



GESDAV

Journal of Environmental and Occupational Science

available at www.scopemed.org



Original Research

Assessment of the prevailing handling and quality of eggs from scavenging indigenous chickens reared in different agro-ecological zones of Ethiopia

Aberra Melesse¹, Zemene Worku², Yosef Teklegiorgis¹

¹School of Animal and Range Sciences, Hawassa University, P.O. Box 5, Hawassa, Ethiopia

²Mirtu Lemariam Agricultural Technical Vocational Education and Training College, Amhara Regional State, Ethiopia

Received: December 29, 2012

Accepted: January 04, 2013

Published: January 13, 2013

DOI : 10.5455/jeos.20130104091334

Corresponding Author:

Aberra Melesse,
Hawassa University, Hawassa, Ethiopia
a_melesse@hu.edu.et

Key words: Agro-ecological zones; Egg handling; Egg quality traits; Rural households; Scavenging chickens

Abstract

A survey based experiment was conducted from November 2010 to April 2011 in 196 households to assess egg handling and qualities of scavenging chickens reared in highland, midland and lowland agro-ecological zones of Amhara Regional State, Ethiopia. For egg quality determination, among 196 households, 30 of them who keep only local chickens were identified from each agro-ecology from which 588 eggs (196 eggs from each agro-ecology) were collected. The flock size in highland, midland and lowland agro-ecologies was 8.5, 7.4 and 8.4 chickens, respectively. The results indicated that about 95% and 70% of the respondents fumigate day old chicks with smoke and clip tail feathers, respectively. The average age at first egg lay was 6.94, 6.43 and 6.57 months for highland, midland and lowland agro-ecologies, respectively. The survivability of chickens in highland, midland and lowland agro-ecological zones was 55.0%, 61.4% and 55.1%, respectively. On the average 79.1% hatchability, 58.3% chick survivability was found in the study area. The observed values of egg weight, egg length, egg width, yolk height, albumen height and Haugh unit were significantly ($p < 0.05$) different between the investigated agro-ecologies. Accordingly, all these traits were ($p < 0.05$) higher in midland than those of highland and lowland agro-ecological zones. Agro-ecology did not affect shape index, shell thickness, yolk width and yolk index values. The respective average egg weight, shell thickness and shape index values were 39.6 g, 0.296 mm and 73.2%. The average values of yolk height, yolk width and Haugh unit were 16.1 mm, 36.8 mm and 73.2, respectively. In conclusion, the midland agro-ecological system appears to favor the survivability and expression of external and internal egg quality traits of scavenging rural chickens.

© 2013 GESDAV

INTRODUCTION

The importance of scavenging local poultry production in the national economy of developing countries and its role in improving the nutritional status and incomes of many small farmers and landless communities has been recognized by various scholars and rural development agencies over the last few decades [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Indigenous and local chicken breeds contribute to poultry meat and egg production and consumption in developing countries, where they make up to 90% of the total poultry population. This is so because they are

well-adapted to the scavenging conditions, with very low impact on environmental degradation, under which they are maintained [6]. Moreover, Van der Weiber [7] reported that poultry meat and egg production is the most environmentally efficient animal protein production system. Scavenging based rural poultry production has also a less detrimental impact on the environment than other livestock and uses less water.

In Ethiopia chickens are the most widespread, and almost every rural family owns scavenging birds, which provide a valuable source of family protein and

extra cash incomes [8, 2.]. The total chicken population in the country is estimated to be 49.3 million [9]. The majorities (96.5%) of these birds are indigenous ecotypes which are maintained under scavenging system with little or no inputs for housing, feeding or health care [9]. This figure proves the importance of village chicken production for rural development and feeding.

Eggs are balanced sources of essential amino acids as well as some minerals and vitamins [10]. Egg proteins contain all essential amino acids for human diet and therefore egg protein is used as standard for measuring the nutritional quality of other food products [11, 12]. A single egg would contribute 3-4% of an adult's average energy requirement per day and contains about 6.5 g of protein [13]. Furthermore, chicken eggs could be stored in hot climates under local conditions more easily than most foods of animal origin [14].

Both external and internal qualities of eggs are of major importance to the egg industry worldwide. However, they are not being given due attention in the developing world, where the majority of the eggs are coming from free scavenging village chicken, as compared to that of the developed world [15]. To date there are no detailed studies conducted on the description of the existing handling and storage of scavenging local hen eggs and assessment of internal and external quality of marketable eggs in various agro-ecological zones of the targeted study area. Therefore, this study was designed to assess the existing handling and quality of eggs collected from local scavenging chickens reared in highland, midland and lowland agro-ecological production systems.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Description of the study area

The study was conducted between November 2010 and April 2011 in three agro-ecological zones of Amhara Regional State, Ethiopia. The coverage of the three agro-ecological zones is highland (>2500 m a.s.l, 12%), lowland (<1500 m a.s.l, 40%) and midland (1500-2500 m a.s.l, 48%). The surveyed area is composed of 37 peasant associations (PAs), which are distributed in the three agro-ecological zones.

Data collection procedures

Sampling technique

The study consisted of survey and egg quality examination of local chickens in the three agro-ecological zones of the studied district. The survey part was accomplished through interview using pre-tested structured questionnaires and this was augmented with group discussions and direct observations. To this

effect, the surveyed district was stratified into highland, midland and lowland agro-ecological zones. One, two and three PAs were selected randomly from highland, lowland and midland agro-ecological zones, respectively. A total of 196 households who keep a minimum of five or above chickens were selected from land registration book of the PAs using systematic random sampling technique.

Eggs were directly collected from local chickens owned by the interviewed household farmers. During egg sampling, the main intention was to collect eggs from local layers that were approximately similar in age. Accordingly, 150 chicken owners were randomly interviewed from each agro-ecology in order to identify those farmers that had only local chicken layer hens with more than one clutch number. In due regard 30 households were identified from each agro-ecology that satisfied the above intention and 588 eggs (196 eggs from each agro-ecology) were collected from the selected farmers.

Measuring egg quality traits

Eggs were weighed to the nearest of 0.01 g using a battery operated digital weighing balance (Model: DT 5k, LARK®). The length (mm) and breadth (mm) of each egg was measured at midpoint using a digital calliper to nearest of 0.05 mm and egg shape index was calculated using the definition of Panda [16].

Each egg was then broken out and albumen and yolk height measurements were taken using a tripod micrometer while yolk diameter was measured using digital calliper meter. Haugh unit (albumen height corrected for egg weight) was calculated for individual egg according to Haugh [17] by the formula: $HU = 100 \log (AH + 7.57 - 1.7EW^{0.37})$, where: HU= Haugh unit, AH= albumen height in mm and EW= egg weight in grams. Yolk height and diameter values were used to compute yolk index of the eggs according to the formula described by Panda [16]. Yolk color was measured with a Roche yolk color fan scale (Roche scale). Before measuring shell thickness, the shell was cleaned with tissue paper and air-dried at room temperature for 24 hours. Then, three pieces of shell was taken from the narrow side (sharp region), the middle side (equatorial region), and the broad-end side (blunt region) of each egg. First, shell membranes were removed by hand and then measured by a digital caliper to the nearest of 0.05 mm. The shell thickness (mm) was then calculated as an average of the thicknesses of the three pieces.

Statistical Analysis

Data were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the General Linear Models (GLM) Procedure of Statistical Analysis System [18]. Single factor ANOVA

test was employed to analyze differences among the three agro-ecologies with respect to various quantitative response variables. Where significant differences were observed, treatment means were compared with Duncan's Multiple Range Test. All statements of statistical differences were based on $p < 0.05$ unless noted otherwise

RESULTS

Incubation and chick management practices

Incubation and chick management practices in the study area are presented in Table 1. About 59% of the households reported that they clip the tail feathers and some extent wing feathers of their chickens. About 18% of chicken owners fumigate the broody hen or incubating hen with smoke of different herbs to make sure that the hen remains free from external parasites while incubating and brooding the chicks. About 80% of chicken owners allowed the incubating hen to feed and drink every other day and only 20.4 % of the respondents do the same every day (Table 1). The common types of incubating materials used are mud made (63.1%), grass made (9.2%), bamboo made (13.9 %), clay made (9.5%) and others (4.3%). Among the interviewed households, about 97% of them use bedding material mainly crop residues such as "Teff" (*Eragrostis tef*) straw, barley straw and wheat straw.

About 95% of the interviewed farmers preferred to incubate eggs during dry season while 4% during both seasons and only 1% during the rainy season (Table 1).

Various practices of chick management in the study area are presented in Table 2. Almost all households (95%) in the study area fumigate the newly hatched chicks with smoke of herbs known as *Tunjit* (*Ostegia integrifolia*). About 70% of chicken owners provide in-water soaked *Enjera* (local bread prepared from flour of *Eragrostis tef*) to the chicks at least during the first week of age. About 70% of households reported that they remove the tail feathers of the chicks. Among the interviewed households, 49% of them allow their chicks to scavenge when they reach the age of one week and above.

Reproductive traits of scavenging chickens

As shown in Table 3, the average chicken flock size in the study district was 7.9 chickens per household. Age at first egg of scavenging chickens in the study area was 6.6 months. The average number of eggs incubated per hen in this study was 12.8. Out of the incubated eggs, only 10 chicks were hatched, giving an average hatchability of 79.1%. Among the hatched chicks, only 5.5 chicks reached market age, which implies 58.3 % survival rate suggesting high chick mortality during the growing period.

Table 1. Incubation practices of chicks observed in highland, midland and lowland agro-ecological zones (N= 196 households)

Parameters (%)	Highland	Midland	Lowland	Overall mean
Hen treatment prior to incubation				
Fumigate with smoke	12.4	30.3	3.10	18.4
Clipping tail feather	81.3	61.6	44.6	59.2
No treatment at all	6.3	8.10	52.3	22.4
Feed and water provision				
Everyday	21.9	25.3	12.3	20.4
Every other day	78.1	74.7	87.7	79.6
Incubation materials				
Clay made	-	3.92	23.8	9.52
Mud made	65.9	66.4	56.3	63.1
Bamboo made	25.0	13.3	8.70	13.9
Grass made	9.10	10.9	6.20	9.15
Others (wood , floor)	-	5.48	5.00	4.33
Incubation seasons				
Rainy season	3.10	-	1.50	1.00
Dry season	96.9	96.0	92.3	94.9
Year round	-	4.00	6.20	4.10

Highland= >2500 m a.s.l; Midland= 1500-2500 m a.s.l; Lowland= <1500 m a.s.l

Table 2. Common chick management practices in highland, midland and lowland agro-ecological zones (N= 196 households)

Parameters (%)	Highland	Midland	Lowland	Overall mean
Fumigating with smoke (yes)	93.8	97.0	93.0	95.4
Type of feed for chicks				
In-water soaked <i>Enjera</i> *	81.3	69.7	64.6	69.9
Ground grains	18.7	29.3	35.4	29.6
Boiled Teff (<i>Eragrostis tef</i>)	-	1.00	-	0.50
Water provision (yes)	28.1	22.2	16.9	21.4
Tail feather clipping (yes)	71.9	72.7	66.2	70.4
Letting to scavenge chicks				
at day old	3.10	9.10	7.70	7.80
after 1-2 weeks	50.0	45.5	55.4	49.5
after 3-4 weeks	43.8	32.3	24.6	31.5
after a month	3.10	13.10	12.3	11.2

Highland= >2500 m a.s.l.; Midland= 1500-2500 m a.s.l.; Lowland= <1500 m a.s.l

*Local bread prepared from flour of *Eragrostis tef*

Table 3. Reproductive characteristics of local chickens reared in highland, midland and lowland agro-ecological zones (Mean \pm SD)

Parameters	Highland	Midland	Lowland	Overall mean (N= 196 Hh)
Flock size/ household	8.5 \pm 5.10 ^a	7.4 \pm 4.34 ^a	8.4 \pm 4.70 ^a	7.90 \pm 4.60
Age at first egg (months)	6.94 \pm 1.60 ^a	6.43 \pm 1.60 ^a	6.57 \pm 1.50 ^a	6.60 \pm 1.60
Number of eggs incubated/hen	13.1 \pm 1.60 ^a	12.0 \pm 1.90 ^b	13.8 \pm 2.80 ^a	12.8 \pm 2.30
Number of eggs hatched/hen	10.8 \pm 2.40 ^a	9.60 \pm 2.30 ^b	10.2 \pm 3.00 ^a	10.0 \pm 2.30
Hatchability (%)	82.5 \pm 13.0 ^a	80.3 \pm 16.0 ^a	75.6 \pm 20.0 ^a	79.1 \pm 17.0
Number of chicks survived	5.63 \pm 1.40 ^a	5.60 \pm 1.50 ^a	5.3 \pm 2.00 ^a	5.50 \pm 1.70
Survivability (%)	55.0 \pm 2.00 ^a	61.4 \pm 5.50 ^a	55.1 \pm 2.30 ^a	58.25 \pm 2.30

^{ab} Means with different subscript across a row are significantly ($p < 0.05$) different

Highland= >2500 m a.s.l.; Midland= 1500-2500 m a.s.l.; Lowland= <1500 m a.s.l

Hh= Households

Egg quality traits

Average values of the investigated external and internal egg quality traits are presented in (Table 4). Some egg quality parameters such as egg weight, egg length, egg width, yolk height, albumen height and Haugh unit (HU) were significantly different between the investigated agro-ecologies in which better quality of the parameters was observed in midland agro-ecology. However, there were no significant differences observed between agro-ecological zones in values of shape index, shell thickness, yolk width and yolk index.

The egg weight obtained from midland scavenging chickens was significantly heavier than those of highland and lowland agro-ecological zones. Eggs collected from midland scavenging chickens had significantly higher length and width than those of highland and lowland agro-ecological zones. The overall mean egg length and egg width of the local chickens in the current study was 51.3 mm and 37.5 mm, respectively. The overall shape index of scavenging local chickens in the present study was 73.2% (Table 4). The average shell thickness in the current study was 0.296 mm.

Table 4. Egg quality traits of scavenging chickens in highland, midland and lowland agro-ecological zones (n= 196 eggs/agro-ecology)

Parameters	Highland	Midland	Lowland	Overall mean	S.E.M
Egg weight (g)	39.3 ^b	40.2 ^a	39.4 ^b	39.6	0.259
Egg length (mm)	51.2 ^b	51.7 ^a	51.1 ^b	51.3	0.156
Egg width (mm)	37.4 ^b	37.7 ^a	37.4 ^b	37.5	0.090
Shape index (%)	73.2 ^a	73.1 ^a	73.2 ^a	73.2	0.197
Shell thickness (mm)	0.298 ^a	0.295 ^a	0.297 ^a	0.296	0.002
Yolk width (mm)	36.6 ^a	37.1 ^a	36.7 ^a	36.8	0.175
Yolk height (mm)	16.1 ^{ab}	16.4 ^a	16.0 ^b	16.1	0.111
Yolk index (%)	44.1 ^a	44.2 ^a	43.7 ^a	44.0	0.337
Yolk color	9.38 ^a	9.29 ^a	9.10 ^a	9.26	0.111
Albumen height (mm)	4.30 ^c	4.75 ^a	4.46 ^b	4.51	0.051
Haugh unit	71.8 ^c	74.9 ^a	73.1 ^b	73.2	0.412

^{abc} Means with different superscript across the row are significantly ($p < 0.05$) different

Highland= >2500 m a.s.l.; Midland= 1500-2500 m a.s.l.; Lowland= <1500 m a.s.l

S.E.M= Standard error of the mean

The yolk height was significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher in midland than in highland agro-ecology (Table 4). The overall average yolk width of local chickens was 36.8 mm whereas yolk height was 16.1 mm resulting 44% of yolk index. The albumen height and HU values were significantly higher in scavenging chickens reared midland than those of lowland and highland agro-ecological zones. Chickens from lowland had significantly lower albumen height and HU values than those of both agro-ecological zones. The overall average values of albumen height and HU were 4.51 mm and 73.2, respectively.

DISCUSSION

Incubation and chick management practices

The most common incubating materials used in the study area were similar to those of Dessie et al. [8] and Moges et al. [14] reported to other parts of Ethiopia. In agreement with the present finding, Mekonnen [19] reported that 89.4% of chicken owners in southern Regional State of Ethiopia preferred incubating eggs during the dry season. The possible explanation why the rainy season is not preferred for incubating eggs might be due to shortage of feed and cold stress due to low ambient temperature and high mortality of hatched chicks caused by ground predators.

Farmers in the study area believe that fumigation of hatched chicks with smoke of herbs will protect them

from the incidence of Newcastle disease. Regardless of their perception, the practice of smoking would provide heat and thus make the chicks strong especially if they are wet. Moreover, the smoke would remove external parasites which the chicks may harbour from the mother hen and the incubation materials used.

Households in the study area believe that when tail feathers are removed from the chicks, they will grow faster and reach market weight at early age. This kind of farmers' perception may have some scientific justifications. Feathers contain approximately 90% crude protein [20] and hence if tail feathers are removed, that part of the protein which otherwise goes to tail feather growth may be used to build important parts of the chickens' body tissues.

Reproduction traits of scavenging chickens

The average flock size found in the current study is in line with those of Halima et al. [21] and Melesse and Negesse [5] who reported average flock size of 7.0 chickens for northwest and southern parts of Ethiopia, respectively. In southern Ethiopia, Mekonnen [19] reported an average flock size of 9.2 chickens per household for scavenging local chickens, which is slightly higher than the present result. On the other hand, a relatively higher flock size (12 chickens per household) was reported by Dinka et al. [22] in the Oromia Region of Ethiopia. Similarly, Yakubu [23] reported an average flock size of 13.9 birds per

household in Nigeria, which varied between 4 and 48 chickens per household.

Consistent with the findings of the current study, Kugonza et al. [24] and Iqbal and Pampori [25] reported average maturity age of 5-6 and 6-7 months for male and female chickens, respectively. A relatively long maturity age of local female chickens (6.8 - 7.6 months) was reported by Dessie et al. [8] and Mandal et al. [26]. These variations could be due to the genetic make of local chickens and management practices used by various communities.

Scavenging system is characterized by high chick mortality in the first two weeks of life, caused mainly by predators and Newcastle disease [5]. The number of hatched chicks out of the incubated eggs identified in this study was similar to the finding of Yakubu [23] who reported average hatched chicks of 8.78. According to Pedersen [27] the number of eggs incubated per clutch was 10.6 with average hatchability rate of 73%. Similarly, Ssewanyana et al. [28] reported higher hatchability (87%) for Ugandan scavenging local chickens. Hatchability of eggs is affected by a number of factors and thus, such differences in hatchability values are expected in the literature. In present study, the number of eggs incubated and hatched in midland was significantly lower than found in highland and lowland agro-ecological zones. This might be attributed to better market access to sale eggs to the nearby urban cities. Since the households set low number of eggs, it is apparent that the number of eggs hatched was lower in midland than highland and lowland agro-ecological zones.

Egg quality traits of scavenging chickens

The overall mean egg weight (39.6 g) obtained from the current study is in good agreement with the findings of Halima [29] and Mengesha et al. [30] for scavenging local chickens reared in various parts of Ethiopia. The egg weight of Indian backyard chicken reported by Mandal et al. [26] ranged from 35 to 40 g which finds similarity to the present work. The mean egg weight of scavenging local chickens in Tanzania reported by Nonga et al. [31] is also similar to the current result.

In agreement with the present finding, Malago and Baitilwake [32] reported average egg length and egg width of 51.4 mm and 38.3 mm, respectively for Tanzanian local chickens. Moges et al. [14] reported an average egg length of 50.9 mm for scavenging local chickens of Burie district of western Ethiopia which is consistent with the current findings.

Egg shape is an important parameter in the poultry industry for uniformed package of eggs during transportation over long distances by reducing possible

breakage of eggs. Eggs with higher shape index percentages are more circular in shape than that of eggs with lower shape index percentages [33]. In line with the present findings, Bekele et al. [34] and Moges et al. [14] reported an average shape index of 73% for scavenging local chickens found in various parts of Ethiopia. Consistent with the current study, Yakubu et al. [35] reported average shape index values of 74.7 and 72.6% for Nigerian naked-neck and normal feather chickens, respectively. However, Parmar et al. [36] reported an average shape index of 84.0% for indigenous chickens of India, which is much higher than found in the present study.

Among external egg quality traits, shell thickness, as a measure of shell strength, is an important bio-economic trait that primarily breeder of egg laying flock incorporate in their breeding programmes to reduce egg shell breakages. The average shell thickness values obtained from the current study are in close agreement with the findings of Parmar et al. [36] for Indian and Bekele et al. [34] for Ethiopian scavenging local chickens. Shell thickness of 0.370 mm was reported by Melesse et al. [37] for Ethiopian naked-neck chickens under on-station research and by Cicek and Kartalkanta [38] for village chickens of Turkey. A high shell thickness value of 0.580 mm was also reported by Fayeye et al. [39] for Fulani ecotype chickens of Nigeria. These variations in shell thickness observed in different regions could be attributed to the quality, quantity and nutrient composition of scavengable feed resources available in different localities. Rajkumar et al. [40] reported that smaller eggs have stronger shells than larger ones, as hens have a limited capacity to deposit calcium in the shell and as a result, the same amount of calcium is spread around over a large area.

Although the external shell provides a unique package for the distribution of the egg contents, it is in fact the internal quality of the egg that is most important to the consumer [41]. The average yolk width and height values found in the present study are consistent with the findings of Melesse et al. [37]. The same author reported 45.0% of yolk index for Ethiopia naked-neck chicken which is in good agreement with current results. Similarly, Iqbal and Pampari [25] reported yolk index value of 45.5% for indigenous chickens of Kashmir. In India, Parmar et al. [36] and Baishya et al. [42] respectively, reported yolk index of 37.1% and 39% for indigenous chickens which are lower than observed in the current study. Much lower yolk index values (31.6%) were also reported by Nonga et al. [31] for free range local chickens. The variations observed in yolk quality of various regions might be caused by the storage conditions of eggs before they are being assessed for quality traits.

Although yolk color is a key factor in any consumer

survey relating to egg quality [41], consumer preferences for yolk color are highly subjective and vary widely from country to country. The average yolk color value observed in the present study was slightly higher than that of Moges et al. [14] but considerably higher than reported by Bekele et al. [34] for scavenging local chickens. However, higher yolk color values were reported for local chickens of Turkey [38] and for naked-neck chickens of Ethiopia [37]. The low yolk color value observed in this study might be attributed to the period of the experiment (dry season) where there was shortage of green plant materials for the scavenging chickens.

Fayeye et al. [39] reported albumen height of 4.91 and HU of 73.4% for Fulani chicken ecotypes of Nigeria which are consistent with the current findings. On the other hand, Cicek and Kartalkanta [38] reported higher HU values (85.82) for village chickens. The albumen height and HU values of Ethiopian naked-neck chickens reported by Melesse et al. [37] were 5.5 mm and 81.8, respectively, which were slightly higher than those of the current findings. These observed variations could be attributed to various factors such as management differences, age of the birds, quality and quantity of feed and production environments in which the animals were maintained. In general, egg quality traits of scavenging chickens reared in the midland agro-ecology was much better than other agro-ecologies. The midland production system is dominated by crop production which would provide to scavenging chickens better access to feed resources such as grains and cereals.

CONCLUSIONS

The midland agro-ecological production system appears to favor the survivability and expression of both external and internal egg quality traits of scavenging rural chickens. It is thus recommended that appropriate intervention packages such as feeding, housing, breeding and health care may focus on those scavenging chickens reared in the midland agro-ecology. This study has further proved that scavenging chickens easily fit to the existing farmers' management system and serve as a means of food security to the poor rural families with negligible impact on environment pollutions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their heartfelt admiration to all farmers in the study area who actively participated in this study and highly acknowledge their great collaboration, hospitality and willingness to share their rich experiences. Andasa Agricultural Research Institute of Amhara Regional State is highly

acknowledged for allowing us to use the laboratory facilities for the egg quality assessment.

REFERENCES

1. Copland JW, Alders RG. The comparative advantages of village or smallholder poultry in rural development. In: Alders, R.G. Spradbrow PB, Young, MP (eds). Proceedings of an international conference, Dares Salaam, Tanzania, 5-7 Oct., 2009; pp: 11-14.
2. Aklilu HA, Udo HMJ, Almekinders CJM, Van der Zijpp AJ. How resource poor households value and access poultry: Village poultry keeping in Tigray, Ethiopia. *Agri. Syst.* 2008; 96: 175-183.
3. Dana N, Dessie T, van der Waaij LH, vanArendonk JAM. Morphological features of indigenous chicken populations of Ethiopia. *Anim. Genetic Resou.* 2010; 46: 11-23.
4. Moges F, Melesse A, Dessie T. Assessment of village chicken production system and evaluation of the productive and reproductive performance of local chicken ecotype in Bure district, North West Ethiopia. *Afr. J. Agric. Res.* 2010; 5(13): 1739-1748.
5. Melesse A, Negesse T. Phenotypic and morphological characterization of Indigenous chicken population in Southern region of Ethiopia. *Anim. Genetic Resou.* 2011; 49: 19-31.
6. Besbes B. Genotype evaluation and breeding of poultry for performance under sub-optimal village conditions. *World's Poult. Sci. J.* 2009; 65: 260-271.
7. Van der Weiber S. Intensive Poultry Production. Farming futures: Climate change series: fact sheet-9. Focus on poultry. *World Poult.* 2007; 23 (12).
8. Dessie T, Million T, Alemu Y, Peters KJ. Village chicken production systems in Ethiopia: 1. Flock characteristics and performance. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2003; 15: 1.
9. CSA, Central Statistics Authority. 2011. Agricultural sample survey 2010-2011. Report on livestock and livestock characteristics, Vol. II. Statistical Bulletin No. 505. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
10. Probst Y, Tapsell L. What to ask in a self-administered dietary assessment website: the role of professional judgment. In: 6th International Food Data Conference, Pretoria. 2005.
11. Bell DD, Weaver WD. Commercial chicken meat and egg production, 5th Ed. Springer Science+Business Media, Inc. USA. 2002.
12. FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United State Nations. Egg marketing. A guide for the production and sale of eggs. Rome. 2003.
13. Sparks NHC. The hen's egg. Is its role in human nutrition changes? *World's Poult. Sci. J.* 2006; 62: 308-325.
14. Moges F, Melesse A, Dessie T. Assessment of the prevailing handling, transportation, marketing and quality of eggs collected from local scavenging hens in Bure district, North West Ethiopia. *Eth. J. Anim. Prod.* 2009; 9(1): 209-227.

15. Robert JR. Factors affecting egg internal quality and egg shell quality in laying hens. *J. Poult. Sci.* 2004; 41: 161-77.
16. Panda PC. *Textbook of Egg and Poultry Technology.* Ram Printograph, Delhi, India. 1996.
17. Haugh RR. The Haugh unit for measuring egg quality, *US Egg. Poultry Management*, 1937; pp: 522-555 and 572-573.
18. SAS, *Statistical Analysis System. SAS® 9.0 Open Metadata Interface: Reference.* Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc. 2002.
19. Mekonnen GEM. Characterization of smallholder poultry production and marketing system of Dale, Wonsho and Loka Abaya weredas of southern Ethiopia. M.Sc Thesis. Hawassa University, Ethiopia. 2007; 95p.
20. Stilborn HL, Moran Jr ET, Gous RM, Harrison MD. Effect of age on feather amino acid content in two broiler strain crosses and sexes. *J. Applied Poult. Res.* 1997; 6: 205-209.
21. Halima HM, Nesor FWC, Van Marle-Koster E, De Kock A. Village-based indigenous chicken production system in north-west Ethiopia. *Trop. Anim. Health Prod.* 2007; 39: 189-197.
22. Dinka D, Chala R, Dawo F, Leta S, Bekana E. Socio-economic importance and management of village chicken production in rift valley of Oromia, Ethiopia. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2010; 22: 203.
23. Yakubu A. Indigenous Chickens of Nasarawa state, Nigeria: Their characteristics, Husbandry and Productivity. *Trop. Subtrop. Agroecosyst.* 2010; 12: 69-76.
24. Kugonza DR, Kyarisiima CC, Iisa A. Indigenous chicken flocks of Eastern Uganda: I. Productivity, management and strategies for better performance. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2008; 20: 137.
25. Iqbal S, Pampori ZA. Production potential and qualitative traits of indigenous chicken of Kashmir. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2008; 20: 182.
26. Mandal MK, Khandekar N, Khandekar P. Backyard poultry farming in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh, India: an analysis. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2006; 18: 101.
27. Pedersen CV. Production of semi-scavenging chickens in Zimbabwe. Ph.D Thesis. Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University, Copenhagen, Denmark. 2002; p143.
28. Ssewanyana E, Ssali A, Kasadha T, Dhikusooka M, Kasoma P, Kalema J, Kwatoty BA, Aziku L. On-farm characterization of indigenous chickens in Uganda. *J. Anim. Plant Sci.* 2008; 1 (2): 33-37.
29. Halima HM. Phenotypic and genetic characterization of indigenous chicken populations in North-West Ethiopia. Ph.D Thesis. Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa. 2007; 175p.
30. Mengesha M, Tamir B, Dessie T. Village chicken characteristics and their seasonal production situation in Jamma District, South Wollo. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2008; 20: 128.
31. Nonga HE, Kajuna FF, Ngowi HA, Karimuribo ED. Physical egg quality characteristics of free range local chickens in morogoro municipality, Tanzania. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2010; 22: 218.
32. Malago JJ, Baitilwake MA. Egg traits, fertility, hatchability and chick survivability of Rhode Island Red, local and crossbred chickens. *Tanzanian Vet. J.* 2009; 26 (1): 24-36.
33. Silversides FG. The Haugh unit correlation for egg weight is not adequate for comparing eggs from chickens of different lines and ages. *J. App. Poult. Res.* 1994; 3: 120-126.
34. Bekele F, Hans MG, Jessica K, Tormod A, Abebe G. Genotype X environment interaction in two breeds of chickens kept under two management systems in southern Ethiopia. *Trop. Anim. Health Prod.* 2009; 41: 1101-1114.
35. Yakubu A, Ogah DM, Barde RE. Productivity and Egg Quality Characteristics of Free Range Naked Neck and Normal Feathered Nigerian Indigenous Chickens. *Int. J. Poult. Sci.* 2008; 7 (6): 579-585.
36. Parmar SNS, Thakur MS, Tomar SS, Pillai PVA. Evaluation of egg quality traits in indigenous Kadaknath breed of poultry. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2006; 18: 132.
37. Melesse A, Maak S, vonLengerken G. Effect of long-term heat stress on egg quality traits of Ethiopian naked neck chickens and their F1 crosses with Lohmann White and New Hampshire chicken breeds. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2010; 22: 71.
38. Cicek T, Kartalkanat A. Comparison of village eggs and commercial eggs in terms of egg quality. *J. Anim. Vet. Advan.* 2009; 8(12): 2542-2545.
39. Fayeye TR, Adeshiyan AB, Olugbami AA. Egg traits, hatchability and early growth performance of the Fulani-ecotype chicken. *Livest. Res. Rural Dev.* 2005; 17:94.
40. Rajkumar U, Sharma RP, Rajaravindra KS, Niranjana M, Reddy BLN, Bhattacharya TK, Chatterjee RN. Effects of genotype and age on egg quality traits in naked neck chicken under tropical climate from India. *Int. J. Poult. Sci.* 2009; 8: 1151-1155.
41. Okeudo NJ, Onwuchekwa CI, Okoli IC. Effect of oil treatment and length of storage on the internal quality, organoleptic attributes and microbial profile of chicken eggs. *Trop. Anim. Prod. Investigations*, 2003; 6: 63-70.
42. Baishya D, Dutta KK, Mahanta JD, Borpujari RN. Studies on certain qualities of different sources of chicken eggs. *Tamilnadu J. Vet. Anim. Sci.* 2008; 4 (4): 139-141.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.