





FACTORS LIMITING TECHNOLOGY ADOPTION: A CASE STUDY OF FEEDING CONCENTRATE FEEDS TO PIGS AMONG PIG FARMERS IN PANYANGO SUBCOUNTY, PAKWACH DISTRICT

BY

ONEGI BONIFANCE

BU/UG/2015/2114

onegibonifance@gmail.com

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

August, 2018

DECLERATION

I ONEGI BONIFANCE, BU/UG/2015/2114 hereby declare that this dissertation represents my work and has not been previously submitted for an award of a degree at this or any other institution of higher learning.

ath /	
Date 13 /08 /2018	Signature

CLASS VOLGE OF THE ACCESS NO. A AS DODO 73 1

APPROVAL

This dissertation has been submitted with the approval of my academic supervisor, Dr. Matovu
Henry.
Department of animal production and management.
Faculty of agriculture and animal sciences.
Busitema University, Arapai campus,
P.O. Box 203,
Soroti – Uganda.
Signature

DEDICATION

I dedicate this piece of work to my Mother Mrs. Apio Jesca, my father Mr. Omia Benson, my uncle Mr. Gwoktho Alfred (RIP), my sister Omia Immaculate, my brother Omia Innocent and to all other family members for their care, love and corporation toward the success of my life in the study period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to acknowledge the support and contribution of the sub-county chief Mr. Adriko Simon, Animal husbandry officer of Panyango Sub-County, Mr. Pikwo James, Panyango sub-county parish chiefs and the local council I chairpersons of Panyango Sub-County who worked tirelessly towards the completion of my data collection.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the staff of animal production and management of Busitema University especially Dr. Matovu Henry, Mr. Mbogua Joseph, Ms. Akullu Jolly, Dr. Etiang Patrick and other lecturers.

Once more, I am thankful to my supervisor, Dr. Matovu Henry for dedicating his time, energy and knowledge so that this dissertation is made to the required standard.

I owe my gratitude to my friends like Acidri Geoffrey, Nyangoma Christine, Meri Emmanuel, Oyungrwoth Jeremy and many others.

Above all I thank the almighty God for caring and blessing me in my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

DECLERA'	TION	į,
APPROVA	L skalling and the state of the	ii
DEDICATI	ONi	iii
ACKNOWI	LEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF	CONTENTS	V
LIST OF TA	ABĹEŚ.,,,.,.,.,.,,.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(ii
LIST OF A	BBREVIATIONS	iii
ABSTRAC	T	ix
CHAPTER	ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Background.	1
1.3	Problem statement.	3
1.4	General Objective	3
1.5	Specific Objectives	.3
1.6	Hypotheses	.3
1.7	Research question.	4
1.8	Significance of the research	4
1.9	Justification	4
1.10	Scope	4
CHAPTER	TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	Technology Transfer	5
2.3	Decision maker for technology adoption.	. 5
2.4	Gender roles, responsibilities and decision making.	6
2.5	Concentrate feeding in swine production.	6
2.5.1	World overview of concentrate use in pig feeding.	. 7
2.5.2	Africa's overview on the use of concentrate for swine feeding.	. 9
2.5.3	Uganda's overview on the use of concentrate for swine feeding	LC
2.6	Factors influencing technology adoption.	L.1
CHAPTER	THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS	13
3.1	Study areas	13

3.2 .	Research approach	1 3
3.3	Sampling design and sample size determination.	13
3.4	Operational design:	14
3.5	Observational design	14
3.6	Statistical design	14
3.7	Data presentation	14
3.8	Ethical Consideration	15
3.9	Problems encountered	15
CHAPTER	FOUR: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS	, 16
4.1	Factors limiting adoption of feeding concentrate to pigs	16
4.2	Categorization of farmers according to Adoption level of concentrate feeding	17
CHAPTER	FIVE: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS	, 18
5.1	Factors limiting adoption of concentrates.	18
5.2	Farmers' adoption level.	19
CHAPTER	SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	20
6.1	Conclusion.	20
6.2	Recommendation	20
REFFÉRE	NCES,	,., 2/1
APPENDI	CES	24
Appe	ndix 1. A scanned Sample of the filled questionnaires	24

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Showing correlation of adoption of concentrate feeding technology with nine selected	
independent variables.	ŧ
Table 2. Showing categorization of farmers according to level of adoption1	7

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

National Agricultural Advisory Services 1. NAADS 2. IFI Individual Farmer Interviews 3. S/C Sub County 4. FAO food and agriculture organization 5. SPSS Statistical package for social sciences. Non-Governmental organizations. 6. NGOs 7. FM fish meal 8. MS Microsoft 9. AA Amino acid Soy Bean Meal 10. SBM

ABSTRACT

Animal agriculture has a specialized significance as it can play an important role in improving the socio-economic status of a sizable section of the weaker and tribal population. Most cases livestock is the source of cash income for the subsistence farmers as well as endurance of family purchasing power in the event of unprofitable agriculture due to unforeseen reasons like drought. These benefit has been hampered by traditional technology which does not yield much in terms of productivity.

Therefore, the government of Uganda has set up a detailed strategy of development for the livestock sector which consists of better animal nutrition, training and delivery of advisory services, supporting livestock research and improving livestock and livestock products marketing system. Hence the research was done on factors limiting technology adoption with emphasis on feeding concentrate to pigs among pig farmers in Panyango Sub County, packwach district in west Nile region with the specific objectives of determining the factors limiting adoption of feeding concentrate to pigs and to find out the level of adoption of feeding concentrate among pig farmers in Panyango S/C.

Samples were picked in all the seven parishes of the sub county. The sample size of 67 farmers were purposively selected out of 81 pig farmer using the formula derived by Yamane (1967). Data was collected using structured closed and open ended questionnaires. Data analysis was done using SPSS version 20 where, a bivariate spearman's correlation was used to determine the relationship between the nine selected independent variable and adoption. Adoption level of the respondents was determined from adoption index developed by Karthikeyan (1994) and. Presentation was done in form of tables bearing percentages and frequencies:

Analysis of result shown a weak positive and negative linear relationship between the nine independent variables and adoption of concentrate feeding in swine production. However, High percentage of farmers were low adopters 76.1%. To increase the level of adoption, farmers are required to be exposed to many sources of information to make them aware of this technology, and Efforts should be made to increase contacts of the farmers with extension agents, and training should be organized for the farmers on various management aspect of livestock.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.

1.1 Introduction

In Uganda, the past 10 years have been characterized by introduction of new agricultural interventions, some of which have targeted increasing the adoption of agricultural technologies as means of changing the structure of agricultural production in the country and ultimately farmer incomes (Kasirye, 2010). However, a farmer is a rational decision maker who normally strives for a better standard of living and seeks ways of adopting new technologies to accomplish this goal.

Technology can be adopted when it is transferred from the technology generators' such as research laboratories and universities to clients such as farmers (Chi & Yamada, 2002). However, the adoption depend on the farmers' decision whether or not to adopt the innovation.

Swine concentrate feeding has been one of the feeding technology used to improve growth rate hence increasing productivity. Many countries worldwide has been and are using concentrate for feeding the pigs. Africa and Uganda are inclusive in using concentrate for feeding pigs either as a supplementary diet or as a whole feeding resources for the pigs.

A variety of feed stuffs exist to pig producers, ranging from commercial concentrates, agroindustrial by products and home grown feeds, despite all these farmers are still involves in keeping pigs on free range system where, pigs scavenging for food around the homestead, village or garbage collection centers. Kitchen wastes and forages make up the bulk of the feed. These feed resources are low in quality to maintain high level of pig growth and reproductive Performance (Maass, Kabirizi, & Zziwa, 2014).

1.2 Background.

Animal agriculture has a specialized significance as it can play an important role in improving the socio-economic status of a sizable section of the weaker and tribal population(Rahman, 2007). Most cases livestock is the source of cash income for the subsistence farmers as well as endurance of family purchasing power in the event of unprofitable agriculture due to unforeseen reasons like drought.

REFFERENCES.

- Ampaire, A. (2011). Farmers â€TM experiences with rearing pigs, goats and chickens to improve household nutrition and income in Kamuli, Uganda.
- Andrew A., I. S. E. (2012). Factors influencing technology adoption among pig farmers in Ashanti region of Ghana. *Journal of Agricultural Technology*, 8(1), 81–92.
- Angello, C. (2017). Urban Agriculture and the Use of ICTS in Accessing and Disseminating Livestock Husbandry Information in Urban Areas of Tanzania. A Review of Related Literature.
- Anne, P., & Zárate, V. (2003). Institute of Animal Flusbandry in the Tropics and Subtropics (480 a) Master Thesis Assessing Input in Pig Production with Special Focus on Feed Resources and Feeding Management in Demand and Resource Driven Production Systems in Son La Province, Vietnam.
- Berihu, M., & Tamir, B. (2015). Characterization of Feed Resources and Body Condition Scores of Pigs under Small Scale Intensive Production in East Shewa, Ethiopia Department of Animal Science, College of Veterinary Medicine and Agriculture, 4(3), 106–112. https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.ajn.2015.4.3.101135
- Boggess, M., Stein, H., & DeRouchey, J. (2008). Alternative Feed Ingredients for Swing Rations. Kansus State University Agricultural Experiment Station and C00 perative Extension Service, 1–36.
- Brief, L. S. (2005). Livestock sector brief. (May).
- Chi, T., & Yamada, R. (2002). Factors affecting farmers' adoption of technologies in farming system: A case study in Omon district, Can Tho province, Mekong Delta. *Omonirice*, 10, 94–100.
- Cramb, R. a. (2000). Processes influencing the successful adoption of new technologies by smallholders. Working with Farmers: The Key to Adoption of Forage Technologies. ACIAR Proceedings, 95.11–22.
- Constantine B. K et al (2012) Strategies for coping with feed scarcity among urban and Periurban livestock farmers in Kampala, Uganda. Department of Agricultural Production, Makerere

- University, Kampala, Uganda, Department of Animal Nutrition and Management, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden
- DeRouchey, J. M. (2007). General Nutrition Principles for Swine. Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service, 1–36.
- Samuel et al, 2012. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). Pig Sector Kenya. Animal Production and Health Livestock Country Reviews. No. 3, Rome.
- Gale, F. (2017). China's Pork Imports Rise Along with Production Costs, LDPM-271-01. United States Department of Agriculture, 33.
- Home Made Animal Feed Concentrates Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (n,d,).
- Israel, G. D. (2003). Determining Sample Size. University of Florida IFAS Extension, 1–5.
- Jabbar, M. A., & Akter, S. (2008). Market and other factors affecting farm specific production efficiency in pig production in Vietnam. *Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing*, 20(3), 29–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974430802157606
- Kasirye, I. (2010). Constraints to Agricultural Technology Adoption in Uganda: Evidence from the 2005/06-2009/10 Uganda National Panel Survey (2010). Poverty, Price Folatility, Efficiency and the Impacts of Population Shifts, (102), 90–107. https://doi.org/http://www.eprc.or.ug
- Kim, H. J., Yu, B. K., Hong, J. T., Choi, K. H., & Yu, J. S. (2013). A Study on Total Mixed Ration Feeding System for Feeding Pigs (11) - Development of Monorall Traveling TMR Feeder for Grow-Finish Pigs -, 38(4), 295–305.
- Kimbi, E., Lekule, F., Mlangwa, J., Mejer, H., & Thamsborg, S. (2015). Smallholder pigs production systems in Tanzania. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology A*, 5(1), 47–60. https://doi.org/10.17265/2161-6256/2015.01.007
- Kinuthia, B. K., & Mabaya, E. (2017). The Impact of Agriculture Technology Adoption on Farmers' Welfare in Uganda and Tanzania, 1–3.
- Kostas Katsoulis, L. L. and, & Kontopidis, G. (2016). Locally Produced Agricultural By-Products as Feed Sources for Pigs. *J Veter Sci Med*, 4(1), 01–05. https://doi.org/10.13188/2325-4645.1000022
- Lukuyu, B., Baker, D., Baltenweck, I., Poole, J., Kabi, F., Katongole, C., ... Wabwire, R. (2013).

- The Concentrate feeds value chain in Uganda The Concentrate Feeds Supply chain in Uganda: emerging trends and implications on quality and access to smallholder farmers and chain efficiency A project report, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-0080.2007.00199.x
- Maass, B. L., Kabirizi, J. M., & Zziwa, E. (2014). The role forages in pig production systems in Uganda, (February), 1–41.
- Mapiye, C., Mwale, M., Mupangwa, J. F., Mugabe, P. H., Poshiwa, X., & Chikumba, N. (2007). Utilisation of ley legumes as livestock feed in Zimbabwe. *Tropical Grasslands*, 41, 84–91.
- Menghak, P. (2015). Working with Ethnic Group: A Case Study of Introducing Pig Fattening to Garay Ethnicity in Ouyaday District, Ratanakiri Province, 29–34.
- Meyer, V. M., Henderson, D., Pinkston, H., Snyder, E., & Speer, V. C. (1815). Understanding Swine Production.
- 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), 346–351. https://doi.org/10.5455/vetworld.2012.346-351
- Phengsavanh, P. (2013). Forage Legumes as Feed for Pigs in Smallholder Production Systems in the North of Lao PDR Production Systems, Forage Biomass Yield and Protein.
- Phengsavanh, P., Ogle, B., & Lindberg, J. E. (2010). Feeding and performance of pigs in smallholder systems in Northern Lao PDR Feeding and performance of pigs in smallholder production systems in Northern Lao PDR, (March 2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-010-9612-4
- Rahman, S. (2007). Adoption of improved technologies by the pig farmers of Aizawi district of Mizoram, India, *Livestock Research for Rural Development*.
- Som, S., & Til, F. (2015). Starfish As Feedingredient for Piglets, (August). Department of Animal Science, Aarhus University
- Ajieli, 2015. CONSTRAINTS AND STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING PIG PRODUCTION IN DELTA STATE. NIGERIA. Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Delta State University, Asaba Campus. Asaba, Nigeria.