



**BUSITEMA
UNIVERSITY**
Pursuing Excellence

**FACTORS HINDERING ADOPTION OF INTENSIVE SWINE PRODUCTION IN SEMUTO
SUB COUNTY NAKASEKE DISTRICT**

BY

NABASIRYE STELLA

BU/UG/2012/46

888nabasirye@gmail.com



**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE AND ANIMAL
SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF
THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ANIMAL PRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT OF
BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY**

JUNE2015

DECLARATION

I NABASIRYE STELLA, declare that this dissertation is original and has not previously been submitted to another university or any institution of higher learning for any academic award.

Signature .....Date 23/06/2015

This dissertation has been submitted for examination with the approval of my supervisor

Ms. AKURUT IMMACULATE

Faculty of Agriculture and Animal Sciences

Busitema University

Signature .....Date 23/06/15



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I take this opportunity to extend my gratitude to the Almighty God for the gift of life all through.

Sincere appreciation goes to my parents Mr.Sseruwagi Joe, Ms.Nagayi Margret and Mr.Sekajja Abu Baker for their unending care, love and support all this far and to my brothers and sisters for their words of encouragement.

I also acknowledge the work done by, Ms.Akurut Immaculate in order for me to complete this report, I extend my appreciation to my beloved lecturers for the knowledge rendered, all my friends and colleagues who were always there for me in case of any help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	i
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF ACRONYMES	vii
RECOMMENDATIONS	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background	1
1.3. General objective.....	2
1.4. Specific objectives.....	2
1.5. Research Questions	2
1.6. Significance of study	2
1.7. Justification	3
1.8. Scope	3
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.0. INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.1. Over view of intensive swine production.....	4
2.3 Swine production in the world	5
2.4 Swine production in Africa	7
2.5 Swine production in Uganda	8
2.6 Common swine production systems.....	9
2.9 Adoption process and Factors Affecting Adoption.....	11
2.10. Constraints to intensive swine production Adoption in Uganda	12
CHAPTER THREE:.....	14
3.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS	14
3.2 Research approach.....	14
3.3 Sampling design	14
3.3.1. Sample size determination.....	14
3.3.2 Sampling procedure.....	15
3.5 Observational design.....	15
3.6 Statistical design.....	15
3.7 Data presentation.....	16
3.8 Ethical consideration	16

3.9 Environmental concern.....	16
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS.....	17
Respondents' Bio data.....	17
4.7 Prevailing pig rearing systems	20
4.8 Breeds of pigs reared.....	21
4.10 Advantages of adoption of intensive swine production.....	21
4.12 Factors hindering adoption of intensive swine production.....	23
CHAPTER FIVE.....	25
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	25
CHAPTER SIX; CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
CONCLUSION	30
RECOMMENDATIONS	30
REFERENCES.....	31
APPENDICES.....	36
APPENDIX I: MAP OF NAKASEKE DISTRICT SHOWING DIFFERENT SUBCOUNTIES.....	36
APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 sex categories of the respondents.....	17
Table 2 Age of respondents.....	17
Table 3 Pig rearing experience of the respondents.....	20
Table 4 shows advantages of intensive swine production as given by farmers.....	22
Table 5 Challenges that affects the adopting of intensive rearing of pigs.....	23
Table 6 showing relationship between selected independent variables with adoption of intensive swine production.....	23

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 shows marital status of respondents.....	18
Figure 2 shows pig rearing systems by respondents.....	18
Figure 3 shows pig breeds reared.....	19
Figure 4 shows what was done by farmers in case of disease outbreak	22

LIST OF ACRONYMES

MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries
Dr.	Doctor
GDP	Growth Domestic Product
E.T.C	And so on
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United States
SSA	Sub Saharan Africa
NAADs	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NGOs	Non-Government Organization
UBOS	Uganda bureau of statistics
NARO	National Agricultural Research Organization
MFPED	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goal

ABSTRACT

Although the government has on several occasions tried to promote modern commercial oriented agriculture in Uganda, many pig farmers still rear pigs using less productive traditional methods. A study was carried out from February-May 2015 in Semuto Sub County to find out the factors hindering the adoption of intensive swine production; with major emphasis put on socio-economic, health factors and the prevailing swine rearing systems. Two villages from four parishes were randomly selected and 12 pig rearing households per village were also randomly selected.

The study concluded that, the social economic factors hindering intensive production significantly included high feed costs, ($P=6.01947E^{-06}$), insufficient capital ($P=0.0432$), inaccessibility of high yielding pig breeds ($P= 0.003838$), insufficient veterinary and extension services however statistically, this was not significant ($P=0.1087$). Lack of general knowledge regarding the system and poor pig marketing structures were also pointed out by 3.13% and 8.33% by the farmers respectively.

Among the health factors, 26.04% of respondents pointed out fear of outbreak of a disease in a confined pig population as the reason why they were not adopting intensive swine production and this had a statistical significance of $P=0.0432$.

The prevailing pig production systems were the extensive type (70.5%), semi intensive system (8.9%), and intensive system (18.8 %).

RECOMMENDATIONS

It was therefore recommended that the government of Uganda or MAAIF should develop policies and guidelines on credit accessibility, financial and agricultural extension services that favour or tailored to the rural poor if they are to take off through pig production as an industry

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

In Uganda, agriculture is characterized by low productivity, MAAIF (2012) with economy and resource base driven by subsistence agricultural production, FAO (2009) characterised by 80% of the population depending on agriculture for food, employment and income (Shivel and Hall, 2012)

Livestock production contributes about 17 percent of agricultural GDP, representing about 7.5 percent of total GDP (Byarugaba, 2007). In 2006, Adejoro reported that one, of the policies by the government to increase the production of food of animal origin was to encourage private sector economy to focus on production of swine. This is because swine production requires little financial capital investment (Ezeibe, 2010). Swine also enables diversification and livelihood security of smallholder and poor households (Waiswa, 2005)

Modern farming methods matter for smallholder agricultural productivity and food security. Adoption of improved agricultural technologies has also been associated with; higher earnings and lower poverty (Kassie *et al.*, 2011; Minten *et al.*, 2007), and improved nutritional status (Kumar and Quisumbing, 2010).According to World Development Report, (2008), the adoption of improved agricultural technology at the global level is being viewed as a way of reducing extreme poverty and hunger .This is in line with the Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture 2000 (PMA) having 'poverty eradication' as its main goal. MAAIF and MFPED (2000) focus on reorientation of farmers towards commercial agriculture. From 2008, farmers under NAADS programme in Uganda were given the freedom to procure inputs locally, MAAIF, (2010) in order to increase farmer access to productivity enhancing technologies. (MFPED, 2011).

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

REFERENCES

1. Ankinola, A.A and Young,T. (1985). "A study of the use of Cocoa spraying chemicals among Nigerian Farmers." Oxford Agrarian studies, Institute of Agricultural Economics, 54:32-35. University of Oxford.
2. Antwi, M., Seahlodi, P., 2011. Marketing constraints facing emerging small-scale pig farmers in Gauteng Province, South Africa. *J. Hum. Ecol.* 36 (1), 37 – 42.
3. Basu, A.C. (1969). "The Relationship of farmer Characteristics to the Adoption of Farm Practices in four villages of Western State of Nigeria". *Bulletin of Rural Economics and Sociology* 4: 76 - 95.
4. Bhalla, S. (1979): "Farm and technical change in Indian Agriculture". *An Agrarian Structure and Productivity in Developing Countries*. Edited by Berry, R. et al. Johns Hopkins University Press.
5. Binswanger, H.P., 1974, A microeconomic approach to induced innovation, *Economic Journal* 84(336), 940–958.
6. Brade, M.A., Edwards, S.A. and Riley, J.E. (1986) The commercial application of electronic sow Identification and feeding systems in the UK. *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting EAAP*, Budapest, Hungary.
7. Bruce, J.M. (1981) Ventilation and temperature control criteria for pigs. In: *Environmental Aspects of Housing for Animal Production*. Ed. J.A. Clark, Butterworths, London. pp 197-216.
8. Bruce, J.M. (1990) Straw-Flow: a high welfare system for pigs. *Farm Buildings Progress* 102: 9-13.
9. Bruce, J.M. and Clark, J.J. (1979) Models of heat production and critical temperature for growing pigs. *Animal Production* 28: 353-369.
10. Characterisation of smallholder pig production in Kikuyu Division, Central Kenya. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 63 (3/4), 183 – 195, doi:10.1016/0167-5877(04)00071-6.

11. CIMMYT Economics Program (1993). *The Adoption of Technology: A guide for Survey Design*: Mexico DF: CIMMYT, The United Republic of Tanzania and the Southern Africa Centre for Cooperation in Agricultural Research (SACCAR). Mc-Graw Hill Inc.
12. Conley T & Udry C. 2001. Social learning through networks: the adoption of new agricultural technologies in Ghana. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 83(3): 668–73.
13. David Sunding and David Zilberman (2000). *Agricultural and Resource Economics*, University of California at Berkeley, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics.
14. Edwards, S.A. and Robinson, A. (1988) Group housing systems for sows. Technical Note T119, Scottish Agricultural Colleges, Perth.
15. Engering, A., Hogerwerf, L. & Slingenbergh, J. 2013. Pathogen–host–environment interplay and disease emergence. *Emerging Microbes and Infections*, 2: e5. <http://www.nature.com/emi/journal/v2/n2/full/emi20135a.html> (accessed 02 November 6, 2014)
16. FAO, 2012c. Pig sector Kenya. FAO Animal Production and Health Livestock Country Reviews. No 3. Rome.
17. FAO. 2011b. World Livestock 2011 – Livestock in food security. Rome. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/i2373e/i2373e00.htm> (accessed 05 November 2014)
18. FAOSTAT, 2011. <http://faostat.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx>.
19. Feder G, Just R & Zilberman D. 1985. Adoption of agricultural innovations in developing countries: a survey. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 33: 255–98.
20. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations/World Organisation for Animal Health/World Bank, 2010. Good practices for biosecurity in the pig sector – issues and options in developing and transition countries. FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 169. Rome, FAO.
21. Frädrieh, H. (1974) A comparison of behaviour in Suidae. *IUCN Publ New Series* 24: 133-143.
22. Ganaba, R., Praet, N., Carabin, H., Millogo, A., Tarnagda, Z., Dorniy, P., Hounton, S., Sow, A., Nitiéma, P., Cowan, L.D., 2011. Factors associated with the prevalence of circulating antigens to

- porcine cysticercosis in three villages of Burkina Faso. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* 5 (1), e927, doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0000927.
23. Garvin, R.T. (1989): "A sociological Investigation into the Efficiency of Adoption and Rejection of Selected Research Recommendations by Tobacco Growers in Zimbabwe", *Zimbabwe Agricultural Journal*, 77(6): 285-288.
 24. Havens, A.E and Flinn, W.L (1976). "Green Revolution Technology and Community Development the Limits of Action, Programmes". *Economic Development Culture Change*, 23: 469 -481.
 25. Hunter, E.J. (1988) Behaviour and welfare of dry sows in different housing conditions. Doctoral thesis, University of Reading.
 26. Kagira, J.M., Maingi, N., Kanyari, P.W.N., Githigia, S.M., Ng'ang'a, J.C., Gachoi, J.M., 2010a. Characteristics of pig trade in low income settings in Busia District, Kenya. *Tanzania Vet. J.* 27, 27 – 35.
 27. Kassie, M., B. Shireraw and G. Muricho. 2011. "Agricultural technology, crop income, and poverty alleviation in Uganda." *World Development*, Vol. 39, No. 10:1784-1795.
 28. Kijima, Y., K. Otsuka and D. Sserunkuuma. 2011. "An inquiry into constraints on a green revolution in Sub-Saharan Africa: The case of NERICA rice in Uganda". *World Development*, Vol. 39, No.1:77-86.
 29. Kurz, J.C. and Marchinton, R.L. (1972) Radiotelemetry studies of feral hogs in South Carolina. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 36: 1240-1248.
 30. Meese, G.B. and Baldwin, B.A. (1975) Effects of ablation of the olfactory bulbs on aggressive behaviour in pigs. *Applied Animal Ethology* 1: 251-262.
 31. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED), Republic of Uganda. 2002.
 32. Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industries and Fisheries. 2010. Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan: 2010/11-2014/15, Entebbe.

33. Morris, J.R. and Hurnik, J.F. (1990) an alternative dry sow housing system. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*
34. Muhanguzi, D., Lutwama, V., Mwiine, F.N., 2012. Factors that influence pig production in Central Uganda – case study of Nangabo Sub-County, Wakiso district. *Vet. World* 5 (6), 346 – 351, doi:10.5455/vetworld.2012.346-351.
35. MUTETIKKA, D. 2009. *A Guide to Pig Production at Farm Level*, Makerere University, Kampala- Uganda, Fountain Publishers, Kampala.
36. Ndébi, G., Ongla, J., 2006. Fonctionnement des systèmes de distribution du porc au Cameroun. *Tropicicultura* 24 (2), 73 – 81.
37. Nsoso, S.J., Mannathoko, G.G., Modise, K. 2006. Monitoring production, health and marketing of indigenous Tswana pigs in Ramotswa village of Botswana. *Livest. Res. Rur. Dev.* 18 (9) <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd18/9/nsos18125.htm> (accessed 04 November, 2014).
38. OIE, 2012c. WAHID Interface, <http://www.oie.int/wahis/public.php?page=home>
39. Oliver, D., Whymark, G., & Romm, C. (2005). *The language action perspective on communication modeling*. Sweden: Kiruna.
40. Oliver, W.L.R., Brisbin, L., 1993. Introduced and feral pigs: problems, policy and priorities, in Oliver, W.L.R. (ed.), *Pigs, peccaries and hippos: status survey and conservation action plan*, pp. 269 – 286. Gland, IUCN.
41. Penrith, M.-L., Vosloo, W., 2009. Review of African swine fever: transmission, spread and control. *J. S. Afr. Vet. Ass.* 80 (2), 58 – 62.
42. Pesson, L. (1967). "Factors Associated with the Adoption of Agricultural Practices". *Rural Sociology* 23 (4):35-88.
43. Petherick, J.C., Bodero, D.A. and Blackshaw, J.K. (1987) the use of partial barriers along the feed trough in a group housing system for non-lactating sows. *Farm Buildings and Engineering* 4: 32-36.

44. Puppe, B. and Tuchscherer, M. (1994) Social Organization Structures in Intensively Kept Pigs. 3. Ethological Investigations on the Rank Order. *Archiv Fur Tierzucht - Archives of Animal Breeding* 37: 309-325.
45. Quenette, P.Y. and Gerard, J. F. (1992) From Individual to Collective Vigilance in Wild Boar (*Susscrofa*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology - Revue Canadienne de Zoologie* 70:1632-1635.
46. Rogers, M.E. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations*, 3rd Edition The Free press, New York.
47. Schultz, Theodore W., 1964, *Transforming Traditional Agriculture* (Yale University Press, New Haven,CT).
48. TATWANGIRE, A. 2012. The Conditions within which the Smallholder Pig Value Chains Operate in Uganda: An overview of past trends, current status, and likely future directions. Smallholder Pig Value Chains Development Project in Uganda:-The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) - Markets, Gender & Livelihoods Kampala, Uganda.
49. Thornton, K. (1988) *Outdoor pig production*. Farming Press, Ipswich.
50. Uganda Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper. Progress Report. 2002.
51. Verhulst, A., 1993. Lessons from field experiences in the development of monogastric animal production in Mack, S. (Ed.), *Strategies for sustainable animal agriculture in developing countries*.
52. Wood-Gush, D.G.M., Jensen, P. and Algers, B. (1990) Behaviour of pigs in a novel semi-natural environment. *Biology of Behaviour* 15: 62-73.