

Breeding Practices, Flock Productivity, and Strategies for Enhancing the Performance of Indigenous Chicken Genetic Resources

Donald Rugira Kugonza

Department of Animal and Range Sciences (DARS), School of Agricultural Sciences (SAS), College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES), Makerere University (MAK), Kampala, Uganda

Aline Kayitesi

ORCID: 0000-0002-5166-630X

Department of Animal and Range Sciences (DARS), School of Agricultural Sciences (SAS), College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES), Makerere University (MAK), Kampala, Uganda and Rwanda Agriculture and Animal Resources Development Board (RAB), Rubona, Rwanda

Christine Nakkazi

Department of Animal and Range Sciences (DARS), School of Agricultural Sciences (SAS), College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES), Makerere University (MAK), Kampala, Uganda and Mukono Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (MUZARDI), National Agricultural Research Organisation, Kampala, Uganda

Marion Wilfred Okot

Department of Animal Production and Range Management, Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, Gulu University, Gulu, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Farmer knowledge of breeding practices, incubation, and disease management strategies for local chickens was studied in 120 households in the Gulu and Kiryandongo regions of Uganda using a questionnaire, administered during one-to-one interviews. We found that farmers were randomly sampled from each of the eight sub-counties studied. Local chickens in both locations reached sexual maturity at six months for both cocks and hens. The overall mean number of egg clutches/bird/year was 3.21 ± 0.07 , and eggs per clutch were 13.07 ± 0.22 . Breeding stock was mostly acquired through purchases for both districts, and 97.5% of all the farmers carry out selective breeding. Farmers in the study area used a variety of criteria when selecting hens and cocks as breeding stock. Body size for both cocks (index = 0.51) and hens (index = 0.38) were a key trait in the selection, and specifically for cocks, body height ranked second as a good physical trait for selection, and is a marker/indicator trait for body weight. In females, farmers rank egg production, mothering, and hatching ability highly, too. All farmers relied on natural incubation to hatch eggs, but the facilities differed widely among respondents in both districts ($P < 0.001$). All farmers in Kiryandongo provided overnight shelters, differing from Gulu ($P < 0.001$) where 43.3% of households had

chickens perching on trees. Newcastle disease was the major disease reported by respondents in both districts. Capacity building of chicken farmers would go a long way to improve local chicken management and thereby, productivity.

Keywords: Local chicken breeding, Selection criteria, Incubation techniques, Productive performance, Chicken management systems.

INTRODUCTION

Smallholder chicken production in much of the world is based on indigenous genetic resources, and as opposed to commercially bred birds that are kept for singular purposes, they are utilized for several purposes simultaneously (FAO, 2010; UBOS, 2018). In much of Africa, indigenous poultry breeds are isolated from conventional breeding programmes, and as a result, genetic diversity/divergence is significantly high (AU-IBAR, 2019). The number of resultant breeds in the various regions of Africa is: 97 breeds in the Western, 85 in the Southern, 71 in the Eastern, 43 in the Northern, and 33 breeds in Central Africa (AU-IBAR, 2019). Chickens are without doubt the most popular species among the domesticated animals of Uganda and play a key role in food, human nutrition, and income security, by contributing over 90% of meat and eggs in Uganda (MAAIF & UBOS, 2018) valued at USD 111.3 million annually (FAO, 2019).

In Uganda, the local chicken population is estimated at 48 million (FAO, 2019), and these chickens play an integral role in the smallholder farming systems, making up 87.7% of the national flock (Yussif et al., 2023). Local chickens have an important role to play in the provision of much-needed protein to a large segment of the Ugandan population (Mugga, 2007), as they are reared by over 40% of the population living in chicken-rearing households (FAO, 2018). This could be the only source of animal protein for resource-poor households (Kyarisiima et al., 2004), and a typical chicken-rearing household currently owns ten chickens (UBOS, 2019). Local chickens also contribute directly to food security through family consumption and as a key means of income generation in rural resource-poor households in developing countries. Local chickens also have a vital role in human livelihoods and contribute significantly to the food security of rural communities, as chicken products have no cultural or religious taboos (Tadelle et al., 2003). The estimated number of people employed along the poultry value chain such as farmers, traders, feed suppliers, veterinarians, and Para veterinarians in Uganda is estimated at 17 million and of these 14 million raise the birds in the free-range systems, 16% use semi-intensive and only 4% keep birds under intensive systems (FAO, 2018).

The contribution of local chickens in rural household economies is mainly limited by low output, mostly because of their poor breeding and management systems, which result in poor productivity. Farmers often do not have access to appropriate technical knowledge, quality breeding stock, and the necessary feed resources needed for birds to attain full production potential for meat and egg production. However, the extent to which these interplay in different production environments and geographical locations is not clear. It is against this research gap that the present study was designed to characterize the production system with a focus on breeding practices and flock productivity. We aimed to identify the breeding methods and management systems of local chickens in Gulu and Kiryandongo districts to represent Northern and Mid-western regions of Uganda, respectively, as a prelude to a nationwide assessment.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ethical Approval

Approval for this study was obtained from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Research and Ethics Committee (CAES/REC). This research followed ethical standards and complied with the regulations of the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST).

Study Sites and Design

The study was carried out in Kiryandongo (n = 60) and Gulu (n = 60) districts (Figure 1), located 210 Km and 330 Km North of Kampala City, respectively. Two sub-counties that are representative of the chicken production system in each district were purposively selected from each district. Two parishes were then randomly selected from each sub-county, making a total of four parishes per district. The study used a descriptive survey design with both qualitative and quantitative questions for data collection, and farmers were selected randomly. Two perpendicular transects were drawn across each parish, and the villages along each transect were selected. Within the parish, accessibility to and the production system on the farm were considered during sampling.



Figure 1: Map of Uganda showing the study areas

Data Collection and Analysis

A standard questionnaire was administered to 120 farming households. The instrument was tested for validity by experts in livestock breeding to make sure that the questions asked were exhaustive for the study objective. Additional survey materials consisted of a GPS and a digital camera. The questionnaire was pre-tested prior to the actual survey using ten farmers from Kiryandongo district, but in villages that did not participate in the actual study. The aims of this pre-test were: to evaluate the appropriateness of the questionnaire design, assess the suitability and clarity of questions, evaluate the interpretation of the questions by farmers, relevance of the questions, quality of the data recorded, and assess the time taken for an interview. Validity during interviewing was tested for some responses using observation. Reliability of the instruments was tested using the internal check by having selected questions asked in two different ways. Results from the pre-test were used to make a few final refinements to the questionnaire. Each questionnaire was coded and entered separately into the computer software SPSS version. 21. After all the field data from each district was entered, the data was verified. Data was then analysed using district as the main class variable. To determine the ranking of traits in order of importance to the households, the ranking index was used on traits selected by farmers for their breeding stock and was performed following the procedure of Kugonza et al. (2012).

RESULTS

Household Characteristics

The mean household size was approximately 10 people in Kiryandongo and 11 people in Gulu districts. There was a non-significant difference ($P>0.05$) in family size between Gulu and Kiryandongo. Most household heads were male in Kiryandongo (90.2%) and Gulu (76.7%), but in Gulu, there were more female heads of households (23.3%) than in Kiryandongo (9.8%). Most heads of households were aged between 30 and 50 years in both districts (Table 1), and the majority had had a primary school education level (Kiryandongo, 39.3% and Gulu, 70.0%).

Table 1: Status of the heads of households in Northern and Midwestern Uganda.

Variable	Category	Proportion of farmers by location (%)		P-value*
		Kiryandongo (n = 60)	Gulu (n = 60)	
Gender of the Household head				
	Male	90.2	76.7	0.046
	Female	9.8	23.3	
Age (years)				
	≤30	8.5	5.9	0.297
	30-50	59.3	55.9	
	≥ 50	32.2	39	
Education level attained				
	Illiterate	9.8	5	0.061
	Primary	39.3	70	
	Secondary	39.3	21.7	
	Tertiary	11.6	3.3	
Marital status of household head				
	Married	95.1	81.7	0.042
	Single	1.6	0.0	

	Divorce	0.0	3.3	
	Widower	3.3	15.0	
* Within each variable, categories with a P-value less than 0.05 are significantly different				

Chicken Ownership, Rearing Chicken Experience, and Source of Knowledge

Chicken ownership was mostly a joint family venture (56.2%) in both districts. However, more chickens were owned by the female spouses in Kiryandongo districts (18%), whereas in Gulu district, male spouses owned more chickens (28.3%) compared to their female counterparts (13.3%). In general, the majority of the farmers in both sites of study reported that they have been rearing local chickens for a period of 1-20 years (67.3%), while 25.5% had reared birds for a period of 21-40 years. Parent-to-child flow of information was the most common pathway through which skills and knowledge on local chicken rearing were passed on from generation to generation. This was observed in 77.0% of households in Kiryandongo and 78.3% of Gulu households. The self-initiative of the farmer and formal training were reported to be the least source of knowledge for farmers in both study sites (Table 2).

Table 2: Chicken rearing experience, ownership, and source of knowledge.

Variable	Category	Proportion of farmers by location (%)			P-value*
		Kiryandongo (n = 60)	Gulu (n = 60)	Overall (n = 120)	
Chicken rearing experience (years)					
	1-20	66.7	67.8	67.3	0.55
	21-40	25.5	25.4	25.5	
	>40	7.8	6.8	7.3	
Chicken ownership					
	Female Spouse	18.0	13.3	15.7	0.05
	Male Spouse	16.4	28.3	22.3	
	Children	6.6	0.0	3.3	
	Joint ownership in the family	54.1	58.3	56.2	
Source of knowledge					
	From parents	77.0	78.3	77.7	0.55
	From own initiative	14.8	15.0	14.9	
	From colleagues & neighbours	1.6	5.0	3.3	
	Formal training	6.6	1.7	4.1	
* Within each variable, categories with a P-value less than 0.05 are significantly different					

Flock Productivity

Sexual maturity of local cocks and hens in Kiryandongo and Gulu districts were reported to be the same ($P>0.05$). The egg-laying cycle was also found to be the same ($P>0.05$) in Gulu and Kiryandongo at three times a year (Table 3). A significant difference ($P<0.01$) was observed in the number of eggs per laying cycle between Kiryandongo and Gulu. Also, eggs given for incubation and the number of chicks hatched per lay differed ($P<0.05$) between the two districts, as did the number of surviving chicks between the two districts ($P<0.01$) (Table 3).

Breeds and Breeding Management of Chickens

In Kiryandongo, the Nyoro chicken ecotype was being reared by 64% of the households, as the rest of the households reared Luo, Acholi, Lango, and Nduli ecotypes (Table 4). In Gulu district, all households reared the Acholi ecotype. All farmers in Gulu practiced selection of breeding stock where whereas in Kiryandongo, a small portion (4.9%) of farmers do not practice selection (Table 4). Breeding cocks in both study sites were kept mostly for a period of one to three years in the flock. In both sites of the study, farmers' flocks were comprised of unimproved birds since most of them were not practicing crossbreeding. Only a small proportion of 10.2% and 1.7% of the farmers were practicing crossbreeding in Kiryandongo and Gulu, respectively (Table 4).

Table 3: Least squares means of flock productivity parameters of chickens reared in northern and mid-western Uganda.

Productivity parameter	Proportion of farmers by location (%)			P-value*
	Kiryandongo (n = 60)	Gulu (n = 60)	Overall (n = 120)	
Age of cocks at sexual maturity (months)	6.12 ± 0.20	6.36 ± 0.12	6.25 ± 0.12	0.333
Age of hens at sexual maturity (months)	5.91 ± 0.22	6.28 ± 0.15	6.10 ± 0.13	0.175
Egg clutches/bird/year	3.33 ± 0.12	3.10 ± 0.07	3.21 ± 0.07	0.104
Number of eggs per clutch	13.87 ± 0.34	12.27 ± 0.26	13.07 ± 0.22	0.001
Eggs given per hen for incubation	10.57 ± 0.28	11.93 ± 0.29	11.25 ± 0.21	0.015
Number of chicks hatched per clutch	8.73 ± 0.32	9.83 ± 0.31	9.28 ± 0.22	0.015
Number of surviving chicks at weaning	5.80 ± 0.24	6.73 ± 0.28	6.27 ± 1.93	0.001
* Within each parameter, locations with a P-value less than 0.05 are significantly different				

Source of Breeding Stock

Breeding stock was mostly acquired through purchasing in 88.5% and 93.3% of the households in Kiryandongo and Gulu, respectively. Overall, few farmers acquired chickens as gifts (8.3%) and through exchange for labour (0.8%).

Table 4: Breeding management of local chickens.

Productivity parameter	Proportion of farmers by location (%)			P-value*
	Kiryandongo (n = 60)	Gulu (n = 60)	Overall (n = 120)	
Chicken ecotype reared by the farmers				
Nyoro	64.0	0.0	32.0	0.001
Acholi	8.0	100	54.0	
Luo	16.0	0.0	8.0	
Lango	6.0	0.0	3.0	
Nduli	6.0	0.0	3.0	
Carrying out selection				
Yes	95.1	100	97.5	0.261
No	4.9	0.0	2.5	
Duration of keeping a breeding cock				
1-3 years	85.7	90.0	88.1	0.419
3 years	14.3	10.0	11.9	
Practicing crossbreeding				
Yes	10.2	1.7	5.9	0.049
No	88.3	98.3	94.1	

* Within each variable, categories with a P-value less than 0.05 are significantly different

Egg Incubation Method

All farmers relied on natural incubation by hens as a mode of egg incubation in both Gulu and Kiryandongo, but the facilities for incubation differed widely among the respondents. The grass nest was mostly used in Kiryandongo (28.3%), while the use of grass with sand as nesting material was mostly reported in Gulu (38.3%). The use of sand together with other facilities for natural incubation was reported frequently (Table 5).

Table 5: Egg incubation facilities used by broody hens.

Incubation facility	Proportion of farmers by location (%)			P-value*
	Kiryandongo (n = 60)	Gulu (n = 60)	Overall (n = 120)	
Grass nest + sand	3.3	38.3	20.8	0.0001
Acholi traditional nest	21.7	16.7	19.2	
Grass nest only	28.3	5.0	16.7	
Brick ring + sand	1.7	16.7	9.2	
Basin + sand	18.3	0.0	9.2	
Basin + sand+ Grass	3.3	13.3	8.3	
Paper box+ grass	10.0	0.0	5.0	
Hole + sand + grass	1.7	5.0	3.5	
Basket + sand	6.7	0.0	3.3	
Basin + clothes	1.7	3.3	2.3	
Hole + sacs	3.3	0.0	1.7	
Wood stem cut cylindrically	0.0	1.7	0.8	

*Categories with a P-value less than 0.05 are significantly different

Selection Criteria of Breeding Stock

Farmers in the study area use a variety of criteria when selecting hens and cocks for a breeding stock. Body size for both cocks and hens was the most important trait used in the selection criteria (Table 6 and 7). Big cocks and hens were reported to be always selected. Specifically, for cocks, tallness was a good physical trait for selection. Other traits of interest in the selection of cocks included fast growth, plumage and the degree of activeness of the flock as shown in Table 6. In addition to the big body size in females, farmers also selected based on egg production, mothering, and hatching ability. In contrast, some farmers preferred small-bodied hens and associated them with good egg production and mothering ability (Table 7).

Housing and Its Maintenance

All farmers in Kiryandongo provided complete enclosures for their birds as overnight shelter (Table 8). In Gulu, 43.3% of the respondents' birds were staying in trees overnight. Cleaning was the major maintenance done by farmers in both districts, followed by spraying chemicals in the facilities against parasites. About 6.5% of the farmers do not undertake any management measures for chicken houses (Table 8).

Mortality Levels and their Associated Causes

Chicks were the household flock sub-group with the highest level of mortality. This was reported by 98% of the respondents. Diseases were the major cause of deaths and loss of chicks,

followed by predators, parasites, cold weather, and thieves. Newcastle disease was the most prevalent disease reported by 46% (in Kiryandongo) and 34% of Gulu farmers, followed by infectious bronchitis (17% in Kiryandongo and 31% in Gulu), chicken pox (13% in Kiryandongo and 14% in Gulu) and bacillary white diarrhoea (7% in Kiryandongo).

Table 6: Selection Criteria for Breeding Cocks.

Variables	Kiryandongo				Gulu				Total			
	HH ^a	HH ^b	Total ^c	Index ^d	HH ^a	HH ^b	Total ^c	Index ^d	HH ^a	HH ^b	Total ^c	Index ^d
Big body size	46	34	124	0.51	51	42	144	0.53	97	76	268	0.51
Tall	26	11	62	0.25	39	11	83	0.30	65	22	145	0.28
Fast growth rate	16	8	38	0.16	10	3	20	0.07	26	11	58	0.11
Uniform feathering	6	2	12	0.05	5	1	10	0.04	11	3	22	0.04
Plumage color ¹	1	0	2	0.01	3	1	7	0.03	4	1	9	0.02
Big comb size	2	0	4	0.02	1	0	1	0.00	3	0	5	0.01
High vigour	4	1	9	0.04	3	2	7	0.03	8	3	17	0.03
Total	101	56	245		112	60	272		214	116	524	

HH^a: total number of households that ranked a trait as a criterion for selection (i.e. 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.)
HH^b: number of households that ranked a trait as the first criterion (e.g., body size);
Total^c: The total weighted rank computed by multiplying the proportion of households that gave a rank to a particular criterion and the rank weight. Rank 1 was weighted 3, rank 2 was weighted 2, and rank 3 was weighted 1
Index^d: was computed as the sum of [3 for rank 1 + 2 for rank 2 + 1 for rank 3] of a criterion divided by the sum [3 for rank 1 + 2 for rank 2 + 1 for rank 3] for all households selecting chickens of a particular sex
¹: The plumage colour preferred was spotted black and white.

Table 7: Selection Criteria for Breeding Hens.

	Kiryandongo				Gulu				Total			
	HH ^a	HH ^b	Total ^c	Index ^d	HH ^a	HH ^b	Total ^c	Index ^d	HH ^a	HH ^b	Total ^c	Index ^d
Big size	26	22	73	0.40	30	23	82	0.36	56	45	155	0.38
Good layer	13	10	36	0.20	23	19	64	0.28	36	29	100	0.24
Small size	12	12	36	0.20	9	6	24	0.11	21	18	60	0.15
Good mothering ability & hatchability	7	3	16	0.09	22	9	51	0.22	29	12	67	0.16
Fast growth	7	3	17	0.09	0	0	0	0.00	5	3	13	0.03
Tall	2	0	4	0.02	3	0	6	0.03	7	0	14	0.03
Total	67	50	182		87	57	227		154	107	409	

HH^a: total number of households that ranked a trait as a criterion for selection (i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) HH^b: number of households that ranked a trait as the first criterion (e.g., body size); Total^c: The total weighted rank computed by multiplying the proportion of households that gave a rank to a particular criterion and the rank weight. Rank 1 was weighted 3, rank 2 was weighted 2, and rank 3 was weighted 1. Index^d: was computed as the sum of [3 for rank 1 + 2 for rank 2 + 1 for rank 3] of a criterion divided but the sum [3 for rank 1 + 2 for rank 2 + 1 for rank 3] for all households selecting chickens of a particular sex ¹: The plumage colour preferred was spotted black and white.

Most diseases in Kiryandongo were reported to occur in the dry season (51.7%), while in Gulu, the peak was mostly during the rainy season (56.3%). With respect to treatment and disease prevention, the majority of the farmers used local herbs such as pawpaw leaves, *Aloe vera*, *Moringa oleifera*, and others. Other measures taken to reduce mortality levels among flocks were the use of commercial veterinary drugs, vaccination, and isolation of the sick birds.

Table 8: Overnight housing facilities for birds and their maintenance.

	Proportion of farmers by location (%)			P-value*
	Kiryandongo (n = 60)	Gulu (n = 60)	Overall (n = 120)	
Housing facilities overnight				
Complete enclosure	100	56.7	78.5	0.0001
Rest on the trees	0.0	43.3	21.5	
Mode of maintenance of chicken housing facilities				
Cleaning/ sweeping	65.5	66.6	66.1	0.02
Spraying with pesticides	13.1	8.3	10.7	
Use hot ash ¹	14.7	0.0	7.4	
Smearing the floor with cattle dung to make it smooth	0.0	21.7	1.9	
Provide litter on the floor	3.2	0.0	1.6	
Repair of the house	1.6	1.7	1.2	
No management	11.4	1.7	6.5	
* Within each variable, categories with a P-value less than 0.05 are significantly different				
¹ Hot ash is broadcast on the floor to dry the dung and kill pathogens in the house/use as a disinfectant.				

DISCUSSION

Smallholder poultry production in much of the world uses local/indigenous genetic resources that are well adapted to harsh environments usually associated with limited resources, extreme climatic conditions, rampant pathogen outbreaks, and severe predation (FAO, 2010). As part of the global plan of action for the sustainable utilisation of animal genetic resources, a key outcome is characterisation, inventorying, and monitoring of existing populations (FAO, 2019), and this study was in line with this objective. We found that household size has increased compared to the household size reported by UBOS (2010), who had reported the average size of households in rural areas of Northern Uganda as having 5.2 members. We report a mean size of 10 people per household in Kiryandongo and 11 in the Gulu district. The shift could be explained by focusing the study on peri-urban and rural areas where households tend to have larger families. The study area had returned to peace after decades of civil war, and the shifts in population could be further attributed to settlement. Most of the households in the northern region were composed of a father and his married sons. The proportion of male-headed households in Kiryandongo (90.2%) is comparable to that of chicken farming households in Eastern Uganda districts of Kumi (91.2%) (Kugonza et al., 2008) and Kamuli (98%) (Natukunda et al., 2011). On the other hand, significant proportions (23.3%) of households in Gulu were female-headed, attributable to the recently ended twenty-year civil war in the region that ravaged the region and caused loss and displacement of the population. Household heads in the age range of 30-50 years (Table 1) were the majority, and their proportion in the two districts was close to the 59.2% national average of Ugandans in the age range of 26-50 years (UBOS, 2010). Most farmers attained some form of education in both locations, and the literacy levels in both districts were much higher than the average for Northern Uganda (77.3%) (UBOS, 2010) and Eastern Uganda (87%) (Kugonza et al., 2008).

In most households, chickens were owned jointly by family members (Table 2), though overall, males still dominated the ownership charts. Local chicken management in rural areas involves all family members who contribute to mutual labour. This is quite unique from other enterprises where livestock are largely owned and managed by the male members of the

household, as has been documented for cattle (Kugonza et al., 2012; Hirwa et al., 2017), pigs (Nabikyu and Kugonza, 2016), and goats (Kugonza et al., 2001); and inheritance only follows the patrilineal path. Most farmers in both study sites reported that they have experience of up to 20 years in managing local chickens. Skills and knowledge on local chicken rearing are passed on from generation to generation from parent to child, and this was the most common pathway for knowledge transfer. This underscores the big role of informal education in most agricultural communities, but also points to a weak extension system, especially for traditional enterprises such as family/local/native chicken farming.

Flock productivity indices, namely: age at sexual maturity, egg number or clutch size, and number of clutches per hen, are very critical for the growth and expansion of a given flock of chickens. These parameters to a great impact on the lifetime performance of a breeder chicken. In this study, both hens and cocks attained sexual maturity at six months (Table 3). Studies elsewhere have shown comparable results of sexual maturity to age of 5-7 months for males and 6-7 months for females (Kugonza et al., 2008); 6-8 months for both sexes (Mwalusanya et al., 2001) and of 5-7 months for both sexes (Kyarisiima et al., 2004). The number of clutches per hen in our study was three per year, with a mean of 13 eggs per clutch. This closely compares with findings of Aboe et al. (2006) who reported 3-4 clutches per year, with a clutch size range of 10-20 eggs in Ghana. Similarly, Kugonza et al. (2008) reported 3-4 clutches per year with an average of 13 eggs in chickens of Eastern Uganda. Another study done in Uganda reported 2.5-3 clutches and a mean of 6-20 eggs per clutch (Kyarisiima et al., 2004). Most farmers in Gulu and Kiryandongo reported high hatchability rates, with an overall mean of 81.8%, quite comparable to 84% reported for chickens in Bangladesh (Hossen, 2010) but much higher than the hatchability of 75% in Ghana (Aboe et al., 2006). A study in Eastern Uganda a decade ago reported a much higher chicken egg hatchability of 90% for naturally incubating chickens (Kugonza et al., 2008).

Farmers in Gulu and Kiryandongo were carrying out selection of their breeding stock within the flock obtained in the two locations (Table 4). Selection of breeding stock is a critical step in ensuring the sustainable utilisation and conservation of a given breed (AU-IBAR, 2019). For the chicken farmers engaged in this study, their practice of selection is probably intended to maintain good traits that are present in their flocks, such as body size and egg production. Furthermore, finding that farmers do not practice cross-breeding in their flocks supports the conservation efforts, especially on such traits as disease resistance/tolerance which is paramount in the rearing of local chickens under the free range system. Cross-breeding programs that aim to produce hybrids require that the logistics that are involved in breeding and distribution of the hybrids to participating smallholder farmers be carefully spelled out (FAO, 2010), and without such arrangements, the status quo is found. Breeding cocks were generally being kept in the flocks for up to three years, but this practice increases the possibility of inbreeding even though the farmers expect to balance this by out-breeding using cocks from the neighbourhood. In most households, the breeding stocks were almost exclusively acquired through purchase. In Teso communities, purchase of breeding cocks is dominant, but exchange for labour and acquisition as gifts are also very common modes of acquiring chickens (Kugonza et al., 2008).

The farmer's selection criteria are mainly focused on improving the productivity of their flocks as opposed to the traditional focus on aesthetic traits. Most traits, namely, big body size, tall height, fast growth rate and vigour (Table 6) aim at having heavy-weight birds as early as possible for marketing. Osei-Amponsah (2024) recently reported that in choosing genetic solutions for improved chicken production in Ghana, farmers have a high preference for better growth performance. Additionally, when selecting hens, emphasis is put on reproductive rate and efficiency. Good laying ability, laying egg with a high hatchability and having good mothering ability are highly regarded traits. It should be noted though that high egg production and broodiness are negatively correlated traits (FAO, 2010) meaning that hens that have been bred for high egg yield have more or less lost their inherent ability to go broody. The positive attributes sought by farmers are good brooders and hens with excellent mothering ability (Kyarisiima et al., 2004) but with proliferation of artificial incubators particularly those that are solar power-operated, as well as innovations that do not need artificial power such as the rice husk incubator (Roy et al. 2004), the interest in natural incubation may wane (FAO, 2010). Farmers in the Middle East rank good layers more highly than birds that are superior in other traits because they contribute significantly to flock productivity (Abdelqader et al., 2007). Innovations that enhance the natural brooding process exist, and these include the brooding box technology that has evaluated and validated (Kugonza et al. 2006; Lutalo et al. 2010).

This study found that farmers provide shelter during night, categorized into household kitchens, houses for human beings, separately built chicken houses and trees. The findings in this study relate to the system used by farmer in Kamuli (Natukunda et al., 2011) and Kumi districts of Uganda (Kugonza et al., 2008). Gondwe and Wollny (2007) reported that in Malawi human dwelling units (84.5%), household kitchens (8.05%) built separately from main house, and traditional poultry houses (locally called *khola*) are used. There is a need for farmers to invest in better housing for their birds. Indeed, it is surprising that almost one quarter of the farmers would rely on trees as shelters to accommodate birds despite the exultance of thefts and predation threats, and still claim to be owning and rearing such chickens for a goal.

In both Kiryandongo and Gulu, chicks were the age group of chickens that died the most. We observed a mortality rate of 98% that was proportionately higher than 73.7% previously reported for chicks in Eastern Uganda (Kugonza et al., 2008) and 75% in the Accra plains of Ghana (Aboe et al., 2006). Chicken deaths/losses mostly occur because of diseases, predators, thieves, and bad weather. Newcastle disease was the major disease reported in this study, and being the devastating infection it is, popularising vaccination, especially with the recently commercialised thermostable vaccine. Similar findings have been reported by Ambala et al. (2007), who reported that seasonal outbreaks of chicken diseases, specifically Newcastle disease, are the major cause of death for local chickens in North-West Amhara in Ethiopia. Similarly, Kugonza et al. (2008) found that Newcastle is the most reported disease by farmers of Kumi district in Uganda. High levels of chick mortality have also been reported by Mwalusanya et al. (2001) at 60% from hatching up to weaning at 10 weeks. To treat sick birds or prevent chicken diseases in their flocks, the majority of the farmers reported that they use local herbs such as pawpaw roots, *Aloe vera* leaves, *Moringa oleifera* leaves, and others. The use of herbs was also reported by Kyarisiima et al. (2004). Other measures taken to reduce mortality levels among flocks are commercial veterinary drugs, vaccination, and isolation of the

sick birds. Reliance on herbs for the treatment of diseases has declined, and this could be a result of increased investment and/or improved returns from investment in better health care of the birds, as well as growth in investment in animal drugs marketing, particularly in traditionally difficult to reach areas.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Farmers in Kiryandongo and Gulu districts are quite interested in rearing local chickens. Most of the farmers' experience in rearing chickens is acquired generation to generation from parents to children. The productivity of local chickens in the regions is mostly limited by breeding method, mostly because of the long period of keeping a breeding cock in the flock which most likely results into inbreeding. The productivity is also affected by the low genetic potential of local chickens. However, chicken productivity could be enhanced by improved breeding management practices, reducing losses on flock numbers, by preventing predation and diseases. This may be achieved by strengthening and prioritizing chickens among the species of focus for extension packages.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

Donald Rugira Kugonza: conceptualisation, research fund acquisition, study design, supervision, data collection, data analysis, writing of manuscript, coordination of reviews, and approval of final manuscript draft. Aline Kayitesi: data collection, writing of manuscript, approval of final manuscript draft. Christine Nakkazi: data collection, writing of manuscript, approval of final manuscript draft. Marion Wilfred Okot: research fund acquisition, supervision, writing of manuscript, approval of final manuscript draft.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge a research ELOCHIP grant project, "Enhancing Local Chicken Productivity through Strategic Breeding and Nutrition Management in Northern Uganda", Grant No. RU-CGS-GRG-30-9-11 from RUFORUM (Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture), and we are grateful for farmers that participated in this study.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Data Availability

The data associated with the manuscript are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

- [1]. Abdelqader, A., Wollny, C.B.A., Gauly, M. (2007). Characterization of local chicken production systems and their potential under different levels of management practices in Jordan. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 39: p.155–164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-007-9000-x>
- [2]. Aboe, P.A.T., Boa-Amponsem, K., Okantah, S.A., Butler, E.A., Dorward, P.T., Bryant, M.J. (2006). Free range village chickens on the Accra plains, Ghana: Their husbandry and productivity. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 38, 235–248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-006-4356-x>

- [3]. Ambala, A.G., Abubakar, M.B., Tamjdo, T. (2007). Rural chicken production: effects of gender on ownership and management responsibilities in some parts of Nigeria and Cameroon. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, 6, 413–416. doi:10.3923/ijps.2007.413.416
- [4]. AU-IBAR (African Union – Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources). (2019). *The State of Farm Animal Genetic Resources in Africa*. AU-IBAR, Nairobi. 304 pp.
- [5]. FAO, (2018). *Africa Sustainable Livestock 2050 - Livestock and livelihoods spotlight – Uganda: Cattle and poultry sectors*. FAO, Rome. 12 pp. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/665e045a-b799-46d4-9027-ac9a95fc9463>
- [6]. FAO, (2019). *The State of the World’s Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture*. FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, Rome. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/<https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/50b79369-9249-4486-ac07-9098d07df60a/content>.
- [7]. Winder, R.J., et al., Algorithms for digital image processing in diabetic retinopathy. *Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics*, 2009. 33(8): p. 608-622.
- [8]. Gondwe, T.N., Wollny, C.B.A. (2007). Local chicken production system in Malawi: household flock structure, dynamics, management and health. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 39, 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-006-4293-8>
- [9]. Hirwa, C.D., Kugonza, D.R., Murekezi, T., Rwemarika, J.D., Kayitesi, A., Musemakweri, A., Shabayiro, J.P., Shumbusho, F., Manzi, M., Safari, T. (2017). Management and phenotypic features of indigenous cattle in Rwanda. *International Journal of Livestock Production*, 8(7), 95–112. <https://doi.org/10.5897/IJLP>
- [10]. Hossen, M.J. (2010). Effect of management intervention on the productivity and profitability of indigenous chickens under rural conditions in Bangladesh. *Livestock Research Rural Development*, 22(192), <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd22/10/hoss22192.htm>
- [11]. Yussif, I., Kugonza, D.R., Okot, M.W., Amuge, P.O., Costa, R., Dos Anjos, F. (2023). The Uganda chicken genetic resources: I. Phenotypic characteristics and production dynamics. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 13, 1033031. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2022.1033031>
- [12]. Kugonza, D.R., Kyarisiima, C.C., Iisa, A. (2008). Indigenous chicken flocks of Eastern Uganda: I. Productivity, management and strategies for better performance. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 20(9), www.lrrd.org/lrrd20/9/kugo20137.
- [13]. Kugonza, D.R., Nabasiye, M., Hanotte, O., Mpairwe, D., Okeyo, A.M. (2012). Pastoralists’ indigenous selection criteria and other breeding practices of the long-horned Ankole cattle in Uganda. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 44(3), 557–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-011-9935-9>
- [14]. Kugonza, D.R., Bareeba, F.B., Kirembe, G. (2001). Characterisation of Meat goat management systems in three districts of central Uganda. *MUARIK Bulletin*, 4, 26–29.
- [15]. Kugonza, D.R., Kirembe, G., Tomusange, E., Mulindwa, P., Namussu, R., Lutalo, D., Drani, E. (2006). Confined incubation and brooding as strategies for improving smallholder rural poultry productivity: An on-farm evaluation of a farmer’s innovations. 9th Annual Graduate Workshop of the Faculty of Agriculture, Makerere University (MUARIK, Uganda) Proceedings, 9, 14–15.
- [16]. Kyarisiima, C.C., Kugonza, D.R., Twesigye, C.K. (2004). The potential role of the Ugandan indigenous chicken in poverty alleviation. *The Uganda Journal*, 50, 85–90. <https://www.africabib.org/rec.php?RID=Q00038698>
- [17]. Lutalo, R., Tomusange-Nvule, E., Kirembe, G., Kugonza, D.R., Lutalo, S., Critchley, W. (2010). Trying out joint experimentation in poultry farming in Uganda: An experiment in itself. (Chapter 10) In: Wettasinha, C. and Waters-Bayer, A. (eds). *Farmer-led joint research: Experiences of PROLINNOVA partners*. Silang, Cavite, Philippines : IIRR/Leusden, ETC EcoCulture. pp. 64–69. https://www.academia.edu/56169631/Trying_out_joint_experimentation_in_poultry_farming_in_Uganda_a_n_experiment_in_itself

- [18]. MAAIF & UBOS (Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries; Uganda Bureau of Statistics), (2018). Uganda Bureau of Statistics; statistical abstract. Kampala. From <http://www.ggdc.net/maddison/> and <http://faostat.fao.org/site/291/default.aspx>.
- [19]. Mugga, R. (2007). Uganda sees a market for indigenous birds. *World Poultry* 23(1): <http://www.worldpoultry.net>.
- [20]. Mwalusanya, N.A., Katule, A.M., Mutayoba, S.K., Mtambo, M.M.A., Olsen, J.E. and Minga, U.M. (2001). Productivity of local chickens under village management conditions. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, 34, 405–416. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020048327158>
- [21]. Nabikyu, J.R., Kugonza, D.R. (2016). Profitability analysis of selected piggery businesses in peri-urban communities of Kampala, Uganda. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 28(5), 1–10. Retrieved December 31, 2024, from <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd28/5/nabi28095.html>
- [22]. Natukunda, K., Kugonza, D.R., Kyarisiima, C.C. (2011). Indigenous chickens of the Kamuli Plains in Uganda: II Factors affecting their marketing and profitability. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 23(10), www.lrrd.org/lrrd23/10/natu23221.htm.
- [23]. Osei-Amponsah R., Aboagye, R.P., Agyemang, E.D., Naazie, A., Ayizanga, R., Njamba, H., Esatu, W., Birhanu, M.Y., Dessie, T. (2024). Genetics solutions for improved chicken production in Ghana. *Genetic Resources* 5(10), 107-116. doi:10.46265/genresj.OFCR3000.
- [24]. Tadelle, D., Million, T., Alemu, Y., Peters, K.J. (2003). Village chicken production systems in Ethiopia: Flock characteristics and performance. *Livestock Research for Rural Development* 15(1), <http://www.cipav.org.co/cipav/pubs/index.htm>
- [25]. UBOS, (Uganda Bureau of Statistics) (2010). Uganda National Household Survey 2008/2009 Report on Agricultural Module. Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Entebbe, Uganda.
- [26]. UBOS, (Uganda Bureau of Statistics) (2018). 2018 Statistical Abstract. Uganda Bureau of Statistics. Kampala, 315 pp.
- [27]. UBOS, (Uganda Bureau of Statistics) (2019). Livestock, crop production increases – UBOS. Brief on the Agricultural Survey 2018. Kampala.