the service of a veterinarian is available in the area. Findings also show that they sometimes slaughtered sick animals, which may not be safe for human consumption.

As mentioned by Bundy (1982) that swine houses should be clean, dry, relatively warm and well ventilated.

Table 13. Medical care for sick animals

CHARACTERISTICS	N (1)	S (2)	A (3)	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE EQUIVALENT
Consult a veterinarian	5	22	23	2.36	Always
Consult another experienced animal raisers	3	33	14	2.22	Sometimes
Treat the animal by myself	14	28	8	1.88	Sometimes
Slaughter it for good	16	27	7	1.82	Never

*Multiple Responses

Legend:

Never = N	1.00 – 1.66 = Never
Sometimes = S	1.67 – 2.33 = Sometimes
Always = A	2.34 – 3.00 = Always



Common diseases and parasites. As shown in Table 14, the most common diseases encountered by the swine raisers is: Swine dysentery (20%) as manifested by the loss of appetite, fever and watery feces flecked with mucus or blood. Followed by Mastitis-Agalactia Syndrome (18%); Hog cholera or swine fever (16%), swine get contaminated through direct contact or by eating uncooked slops or kitchen scraps containing the virus. At least Scouring (Diarrhea) or gastroenteritis complex (8%) and Brucellosis of pigs or contagious abortion (4%) were minimal cases and Roundworm Infection were not encountered.

As mentioned by Col-iteng (1990) it is necessary to dispose animal waste, otherwise, these serve as breeding places of bacteria, fungi, molds and other diseases.

Table 14. Common diseases and parasites

DISEASE AND PARASITES	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Swine Dysentery	10	20
MMA (Mastitis-Agalactia Syndrome)	9	18
Hog Cholera or Swine fever	8	16
Scouring (Diarrhea) or gastroenteritis complex	4	8
Brucellosis of pigs or contagious abortion	2	4

*Multiple Responses



Marketing Practices of the Swine Raisers. As shown in Table 15, the respondents had no definite or specific marketing practices. Data shows that most of them sometimes sell their swine through live weight (2.20), dressed weight (2.14) per head (*bulto*) (1.94) and retail them per kilo (1.92). This may be attributed to volume of production, which is very limited and they have no definite market outlet, moreover, they don't market their swine at the same time.

Marketing is the best last job done on growing finishing swine. Swine are marketed when they reach at least 80 kg. Marketable swine may be sold to middlemen who usually act as buying or selling agents, direct meat processor without the intervention of a middleman (Swine Raising Booklet, 1999)

Table 15. Marketing systems of the swine raisers

MARKETING SYSTEM	N (1)	S (2)	A (3)	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE EQUIVALENT
Live weight	2	30	18	2.20	Sometimes
Dressed weight (whole sale)	6	31	13	2.14	Sometimes
Per head (<i>bulto</i>)	12	29	9	1.94	Sometimes
Sell as per kilo	13	28	9	1.92	Sometimes

*Multiple Responses

Legend:

Never = N	1.00 – 1.66 = Never
Sometimes = S	1.67 – 2.33 = Sometimes
Always = A	2.34 – 3.00 = Always

Problems Encountered by the Swine Raisers



In Table 16, the serious problems that were encountered by the swine raisers were; high cost of feeds were a mean of (2.02); lack of capital, 1.98; polluted air due to foul odor from swine pens, 1.98; clogging of canals, 1.88; polluted canals, 1.94; and unpleasant environment, 2.14. The problems that were determined as not serious are: inadequate technical knowledge, 1.28; lack of veterinary services, 1.28; and increasing disease incidence, 2.14.

This result is similar to the finding of Wagang (1984) that the most common problems encountered by the swine raisers in Benguet were the high cost of feeds and lack of capital. Though lack of technical knowledge is not serious problems in the case of the swine raisers in Poliwes, Baguio City

Finding shows that their problems encountered by the swine raisers is similar with the recommendation of the PCARRD (1981) these were: inadequate supply and high cost of feeds, high losses due to occurrence of major diseases and parasites, poor feeding, and management practices.

As mentioned by the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics (1993) that the low productivity of swine industry is due to the disease out-breaks and improper management practices.



Table 16. Problems encountered by the swine raisers

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED	NS (1)	S (2)	VS (3)	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE EQUIVALENT
Inadequate technical knowledge	37	12	1	1.28	Not Serious
High cost of feeds	3	41	6	2.18	Serious
Lack of capital	9	34	7	1.96	Serious
Lack of veterinary services	37	12	1	1.28	Not Serious
Polluted air	8	35	7	1.98	Serious
Clogging of canals	12	32	6	1.88	Serious
Increasing disease incidence	27	21	2	1.14	Not Serious
Polluted canals	9	35	6	2.14	Serious
Creating unpleasant environment	19	35	6	1.78	Serious

*Multiple Responses

Legend:

Not Serious =NS	1.00 – 1.66 = Not Serious
Serious = S	1.67 – 2.33 = Serious
Very Serious = VS	2.34 – 3.00 = Very Serious



SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study looked into the management practices of backyard swine raisers in Poliwes, Baguio City. It aimed to document the socio-demographic profile of the respondents; determine their management practices and problems encountered in swine raising.

The data were gathered with the used of a guide questionnaire, ocular survey and photo documentation. Fifty (50) swine raisers were interviewed in this study (90% of the whole Barangay Poliwes raised backyard swine raising). The study was conducted in December, 2011

The salient findings of the study were the following:

The demographic profile of the respondents shows that: most of the swine raisers belonged to the ages of 41 to 60 years old; mostly married; mostly high school and college education; majority of them had been raising swine for six years or more; most of them were raising 5 to 10 heads; they learned how to raise swine from their parents/relatives; they were more into a combination of breeding and fattening, where they produce their own piglets and fatten them before they are marketed.

The management practices of the swine raisers in terms of breed selection shows that most of the breeds they raised were large white, Peitrain, landrace, and mixed breeds. Very few were raising native breeds. The sources of their stocks were from their neighbours, friend and relatives, while many have incidence of inbreeding.

In terms of housing management, they used conventional/all purpose housing type as their swine pens, mostly located under their residential houses, a few have centralized



housing pens though. The swine pens were mostly made of concrete walling and slotted flooring. All of the swine pens have feeding and watering trough and food cart as well. Majority of the swine pens have lighting systems and septic tank. Only few of them had drainage canals.

The swine raisers perceived that their swine pens had very good ventilation and flooring, which were concrete. They have at least good ventilation, flooring, drainage canals, lighting, and size of pen. Honestly, they admitted that their pens don't have good sewage or septic tank.

On their feeding practices, the majority of the respondents used kitchen left-over and vegetable waste/rejects (ubak). Some fed their swine with *camote* (sweet potato) leaves, *galiang*/taro and banana trunk.

The health and sanitation, the swine raisers always are: cleaning of pens and drainage canals, immunization or vaccination of swine against diseases, and maintenance of the environment. They sometimes disinfect the building, walkways, pens, tools and equipment, quarantine or isolated animals recently bought from outside sources, feed their animals with adequate balanced diet. But they never practice the restriction of visitors to their area. In case their animals get sick, they always consult a veterinarian and sometimes they consult other animal raisers, treat the animal by themselves or slaughter the animal for good. The most common diseases that they encountered are swine dysentery, Mastiti-Agalactia and hog cholera or swine fever.

The marketing practices of the backyard swine raisers are carried depending on the kind of swine they sell and the type of buyer. Sometimes they sell their swine by live weight, dressed weight on a whole sale, per head or they retail the meat per kilo. This may



be attributed to the very limited volume of their swine that they sell and they don't sell at the same time.

The most common problem encountered by the respondents were: high cost of feeds, lack of capital, air pollution due to the foul odor of the swine pens and canals, clogging and pollution of drainage canals due to swine manure, and unpleasant environment. Inadequate technical knowledge on swine production, lack of veterinarian, and incidence of diseases are not serious problems to them.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The swine raisers of Poliwes, Baguio City belong to the ages of 41 to 60 years old, married, high school and college education, they were raising swine for six years and more, they were raising 5 to 10 heads of swine, they learned swine raising from their parents, relatives or friends and they were into a combination of breeding and fattening.

2. The management practices in terms of breed selection were: large white, Berkshire and mixed breeds. The sources of stocks were from their neighbours, friends or relatives. They used conventional housing, the swine pens were made use of concrete walling and slotted flooring. They fed their animals with kitchen left-over and vegetable waste. They disinfect the buildings, pens equipments/tools, quarantine or isolate sick animal. They never practiced the restriction of visitors to their area. They marketed their swine depending on the kind swine they sell and the type of buyer.

3. The problems encountered by the swine raisers were: high cost of feeds, lack of capital, air pollution, clogging and pollution drainage of canals, and unpleasant environment.



Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions the following were recommended:

1. The swine raisers should be aware of inbreeding since they get their stocks from the neighbourhood.
2. The practices of butchering sick animals should be discouraged to prevent spread of diseases.
3. The swine raisers may form an organization or cooperative in order to help one another to improve and monitor their production and marketing practices.
4. The swine raisers should be encouraged to continue improving their health and sanitation practices.
5. The most common problems should be addressed by the swine raisers themselves in cooperation with their barangay officials and other government and non-government agencies.
6. More in depth study should be done to look into the other aspects in management practices of the backyard swine raisers such as feeding practices, marketing and record keeping.
7. The swine raisers attend seminars on swine management practices to strengthen their technical knowledge.
8. The barangay officials should implement policies or ordinance in maintaining cleanliness of surroundings in the swine pens and proper disposal of animal wastes.



LITERATURE CITED

- AMBONA, W.R. 2002. Swine raising practices in Ilocos Sur. BS Thesis Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet. Pp. 1-2.
- BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (BAS). 1993. Swine Inventory Department of Agriculture, Quezon City.
- COL-ITENG, R.C. 2003. Management practices of backyard swine raisers in Banao, Bauko Mountain Province BS Thesis Benguet State University, La Trinidad Benguet. P. 4.
- EUSEBIO, J. 1978. The science and practice of swine production. University of the Philippines, Los Baños, Laguna. P.122.
- GADD, J. A. 1990. Major farm practices on swine management. BS Thesis Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet. P. 8.
- MADDUL, S. B. 1991. Production, management and characteristics of native pigs in the Cordillera. University of the Philippines, Los Baños, Laguna. P. 120.
- MIGUEL, W. E. 2002. Major farm practices on swine management . BS Thesis Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet. Pp. 4-5.
- PHILIPPINE COUNCIL FOR AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND NATURAL RESOURCES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT. 1981. Philippine recommends for Pork Production. PCARRD Los Banos, Laguna. Pp. 29-59.
- SANITATION CODE OF THE PHILIPPINES. 1978. Implementing rules and Regulations of Charter XIX –“Nuisances and Offensive trades and Occupations” of the Code of Sanitation of the Philippines Presidential Decree No. 856. Retrieved 2011 from http://www.fmh.ph/clp/irr_pd_856.htm.
- SOLIWEG, G. A.1995. Major farm practices on swine management. BS Thesis Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet. Pp. 11-15.
- SWINE RAISING. 1999. Livestock Development Council Department of Agriculture. Elliptical Road, Diliman Quezon City.
- WAGANG, D.B. 1984. The management practices of swine raisers of Benguet. MS Thesis Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet.

