

BIBLIOGRAPHY

OLA-O, GEMARSON M. APRIL 2012. Documentation on the Management Practices of Swine Production in Balili, La Trinidad Benguet. Benguet State University La Trinidad, Benguet.

Adviser: Cunegunda D. Abellera, MSc

ABSTRACT

The study was about the documentation on the management practices of swine production specially the study aims to determine the socio-demographic profile of the respondents; management practices of swine raisers; and management problems related to swine raising.

The data were obtained from 40 respondents. It was conducted in December 2011 with the use of survey questionnaire and personal interview. The data gathered were tabulated, categorized, analyzed and documented.

Findings shows that most of the respondents who were engaged in swine raising are female. Majority of them were married; Land lady of boarding houses as their source of income. Most of the respondents raised one kind of breed of swine like the large white breed.

On the management practices, the respondents always kept their swine at a well designed house and at the same time they cleaned the canals going to the drainage canals and sometimes they used biocide in cleaning the floors and walls. Also, the respondents



provided adequate and well balanced diet for the swine. The respondents never restricted the entry of their visitors in the swine pen. The respondents never treated their swine by themselves thus consult other animal users for the sick swine. Also they never consulted the veterinarian for the reason that they lack capital.

Most of the respondents fed their swine with commercial feeds and kitchen refuses. Also, they fed with commercial feeds that were being mixed with “ubbak”(vegetable wastes), rice bran ,sweet potato vein and leaves. Respondents practiced wet feeding. All of the respondents kept their swine in shed and pen type and most of them constructed their pens with GI roofing with solid concrete walling and roofing.

The problems encountered were mostly lack of capital, presence of diseases and parasites, and lack of technical knowledge.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Socio-demographic Profile of the Respondents

The Table 1 shows the age, sex, civil status, and means of livelihood.

Age. Less than one half of the respondents or (32.5%) fall within the age bracket of 40-50 years old and above.

Sex. Most of the respondents who were engaged in swine raising were female (70%); and 18% male. This confirms the finding of Maddul (1991) that look a foremost role in swine raising while male did other jobs like working on a company or field rather than taking care of animals.

Civil Status. As represented in Table 1. Seventy percent (70%) of the respondents were married; 30% single. This indicates that majority of the respondents involved in backyard swine raising are married and are satisfied with small scale farms. Accordingly, is profitable if they were able to pay their debts and felt losing if they can no longer pay them on time.

Other source of income. Majority of the respondent (35%) claimed that they were landlady; 22.5%, vegetable producers and baby sitter. This shows that all the respondents had other source of income aside from swine production to increase their annual income for their own family.



Table 1. Socio-demographic profile of the respondents

CHARACTERISTICS	NO. OF RESPONDENT	PERCENTAGE (%)
Age		
18-28	6	15
29-39	8	20
40-50	13	32.5
51 AND ABOVE	13	32.5
TOTAL	40	100
Sex		
Male	12	30
Female	28	70
TOTAL	40	100
Civil Status		
Single	12	30
Married	28	70
TOTAL	40	100
Other means of income		
Store Keeper	7	17.5
Vegetable producer	9	22.5
Government employee	1	2.5
Land lady	14	35
Baby sitter	9	22.5
TOTAL	40	100



Years in Swine Raising

Table 2 shows the number of years in swine raising .Majority (55%) of the respondents had been engaged in backyard swine raising for almost 10 years. About 30% raised swine for 11 to 20 years and other respondents have been raising for more than 21 years (15%). This hopes that the respondents will bring appropriate technology to the interested farmers and would be backyard swine producers in order that they may realize profitable production and improve their quality of life based on their experience.

Breeds being Raised by the Respondents

Table 3 shows the breeds of swine raised by the respondents. Majority (70%) of the respondents raised the breed Large White because according to them that this breed produced fine quality meat and compare favorably with other breeds in growth and economy of swine. Only 10% raised the breed Landrace, have weak on the feet and legs and have problems adapting conditions.

It was noted that the respondents only produced 1 to 3 numbers of heads per swine house.

Table 2. Number of years the respondents in swine raising.

NO. OF YEARS ENGAGE IN SWINE RAISING	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1 to 10 years	22	55
11 to 20 years	12	30
21 to 30 years	6	15
TOTAL	40	100



Table 3. The breed of swine raised by the respondents

BREEDS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Large White	28	70
Native	12	30
Duroc	8	20
Land race	4	10

*multiple responses

Breeds of Swine Raised by the Respondents



Figure 2. Large White. Most common kind of breed raised by the respondents. of white, prick-eared pig, face and straight nose.



Figure 3. Native. Used for butchering and cultural sacrifices because of its color. A breed with a long face and straight nose.

Feeds and feeding practices

Table 4 shows the feeds and feeding management of swine.

Kinds of feeds used by the respondents. The farmers commonly used commercial feeds (80%) the swine are about one week; 70%, after 2 months the swine were given and when the kitchen refuses is mixed with the rice bran; 37.5% vegetable wastes are provided they are properly cooked. Accordingly all the backyard producers are using wet feeding.

Table 4. Feeds and feeding practices

FEEDS AND FEEDING	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
commercial feeds	23	57.5
rice bran and sweet potato vine and leaves	13	32.5
Vegetable wastes	15	37.5
kitchen refuses	28	70.0

*multiple responses



Feeds and Feeding



Figure 4. Commercial Feeds. Mixed with kitchen refuses or they just give it to the swine mixed with water



Figure 5. Cooked Sweet Potato vine and leaves.



Figure 6. Vegetable Wastes. They cook together with the sweet potato and mix with commercial feeds.



Figure 7. Kitchen Refuses. Cook it with sweet potato and mixed and mix with commercial

Care and Sanitation. Majority of the respondents claimed that they always (72.5%) cleaned the canals going to the drainage canals; 57.5% always disinfect the house, runways, pens and equipment stocks; 45%, never used biocide in cleaning the floors and walls.

Whereas, the health maintenance of the respondents' swine. Majority of the respondents (72.5%) always provided their swine with adequate well balanced diet; 40%, they always give the complete vaccination to their swine and they maintain environmental hygiene, as shown in table 5.

On the disease management. Table 5 shows that majority of the respondents never (70%) treated their swine by themselves; 67%, never slaughtered swine for good; 60%, always consulted other swine raisers.



Table 5. Care and Sanitation of the swine houses

*multiple respondents

Cleaning	Never		Sometimes		Always	
	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Disinfection of building, runways, pens and equipment stocks	0	0	17	42.5	23	57.5
Use of biocide in cleaning the floors and walls	18	45	19	47.5	8	20
Cleaning of canals going to the drainage canals	0	0	11	27.5	29	72.5
Immunization of prevalent diseases	19	47.5	15	37.5	6	15
well designed buildings for swine	0	0	10	25	30	75
Health Maintenance						
Maintenance of environmental hygiene	0	0	24	60	16	40
Quarantine or swine recently brought from other resources	0	0	27	67.5	13	32.5
Vaccination of swine with available vaccines	4	10	20	50	16	40
Restriction entry of visitors	25	62.5	11	27.5	4	10
Provide the swine with adequate and well balance diet	0	0	11	27.5	29	72.5
Disease Management						
Consult a veterinarian	22	55	13	32.5	5	12.5
Consult other swine users	0	0	16	40	24	60
Treat swine by myself	28	70	12	30	0	0
Slaughter it for good	26	65	13	32.5	1	2.5



Care and Sanitation of Swine Houses



Figure 8. Drainage Canals Swine.



Figure 9. Well Designed Housing for Swine.



Figure 10. Restriction of entry of visitors



Figure 11. Use of biocide in cleaning the floors and walls

Housing of Swine

It was noted that for a small backyard operations, cheap and locally available materials were used such as GI roofing with solid concrete walling and flooring (75%); and only 10%, GI roofing wooden walling as shown in Table 6.

Facilities and Equipment

As shown in Table 7 all of the respondents claimed that they had facilities and equipment available in their swine house like the drinking troughs and feeders. The feeders and water troughs were made up of concrete; and only 25%, had electric brooders for survival of newborn swine.

Table 6. Housing management

HOUSING MANAGEMENT	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
GI roofing with solid concrete	30	75
GI roofing with elevated floor	6	15
GI roofing and wooden walling	4	10
TOTAL	40	100

*multiple respondent



Figure 12. GI roofing with solid concrete walling and flooring

Table 7. Facilities and Materials

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENTS AVAILABLE	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Drinking trough	40	100
Feeding trough	40	100
Electric brooder	10	25

*multiple responses

Facilities and equipment available.



Figure 13. Feeding trough



Figure 14. Electric Brooder



Figure 15. Drinking trough

Marketing Practices

Age to Market Swine. Table 8 shows that the respondents sold their swine with the age of 4 to 5 months (40%); 6 to 7 months (37.5%); 8 to 9 (20%); 10 months and above (2.5%) depending on the buyer.

Weight of ready to market swine. Table 9 shows that most of the respondents sold their pigs with a weight of 71 to 80 kilograms (55%); 81-90kgs (25%); 61-70kgs (10%); 91- and above (7.5%); and 50-60 kilograms (2.5%) depending on the age and how the swine were fed. The price of swine depends on the weight of the swine that is ready to be sold.

Way of Selling Swine. Table 10 shows that most of the producers sold their swine by live weight basis (70%) when an individual or the buyer brought the whole pig. While the dressed weight basis (50%) when the producer sold them by their own or called “ulaga” which means to butcher and sell to neighbors.

Table 8. Age to market swine

AGE TO MARKET SWINE	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
4 to 5	16	40
6 to 7	15	37.5
8 to 9	8	20
>10	1	2.5
TOTAL	40	100



Table 9. Weight of ready to market swine

WEIGHT TO MARKET SWINE	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
50-60 kgs	1	2.5
61-70 kgs	4	10
71- 80 kgs	22	55
81- 90 kgs	10	25
91 and above	3	7.5
TOTAL	40	100

Way of Selling Swine. Table 10 shows that most of the producers sold their swine by live weight basis (70%) when an individual or the buyer brought the whole pig. While the dressed weight basis (50%) when the producer sold them by their own or called “ulaga” which means to butcher and sell to neighbors.

Table 10. System to market swine

SYSTEM TO MARKET SWINE	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Live weight	28	70
Dressed weight	20	50

*multiple responses



Management Problems Encountered
In Raising Swine By Respondents

Table 11 shows the management problem encountered by the respondents in raising their swine. The problems encountered most are lack of capital (85%), presence of diseases and parasites (45%); lack of technical knowledge (25%). These results show that lack of capital was the foremost problem of the respondents, which conforms with the findings of Wagang (1984).

Table 11. Management problems encountered in raising swine by respondents

MANAGEMENT PROBLEM	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
Capital	34	85
Lack of knowledge	10	25
Presence of diseases	18	45

*multiple responses



SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Summary

The study determines the socio-demographic profile of the respondents; management practices of swine raisers; and management problems related to swine raising.

The data were gathered by means of a survey questionnaire couples by personal interview of the respondents.

Based on gathered data it is revealed that most of the swine raisers were females whose ages were 40. Majority of them were married; Land lady of boarding houses. Most of the respondents raised one kind of breed of swine like the large white breed.

On the management practices, the respondents always kept their swine at a well-designed house and at the same time they cleaned the canals going to the drainage canals and sometimes they used biocide in cleaning the floors and walls. Also, the respondents provided adequate and well balanced diet for the swine. The respondents never restricted the entry of their visitors in the swine pen. The respondents never treated their swine by themselves thus consult other animal users for the sick swine. Also they never consulted the veterinarian for the reason that they lack capital.

Most of the respondents fed their swine with commercial feeds and kitchen refuses. Also, they fed with commercial feeds that were being mixed with “ubbak”(vegetable wastes), rice bran ,sweet potato vein and leaves. Respondents practiced wet feeding. All of the respondents kept their swine in shed and pen type and most of them constructed their pens with GI roofing with solid concrete walling and roofing.



The problems encountered were mostly lack of capital, presence of diseases and parasites, and lack of technical knowledge.

On market system, most of the respondents sold their swine on live weight basis and dressed weight basis at ages 4 to 5 months.

Conclusions

Based from the finding and observations the following conclusions were drawn.

1. Respondents were females; married; had other sources of income; and at their mid age.
2. Swine producers build their pig pens just beside their houses, designed their swine house with light materials, cleaned the canals, provided with well balanced diet, never treated their swine by themselves but they consulted other animal producers.
3. The respondents had problems encountered such as the following: lack of capital, presence of diseases and parasites, and lack of technical knowledge.

Recommendations

Based from the conclusions the following were recommended:

1. The backyard swine producers must maintain the cleanliness of their surroundings by avoiding scattering their wastes to control parasites and diseases.
2. The respondents must at least build their pig pens far away from houses.



3. Swine producers must attend any seminars on swine management practices to strengthen the technical knowledge of swine users.
4. Respondents should involve themselves on cooperative in order to be able and avail loans and in buying other animal needs.



LITERATURE CITED

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE STATISTICS (BAS). 1993. Swine Inventory Department of Agriculture; Quezon City.

CHURCH, D. C. 1986. Livestock Feeds And Feeding . New Jersey. Prentice Hall. Pp. 405-406

EUSEBIO, J. A. 1980. Pig production in tropics. Essex: Long man group. Ltd. P. 155

GALASGAS, M. K. 1996. Input and Output in swine production and marketing in selected barangays of Bokod.Benguet. BS Thesis Benguet State University, La Trinidad,Benguet. P. 20.

ITKIN, Aron 2011 Swine Economic Management Publications . Retrieved June 20, 2011 from http://www.abtwifarms.com/oder-and_diseases.shtml

KOHL, R. L. and J. N. UHL. 1980. Marketing of agricultural products. 5thed. New York Mcmillan Pub.Co. Pp. 61,476.

LAMBIO, A. L. 1993. Brooding and growing performance of four genetic groups of Philippines native chicken. Animal Husbandry and Agricultural Journal (29):11 Pp.12.

MADDUL, S. B. 1991. Production, management and characteristic of native pigs in the Cordillera.Ph.D. Dissertation.University of the Philippines at Los Banos, Laguna.P. 120.

MARCOS, F. 1975. Philippine Environment Law. Retrieved November 29, 2011 from <http://www.chanrobles.com/presidentialdecreeno856.htm>

MERK. M. 1998. Swine Production. Hand-out in Animal Science 150. Department of Animal Science.College of Agriculture Benguet State University. Pp. 1-5.

PCARRD. 1981. Philippine Recommends For Pork Production. PCARRD Los Banos, Laguna. Pp220-221

SUPNET. M. and GATMAITAN. 1980. Swine Farming Manual. Philippine Squibb and sons Corporation. Pp. 29-59.

TIZIKARA, C. 1985. A Review of Factors Limiting Productivity and Voluntary Adaptation of Tropical Live Stock. World Rev. Animal Production. 2(4): 41-46.

WAGANG, D. B. 1984. The Management Practices Of Swine Raisers Of Benguet. Ms. Thesis. Benguet State University, La Trinidad Benguet.

