Global Advanced Research Journal of Agricultural Science (ISSN: 2315-5094) Vol. 7(12) pp. 383-392, December, 2018 Special Anniversary Review Issue.
Available online http://garj.org/garjas/home

Full Length Research Paper

Production, Feeding and Marketing Practices of Native Pig Raisers in Selected Regions of the Philippines

Jesse Jay O. Villanueva[1*] and Rommel C. Sulabo[2]

[1]Department of Animal Science, College of Agriculture, Mindanao State University Marawi City, Lanao del Sur, Philippines.
[2]Institute of Animal Science, College of Agriculture and Food Sciences, University of the Philippines Los Bańos, College, Laguna 4031, Philippines.

Accepted 18 December, 2018

The study aimed to obtain baseline information about production, feeding, and marketing practices of native pig raisers in selected regions of the Philippines. A total of 240 native pig raisers were personally interviewed using either self-assisted or self-administered survey questionnaire. The multi-stage sampling procedure was used in the selection of the provinces, municipalities, and barangays covered by the study. Descriptive statistics was used in this research study. Majority of respondents were male, in their productive age, married, finished elementary education and with 1-5 household members. Moreover, respondents mentioned that native pig raising has been a traditional enterprise and has been their major source of income. Common problems encountered consist of inadequate capital, lack of technical knowledge, diseases, low market price and high cost of feeds. Parents and friends are sources of knowledge and information in native pig raising. Overall, majority of the respondents employed traditional practices in terms of feeds and feeding, housing, breeding, health and disease prevention, and marketing.

Keywords: pig, native pig, feeding, marketing, management, production, practices

INTRODUCTION

Raising of livestock particularly native pigs in addition to planting of field crops is a major source of livelihood especially in rural communities. Many Filipino farmer households considered swine raising a popular business enterprise, practicing the activity as part of the farmers farming operations. Evidently, the swine industry remains the dominant force in the Philippines meat industry, accounting for over 60% of the country's total meat demand.

Native pig raising can be a lucrative business. Unfortunately, not all farmers can afford to own a head of animal, and even if the animal can be acquired, the problems of management, feeding, breeding, and health care are often limitations to its development. Feed comprises the largest cost in the production of either modern crossbred or indigenous breeds of pigs. Native pig raisers either feed indigenous feeds, commercial feeds or a combination of both.

Backyard farming has very low resources of labor and capital. Often, they are not able to derive a regular and adequate supply of food or an acceptable income and standard of living (FAO–UNESCO, 2002). This represents a vast scene of small farms with large populations of small farmers owning a few pig heads using low inputs and

*Corresponding Author's Email: jessejay_villanueva2001@yahoo.com

producing low outputs (Devendra, 1993). There is a constant struggle by man to produce enough food to meet the needs of its ever-expanding population. Animal are a valuable part of the food chain, they are sources of food of high nutritional value, and often use feeds which are not eaten by people (Warwick, 1979).

The primary purpose of this study therefore, is to obtain baseline information about specific aspects on Philippine native pig in the region. The areas addressed include management practices, feeds and feeding systems, marketing, and the farmers' general attitudes and perceptions as regards to native pigs as a potential vehicle for sustainable livelihoods.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in three regions of the country, one each in Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao. The selection of the region was based on the prevalence of native pig raisers, the information of which was obtained from the National Small Business Chamber (NSBC) or other National Agriculture Statistics Office (i.e. regional DA offices, PNAD). The sites of the study were the identified regions with the highest concentration of native pig raisers. From the selected regions, the multi-stage sampling procedure was used in the selection of the provinces, municipalities, and barangays to be covered by the study. The method followed was: from each region, two provinces with the highest concentration of native pig raisers were identified. From each province, two municipalities with the highest concentration of native pig raisers were determined, and from each municipality, two barangays with the highest concentration of native pig raisers were selected.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents were backyard native pig raisers. The list of native pig raisers was obtained from the Municipal Agriculture Office or from other sources (i.e. regional offices, PNAD). From the list, 10 backyard native pig raisers were randomly selected. In the absence of the list of native pig raisers, the respondents were purposively sampled. The total number of respondents was 240 backyard native pig raisers.

Data Gathering

The respondents were personally interviewed using either self-assisted or self-administered survey questionnaire translated in their local dialect. The data gathered include: profile of the respondents, production and management practices and reasons for each practice; feeds and feeding practices, marketing practices and reasons (i.e. market outlets) and socio-economic dimensions in raising native pigs. The respondents were briefed on the content of the questionnaire before they started to fill it out. The data from the answered questionnaires were consolidated, tabulated, and classified according to the parameters to describe the general characteristics of the respondents.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was used in this research study. Percentages were used as ratios to express how large or small one quantity is relative to another quantity. The percentage is equal to (Calmorin, 1994):

$$P = \frac{X}{N}(100\ \%)$$

Where X is the answer of the respondents, N is the total number of the respondents and 100% is constant.

Mean refers to the authentic balance point of a distribution of values obtained by dividing the sum of all values by the number of cases. The Mean is equal to (Calmorin, 1994):

$$X = \frac{\sum fM}{N}$$

Where X is the arithmetic mean, fM is the sum of the product of midpoints by frequencies and N is the total number of cases or observations.

Weighted mean was used in order to give the quantities being averaged their proper degree of importance. The weighted mean is equal to (Calmorin, 1994):

$$\bar{x}_w = \frac{\sum w\,(x)}{\sum w}$$

Where $\sum$ means add them up, w is the weights and x is the value.

Ranking was used to determine the relationship between a set of items such that, for any two items, the first is either 'ranked higher than', 'ranked lower than', or 'ranked equal to' the second (Calmorin, 1994).

Likert scale was also used to determine the sum of responses on several Likert items and the typical five-level Likert item format consist of (Rattray and Jones, 2007) : 5 (Strongly disagree), 4 (Disagree), 3 (Uncertain/Neutral), 2 (Agree), and 1 (Strongly agree).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents' Profile

Demographic characteristics. Table 1 shows the demographic profile of respondents from the three regions covered by the study. Majority (65.8%) of respondents were male and the remaining were female. Less than half (49.6%) belonged to the age bracket 41-60; another 45% fell in the age group 20-40 and very small percentage were aged 61 and above. The respondents in Visayas and Mindanao were older by six years with a mean age of 44

Table 1. Demographic profile of respondents.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)		TOTAL (N=240)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Gender								
Female	20	25.0	20	25.0	42	52.5	82	34.2
Male	60	75.0	60	75.0	38	47.5	158	65.8
Age range (yrs)								
20-40	48	60.0	30	37.5	30	46.2	108	45.0
41-60	32	40.0	44	55.0	43	53.8	119	49.6
61 and above	--	--	6	7.5	7	8.8	13	5.4
Mean	38		44		44.25		42.08	
Civil status								
Single	1	1.2	8	10.0	5	6.2	14	5.8
Married	79	98.8	66	82.5	73	91.2	218	90.8
Widowed	--	--	5	6.2	2	2.5	7	2.9
Separated	--	--	1	1.2	--	--	1	0.4
Educational attainment								
Elementary	33	41.2	32	40.0	47	58.8	112	46.7
Secondary	28	35.0	35	43.7	26	32.5	89	37.0
Tertiary	19	23.8	13	16.3	7	8.8	39	16.3
Household size								
1-5	53	66.2	45	56.2	52	65.0	150	62.5
6-10	27	33.8	35	43.8	28	35.0	90	37.5
Mean	4.69		5.19		4.75		4.88	

Table 2. Respondents' length of experience in raising native pigs.

RANGE (years)	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)		TOTAL (N=240)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
5 and below	12	15.0	38	47.5	10	12.5	60	25.0
6-10	18	22.5	28	35.8	29	36.2	75	31.2
11-15	13	16.2	4	5.0	26	32.5	43	17.9
16-20	10	12.5	2	2.5	5	6.2	17	7.1
21 and above	27	33.8	8	10.0	10	12.5	45	18.8
Mean	15.57		7.39		10.26		11.07	

and 44.25 years, respectively than those in Luzon having a mean age of 38 years. Majorities are married and slightly less than half finished elementary education. More than 60 of respondents have 1-5 household members.

Length of experience in pig raising. Across regions, one-third of the respondents have been into pig raising from 6-10 years (31.2%) while 18.8% were engaged in the activity for more than 20 years (Table 2). This suggests that native pig raising has been a backyard enterprise in the different regions of the country and has become a source of income among the members of the rural community. The respondents from Luzon had longer experience in raising native pigs with 15.57 years than those in Visayas (7.39 years) and Mindanao (10.26 years).

Sources of income and capital. Most of the respondents indicated that the major source of their income came from crops (45%) followed by livestock (29.6%) (Table 3). Others cited poultry (11.7%), wage

Table 3. Respondents' sources of income and capital in raising native pigs.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)		TOTAL (N=240)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Primary source of income								
Crop	40	50.0	35	43.8	33	41.2	108	45.0
Poultry	17	21.2	6	7.5	5	6.2	28	11.7
Livestock	16	20.0	24	30.0	31	38.8	71	29.6
Wages	6	7.5	15	18.7	11	13.8	32	13.3
Profession	1	1.3	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Initial capital (₱)								
1,000-5,000	53	66.2	80	100.0	77	96.2	210	87.5
5,001 -10,000	25	31.2	-	-	2	2.5	27	11.2
11,000-15,000	2	2.5	-	-	1	1.2	3	1.2
Mean	4,656.25		3,000.00		3,237.50		3,631.25	
Source of initial capital								
Crops	41	51.2	31	38.8	48	60.0	120	50.0
Livestock	16	20.0	5	6.2	3	3.8	24	10.0
Poultry	13	16.2	1	1.2	3	3.8	17	7.1
Credit/ lending	7	8.8	43	53.8	23	28.8	73	30.4
Income from driving motorcycle	3	3.8	-	-	3	3.8	6	2.5
Monthly income (₱)								
1,000-5,000	57	71.2	65	81.2	49	61.2	171	71.2
5,001-10,000	23	28.8	11	13.8	20	25.0	54	22.5
10,001-20,000	-	-	4	5.0	10	12.5	14	5.8
20,000 &above	-	-	-	-	1	1,2	1	0.4
Mean	4,293.75		4,218.75		5,556.25		4,689.58	

Table 4. Respondents' reason (s) and problems encountered in raising native pigs.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)		TOTAL (N=240)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Reasons for engaging in native pig raising								
For additional income	79	98.8	77	96.2	76	95.0	232	96.7
Family business	1	1.2	3	3.8	4	5.0	8	3.3
Problems encountered in native pig raising								
High cost of feeds	7	8.8	13	16.2	11	13.8	31	12.9
Low market price	13	16.2	4	5.0	17	21.2	34	14.2
Not enough capital	30	37.5	21	26.2	18	22.5	69	28.8
Lack of technical knowledge	21	26.2	26	32.5	16	20.0	63	26.2
Diseases	9	11.2	16	20.0	18	22.5	43	17.9

Table 5. Respondents' knowledge and information in native pig raising.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)		TOTAL (N=240)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Source of initial knowledge in native pig raising								
Parents	60	75.0	55	68.8	62	77.5	177	73.8
Books	-	-	-	-	1	1.2	1	0.4
Friends	20	25.0	25	31.2	17	21.2	62	25.8
Source of additional knowledge								
Extension workers	35	43.8	21	26.2	17	21.2	73	30.4
Books/pamphlets	-	-	9	11.2	6	7.5	15	6.2
Friends	35	43.8	43	53.8	46	57.5	124	51.7
Trainings/ seminars	10	12.5	7	8.8	11	13.8	28	11.7
Attended seminars on native pig raising								
Yes	31	38.8	18	22.5	16	20.0	65	27.1
No	49	61.2	62	77.5	64	80.0	175	72.9
If yes, sponsor of the seminar?	**(n =31)**		**(n =18)**		**(n =16)**		**(N =65)**	
Private companies	2	6.4	1	5.5	7	43.8	10	15.4
NGOs	5	16.1	4	22.2	-	-	0	13.8
Government	24	77.4	13	72.2	9	56.2	46	70.8
Visited by government extension workers?								
Yes	38	47.5	27	33.8	35	43.8	100	41.7
No	42	52.6	53	66.2	45	56.2	140	58.3
Visited by private extension workers?								
Yes	15	18.8	21	26.2	20	25.0	56	23.3
No	65	81.2	59	73.8	60	75.0	182	76.7

earner (13.3%) and practice of profession (0.4%). Results indicate that crop and livestock are the main sources of income and capital across regions of the country.

Majority has very small capital in native pig raising. Half of the respondents sourced their capital from livestock (50%) while another 30% derived capital from credit. About 71.2% of respondents earned a monthly income ranging from ₱1,000 to ₱5,000 and another 22.5% earned ranging from ₱5,000 to ₱10,000.

Reasons and problems encountered in raising native pigs. Majority (96.7%) of respondents across regions are engaged in native pig raising for additional income (Table 4). A few is into the business of native pig raising (3.3%). The most common problems encountered are inadequate capital (28.8%) and lack of technical knowledge (26.2%). Other problems include diseases (17.9%), low market price (14.2%) and high cost of feeds (12.9%). Similar to these findings are those mentioned by other livestock raisers that inadequacy of capital and lack of knowledge as major constraints in their enterprise.

Knowledge and information in native pig raising. Respondents mentioned that their knowledge and information on native pig raising came from their parents (73.8%) and a few others said it was from friends (25.8%) (Table 5). Friends and extension workers were the two top sources of additional knowledge and information about native pig raising with 51.7% and 30.4%, respectively. Trainings/seminars and books were also reported as

Table 5. Continued.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)		TOTAL (N=240)	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Information to learn								
Breeds	3	3.8	-	-	9	11.3	12	5.4
Disease prevention	26	32.5	28	35.0	27	33.8	81	33.8
Feeds/nutrition	16	20.0	21	26.2	8	10.0	45	18.8
Management practices	30	37.5	29	36.2	29	36.2	88	36.7
Marketing	5	6.2	2	2.5	7	8.8	14	5.8
Source of native pigs								
BAI breeding station	6	7.5	-	-	-	-	6	2.5
Agricultural institution	10	12.5	-	-	-	-	10	4.2
Commercial pig raisers	2	2.5	15	18.8	1	1.2	18	7.5
Other backyard raisers	62	77.5	65	81.2	79	98.8	206	85.8

sources of information. Majority (72.9%) of respondents had not attended any training on native pig raising. It was reported that if there were trainings or seminars, they were usually sponsored by the government (70.8%). More than half of the respondents had the chance to be visited by government extension workers while a bigger percentage said they were not visited by private extension workers (76.7%). Respondents also expressed the need to learn more about management practices and disease prevention (36.7% and 33.8%, respectively). Feeds or nutrition was another area they wanted to learn more. Marketing and breeding were cited the least among the information they wanted to learn. Majority of the respondents got their native pigs from other backyard raisers (85.8%). The remaining sourced their stock from commercial pig raisers, agricultural pig raisers and BAI breeding station in descending order.

Findings reveal that native pig raising is an activity that has been passed from parents to their children and that knowledge about this enterprise are mainly a product of an individual's interaction with family, friends and his community. It was also observed that respondents across regions follow conventional management practices in native pig raising.

Management Practices

Table 6 presents the knowledge on production and management practices in native pig raising. Data are shown in weighted mean with their corresponding descriptive ratings. Across regions, respondents strongly agree that raising pigs are mainly for sale while they agree that they raised pigs for food. It was also found that most of the respondents strongly agree that fathers and mothers are the one responsible for taking care of the pigs. In raising native pigs, respondents from Luzon agreed on complete confinement while those from Visayas and Mindanao were uncertain on both complete and semi-confinement systems. Among Visayas respondents, they strongly agree on the use of natural materials for walls, roofing and fencing. In terms of frequency of vaccination, respondents across regions disagree or were uncertain.

Respondents from Mindanao agree on the vaccination program for Hog Cholera while others from Luzon and Visayas were in strong disagreement to the different vaccination program for native pigs. In the practice of deworming, only Visayas respondents agree, while respondents from Luzon and Mindanao were uncertain. Respondents from all three regions were in disagreement in seeking the services of private and government veterinarians as well as pig owners for vaccination of native pigs. Meanwhile, respondents from Visayas and Mindanao were uncertain of consulting government veterinarians or piggery owners for vaccination. Respondents from Visayas agree in consulting government veterinarian while others either disagree or were uncertain. Luzon and Visayas respondents agree that scouring as the most common health problem while those from Visayas and Mindanao agree that it was pneumonia. Luzon respondents were uncertain on the process of cleaning while respondents from other regions agree to strongly agree for the processes of cleaning such as water,

Table 6. Respondents' knowledge on production and management practices in native pig raising.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)	
	WM	Scale	WM	Scale	WM	Scale
Raising native pigs						
As food	1.88	A	1.99	A	2.14	A
For sale of pig and products	1.71	SA	1.59	SA	1.55	SA
Take care of native pigs						
Grandparents	3.95	DA	4.24	SD	3.84	DA
Father	1.91	A	1.71	SA	1.74	SA
Mother	1.86	A	2.48	A	2.16	A
Children	2.91	U	3.00	U	3.05	U
Relatives	4.31	SD	2.33	U	2.96	U
System of raising						
Complete confinement	3.79	DA	2.69	U	3.16	U
Semi-confinement	3.69	DA	3.04	U	3.16	U
Range with shelter	3.53	DA	3.16	U	2.73	U
Range without shelter	4.01	DA	3.43	DA	3.00	U
Tethering	2.84	U	3.10	U	2.79	U
Materials for walls						
Natural	2.85	U	1.79	SA	1.68	SA
Commercial	3.96	DA	3.16	U	3.53	DA
Roofing materials						
Natural	2.66	U	1.74	SA	2.01	A
Commercial	3.89	DA	3.03	U	3.39	U
Materials for fencing						
Natural	2.94	U	1.74	SA	1.63	SA
Commercial	4.21	SD	3.10	U	3.65	DA
Frequency of Vaccination						
Once a year	4.53	SD	3.79	DA	2.74	U
Vaccination program						
Hog cholera	4.64	SD	3.28	U	2.51	A
Foot and mouth disease	4.81	SD	3.31	U	3.50	DA
Pneumonia	4.69	SD	3.29	DA	3.40	U
Deworming						
Natural	3.20	U	2.63	U	2.69	U
Commercial	3.10	U	2.38	A	3.00	U

Table 6. Continued.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)	
	WM	Scale	WM	Scale	WM	Scale
Person who vaccinate						
Private veterinarian	4.55	SD	3.49	DA	3.48	DA
Government veterinarian	3.70	DA	3.29	U	2.65	U
Piggery owner	4.16	DA	3.24	U	3.18	U
Consults the pig						
Nobody	3.40	U	3.25	U	2.98	U
Veterinarian	4.19	DA	2.76	U	4.21	SD
Government employee (DA)	3.23	U	1.90	A	3.18	U
Health problems						
Scouring	2.33	A	1.91	A	1.78	SA
Pneumonia	2.69	U	1.93	A	2.24	A
Process of cleaning						
Water only	3.34	U	1.76	SA	2.36	A
Scraping the feces	3.29	U	1.93	A	2.33	A
Water and scraping	3.28	U	1.65	SA	2.04	A
Pig feces						
Disposed	1.88	A	1.94	A	1.85	A
Treat	3.73	DA	3.51	DA	3.59	DA
Recycle	3.99	DA	3.28	U	3.26	U
Recording practices						
Farrowing time	3.55	DA	2.59	A	2.84	A
Feed consumption	4.01	DA	2.99	U	3.20	U
Health/Diseases	3.19	DA	2.74	A	3.29	U

Legend:
1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA)
1.81-2.60 – Agree (A)
2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U)
3.41-4.20 – Disagree (DA)
4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD)

scraping feces and combination. All respondents agree in disposing pigs' feces. On the other hand, they all disagree in treating pigs' feces. Recycling was a matter of uncertainty to disagreement among respondents across regions. Luzon respondents were in disagreement in recording farrowing, feed consumption and diseases. On the other hand, Visayas and Mindanao respondents agree on the practice of keeping farrowing records. Both groups were uncertain of recording feed consumption and health information while respondents from Visayas are in agreement in keeping records about health and diseases.

Findings are in agreement with Geromo (1993) who reported that most native pig raisers are generally poor and their means of livelihood is basically crop-based farming with the livestock integration as secondary source of income. In addition, majority of respondents across regions of the country follow the traditional management practices in native pig raising. Farmers kept pigs under their houses and other improvised shelter within the farm. They commonly fed their pigs twice daily with rice or corn bran mixed with farm products placed in improvised troughs made out of local materials. Improved practices are still not being adopted which could be attributed to the limited access to information and services about native pig raising.

Feeds and Feeding Practices

Respondents from the three regions agree on the use of farm products and by-products as feeds for native pigs (Table 7). However, they were not sure of scavenging as a form to feed their pigs. Most respondents across regions

Table 7. Respondents' knowledge on feeds and feeding practices in native pig raising.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)	
	WM	Scale	WM	Scale	WM	Scale
Feeds						
Commercial	3.48	DA	3.39	U	3.64	DA
Self-mixed	3.45	DA	2.11	A	2.70	U
Farm products	1.75	SA	1.59	SA	1.35	SA
Farm by-products	1.86	A	1.63	S	1.83	A
Domestic left-overs	2.08	A	1.90	A	3.30	U
Scavenging	2.99	U	3.29	U	2.74	U
Frequency of feeding						
Thrice a day	3.30	U	2.04	A	2.40	A
Twice a day	1.93	A	2.46	A	1.93	A
Once a day	3.86	DA	3.81	DA	3.89	DA
Only when feed is available	3.98	DA	3.61	DA	4.20	DA
Place to provide feed						
Feeding trough	1.73	SA	2.00	A	1.70	SA
Scattered on the ground	4.00	DA	3.58	DA	3.68	DA
Form of feeding						
Dry	3.84	DA	2.50	A	2.84	U
Wet	2.18	A	1.65	SA	1.36	SA
Combination	2.46	U	1.76	SA	2.76	U
Provide water in native pigs						
Never	3.66	DA	3.91	DA	3.91	DA
Once a day	3.66	DA	2.68	U	2.39	A
Occasionally	3.55	DA	3.33	U	3.36	U
Place to provide water						
Commercial water trough	4.10	DA	3.43	DA	3.70	DA
Improvised water trough	2.01	A	1.64	SA	2.19	A
Frequency of providing water						
Always	4.05	DA	3.23	U	2.28	A
Sometimes	3.46	DA	3.30	U	3.`9	U

Legend:
1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA)
1.81-2.60 – Agree (A)
2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U)
3.41-4.20 – Disagree (DA)
4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD)

agree on feeding their pigs from two to three times a day. Troughs are used in feeding the native pigs. The combination of wet and dry method is the common method of feeding and that they were uncertain whether water is provided. Improvised water troughs are used in providing water in uncertain frequencies. Data reveal that native pig raising in the country is still preferred especially in rural areas because they thrive and reproduce well under natural environment even with minimal cash input and management. However, the studies of Philippine native pigs are not conclusive because of the very limited information of the animals.

Marketing Practices

Table 8 shows the management practices of respondents across regions. Majority of respondents across regions agree in considering age and weight as bases for marketing native pigs. They also agree that selling is per weight and/or per head basis. Respondents from

Table 8. Respondents' knowledge on marketing practices in native pig raising.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)	
	WM	Scale	WM	Scale	WM	Scale
Basis of marketing						
Age	2.86	U	1.90	A	2.05	A
Weight	2.16	A	1.53	SA	1.51	SA
Methods of selling						
Per weight basis	2.76	U	1.63	SA	1.58	SA
Per head basis	2.43	A	2.08	A	2.14	A
Frequency of selling						
Every 3 months	3.40	U	3.03	U	2.48	A
Every 6 months	3.16	U	2.49	A	2.24	A
When there is a need	2.61	U	2.00	A	2.20	A
Place to sell						
Own farm	3.69	DA	2.29	A	2.29	A
Market (regular)	4.21	SD	2.44	A	2.84	U
Flea market	4.11	DA	3.09	U	3.60	DA
Neighborhood	3.01	U	2.65	U	2.86	U
Middlemen	2.31	A	3.03	U	2.38	A
Sets the price						
Owner	1.65	SA	1.43	SA	1.35	SA
Middlemen	3.86	DA	3.83	DA	3.73	DA
Buyers	3.80	DA	3.68	DA	3.50	DA
Prevailing market price	3.65	DA	1.80	SA	2.49	A
Demand for native pigs						
Very low	4.15	DA	3.29	U	2.66	U
Low	3.84	DA	2.41	A	2.70	U
Moderate	2.10	A	2.26	A	2.80	U
High	2.40	A	2.60	A	2.58	A
Very high	2.83	U	3.28	U	2.66	U
Methods to select pigs for sale/slaughter						
Age	2.16	A	1.85	A	1.91	A
Productivity	3.66	DA	2.30	A	2.16	A
Behavior	3.48	DA	3.01	U	3.26	U
Phenotypic characteristics	3.43	DA	3.05	U	3.20	U
By chance	3.26	U	3.70	DA	3.35	U

Table 8. Continued.

VARIABLE	LUZON (n = 80)		VISAYAS (n = 80)		MINDANAO (n = 80)	
	WM	Scale	WM	Scale	WM	Scale
Buyer's preference						
Body conformation	2.26	A	2.09	A	1.68	SA
Body size	1.68	SA	1.64	SA	1.69	SA
Color	3.78	DA	2.94	U	3.43	DA
Socioeconomic reasons						
As main source	2.58	A	2.59	A	2.00	A
As sideline to permanent job	2.21	A	2.19	A	1.91	A
As hobby or past time	3.11	U	2.50	A	2.21	A
Keep members busy	3.56	DA	2.74	U	2.55	A
Utilize existing building	3.81	DA	2.23	A	2.34	A

Legend:
1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA)
1.81-2.60 – Agree (A)
2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U)
3.41-4.20 – Disagree (DA)
4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD)

Mindanao agree that they sold their pigs every three and six months and whenever there is a need while those from Visayas sold their pigs every five months and when there is a need. Luzon respondents were uncertain on the frequency of selling their pigs.

The common places of selling pigs according to most of the respondents from the three regions are own farm and regular market while other respondents were uncertain whether they sold their pigs in flea market, neighborhood and middlemen. Respondents across regions agree that it is the owner who sets the price of their pigs while those from Visayas and Mindanao respondents strongly agree that prevailing market prices as the basis for setting the price in selling their pigs.

Moreover, all of the respondents disagree that middlemen and buyers set the selling price of their pigs. All respondents across regions agree that the demand for native pigs is high. Age and productivity are the common bases for selecting pigs for sale or slaughter across regions. Across regions, respondents agree to strongly agree on the use of body conformation and size as common preferences of buyers rather than color. In general, all respondents from the three regions agree that their reason for native pig raising is primarily because it is a source of income. Additional incomes, hobby, to keep family members busy and to utilize existing building are also some of socioeconomic reasons for engaging into native pig raising.

Results reveal the differences in marketing practices of native pig raisers in the country. This also implies the continuous existence of the Philippine native pig due to the current demand for pigs coupled with the support of the local government units through its dispersal program (Monleon, 2011).

CONCLUSION

Native pig raisers in the different regions of the country are still on a backyard scale and follow the conventional production and reproduction practices.

REFERENCES CITED

Calmorin LP (1994). Educational research measurement and evaluation. 2nd edition. 24k Printing Co., Inc. 33 Acebo St., Marulas Valenzuela, Metro Manila.

Devendra C (1993). Sustainable Animal Production from Small Farm Systems in South-East Asia. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

FAO–UNESCO (2002). Education for Rural Development in Asia: Experiences and Policy Lessons. Bangkok, Thailand. http://www.fao.org/sd/2002/KN1201en. htm:.

Geromo FB (1993). Survey and evaluation of indigenous pig production and management practices in the Zamboanga Peninsula [Philippines].

Monleon AM (2011). Local Conservation Efforts for the Philippine Native Pig (*Sus domesticus*) in Marinduque. Philippine Journal of Veterinary and Animal Sciences. 32(1).

Rattray J, Jones MC (2007). Essential elements of questionnaire design and development. Journal of clinical nursing, 16(2), 234-243.

Warwick EJ, Legates JE (1979). Breeding and improvement of farm animals (No. Ed. 7). McGraw-Hill Book Company.