

636.39

At1

1999

**EFFECT OF TREATING RICE STRAW WITH UREA AND MOLASSES  
ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND CARCASS AND  
MEAT QUALITY TRAITS OF GOAT**

**THESIS**

**JERWIN O. ATAYDE**

**Department of Animal and Veterinary Sciences**

**CAVITE STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Indang, Cavite**

**April 1999**



**EFFECT OF TREATING RICE STRAW WITH UREA AND MOLASSES  
ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND CARCASS AND  
MEAT QUALITY TRAITS OF GOAT**

**Undergraduate Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Cavite State University  
Indang, Cavite**

**In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
of Bachelor of Science in Agriculture  
(Major in Animal Science)**



00006316

*Effect of treating rice straw with urea &  
molasses on growth performance & carcass &  
636.39 At1 1999  
T-1881*

**JERWIN Q. ATAYDE  
April 1999**

## **ABSTRACT**

**Atayde, Jerwin Querijero, Cavite State University, Indang, Cavite, April 1999.**  
**“Effect of Treating Rice Straw With Urea and Molasses on Growth Performance and Carcass and Meat Quality Traits of Goat”. Dr. Andrew T. Bunan, Adviser.**

**A study was conducted to determine the effect of treating rice straw with urea and molasses on the growth performance and carcass and meat quality traits of goat and the sensory properties of “Mara” .**

**The following treatments were used: Treatment 1, rice straw with molasses (control) and Treatment 1, rice straw with urea and molasses (experimental).**

**Results revealed that body weight of goats had no significant differences ( $P>0.05$ ) throughout the study. However, those fed the experimental diet were relatively heavier than the control.**

**Feed consumption of the treated goats was significantly lower ( $P>0.05$ ) in the last week of the experiment. However, total feed consumption did not vary ( $P>0.05$ ) between the two groups.**

**Although not significant, the total feed consumption appeared to be inversely related to the final body weight of the two groups. It is worth nothing that the treated group which had higher body weight had lower feed consumption than the untreated| group.**

**The two treatments had no significant differences ( $P>0.05$ ) on average feed conversion efficiency, although that of the treated group was 19.36 kg lower than that of**

the untreated group. On the other hand, dressing percentage, gain in weight and fabrication of the two treatments had no significant differences.

Treatment 2 had higher marbling content than Treatment 1. Sensory evaluation showed that the two treatments did not significantly differ ( $P>0.05$ ) in terms of color, odor, tenderness, off-flavor, juiciness and general acceptability. In terms of chevon flavor, Treatment 1 is significantly ( $P<0.05$ ) different from Treatment 2.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
BIOGRAPHICAL DATA.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xiii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Importance of the Study.....	3
Objective of the Study.....	3
Time and Place of the Study.....	3
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	4
Meat Quality.....	4
Components of Meat.....	6
Urea Molasses Mineral Block (UMMB) as Supplement to Rice Straw Diet of Cross Bred Carabaos .....	6
Rice Straw for Feedlot Bulls.....	7
DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	9
MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	10
Selection of Raw Materials.....	10
Experimental Design and Treatment.....	10

Feeds and Feeding .....	10
Care and Management .....	11
Gathering of Data.....	11
Slaughtering Procedure.....	11
Statistical Analysis .....	13
Preparation of Samples for Sensory Evaluation .....	13
Proximate Analysis .....	14
Sensory Evaluation .....	14
<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Body Weight.....	15
Feed Consumption.....	15
Feed Conversion Efficiency.....	16
Gain in Weight.....	17
Fabrication of Different Wholesale Cuts, kg.....	18
Slaughter Weight and Carcass Characteristics.....	19
Sensory Evaluation .....	19
Sensory Traits.....	20
Color.....	20
Odor.....	20
Tenderness.....	20
Chevon flavor.....	20
Off-flavor.....	20

Juiciness.....	21
General acceptability.....	21
Proximate Analysis.....	22
Cost and Return Analysis .....	22
Mortality .....	23
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	24
Summary.....	24
Conclusion.....	24
Recommendation.....	25
LITERATURE CITED .....	26
FIGURES .....	28
APPENDICES.....	40

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Proximate Composition of fresh lean samples.....	6
2. Proximate analysis (D.M basis) of rice straw preparation.....	8
3. Body Weight performance of goat fed with rice straw treated with urea and molasses, kg.....	15
4. Average weekly and total feed consumption of goats fed with rice straw treated with urea and molasses,kg.....	16
5. Average feed conversion efficiency of goats fed with rice straw treated with urea and molasses, kg.....	16
6. Dressing percentage of goats fed rice straw and molasses with or without urea .....	17
7. Average gain in weight of goats fed with rice straw treated with urea and molasses, kg.....	18
8. Mean of wholesale cuts of goats fed rice straw treated with urea and molasses , kg.....	18
9. Mean of slaughter weight and carcass characteristics of of goats fed rice straw treated with urea and molasses.....	19
10. Mean sensory scores of processed "Mara" .....	20
11. Proximate analysis of fresh lean samples of goats fed rice straw treated with urea and molasses.....	22
12. Cost and Return Analysis of goat production using rice straw treated with urea and molasses.....	22



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Random distribution of experimental goats .....	29
2. Raw materials for urea-ammonia treatments .....	30
3. The author during urea-ammonia treatment.....	31
4. The author while weighing the experimental goats .....	32
5. Treatment 1 ready for slaughter .....	33
6. Treatment 2 ready for slaughter .....	34
7. Experimental goats being slaughtered .....	35
8. Fabrication of different wholesale cuts .....	36
9. Raw meat ready for processing.....	37
10. Prepared “mara” samples.....	38
11. The panelists during the sensory evaluation .....	39

# **EFFECT OF TREATING RICE STRAW WITH UREA AND MOLASSES ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE AND CARCASS AND MEAT QUALITY TRAITS OF GOAT**

**JERWIN Q. ATAYDE**

---

An undergraduate thesis presented to the faculty of the Department of Animal and Veterinary Sciences, College of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Natural Resources, Cavite State University, Indang, Cavite in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, major in Animal Science with Contribution No. A.S. 98-99 AS-004-R(T)-03-99. Prepared under the supervision of Dr. Andrew T. Bunan.

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

Among the domestic ruminants, goats (*Capra hircus*) have the optimum potential as one of the main sources of milk and meat which has not been fully tapped in the Philippines. The goat is popularly known as the poor man's cow because children and old folks who cannot afford cow's milk prefer drinking goat's milk.

Goat raising is undertaken mostly by small farmers or backyard raisers. An average of one or two heads are raised by every farmer. Only a handful of commercial-scale goat farms can be found in the country.

In the Philippines, the goat population is estimated by Livestock Development Council at 2,120,110 as of 1988. This figure shows a minimal increase of 5.19 percent as compared to the previous year.