

Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities

A Scientific Journal of Caraga State University



Editor-in-Chief

Sherryl L. Paz
Caraga State University, Philippines

**Editors**

Elizabeth P. Parac
Caraga State University, Philippines

Felmer S. Latayada
Caraga State University, Philippines

Jess H. Jumawan
Caraga State University, Philippines

Jonathan P. Manigo
Caraga State University, Philippines

Jan Rey M. Flores
Caraga State University, Philippines

Managing Editor

Chennie Solania-Naling

Editorial Assistant

Jeremie G. Moraleda

Editorial Adviser

Anthony M. Penaso

Joycelyn C. Jumawan

The journal, *Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities* (jASSH) is a peer-reviewed open-access journal, which publishes quality papers to promote scholarly discussion across a broad range of academic disciplines. It accepts submissions in any area within basic natural sciences, socio-environmental sciences, fishery, forestry, agri-forestry, minerals, eco-tourism, and humanities. The journal is in English and published biannually in both online and print versions. ASSH is one of the official research publication of the Caraga State University published by the University itself through the efforts of the Office of the Vice President for Research, Innovation and Extension.

Online Edition: E-ISSN 2408-3631 available at www.journal.carsu.edu.ph/index.php/assh
Print Edition: ISSN 2408-3623

Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities. Volume 4, Number 1, June 2022.

Articles published in this journal may be quoted without permission in other scholarly writing and in popular writing, as long as credit is given to the source. However, no article may be published in its entirety without written permission from jASSH.

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to: The Editor-in-Chief, *Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities*, Caraga State University, Ampayon, Butuan City, 8600 Philippines, or e-mail at jassh@carsu.edu.ph.

Subscription rates: Annual subscription for printed copies, rates are as follows: Institution (USD 40); Individual (USD 20). Rates are exclusive of mailing cost. To subscribe, kindly send your name and complete mailing address to: Research and Development Publication Office, Office of the Vice President for Research, Innovation and Extension, Caraga State University, Ampayon, Butuan City, 8600 Philippines, or e-mail at jassh@carsu.edu.ph.

Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities

Volume 4 | Issue 1 | June 2022



PRINT ISSN: 2408-3623 | ONLINE ISSN: 2408-3631 | www.journal.carsu.edu.ph/index.php/assh

Published in 2022 by the

Research and Development Publication Office
Office of the Vice President for Research, Innovation and Extension Caraga State University
Ampayon, Butuan City 8600, Philippines

Copyright © June 2022 by the Caraga State University-Main Campus.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities

Volume 4 | Issue 1 | June 2022



Title of Article

Page No.

Assessment of Philippine Native Pig (*Sus scrofa domesticus*) Raisers in selected Municipalities of Agusan del Sur, Philippines

1

Crishel S. Artiza, Chris Jiemel A. Menchavez, Kenneth Fel Collin L. Suase, and Jesse Jay O. Villanueva



Assessment of Philippine Native Pig (*Sus scrofa domestica*) Raisers in selected Municipalities of Agusan del Sur, Philippines

Crishel S. Artiza¹, Chris Jiemel A. Menchavez¹, Kenneth Fel Collin L. Suase¹, and Jesse Jay O. Villanueva^{1,2,*}

¹Department of Animal Science, College of Agriculture, Mindanao State University, Marawi City, Lanao del Sur, Philippines, 9700

²Graduate School, University of the Philippines Los Baños, College, Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines, 4031

ABSTRACT

The native pig raising in the Philippines is continuously increasing because of the market potential as additional income for backyard farmers. Most locations, particularly rural areas like Agusan del Sur, Philippines, have backyard pig breeding enterprises. This study aimed to obtain baseline information about the production, feeding, and marketing practices of native pig raisers in selected municipalities of Agusan del Sur. A total of 300 Philippine native pig raisers were personally interviewed using either a self-assisted or self-administered survey questionnaire. The random sampling procedure was used in selecting municipalities covered by the study. Descriptive statistics were used in this research study. The majority of respondents were male, in their productive age, married, finished secondary education and, with 1-5 household members. Across municipalities, respondents have been into native pig raising for at least five years. Moreover, respondents mentioned that native pig raising had been a traditional enterprise in their community. Common problems encountered include 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, the 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*

*Corresponding Author


*Email: jessejay.villanueva@gmail.com

Received: August 12, 2021

Revised: September 21, 2021

Accepted: May 18, 2022

Released Online: June 30, 2022

Copyright © June 2022, Caraga State University. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. 

Cite this article: Artiza, C. S., Menchavez, C. J. A., Suase, K. F. C. L., & Villanueva, J. J. O. (2022). Assessment of Philippine Native Pig (*Sus scrofa domestica*) Raisers in selected Municipalities of Agusan del Sur, Philippines. *Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities*, 4(1):1-17.

1 Introduction

Raising livestock particularly, native pigs, in addition to the planting field crops, is a significant source of livelihood in rural communities (Villanueva and Sulabo, 2018). As of 01 April 2021, the total swine inventory in the Philippines was estimated at 9.55 million heads (<https://psa.gov.ph/inventory>). The demand for the market of this animal commodity is continuously increasing. This is due to the love of meat products by local consumers in the Philippines. In a 2021 forecast, pork will be the most consumed type of meat in the Philippines at approximately 15 kilograms per person per annum (<https://www.statista.com/statistics>).

Backyard farming has meager resources of labor and capital. Often, it is not able to derive a regular and adequate supply of food or an acceptable income and standard of living (Huynh et al., 2006). This represents a vast scene of small farms with large populations of small farmers owning a few pig heads using low inputs and 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. Indigenous animals are a valuable part of the food chain since they are sources of food with high nutritional value, and often use feeds not eaten by people (Pond et al.,

2012; Oosting et al., 2021).

Many Filipino farmer households considered swine raising a popular business enterprise, practicing the activity as part of the farmers farming operations. The swine industry remains the dominant force in the Philippines meat industry, accounting for over 60 percent of the country's total meat demand. Smallholder pig raisers, however, keep the majority of pigs in the Philippines, accounting for around 65 percent of all pigs (<http://www.pcaarrd.dost.gov.ph/philippine-pork-to-the-world>). Native pig raising can be a lucrative business. Unfortunately, not all farmers can afford to own a head of an animal, and even if the animal can be acquired, the problems of management, feeding, breeding, and health care are often limitations to its development. However, at present, there is currently no update on the status of Philippine native pig raisers in Agusan del Sur. The significance of the present study will provide information and guide farmers in the proper management of raising Philippine native pigs. The findings will serve as a useful guide to government change agents, students, and future researchers in undertaking and implementing the operation to enhance a better production of Philippine native pigs.

This study aimed to obtain baseline information about specific aspects of Philippine native pigs in Agusan del Sur. The areas addressed include management practices, feeds and feeding systems, marketing, and the farmers' general attitudes and perceptions with regard to native pigs as a potential vehicle for sustainable livelihood.

2 Materials and Methods

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in 12 municipalities of Agusan del Sur, namely: Bayugan, Bunawan, Esperanza, Rosario, San Francisco, San Luis, Santa Josefa, Sibagat, Prosperidad, Talacogon, Trento, and Veruela, using a random sampling procedure.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents were backyard native pig raisers. The list of native pig raisers was obtained from the Municipal Agriculture Office and other sources (i.e., regional offices, Philippine Native Animal Development, or PNAD). Each town had at least 20 backyard native pig raisers chosen

at random. The respondents were purposefully sampled in the absence of a list of native pig raisers. A total of 300 backyard native pig raisers responded to the survey.

Data Gathering

The respondents were personally interviewed using either a self-assisted or self-administered survey questionnaire translated into their local dialect. The data gathered include: the 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 were used in this research study. Percentages were used as ratios to express how large or small one quantity is relative to another. 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 exact 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):

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

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 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.

The 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 consists of (Rattray and Jones, 2007): 5 (Strongly disagree), 4 (Disagree), 3 (Uncertain/Neutral), 2 (Agree), and 1 (Strongly agree).

3 Results and Discussion

Respondents' Profile

Demographic characteristics

Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents from the 12 municipalities of Agusan del Sur covered by the study. The majority (52%) of respondents were male, and the remaining were female (48%). Less than half (46%) belonged to the age bracket of 18-40 years old; another 44% belonged to the age bracket of 41-60 years old, and (10%) belonged to the age bracket 61 years old and above. The respondents in Bunawan and Talacogon were older by 16 years, with a mean age of 48 years, than those in Prosperidad, having a mean age of 32 years. The majority were married (75%), and more than half finished secondary education (54%). More than 40% of respondents have 1-5 household members.

Length of experience in pig raising

Among the selected municipalities, about 40% of the respondents were engaged in pig raising from 5 years and below, while 29% were engaged in pig raising from 6 to 10 years (Table 2). This suggests that native 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 Trento had more extended experience in raising native pigs with 11 years than other selected municipalities.

Source of income and capital

Most of the respondents indicated that the primary source of their income came from crops (30%), followed by an incurred wage (24%) (Table 3). Others cited motorcycle driving (20%), livestock (17%), practice of profession (5%), and poultry (3%). Results indicate that crop and incurred wages are the primary sources of income and capital among the selected municipalities. The majority (90%) of the respondents have minimal capital in native pig raising. Less than half of the respondents derived their capital from crops (31%), while (37%) derived their capital from unspecified sources. About 49% of respondents earned a monthly income ranging from ₱5,001 to ₱10,000, and another 33% earned a monthly income ranging from ₱10,001 to ₱20,000.

Reasons and problems encountered in raising native pigs

The majority (79%) of respondents from the selected municipalities were engaged in native pig raising for additional income (Table 4). Only 21% of the respondents were into the business. The three (3) most common problems encountered are the high cost of feeds (42%), not enough capital (24%), and diseases (21%). Other problems include low market price (9%) and lack of technical knowledge (4%). Similar to these findings are those mentioned by other livestock raisers that expensive feeds and capital inadequacy as significant constraints in their enterprise (Muhanguzi et al., 2012).

Knowledge and information in native pig raising

Table 5 shows that most respondents mentioned that their knowledge and information on native pig raising came from their parents (76%), and a few others said it was from friends (19%). Friends and training or seminars were the two top sources of additional knowledge and information about native pig raising with 88% and 8%, respectively. The majority (88%) of respondents had not attended any training or seminar on native pig raising. Less than half of the respondents had the chance to be visited by government extension workers (27%). At the same time, a bigger percentage said they

Table 1. Demographic profile of the respondents in selected municipalities of Agusan Del Sur, Philippines.

VARIABLES	Bayagan		Bunawan		Esperanza		Rosario		San Francisco		San Luis		Sibagat		Santa Josefa		Prosperidad		Talaogon		Trento		Veruela		TOTAL			
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=30	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=300	N=300		
Gender	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Male	10	50	15	75	13	65	9	36	15	60	12	60	14	56	14	47	14	56	12	60	16	46	13	37	157	52		
Female	10	50	5	25	7	35	16	64	10	40	8	40	11	44	16	53	11	44	8	40	19	54	22	63	143	48		
Age																												
18-40	8	40	9	45	10	50	12	48	17	68	11	55	16	64	8	27	21	84	8	40	10	29	8	23	138	46		
41-60	7	35	10	50	10	50	13	52	8	32	7	35	9	36	15	50	4	16	10	50	15	43	25	71	133	44		
61-above	5	25	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	10	-	-	7	23	-	-	2	10	10	29	2	6	29	10		
Mean	46		48		38		40		36		42		37		45		32		48		42		44		42			
Civil Status																												
Single	4	20	2	10	6	30	2	8	3	12	2	10	5	20	4	13	7	28	5	25	3	9	5	14	48	16		
Married	16	80	18	90	14	70	23	92	22	88	18	90	20	80	17	57	18	72	15	75	24	69	20	57	225	75		
Widowed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	30	-	-	-	-	8	22	8	23	25	8		
Separated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	2	1		
Educational Attainment																												
Elementary	6	30	7	35	7	35	15	60	6	24	8	40	9	36	9	30	10	40	4	20	9	25	9	26	99	33		
Secondary	14	70	10	50	11	55	9	36	15	60	10	50	9	36	14	47	12	48	16	80	23	66	20	57	163	54		
Tertiary	-	-	3	15	2	10	1	4	4	16	2	10	7	28	7	23	3	12	-	-	3	9	6	17	38	13		
Household Size																												
1-5	5	25	-	-	2	10	20	80	23	92	1	5	15	60	15	50	15	60	-	-	9	26	20	50	125	42		
6-10	11	55	12	60	12	60	5	20	2	8	9	45	9	36	8	27	9	36	10	50	14	40	8	27	109	36		
11-above	4	20	8	40	6	30	-	-	-	-	10	50	1	4	7	23	1	4	10	50	12	34	7	23	66	22		
Mean	13		12		12		4		3		13		5		4		5		13		7		4		8			

F - frequency

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

Range (years)	Bayugan		Bunawan		Esperanza		Rosario		San Francisco		San Luis		Sibagat		Santa Josefa		Prosperidad		Talakogon		Trento		Veruela		TOTAL	
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	N=300	N=300
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Gender																										
5-below	8	40	19	95	8	40	10	40	14	56	15	75	14	56	5	17	13	52	10	50	-	-	5	14	121	40
6-10	8	40	1	5	11	55	13	52	8	32	4	20	7	28	5	17	8	32	9	45	5	14	9	26	88	29
11-15	2	10	-	-	-	-	1	4	3	12	1	5	3	12	7	23	4	16	1	5	10	29	5	14	37	12
16-20	2	10	-	-	1	5	1	4	-	-	-	-	1	4	9	30	-	-	-	-	12	34	6	17	32	11
21-above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	13	-	-	-	-	8	23	10	29	22	8
Mean	10		5		9		6		6		6		6		8		7		7		11		7		7	

F - frequency

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan		Banawan		Esperanza		Rosario		San Francisco		San Luis		Sibagat		Santa Josefa		Prosperidad		Talaogon		Trento		Verruela		TOTAL			
	n=20	F %	n=20	F %	n=20	F %	n=25	F %	n=25	F %	n=20	F %	n=25	F %	n=30	F %	n=25	F %	n=20	F %	n=35	F %	n=35	F %	N=300	F %		
Primary Source of Income																												
Crop	5	25	4	20	6	30	7	28	4	16	11	55	10	40	15	50	3	12	-	-	15	43	10	29	90	30		
Poultry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	10	-	-	-	-	2	6	5	14	10	3		
Livestock	7	35	6	30	7	35	1	4	4	16	4	20	4	16	2	6	3	12	4	20	4	11	5	14	51	17		
Wages	6	30	5	25	3	15	9	36	6	24	2	10	-	-	5	17	7	28	10	50	10	29	10	29	73	24		
Profession	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	1	4	-	-	6	24	-	-	3	12	1	5	3	9	-	-	15	5		
Motorcycle	2	10	5	25	4	20	7	28	10	40	3	15	5	20	5	17	9	36	5	25	1	2	5	14	61	20		
Initial Capital (P)																												
600-5,000	20	100	20	100	20	100	24	96	23	92	20	100	20	80	23	77	22	88	20	100	29	83	30	86	271	90		
5001-10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	2	8	-	-	4	16	7	23	3	12	-	-	6	17	5	14	28	9		
10,001-15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1		
Mean	3,100		2,100		3,250		2,988		3,176		2,600		3,940		2,671		3,364		2,950		2,323		2,419		2,907			
Source of Initial Capital																												
Crops	7	35	4	20	9	45	7	28	4	16	10	50	7	28	15	50	1	4	-	-	15	43	15	43	94	31		
Livestock	3	15	2	10	3	15	-	-	2	8	2	10	1	4	2	7	-	-	2	10	4	11	5	14	26	9		
Poultry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	10	-	-	2	10	2	6	5	14	12	4		
Lending	4	20	6	30	-	-	1	4	1	4	-	-	5	20	-	-	11	44	4	20	10	29	-	-	42	14		
Motorcycle	1	5	-	-	-	-	3	12	3	12	-	-	2	8	-	-	1	4	2	10	3	9	-	-	15	5		
Others	5	25	8	40	8	40	14	56	15	60	8	40	10	40	10	33	12	48	10	50	1	3	10	29	111	37		
Monthly Income (P)																												
600-5,000	5	25	6	30	2	10	1	4	-	-	1	5	6	24	5	17	1	4	1	5	9	26	6	17	43	14		
5,001-10,000	9	45	13	65	8	40	11	44	14	56	6	30	8	32	15	50	13	52	9	45	20	57	20	57	146	49		
10,001-20,000	6	30	1	5	8	40	10	40	9	36	11	55	11	44	10	33	8	32	9	45	6	17	9	26	98	33		
20,000-above	-	-	-	-	2	10	3	12	2	8	2	10	-	-	-	-	3	12	1	5	-	-	-	-	13	4		
Mean	8,000		5,300		12,250		10,432		9,081		15,000		8,232		8,534		9,472		13,000		5,562		7,128		9,333			

F - frequency

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan	Bunawan	Esperanza	Rosario	San Francisco	San Luis	Sibagat	Santa Josefa	Prosperidad	Talacogon	Trento	Veruela	TOTAL														
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=25	n=30	n=25	n=20	n=35	n=35	N=300														
	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F														
Reasons for engaging in native pig raising																											
For additional income	10	50	20	100	16	80	24	25	83	19	76	13	65	28	80	25	71	236	79								
Family business	10	50	-	12	60	2	8	-	4	20	1	4	5	17	6	24	7	35	7	20	10	29	64	21			
Problems encountered in native pig raising																											
High cost of feed	17	85	8	40	10	50	2	8	6	24	10	50	4	16	15	50	4	16	20	100	18	51	12	34	126	42	
Low market price	1	5	3	15	1	5	-	2	8	1	5	1	4	3	10	2	8	-	8	-	5	14	7	20	26	9	
Not enough capital	1	5	8	40	7	35	10	40	11	44	9	45	2	8	4	13	9	36	-	-	7	20	5	14	73	24	
Lack of technical knowledge	-	-	-	-	1	5	-	-	1	4	-	1	4	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	3	9	11	4
Diseases	1	5	1	5	1	5	13	52	5	20	-	17	68	5	17	10	40	-	-	-	3	9	8	23	64	21	

F - frequency

Table 5. Respondent's knowledge and information in native pig raising.

VARIABLES	Bayugan	Bunawan	Esperanza	Rosario	San Francisco	San Luis	Sibagat	Santa Josefa	Prosperidad	Talacogon	Trento	Veruela	TOTAL														
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=25	n=30	n=25	n=20	n=35	n=35	N=300														
	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F														
Source of initial knowledge in native pig raising																											
Parents	20	100	14	70	18	90	8	32	10	40	14	70	12	48	20	66	13	52	16	80	30	86	27	77	202	67	
Friends	-	-	5	25	2	10	8	32	6	24	6	30	5	20	5	17	7	28	4	20	3	9	5	14	56	19	
Others	-	-	1	5	-	-	9	36	9	36	-	8	32	5	17	5	20	-	-	-	2	5	3	9	42	14	
Source of additional knowledge																											
Extension workers	20	100	20	100	20	100	24	96	23	92	20	100	20	80	23	77	22	88	20	100	29	83	30	86	271	90	
Friends	-	-	-	-	1	4	2	8	-	8	-	4	16	7	23	3	12	-	-	-	6	17	5	14	28	9	
Trainings/ seminars	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Internet	7	35	4	20	9	45	7	28	4	16	10	50	7	28	15	50	1	4	-	-	15	43	15	43	94	31	

F - frequency



Table 5. Respondent's knowledge and information in native pig raising (continuation).

VARIABLES	Bayugan		Bunawan		Esperanza		Rosario		San Francisco		San Luis		Sibagat		Santa Josefa		Prosperidad		Talaogon		Trento		Veruela		TOTAL		
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=30	n=25	n=20	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	N=300	F	%	F	%
Attended seminars on native pig raising																											
Yes	-	-	-	-	5	20	4	16	-	-	2	8	7	23	3	12	-	-	-	-	10	29	5	14	36	12	
No	20	100	20	100	20	80	21	84	20	100	23	92	23	77	22	88	20	100	25	71	30	86	264	88			
Visited by government extension workers																											
Yes	10	50	6	30	10	50	-	-	11	55	1	4	7	23	-	-	20	100	10	29	5	14	80	27			
No	10	50	14	70	10	50	25	100	9	45	24	96	23	77	25	100	-	-	25	71	30	86	220	73			
Visited by private extension workers																											
Yes	8	40	16	80	3	15	2	8	-	-	7	35	-	-	3	10	1	4	-	-	5	14	-	-	45	15	
No	12	60	4	20	17	85	23	92	25	100	13	65	25	100	27	90	24	96	20	100	30	86	35	100	255	85	
Information to learn																											
Breeds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	2	8	3	10	-	-	-	-	1	3	5	14	12	4		
Diseases prevention	-	-	2	10	4	20	11	44	5	20	-	-	15	60	16	53	19	76	-	-	26	74	23	65	121	40	
Feeds/nutrition	2	10	3	15	14	70	-	-	-	8	40	4	16	4	13	-	-	18	90	3	9	3	9	59	20		
Management practices	10	50	14	70	2	10	14	56	18	72	12	60	3	12	5	17	5	20	2	10	5	14	2	6	92	31	
Marketing	8	40	1	5	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	1	4	2	7	1	4	-	-	-	-	2	6	16	5		
Source of native pigs																											
Agricultural station	-	-	-	-	-	3	12	4	16	-	-	-	-	7	23	-	-	-	-	2	6	-	-	16	5		
Commercial pig raisers	-	-	-	-	-	6	24	1	4	-	-	3	12	-	-	10	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	7		
Backyard raisers	20	100	17	85	20	100	16	64	20	80	16	64	23	77	15	60	20	100	33	96	35	100	255	85			
BAI breeding station	-	-	3	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	3		

F - frequency; BAI - bureau of animal industry

were not visited by private extension workers (85%). Respondents also needed to learn more about disease prevention and management practices (40% and 31%, respectively). Feed or nutrition (20%) was another area they wanted to learn more about. Marketing (5%) and breeds (4%) were cited the least among the information they wanted to learn. Most of the respondents got their native pigs from other backyard raisers (85%). The remaining sourced their stock from commercial pig raisers (7%), agricultural pig raisers (5%), and the Bureau of Animal Industry or BAI breeding station (3%) in descending order.

Findings reveal that native pig raising is an activity passed from parents to their children and that knowledge about this enterprise is mainly a product of an individual's interaction with family, friends, and his community (Villanueva and Sulabo, 2018). 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. Respondents in all communities overwhelmingly agree that they keep pigs primarily for sale and food. It was also found that most of the respondents agree that fathers, mothers, and children take turns in taking care of the native pigs. In raising native pigs, respondents from selected municipalities agreed on tethering, and most of the respondents agreed on the use of natural materials for walls, roofing, and fencing. In terms of frequency of vaccination, respondents across municipalities agree and or disagree. Respondents from selected municipalities of Agusan del Sur disagree on the vaccination program for hog cholera and foot and mouth disease. In the practice of de-worming, respondents agreed on the use of commercially available anthelmintics. In contrast, other respondents were uncertain about using naturally available. Respondents from selected municipalities disagree in seeking the services of private veterinarians and are uncertain about the services of government veterinarians, while pig owners agree to vaccination of native pigs. Meanwhile, respondents from selected municipalities were uncertain of consulting government veterinarians for vaccination, while

others disagreed. Respondents in Agusan del Sur were uncertain that scouring and pneumonia are the most common health problems of their native pigs. Agusan del Sur respondents were uncertain about the process of cleaning, while other respondents agreed on the processes of cleaning, like the combination of water and scraping. On the other hand, they all disagree on treating and recycling pigs' feces. Agusan del Sur respondents disagree with recording feed consumption and health information, while respondents from the selected municipalities were uncertain about keeping records about farrowing time.

The findings agree with Geromo (1993) and Villanueva and Sulabo (2018), who reported that 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 selected municipalities of Agusan del Sur strongly agree on the use of farm products (corn, rice, soybean) and by-products (corn bran, rice bran, soybean meal) as feeds for native pigs (Table 7). However, they were not sure of scavenging as a form to feed their pigs. Most respondents across municipalities strongly agree on feeding their pigs three times a day. Troughs are used in feeding the native pigs. The combination of the wet and dry methods is the common method of feeding. Improvised water troughs are used to provide water in uncertain frequencies. Furthermore, most of the respondents from the selected municipalities disagree on feed supplementation practices in native pig raising. However, the studies of Philippine native pigs are not conclusive because of the very limited information on the animal (Villanueva and Sulabo, 2018).

Marketing Practices

Table 8 shows the marketing practices of respondents across Agusan del Sur. Most of respondents across municipalities agree and strongly agree with considering age and weight as bases for marketing native pigs, respectively. They also agree that selling is on a per weight and/or per head basis. Respondents from Agusan del Sur agree and strongly agree that they sell their pigs every three months and whenever there is a need, respectively.

The common places of selling pigs, according to most of the respondents from selected

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan n=20	Bunawan n=20	Esperanza n=20	Rosario n=25	San Francisco n=25	San Luis n=20	Sibagat n=25	Santa Josefa n=30	Prosperidad n=25	Talacogon n=20	Trento n=35	Veruela n=35	TOTAL N=300
Raising native pigs													
As food	3.05 U	2.55 A	2.55 A	2.20 A	2.48 A	2.25 A	1.60 SA	3.1 U	2.36 A	2.70 U	2.1 A	2.3 A	2.4 A
For sale	1.15 SA	1.10 SA	1.20 SA	2.32 A	1.80 SA	1.50 SA	2.68 U	2.0 A	2.16 A	1.20 SA	1.1 SA	2.1 A	1.7 SA
Take care of native pigs													
Grandparents	4.90 SD	4.95 SD	4.95 SD	4.32 SD	4.28 SD	4.90 SD	4.20 D	4.2 D	4.12 D	4.90 SD	4.6 SD	4.6 SD	4.6 SD
Father	1.10 SA	1.45 SA	1.50 SA	2.08 A	2.24 A	1.25 SA	2.68 U	3.8 D	2.60 A	1.90 A	3.7 D	3.7 U	2.3 A
Mother	1.40 SA	1.50 SA	1.00 SA	1.64 SA	1.92 A	1.60 SA	1.72 SA	4.0 D	1.76 SA	2.05 A	3.7 D	3.9 U	2.2 A
Children	2.15 A	2.55 A	2.40 A	3.64 D	3.00 U	1.25 SA	3.88 D	3.1 U	3.16 U	1.85 A	1.7 SA	2.2 A	2.6 A
Relatives	4.90 SD	4.85 SD	4.90 SD	4.84 SD	4.56 SD	4.70 SD	4.68 SD	3.3 U	4.68 SD	4.35 SD	3.0 U	3.5 D	4.4 U
System of raising													
Complete confinement	4.40 SD	4.15 D	4.80 SD	1.84 A	2.04 A	4.20 D	1.84 A	4.2 D	2.16 A	4.90 SD	4.1 D	3.7 D	3.5 D
Semi-confinement	3.70 D	2.65 U	3.50 D	1.92 A	2.20 A	3.60 D	2.12 A	3.8 D	2.32 A	4.05 D	2.8 U	2.9 U	2.9 U
Range with shelter	3.05 U	2.70 U	2.70 U	2.84 U	2.48 A	2.05 A	3.24 U	4.0 D	2.72 U	2.80 U	1.6 SA	1.6 SA	2.6 U
Range without shelter	3.60 D	4.15 D	4.25 SD	3.00 U	2.92 U	3.70 D	3.56 D	3.1 U	2.96 U	3.85 D	4.1 D	4.4 SD	3.6 D
Tethering	2.15 A	2.40 A	2.55 A	2.12 A	1.72 SA	2.30 A	2.44 A	3.3 U	2.36 A	1.45 SA	1.7 SA	2.0 A	2.2 SA
Materials for walls													
Natural	3.40 U	2.80 U	2.90 U	1.84 A	1.72 SA	2.80 U	1.96 A	1.3 SA	1.80 SA	4.00 D	1.6 SA	1.3 SA	2.3 A
Commercial	4.65 SD	4.90 SD	4.50 SD	1.64 SA	2.12 A	4.40 SD	2.00 A	2.9 U	2.20 A	4.55 SD	1.9 A	2.3 A	3.2 U
Roofing materials													
Natural	4.20 D	2.30 A	2.95 U	1.72 SA	1.84 A	2.45 A	1.96 A	2.5 A	1.92 A	2.75 U	1.3 SA	1.9 A	2.3 A
Commercial	4.60 SD	4.95 SD	4.25 SD	1.72 SA	2.12 A	4.50 SD	2.00 A	2.9 U	2.08 A	4.65 SD	1.9 A	1.7 A	3.1 U
Materials for fencing													
Natural	3.80 D	2.80 U	3.05 U	1.92 A	1.96 A	2.70 U	1.96 A	2.2 A	1.88 A	3.75 D	1.4 SA	2.1 SA	2.5 A
Commercial	4.50 SD	4.90 SD	4.80 SD	2.00 A	2.04 A	4.60 SD	2.16 A	2.8 U	2.08 A	4.55 SD	2.0 A	2.9 U	3.3 U

1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA); 1.81-2.60 – Agree (A); 2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U); 4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD); 3.41-4.20 – Disagree (D); W – weighted mean; S – scale

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan n=20		Banawan n=20		Esperanza n=20		Rosario n=25		San Francisco n=25		San Luis n=20		Sibagat n=25		Santa Josefa n=30		Prosperidad n=25		Talaogon n=20		Trento n=35		Veruela n=35		TOTAL N=300				
	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	
Frequency of vaccination																													
Once a year	1.00	SA	2.45	A	1.15	SA	3.12	U	3.08	U	2.50	A	2.96	U	3.4	U	3.12	U	1.95	A	2.4	A	2.4	A	3.6	D	2.6	A	
Every six months	4.20	D	3.90	DA	4.15	D	3.08	U	3.44	D	4.45	SD	3.24	U	3.4	U	3.52	D	4.10	D	2.7	U	3.3	U	3.6	D	3.6	D	
Vaccination program																													
Hog cholera	4.40	SD	4.80	SD	4.05	D	3.72	D	3.52	D	4.60	SD	3.76	D	2.5	A	3.72	D	3.90	D	1.5	SA	2.3	A	3.6	D	3.6	D	
FMD	4.40	SD	4.95	SD	4.10	D	3.60	D	3.36	U	4.45	SD	3.64	D	2.5	A	3.88	D	4.15	D	1.7	SA	1.9	A	3.6	D	3.6	D	
Pneumonia	4.40	SD	4.80	SD	3.45	SD	3.48	D	3.44	D	4.30	SD	3.52	D	1.8	SA	3.72	D	4.35	SD	1.6	SA	1.6	SA	3.4	U	3.4	U	
Deworming																													
Commercial	1.00	SA	1.05	SA	1.15	SA	1.56	SA	1.40	SA	1.60	SA	1.60	SA	1.1	SA	1.84	A	1.80	SA	1.0	SA	1.0	SA	1.3	SA	1.3	SA	
Natural	2.70	U	4.80	SD	4.05	D	3.28	U	3.24	U	3.60	D	3.56	D	2.5	A	3.20	U	4.35	SD	2.2	A	1.3	SA	3.2	U	3.2	U	
Persons who vaccinate																													
Private veterinarian	4.35	SD	2.60	A	4.20	D	3.88	D	4.04	D	4.85	SD	3.92	D	2.9	U	4.04	D	4.40	SD	3.1	U	2.4	A	3.7	D	3.7	D	
Government veterinarian	4.40	SD	4.35	SD	3.60	D	3.72	D	3.28	U	3.60	D	3.80	D	2.3	A	3.76	D	2.35	A	1.7	SA	2.1	A	3.2	U	3.2	U	
Piggery owner	1.20	SA	3.55	D	1.60	SA	3.12	U	2.84	U	1.90	A	3.08	U	3.4	U	3.36	U	2.10	A	2.1	A	2.9	U	2.6	A	2.6	A	
Visits the pig																													
Nobody	2.15	A	2.40	A	2.55	A	2.12	A	1.72	SA	2.30	A	2.44	A	3.3	U	2.36	A	1.45	SA	1.7	SA	2.0	A	2.2	SA	2.2	SA	
Veterinarian	1.05	SA	3.25	U	2.80	U	3.24	U	3.56	D	2.65	U	3.12	U	3.9	D	3.32	U	1.70	SA	3.9	D	3.9	D	3.0	U	3.0	U	
DA	4.40	SD	2.35	A	3.95	D	3.92	D	3.96	D	4.55	SD	3.92	D	3.0	U	3.80	D	4.15	D	3.2	U	3.2	U	3.7	D	3.7	D	
Health problems																													
Scouring	5.00	SD	5.00	SD	4.35	SD	2.68	U	2.48	A	4.74	SD	2.60	A	2.0	A	2.80	U	4.10	D	1.2	SA	1.5	SA	3.2	U	3.2	U	
Pneumonia	3.20	U	5.00	SD	3.85	D	2.36	A	2.48	A	4.25	SD	2.52	A	2.8	U	2.84	U	4.05	D	1.4	SA	2.1	A	3.1	U	3.1	U	
Process of cleaning																													
Water only	4.25	SD	3.20	U	4.45	SD	2.28	A	1.84	A	3.95	D	2.56	A	1.8	SA	2.16	A	4.40	SD	2.1	A	1.9	A	2.9	U	2.9	U	
Scrape the feces	1.35	A	2.35	A	1.15	SA	3.72	D	3.28	U	1.45	SA	4.00	D	4.3	SD	3.64	D	1.80	SA	3.4	U	3.5	D	2.8	U	2.8	U	
Water and Scrapping	3.80	D	2.70	U	4.35	SD	1.00	SA	1.08	SA	3.75	D	1.00	SA	1.0	SA	1.04	SA	3.70	D	1.1	SA	1.1	SA	2.1	A	2.1	A	

1.00-1.80 - Strongly Agree (SA); 1.81-2.60 - Agree (A); 2.61-3.40 - Uncertain (U); 4.21-5.00 - Strongly Disagree (SD); 3.41-4.20 - Disagree (D); W - weighted mean; S - scale; FMD - foot and mouth disease

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan n=20	Bunawan n=20	Esperanza n=20	Rosario n=25	San Francisco n=25	San Luis n=20	Sibagat n=25	Santa Josefa n=30	Prosperidad n=25	Talacogon n=20	Trento n=35	Veneria n=35	TOTAL N=300	
Pigs' feces	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S
Disposed	1.15 SA	2.10 A	1.00 SA	2.40 A	2.60 A	1.20 SA	2.56 A	3.3 U	2.88 U	1.65 SA	2.0 A	1.6 SA	2.0 A	
Treat	4.65 SD	3.80 D	4.65 SD	3.60 D	3.24 U	4.40 SD	3.80 D	3.5 D	3.32 U	4.55 SD	2.9 U	2.9 U	3.8 D	
Recycle	4.90 SD	4.45 SD	4.60 SD	3.36 U	3.32 U	4.85 SD	3.56 D	1.4 SA	3.28 U	4.90 SD	2.3 A	2.3 A	3.6 D	
Recording practices														
Farrowing time	2.60 A	3.70 D	3.00 U	3.48 D	3.04 U	4.15 D	3.64 D	1.8 SA	3.28 U	4.45 SD	2.0 A	2.0 A	3.1 U	
Feed consumption	5.00 SD	5.00 SD	4.90 SD	3.52 D	3.44 D	4.65 SD	3.72 D	3.8 D	3.40 U	4.70 SD	3.1 U	3.4 U	4.1 D	
Health/ disease	5.00 SD	5.00 SD	4.60 SD	3.76 D	3.76 D	4.90 SD	3.84 D	3.5 D	3.92 D	4.85 SD	2.9 U	3.3 U	4.1 D	

1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA); 1.81-2.60 – Agree (A); 2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U); 4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD); 3.41-4.20 – Disagree (D); W – weighted mean; S – scale

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan n=20	Bunawan n=20	Esperanza n=20	Rosario n=25	San Francisco n=25	San Luis n=20	Sibagat n=25	Santa Josefa n=30	Prosperidad n=25	Talacogon n=20	Trento n=35	Veneria n=35	TOTAL N=300	
Feeds in native pig	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S
Commercial feeds	3.05 U	3.05 U	2.50 A	1.56 SA	1.72 SA	2.30 A	1.96 A	2.4 A	2.16 A	1.95 A	2.0 A	3.2 U	2.3 A	
Self-mix	2.00 A	2.00 A	1.85 A	1.92 A	1.84 A	2.00 A	2.20 A	2.0 A	2.16 A	2.60 A	1.7 SA	3.1 U	2.1 A	
Farm products	1.10 SA	1.10 SA	1.10 SA	1.96 A	1.84 A	1.00 SA	1.88 A	1.7 SA	1.84 A	1.00 SA	1.5 SA	1.4 SA	1.5 SA	
Farm by-products	1.05 SA	1.05 SA	1.30 SA	2.08 A	1.84 A	1.00 SA	2.32 A	1.7 SA	2.04 A	1.00 SA	1.6 SA	1.3 SA	1.5 SA	
Domestic left-overs	1.05 SA	1.05 SA	1.40 SA	2.24 A	2.16 A	1.00 SA	2.20 A	3.4 U	2.32 A	1.00 SA	3.1 U	3.4 U	2.0 A	
Seavenging	3.55 D	3.55 D	3.55 D	2.60 A	2.68 U	2.70 U	2.76 U	4.3 SD	2.64 U	3.40 U	4.7 SD	4.7 SD	3.4 U	
Frequency of giving feeds														
Thrice per day	2.80 U	1.85 A	1.85 A	1.44 SA	1.56 SA	1.00 SA	1.52 SA	2.5 A	1.64 SA	1.15 SA	1.9 A	2.6 A	1.8 SA	
Twice per day	2.90 U	3.30 U	3.30 U	1.96 A	2.12 A	4.60 SD	2.20 A	2.2 A	2.16 A	3.70 D	1.9 A	2.1 A	2.7 U	
Once a day	4.80 SD	4.75 SD	4.85 SD	3.68 D	3.28 U	4.95 SD	4.00 D	3.7 D	3.52 D	5.00 SD	4.0 D	3.9 D	4.2 D	
Only when there is feedstuff available	5.00 SD	4.80 SD	4.85 SD	4.52 SD	4.24 SD	4.95 SD	4.72 SD	5.0 SD	4.60 SD	5.00 SD	4.7 SD	4.9 SD	4.7 SD	

1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA); 1.81-2.60 – Agree (A); 2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U); 4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD); 3.41-4.20 – Disagree (D); W – weighted mean; S – scale

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan		Bunawan		Esperanza		Rosario		San Francisco		San Luis		Sibagat		Santa Josefa		Prosperidad		Talaogon		Trento		Veruela		TOTAL			
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	N=300		
	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S		
Place to provide feeds																												
In feeding trough	1.00	SA	1.60	SA	1.10	SA	1.28	SA	1.32	SA	1.30	SA	1.40	SA	1.0	SA	1.56	SA	1.05	SA	1.0	SA	1.0	SA	1.0	SA	1.2	SA
Scattered in the ground	3.25	U	2.55	A	3.15	U	2.64	U	2.84	U	1.95	A	3.04	U	4.3	SD	2.88	U	2.05	A	3.9	D	4.5	SD	3.1	U		
Form of feeding																												
Dry feeding	2.00	A	1.60	SA	2.00	A	2.68	U	3.04	U	2.00	A	2.84	U	3.7	D	3.08	U	2.00	A	2.9	U	3.9	D	2.6	A		
Wet feeding	2.00	A	1.50	SA	2.00	A	1.36	SA	1.60	SA	2.00	A	1.48	SA	2.7	U	1.72	SA	2.00	A	2.0	A	1.8	SA	1.8	SA		
Combination	1.00	SA	1.10	SA	1.00	SA	2.40	A	2.08	A	1.00	SA	2.80	U	1.7	SA	2.24	A	1.00	SA	1.6	SA	1.3	SA	1.6	SA		
Provide water in native pigs																												
Never	4.90	SD	5.00	SD	5.00	SD	4.12	D	4.08	D	5.00	SD	4.36	SD	4.0	D	4.48	SD	5.00	SD	4.4	SD	3.0	U	4.4	SD		
Once a day	4.05	D	4.65	SD	4.40	SD	1.96	A	2.52	A	4.80	SD	2.12	A	2.7	U	2.52	A	4.40	SD	2.1	A	2.1	A	3.2	U		
Occasionally	1.00	SA	1.00	SA	1.05	SA	4.36	SD	4.08	D	1.00	A	4.64	SD	3.4	U	4.40	SD	1.00	SA	3.5	D	3.4	U	2.7	U		
Place to provide water																												
In commercial water trough	4.65	SD	4.60	SD	4.45	SD	1.88	A	2.20	A	4.95	SD	2.32	A	4.2	D	2.56	A	5.00	SD	3.5	D	4.1	D	3.7	D		
In improvised water trough	1.00	SA	1.20	SA	1.50	SA	1.96	A	1.76	SA	1.00	SA	2.08	A	1.5	SA	1.92	A	1.00	SA	1.1	SA	1.0	SA	1.4	SA		
Practice feed supplementation																												
Always	4.95	SD	4.95	SD	4.45	SD	3.12	U	2.88	U	4.55	SD	3.04	U	3.6	D	2.80	U	4.70	SD	2.6	A	3.6	D	3.8	D		
Sometimes	4.95	SD	4.95	SD	4.25	SD	3.16	U	3.12	U	4.00	D	3.28	U	2.4	A	3.32	U	4.65	SD	2.5	A	3.1	U	3.6	D		

1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA); 1.81-2.60 – Agree (A); 2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U); 4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD); 3.41-4.20 – Disagree (D); W – weighted mean; S – scale

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan		Bumawan		Esperanza		Rosario		San Francisco		San Luis		Sibagat		Santa Josefa		Prosperidad		Talakogon		Trento		Veruela		TOTAL			
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=30	n=25	n=20	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	N=300		
Process of marketing the native pigs	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S		
Age	2.20	A	1.75	SA	2.55	A	3.20	U	3.52	D	1.80	SA	3.12	U	3.2	U	2.96	U	1.65	SA	2.4	A	2.9	U	2.6	A		
Weight	1.20	SA	1.45	SA	1.40	SA	1.48	SA	1.32	SA	1.55	SA	1.36	SA	1.2	SA	1.28	SA	1.25	SA	1.3	SA	1.2	SA	1.3	SA	1.3	SA
Methods of selling the native pigs																												
Per weight Basis	1.40	SA	1.50	SA	1.25	SA	1.64	SA	1.40	SA	1.50	SA	1.76	SA	1.2	SA	1.60	SA	1.15	SA	1.0	SA	1.3	SA	1.4	SA		
Per head basis	1.40	SA	1.30	SA	1.65	SA	2.28	A	2.20	A	1.80	SA	2.44	A	3.0	U	2.36	A	1.70	SA	2.8	U	2.9	U	2.2	A		
Sells the native pig																												
Every three months	1.25	SA	1.75	SA	1.25	SA	3.16	U	3.28	U	1.65	SA	3.12	U	3.3	U	3.16	U	1.15	SA	3.2	U	3.5	D	2.5	A		
Every six months	2.75	U	4.10	D	3.75	D	3.36	U	3.20	U	3.65	D	3.08	U	3.2	U	3.04	U	4.45	SD	2.9	U	3.3	U	3.4	U		
When there is a need	2.15	A	1.25	SA	2.30	A	1.52	SA	1.56	SA	1.45	SA	1.52	SA	1.3	SA	1.64	SA	2.40	A	1.3	SA	1.3	SA	1.6	SA		
Place to sell the native pig																												
Own farm	1.20	SA	3.55	D	1.25	SA	2.24	A	2.44	A	2.00	A	2.32	A	2.3	A	2.52	A	1.35	SA	2.3	A	2.3	A	2.1	A		
Market (regular)	2.55	A	3.95	D	3.70	D	3.20	U	2.96	U	4.15	D	3.36	U	2.3	A	3.08	U	4.25	SD	2.2	A	2.2	A	3.2	U		
Flea market	2.60	A	3.10	U	3.75	D	2.88	U	3.16	U	4.00	D	3.08	U	3.8	D	3.28	U	3.50	D	3.5	D	3.5	D	3.3	U		
Neighborhood	2.30	A	2.00	A	2.75	U	2.32	A	2.68	U	1.80	SA	2.80	U	2.4	A	2.92	U	1.35	SA	1.6	SA	1.4	SA	2.2	A		
Middlemen	2.10	A	1.85	A	2.25	A	2.72	U	2.64	U	2.35	A	2.56	A	2.3	A	2.76	U	2.05	A	1.8	SA	3.1	U	2.4	A		
Sets the price of native pigs																												
Owner	1.20	SA	1.00	SA	1.40	SA	1.36	SA	1.60	SA	1.25	SA	1.48	SA	2.3	A	1.80	SA	1.05	SA	1.5	SA	1.7	SA	1.5	SA		
Middlemen	3.10	U	3.00	U	3.35	U	3.28	U	3.36	U	3.80	D	3.24	U	3.0	U	3.40	U	3.35	U	3.2	U	3.6	D	3.3	U		
Buyers	2.85	U	3.30	U	3.50	D	3.56	D	3.64	D	3.55	D	3.64	D	3.2	U	3.80	D	3.20	U	2.9	U	3.3	U	3.4	U		
Prevailing market price	2.95	U	3.70	D	3.05	U	3.80	D	3.60	D	3.80	D	3.92	D	1.9	A	3.68	D	3.45	D	1.7	SA	1.6	SA	3.1	U		

1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA); 1.81-2.60 – Agree (A); 2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U); 4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD); 3.41-4.20 – Disagree (D); W – weighted mean; S – scale

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan		Bunawan		Esperanza		Rosario		San Francisco		San Luis		Sibagat		Santa Josefa		Prosperidad		Talaogon		Trento		Vernela		TOTAL	
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=30	n=25	n=20	n=35	n=35	N=300	W	S	W	S	W
Demand for native pig in your area	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S
Age	2.20	A	1.75	SA	2.55	A	3.20	U	3.52	D	1.80	SA	3.12	U	3.2	U	2.96	U	1.65	SA	2.4	A	2.9	U	2.6	A
Weight	1.20	SA	1.45	SA	1.40	SA	1.48	SA	1.32	SA	1.55	SA	1.36	SA	1.2	SA	1.28	SA	1.25	SA	1.3	SA	1.2	SA	1.3	SA
Methods of selling the native pigs	4.70	SD	2.70	U	4.60	SD	1.76	SA	1.72	SA	3.95	D	1.88	A	1.2	SA	1.88	A	4.65	SD	1.2	SA	1.8	SA	2.7	U
Very low	1.40	SA	1.45	SA	1.60	SA	2.84	U	2.80	U	1.75	SA	2.84	U	2.1	A	2.92	U	1.45	SA	1.8	SA	2.2	A	2.1	A
Low	1.35	SA	1.55	SA	1.50	SA	3.04	U	3.00	U	2.35	A	2.96	U	2.7	U	3.08	U	1.35	SA	2.8	U	2.8	U	2.4	A
Moderate	3.65	D	4.10	D	4.00	D	3.76	D	3.76	D	4.50	SD	3.44	D	3.5	D	3.52	D	3.80	D	4.3	SD	3.5	D	3.8	D
High	3.95	D	4.45	SD	4.30	SD	4.24	SD	4.12	D	4.85	SD	4.08	D	4.6	SD	4.00	D	4.55	SD	4.8	SD	4.8	SD	4.4	SD
Methods to select which native pig to be sold or slaughtered	1.00	SA	1.30	SA	1.15	SA	2.72	U	3.28	U	1.45	SA	2.68	U	2.2	A	3.00	U	1.00	SA	2.0	A	2.2	A	1.9	A
Age	3.50	D	2.95	U	3.15	U	2.04	A	2.32	A	2.60	A	2.36	A	1.7	SA	2.40	A	2.95	U	1.3	SA	1.3	SA	2.4	A
Productivity	4.25	SD	3.25	U	3.40	U	3.04	U	3.00	U	4.65	SD	3.08	U	1.4	SA	2.88	U	3.80	D	1.6	SA	2.7	U	3.1	U
Behavior	5.00	SD	3.90	D	4.50	SD	2.52	A	2.44	A	4.85	SD	2.76	U	2.2	A	2.64	U	4.85	SD	2.2	A	2.4	A	3.3	U
Phenotypic characteristics	2.05	A	2.25	A	2.35	A	2.24	A	2.24	A	1.55	SA	2.44	A	1.2	SA	2.24	A	1.90	A	1.4	SA	2.3	A	2.0	A
By chance only	1.70	SA	1.60	SA	1.15	SA	2.04	A	2.04	A	1.30	SA	2.00	A	1.2	SA	2.16	A	1.00	SA	1.2	SA	1.1	SA	1.5	SA
Buyers' preferences in native pigs	1.00	SA	1.05	SA	1.20	SA	1.56	SA	1.68	SA	1.30	SA	2.04	A	1.3	SA	2.04	A	1.00	SA	1.4	SA	1.4	SA	1.4	SA
Body conformation	4.80	SD	3.55	D	4.45	SD	3.28	U	3.40	U	4.50	SD	3.20	U	2.2	A	3.48	D	4.60	SD	2.2	A	2.7	U	3.5	D
Body size																										
Color																										

1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA); 1.81-2.60 – Agree (A); 2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U); 3.41-4.20 – Strongly Disagree (SD); 4.21-5.00 – Disagree (D); W – weighted mean; S – scale

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

VARIABLES	Bayugan		Bunawan		Esperanza		Rosario		San Francisco		San Luis		Sibagat		Santa Josefa		Talaogon		Trento		Veruela		TOTAL			
	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=20	n=20	n=25	n=25	n=25	n=30	n=20	n=35	n=35	n=35	n=35	N=300	N=300			
	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S		
Socio-economic reasons																										
As main source of income	2.20	A	1.75	SA	2.55	A	3.20	U	3.52	D	1.80	SA	3.12	U	3.2	U	2.96	U	1.65	SA	2.4	A	2.9	U	2.6	A
As sideline to permanent job	1.20	SA	1.45	SA	1.40	SA	1.48	SA	1.32	SA	1.55	SA	1.36	SA	1.2	SA	1.28	SA	1.25	SA	1.3	SA	1.2	SA	1.3	SA
As hobby or past time	4.70	SD	2.70	U	4.60	SD	1.76	SA	1.72	SA	3.95	D	1.88	A	1.2	SA	1.88	A	4.65	SD	1.2	SA	1.8	SA	2.7	U
Keep members busy	1.40	SA	1.45	SA	1.60	SA	2.84	U	2.80	U	1.75	SA	2.84	U	2.1	A	2.92	U	1.45	SA	1.8	SA	2.2	A	2.1	A
Utilize existing building	1.35	SA	1.55	SA	1.50	SA	3.04	U	3.00	U	2.35	A	2.96	U	2.7	U	3.08	U	1.35	SA	2.8	U	2.8	U	2.4	A
Utilize extra area into profitable enterprise																										

1.00-1.80 – Strongly Agree (SA); 1.81-2.60 – Agree (A); 2.61-3.40 – Uncertain (U); 4.21-5.00 – Strongly Disagree (SD); 3.41-4.20 – Disagree (D); W – weighted mean; S – scale

municipalities, are their own farms, neighborhoods and, middlemen, while other respondents were uncertain whether they sell their pigs in the flea markets and regular markets. Respondents across municipalities strongly agreed that it was the owner who would set the price of their pigs, while other respondents were uncertain. All respondents across municipalities agree that the demand for native pigs is low and moderate. Age, productivity, and by chance are the common bases for selecting pigs for sale or slaughter across municipalities. Across municipalities, respondents strongly agree on the use of body conformation and size as common preferences of buyers rather than color. In general, all respondents from Agusan del Sur agree to strongly agree that their reason for native pig raising is primary because it is a source of income and sideline to their permanent job. Additional incomes, hobbies, keeping family members busy, and utilizing existing buildings are also some of the socioeconomic reasons for engaging in native pig raising.

Results revealed the differences in marketing practices of native pig raisers in the country. This also implies the continued 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, 2006; Villanueva and Sulabo, 2018).

4 Conclusions and Recommendations

Philippine native pig raisers in Agusan del Sur's selected municipalities are still operating on a small scale, employing traditional production methods for feeds and feeding, housing, breeding, health and disease prevention, and marketing. It is also suggested that funds be allocated to research and development (R&D) projects in order to improve the country's native pig. Native pigs in the Philippines provide a lot of benefits in terms of extra money, high-quality protein food, and socio-cultural and economic services.

5 Statement of Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

6 Literature Cited

- Calmorin, L. (1994). Educational research measurement and evaluation 24K Printing Co. Inc., Valenzuela, MMP **26**, 27, (1-293)
- Devendra, C. (1993). Sustainable animal production from small farm systems in South-East Asia (No. 106). Food & Agriculture Organization, 1-143.
- Geromo, F. B. (1993). Survey and evaluation of indigenous pig production and management practices in the Zamboanga Peninsula [Philippines], Food & Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 1-126.
- Huynh, T. T. T., Aarnink, A. J. A., Drucker, A., & Verstege, M. W. A. (2006). Pig production in Cambodia, Laos, Philippines, and Vietnam: a review. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Development*, **3** (1362-2016-107621), 69-90.
- Monleon, A. M. (2006). Local conservation efforts for the Philippine native pig (*Sus domesticus*) in Marinduque. *Philippine Journal of Veterinary and Animal Sciences*, **32**(1), 1-1.
- Muhanguzi, D., Lutwama, V., & Mwiine, F. N. (2012). Factors that influence pig production in Central Uganda-Case study of Nangabo Sub-County, Wakiso district. *Veterinary World*, **5**(6), 346-51.
- Oosting, S., van der Lee, J., Verdegem, M., de Vries, M., Vernooij, A., Bonilla-Cedrez, C., & Kabir, K. (2021). Farmed animal production in tropical circular food systems. *Food Security*, 1-20.
- Pond, W. G., Church, D. B., Pond, K. R., & Schoknecht, P. A. (2004). Basic animal nutrition and feeding. John Wiley & Sons, 1-608.
- Rattray, J., & Jones, M. C. (2007). Essential elements of questionnaire design and development. *Journal of clinical nursing*, **16**(2), 234-243.
- Villanueva, J. J. O., & Sulabo, R. C. (2018). Production, Feeding and Marketing Practices of Native Pig Raisers in Selected Regions of the Philippines. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Agricultural Science*, **7**(12), 383-392.
- <https://psa.gov.ph/inventory>
- <https://www.statista.com/statistics>
- <http://www.pcaarrd.dost.gov.ph/philippine-pork-to-the-world>

The journal, *Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities* would like to thank the following reviewers who were instrumental in ensuring quality, clarity and consistency among papers included in this issue:

TOMAS M. AUSTRAL, PhD
Caraga State University
Ampayon, Butuan City, Philippines

JOHN MARK RAMADA, PhD
Caraga State University
Ampayon, Butuan City, Philippines

Guidelines to Author/s:

•All submissions shall be submitted through the journal's official website: www.journal.carsu.edu.ph/index.php/assh and shall include the following as attachments (in word format):

1. Full manuscript with figures and tables. It is advised that figures and tables generated from excel should be left as is in excel. Likewise, pictures should be in their original (raw) format. This is to be emailed to jassh@carsu.edu.ph after the acceptance of the paper.
2. Contact details of the senior author with complete contact information (full name with title, affiliation, telephone number and e-mail address).

Incomplete submissions will not be reviewed.

•Abbreviate units of measure when used only with numerals. For example, used L for liter (1 L for 1 liter) and % instead of percent (10% for 10 percent).

•Reviews of previous works that deserve to be published but cannot be justified as full-length articles can be published as research notes. Its contents should follow the sections of a full-length article but only limited to 4 printed pages.

Manuscript format

Full manuscript should be written in an A4 sized document. The title page includes the title, name of the author/s and addresses. The title should not exceed 250 characters, without active verbs, abbreviations, and punctuation marks. Write the full name of each author (if more than 1 author). Give the contact address, phone number, and e-mail address of the corresponding author to whom inquiries regarding the paper should be sent.

The abstract should follow the title of the manuscript and be written in one paragraph, not to exceed 250 words. It should summarize the background of the work, the major findings, and the implications of the results or the conclusions. Citation of references and use of acronyms are not allowed. Since the abstract will be indexed by indexing services, it should capture the main content of the paper to be intelligible without the text. On the bottom of the page, at most six keywords that reflect the content of the paper should be listed.

The main text should include the introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion. (Exception to this are researches that are theoretical in nature). They may be written as headings of separate sections or as an integrated text with appropriate headings suitable to the discipline. Headings and subheadings should be aligned to the left side of the page and set in bold face and italics. The main text of the manuscript should be written in this order:

- Introduction
- Materials and Methods
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusion
- Acknowledgement (if necessary)
- Statement of No Conflict of Interest

All literature citations will follow the APA format.



Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities

Volume 4 | Issue 1 | June 2022

CONTENT

*Assessment of Philippine Native Pig (*Sus scrofa domestica*) Raisers in selected Municipalities of Agusan del Sur, Philippines*

*Crishel S. Artiza, Chris Jiemel A. Menchavez, Kenneth Fel Collin L. Suase,
and Jesse Jay O. Villanueva*



CARAGA STATE UNIVERSITY

Ampayon, Butuan City, Agusan del Norte, 8600

Published in June 2022