APPENDIX A CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY HOUSEHOLDS

a. Family structure

		(person)
Family	structure	Average
- 17	. //6 9/10	
Family		5.17
	adults	3.31
No. of	felders	0.76
No. of	children	1.12
Age of	f household head	47.7

b. Educational level of household head

			(per	cents)
School level	Percent Small	of househo Medium	lds by far Larger	m size
No education	22.2	16.4	0.0	3
Through Grade 4	60.3	74.6	80.0	
Through Grade 7	17.4	9.0	20.0	

c. Proportion of children to adult in household

	(3)		(percents)	_
No. of children per one adult		of househo Medium	olds by farm size Larger	
T + h 0 0 0 0	30.2	34.3	60.0	_
Less than 0.26 0.26 to 0.5	33.3	35.8	20.0	
0.51 to 0.75	20.6	14.9	20.0	
0.76 to 1.0	15.9	11.9	0.0	
1.1 to 1.5	0.0	3.0	0.0	

Source: Formal survey, 1990.

APPENDIX B

CROP PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY

a. Average labor required to produce one hectare of crop

			(hours)
Crop	Labor ho	ours by farm s	ize
	Small	Medium	Larger
	J. 44		
Rice	1201	1256	1418
Soybean	1000	1133	1314
Pepper	1363	1565	1714
Garlic	1323	1177	1716
Garlic-Pepper ^l	2224	2566	2599
Tobacco .	1156	1228	1547
Tobacco-Pepper ¹	1955	2050	2328
Vegetable	1241	1318	1960
Mungbean	1428	1617	0
			30%

Intercrops

b. Net income derived per crop (Baht)

Crop	Baht/rai	Baht/ha
Rice	632	3952
Soybean	625	3904
Pepper	2318	14489
Garlic	3416	21350
Garlic-Pepper	9812	61325
Tobacco	2297	14357
Tobacco-Pepper	5988	37425
Vegetable	2173	13583
Mungbean	575	3594
Dry garlic	16576	103600

Source: Formal survey, 1990.

APPENDIX C RURAL EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE THE HOUSEHOLD'S FARM

a. Hours per year devoted to outside activities

Type of labor		per year per ho Medium	(hours) ousehold Larger
Casual farm Casual non-farm Trade & business Total hours	799.7 (57.0)	223.3 (21.3)	0.0 (0.0)
	386.0 (27.5)	207.5 (19.8)	110.0 (23.9)
	217.5 (15.5)	617.9 (58.9)	350.0 (76.1)
	1403.2	1048.7	460.0

Note: Figures in parentheses are percentages of total hours

b. Annual income from outside labor activities

			(Baht)
Type of labor	Average annual	income per	household
	Small	Medium	Larger
Casual farm Casual non-farm Trade & business Total income	6741 (43.8)	2088 (12.0)	0 (0.0)
	4542 (29.5)	2712 (15.6)	1580 (12.2)
	4120 (26.7)	12573 (72.4)	11320 (87.8)
	5403	17373	12900

Note: Figures in parentheses are percentages of toal income

c. Location of outside labor activities

		(percents)
Percent of Small	households Medium	w/ work at site Larger
38.1	30.5	0.0
49.2	45.8	/21 25.0 \/ \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
12.7	23.7	75.0
	38.1 49.2	38.1 49.2 30.5 45.8

Source: Formal survey, 1990.

APPENDIX D

CASUAL LABOR EMPLOYMENT

a. Amount of household members in casual labor

	// ag L		(percents)
No. of individuals	Percent of Small	households by fa Medium	rm size Larger
0	0.0	11.9	60.0
1 // 9	17.5	26.9	10.0
$\overset{-}{2}$	77.8	56.7	30.0
3	4.8	₩ 4.5	0.0
		(4)	

b. Number of households in casual labor each month

			(household)
708	Small	Medium	Larger
January	48 (76.2)	35 (52.5)	0 (0.0)
February	30 (47.6)	23 (34.3)	2 (20.0)
March	18·(28.6)	12 (17.9)	3 (30.0)
April	11 (17.5)	11 (16.4)	2 (20.0)
May	11 (17.5)	10 (14.9)	2 (20.0)
June	16 (25.4)	13 (19.4)	2 (20.0)
July	29 (46.0)	12 (17.9)	0 (0.0)
August	31 (49.2)	16 (23.9)	0 (0.0)
September	8 (12.7)	2 (3.0)	0 (0,0)
October	15 (23.8)	4 (6.0)	0 (0.0)
November	49 (77.8)	31 (46.3)	0 (0.0)
December	52 (82.5)	37 (55.2)	0 (0.0)
Total household	63 (100)	66 (100)	10(100)
	•		

Note: Figures in parentheses are percentage of households with members working in the given months, determined from the total number of households belonging to that farm size.

Source: Formal survey, 1990.

166

APPENDIX E

HOUSEHOLD INCOME, EXPENSES AND SAVINGS DISTRIBUTIONS

a. Annual income distribution

			(percents)
Income range (1000 Baht)		ds by farm siz	ze Larger
		9	
0 to 50	79.37	31.34	0.00
51 to 100	19.05	52.24	30.00
101 to 150	1.59	14.93	50.00
151 to 200	0.00	1.49	10.00
201 to 250	0.00	0.00	0.00
251 to 300	0.00	0.00	10.00

b. Distribution of annual expenses

		<u> </u>	(percents)
Expense range (1000 Baht)	Small	Medium	Larger
0 to 15	3.17	14.93	20.00
16 to 30	50.79	22.39	20.00
31 to 45	39.68	38.81	40.00
46 to 60	4.76	17.91	0.00
61 to 75	1.59	5.97	0.00
76 to 100	0.00	0.00	0.00
over 100	0.00	0.00	20.00
			· / / / ·

c. Distribution of annual savings

		(percents)			
Savings range (1000 Baht)	Small	Medium	Larger		
Less than 1	12.70	1.49	0.0		
1 to 25	74.60	47.76	0.0		
26 to 50	11.11	32.84	20.0		
51 to 75	1.59	11.94	20.0		
76 to 100	0.00	2.99	30.0		
101 to 125	0.00	2.99	20.0		
126 to 150	0.00	0.00	0.0		
151 to 175	0.00	0.00	10.0		

Source: Formal survey, 1990.

APPENDIX F

TEST STATEMENTS USED IN ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT

Stat	ement Dire	ction of scoring
1.	My pig-production is not orientedtowards making profits.	(Agree: 5)
2.	Pig-raising helps me to save (collect) a sum of money.	(Agree: 5)
3.	I have many ways of collecting money, and pig-raising is not the best way for	me. (Agree: 1)
4.	Pig-raising is the easiest way for me to save money.	(Agree: 5)
5	I need to keep cash to buy pig feed, so sometimes I cannot spend	
ð,	money as easily as I would otherwise.	(Agree: 5)
δ.	Because I need cash to buy pig feed, pig-raising is a good strategy	30/
•	to help me save money from unnecessary expenses.	(Agree: 5)
7.	I think pig-raising takes more time then raising other animals does.	(Agree: 1)
8.	Sometimes I cannot do other activities because I have to spend	
•	time properly managing my pigs.	(Agree: 1)
9.	The time I spend with pigs everyday does not interrupt my other activities.	(Agree: 5)
10.		, \ <u>.</u>
	inexpensive to raise; and easy to sell.	(Agree: 5)
11.	The main reason I raise pigs is to make use of available excess time.	(Agree: 5)
12.	Pig-raising gives me a non-regular (occasional) minor supportive income.	(Agree: 5)
13.	Pig-raising gives me a regular (steady) major supportive income.	(Agree: 1)
14.	Quite often I do not sell my pigs at the time I planned (because I	
	wait for a better market price or buyer).	(Agree: 1)
15.	Even though compound feed is better quality, I decided to use my own	
	mixed feed because it costs less.	(Agree: 5)
16.	Hy use of bran and broken rice does not help to lower production	
	expenses much (I still pay for it).	(Agree: 5)
17	I call the veterinarian whenever my pigs are sick.	(Agree: 1)
18.	I would be willing to take a loan for pig-production investment.	(Agree: 1)
19.	If I did not get any profit from selling pigs, I would stop	
	raising them temporarily.	(Agree: 5)
20.	If I get good profits from selling pigs, I will raise them continuously	
	(despite constraints such as labor demand in crop season, increase in	
	feed price, etc).	(Agree: 1)
21.	Profit-making is not my primary motivation in raising pigs.	(Agree: 5)

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ Copyright[©] by Chiang Mai University All rights reserved

APPENDIX G

TOTAL ATTITUDE SCORES AND VALUES FOR ECONOMIC PARAMETERS USED IN SPEARMAN'S RANK CORRELATION

Farm number	Attitude score	Cash costs per pig	Cash revenues per pig	Cash costs by herd	Cash revenue by herd	Net benefit by herd	Net cash benefit by herd
1	47	1398.37	1633	4195.11	4900	729.49	704.88
2	49	1280.58	1550	2561.17	3100	544.71	538.83
3	47	1519.16	1450	3038.33	2900	-127.56	-138.33
4	48	1645.29	1600	1645,29	1600	-50.73	-45.29
5	44	1488.36	1550	2976.71	3100	135.86	123.29
6	36	1317.96	1500	2635.92	3000	368.19	364.08
7	45	1482.91	1550	5931.63	6200	294.01	268.37
8	88	1997.65	2200	15,981.20	17600	1255.04	1618.80
9	42	995,11	1400	1990.22	2800	828.67	809.78
10	41	1480.64	1500	1480,64	1500	17.57	19.36
11	41	914.90	1300	1829.80	2600	192.64	710.20
12	31	1012.56	1400	2025.13	2800	760.84	774.87
13	43	1389.65		1389.65	1550	168.73	160.35
14	46	1174.45	1600	1174.45	1600	438.89	425.55
15	49	1575.18	1750	3150.36	3500	358.02	349.84
16	47	1896.58	1780	3793.17	3560	-239.68	-233.17
17	35	1469.32	1550	1469.32	1550	87.31	80.68
18	47	1782.08	1650	3564.17	3300	-265.17	-264.17
19	52	1325.02	1500	2650.03	3000	369.71	349.97
20	82	1802.23	2000	14,417.81	16000	1445.21	1582.19
21	58	982.10	1300	6874.68	9100	2181.48	2225.32
22	40	1133.18	1200	2266.36	2400	146.16	133.64
23	58	1677.46	1600	3354.92	3200	-151.56	-154.92
24	50	1444.29	1575	2888.59	3150	275.50	261.41
25	66	1690.13	1633	5070.39	4900	-166.16	-170.40
26	84	1769.31	1800	8846.55	9000	71.65	153.45
27	90	1774.03	1940	8870.13	9700	747,11	829.87
28	88	1206.52	1300	6032,60	6500	490.40	467.40
29	94	1072.84	1348	24,675.38	31000	6362.00	6324.48
30	95	1509.29	1600	21,130.05	22400	1235,58	1269.95
31	57	1861.29	1800	5583.88	5400	-191.32	-183.88
32	86	1451.53	1950	11,612.26	15600	3723.42	3987.74
33	39	996.61	1250	3986.44	5000	987.15	1013.56

169 APPENDIX H

MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: RANGE OF HERD SIZES AND PIGSTY AREAS

a. Size of pig herds per household

		(percent	<u>of households)</u>
No. of pigs	Small		Larger farms
	9 702	20 7 9	40.0
0 to 2	73.0	68.7	40.0
3 to 5	20.6	13.4	0.0
6 to 8	1.6	4.5	20.0
9 to 14	4.8	9.0	0.0
over 14	0.0	4.5	40.0

b. Size of pigsty

		(percent	of households)
Sty area (m2)	Small	Medium	Larger farms
0 to 4	41.3	34.3	40.0
5 to 8	52.4	53.7	40.0
9 to 12	3.2	4,5	20.0
13 to 16	3.2	3.0	0.0
17 to 20	0.0	4.5	0.0

c. Sty area available per head of pig (m2)

		(percent	ent of households)		
Area per head (m2)	Small	Medium	Larger farms		
0 to 1	9.5	20.9	60.0		
1.1 to 2	41.3	35.8	40.0		
2.1 to 3	25.4	26.9	0.0		
3.1 to 4	22.2	16.4	0.0		
over 4	1.6	0.0	0.0		

APPENDIX I

ANALYSES OF FEED CONVERSION RATIOS BY DIET

- A. 5 diets included (133 pigs)
- 1. One-way ANOVA for FCR (1st month) = Diet
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

Chi Sq DF P
Test on raw data 19.03 4 0.0008
Test on transformed data 15.87 4 0.0032
Group variances unequal; Kruskall-Wallis required.

b. Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of ranks

Kruskall-Wallis statistic 58.19 P-value (Chi-Square) 0.000

- c. Diet has significant effect on FCR in first month.
- 2. One-way ANOVA for FCR (2nd month) = Diet
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

 Chi Sq DF P

 Test on transformed data 4.96 4 0.291

 Group variances concluded equivalent.
 - ANOVA on square root transformed data MS Source DF SS 0.0000 24.95 11.71 2.927 Between 4 15.02 0.117 128 Within 26.73 132 Total
 - c. Diet has significant effect on FCR in second month.
- One-way AOV for FCR (3rd month) = Diet
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances
 Chi Sq DF P
 Test on raw data 6.88 4 0.1423
 Group variances concluded equivalent.
 - ANOVA on raw data MS DF SS Source 4 329.1 82.28 Between 2.811 359.8 Within 128 688.9 Total 132

- c. Diet has significant effect on FCR in third month.
- 4. One-way AOV for FCR (avg of 3 months) = Diet
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

 Chi Sq DF P

 Test on raw data 20.90 4 0.0003

 Test of transformed data 11.42 4 0.0216

 Group variances unequal; Kruskal-Wallis required.
 - b. Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis on ranks
 Kruskal-Wallis statistic 57.619
 P-value (Chi Sq) 0.0000
 - c. Diet has significant effect on FCR averaged over three months.
- B. 4 diet treatments included (99 pigs)
- 1. One-way ANOVA for FCR (first month) = Diet
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

 Chi Sq DF P

 Test of raw data 1.12 3 0.7719

 Group variances considered equivalent.
 - b. ANOVA on raw data MS SS F DF Source 18.24 5.87 0.0011 Between 54.72 3.107 Within 95 295.2 349.9 98 Total
 - c. Diet has significant effect on FCR in first month.
- 2. One-way ANOVA for FCR (2nd month) = Diet
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances
 Chi Sq DF P
 Test of raw data 5.19 3 0.1585
 Group variances considered equivalent.

- ANOVA on raw data b. MS F DF SS Source 0.0000 13.91 135.8 45.26 Between 3 3.254 309.2 Within 95 98 444.9 Total
- c. Diet has significant effect on FCR in second month.
- 3. One-way ANOVA for FCR (3rd month) = Diet
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances
 Chi Sq DF P
 Test of raw data 4.05 3 0.2564
 Group variances concluded equivalent.
 - b. ANOVA on raw data

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Between	3	205.0	68.34	21.82	0.0000
Within	95	297.5	3.132		
Total	98	502.6			

- c. Diet has significant effect on FCR in third month.
- 4. One-way AOV for FCR (avg of 3 months) = Diet
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

 Chi Sq DF P

 Test of raw data 15.79 3 0.0013

 Test of transformed data 11.51 3 0.0093

 Group variances unequal; Kruskal-Wallis required.
 - Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis by ranks
 Kruskal-Wallis statistic 32.727
 P-value (Chi Sq) 0.0000
 - c. Diet has significant effect on FCR averaged over three months.

APPENDIX J

ANALYSES OF FEED CONVERSION RATIOS BY INITIAL WEIGHT

- A. 5 diet groups included in analysis (133 pigs)
- One-way AOV for FCR (1st month) = Initial weight (using square root transformed data)
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

 Chi Sq DF P

 Test of transformed data 4.89 2 0.0867

 Group variances considered equivalent.
 - b. ANOVA on transformed data

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	Р
Between	2	0.984	0.4918	2.95	0.0543
Within	130	21.65	0.1665		
Total	132 🤄	22.63			

- c. Initial weight does not have significant effect on FCR in first month.
- 2. One-way AOV for FCR (2nd month) = Initial weight (using square root transformed data)
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances
 Chi Sq DF P
 Test on transformed data 2.78 2 0.2486
 - b. ANOVA on transformed data

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	Р
Between	2	1.954	0.977	5.13	0.0073
Within	130	24.77	0.1906		
Tota1	132	26.73			

- Initial weight has significant effect on FCR in second month.
- One-way AOV for FCR (3rd month) = Initial weight (using square root transformed data)

a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

Chi Sq DF P

Test on transformed data 2.78 2 0.2486

Group variances concluded equivalent.

b. ANOVA on transformed data

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	Р
Between	2	1.345	0.673	3.72	0.0262
Within	130	23.48	0.181		
Total	132	24.83			

- c. Initial weight has significant effect on FCR in third month.
- 4. One-way AOV for FCR (avg of 3 months) = Initial weight (using square root transformed data)
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances
 Chi Sq DF P
 Test of transformed data 5.33 2 0.0695
 Group variances concluded equivalent.
 - b. ANOVA on transformed data

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Between	2	1.187	0.5937	4.65	0.0112
Within	130	16.59	0.1276		
Total	132	17.77			

- c. Initial weight has significant effect on FCR averaged over three months.
- B. 4 diets included in analysis (99 pigs)
- 1. One-way AOV for FCR (1st month) = Initial weight
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

 Chi Sq DF P

 Test on transformed data 5.47 2 0.065

 Group variances concluded equivalent.

b. ANOVA on transformed data

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	Р
Between	2	4.029	2.015	0.56	0.579
Within	96	345.9	3.603		
Total	98	349.9			

- c. Initial weight has no effect on FCR in first month.
- 2. One-way AOV for FCR (2nd month) = Initial weight
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

 Chi Sq DF P

 Test on transformed data 1.97 2 0.3729

 Group variances concluded equivalent.
 - b. ANOVA on transformed data

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	. P
Between	2	23.31	11.66	2.65	0.0737
Within	96 🥌	421.6	4.392		
Total	98	444.9	7		

- c. Initial weight does not have significant effect on FCR in second month.
- 3. One-way AOV for FCR (3rd month) = Initial weight
 - a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

 Chi Sq DF P

 Test on transformed data 0.62 2 0.7325

 Group variances concluded equivalent.
 - b. ANOVA on transformed data

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Between	2	29.6	14.8	3.00	0.0529
Within	96	472.9	4.927		
Total	98	502.6			

- c. Initial weight has slightly significant effect on FCR in third month.
- 4. One-way AOV for FCR (avg of 3 months) = Initial weight

a. Bartlett's test of equal variances

Chi Sq DF P

Test on raw data 7.35 2 0.0253

Test of tranformed data 18.07 2 0.0001

Group variances unequal; Krukal-Wallis required.

b. Kruskal-Wallist one-way analysis by ranks

Kruskal-Wallis statistic 6.0572 P-value (Chi-Sq) 0.0484

c. Initial weight has significant effect on FCR averaged over three months.



Curriculum vitae

Name:

Nara Kaophong

Date of birth: 14 March 1961

Educational background:

1992 M.S. Agricultural Systems, Chiang Mai University 1982 B.A. Sociology and Anthropology, Kasetsart University

Fellowships and grants:

1989-90 Rockefeller Brothers' Foundation Grant

1988-90 Winrock International Fellowship

1980-81 Mitsui Bank Fellowship

Working experience:

1984-88 Project Evaluation Officer, Thung Luang Highland Development Project, Maejo Institute of Agricultural Technology.

1984-88 Assistant to the Vice-Rector, Maejo Institute of Agricultural Technology.

1984 Social Researcher, Royal Project, Chiang Mai.

1983 News reporter, Matoopoom Newspaper.

1981-82 Volunteer, Thai Development Reconstruction Agency.

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ Copyright[©] by Chiang Mai University All rights reserved