Respondents' Preferences and Profitability of the Native and Upgraded Chickens in Samar, Philippines

Feliciano R. Bejar
Department of Agriculture and Related Programs,
Northwest Samar State University San Jorge, Samar, Philippines
bejar_43@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study was conducted using descriptive survey with the questionnaire as the principal instrument used. A Samar province-wide study aimed to evaluate the respondents' demand and profitability of raising native and improve native chickens. The result indicated that chicken respondents were in the ages ranging from 31-40 years old, mostly married. The illiteracy rate in both districts is zero to .064 percent for both respondents and producer respondents in both sites, and close to high school and college graduate. The household number of the families consist mostly of 4-6 members, crop farming is the main source of income, with less than 10,000 pesos for farmers and student respondents, while between 15,000 and 20,000 pesos for the employed respondents. Generally, respondents purchased chicken only for food, with live-whole chicken most preferred by respondents considering the taste of fresh meat specially tinola or sinigang preparation. Backyard raising was common among raisers with less than 20 heads of chicken kept in their farm. Most farmers (64.5%) prefer to raise native chickens as they consider more profitable over other types. Both upgrades and commercial chickens are bought by contracting individuals, while native chicken are sold to buyers by bringing them in livestock market. Availability of contract buyers made them easy in marketing their chicken. Diseases of chicken remain the most prevailing problem of the chicken growers. Native, upgrade and commercial breeds of chicken are demanded and profitable for raising in the province of Samar.

Keywords: *Respondents' preference, economic profitability, upgraded chicken, native chicken*

I. INTRODUCTION

The chicken industry in the Philippines has diverse components. The commercial sector is characterized by large-scale, industrialized production systems of broilers and layers of exotic hybrids. On the other hand, the backyard sector is made up of many smallholders who keep a few native, crossbred and upgrade chickens mainly for their own consumption. The backyard sector is worth a separate investigation because it differs from the commercial sector in terms of production and marketing issues and has, so far, received less attention from researchers and policymakers.

Chicken production serves many functions, which include the provision of meat and eggs for home consumption and income from sales. Chicken meat is the second most popular meat in the Philippines, following pork. It can be observed that in 2017 the annual per capita pork consumption was 14.2 kilogram, followed by chicken meat at 11.6 kilograms, and beef 3.0 kilograms (Tomacruz, 2017).

Among the poultry products, above the base year's per capita production levels were noted for chicken (dressed) at 12.81 kilograms and chicken egg at 4.69 kilograms in 2017. Correspondingly, production indices were 108.55 percent and 107.57 percent (Philippines Statistics Authority, 2018). The demand for chicken meat is increasing faster than that of other meats, as observed elsewhere in the world, because of its many advantages; namely, its lower price, lower fat content, and the more convenient and versatile methods of meal preparation, compared to other meats (Salazar,2016).

The increase in demand for chicken is a result of a growing consumer preference. In terms of volume production in 2016, the produced chickens pegged at 1,674,505 metric tons than eggs at 461,719 metric tons. In the Performance of Philippine Agriculture in 2016, the gross value of production of the chicken industry reached P146 billion, just P64 billion behind the hog industry. Chicken and egg production both grew, with the number of chicken broilers growing in most regions. The chicken meat in supermarkets or groceries costs P136 to P145 per kilo, while pork costs P220 to P249 per kilo, and beef costs P305 ot P495 per kilo (Olarte, 2017).

Amidst the peaked increase in the hog industry of chickens, food safety, environmental and animal welfare concerns have also become important considerations in meat consumption. To learn more about whether and why the

demand for meats has changed over time in the Philippines would require a demand systems analysis to determine consumer responses to changes in prices and income, as well as changing demographics and eating habits. (Apostolidis & Mcleay, 2016).

Samar as one of the largest and depressed provinces of the Philippines. Agriculture and fishing are the main sources of livelihood in the island. The agricultural sector takes up 66 percent of the total labor force. Fishing takes up nearly 15 percent and the other 30 percent of the labor force are engaged in trade, construction, mining, manufacturing and other services (Philippines Statistics Authority, 2017). The place is potential for chicken industry, however, consumer's preferences and profitability of native chicken in the province of Samar is very limited. Hence, this study was conducted to determine the respondents' preferences and production status of the indigenous (native) chicken and upgraded native chickens in Samar.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study used descriptive-evaluative research design. The main aimed of the investigation focused on the evaluation of respondents' demand and profitability of raising native and improve native chickens. Included in the assessment is the identification of type of respondents the respondents are; respondents' personal variables; data on chicken preferences and consumption, and the profitability of native and upgraded native chickens.

Research Locale

The locale of the study is in the first and second legislative district of Samar, Philippines. For the first legislative district, the municipalities are San Jorge, Tarangnan, Sto. Niño, Gandara, Pagsanghan, Matuguinao, and the City of Calbayog. For the second legislative district, the municipalities are Motiong, Pinabacdao, Calbiga, Jiabong, Villareal, Paranas, and the City of Catbalogan. These municipalities and cities have poultry and hog industries. These are also at the same time selected through simple random sampling.

Participants

The respondents were randomly selected from the different municipalities of both Districts 1 and 2 (Table 1). There were 196 and 170 respondents from the districts 1 and 2 respectively for respondents' respondents; and 86 poultry raisers from the district 1 and 70 raisers from district 2 as respondents for profitability study.

Table 1. Respondents of the Study

Municipalities	Respondents	
	Consumers	Producers
District I		
San Jorge	37	11
Calbayog City	45	24
Taranganan	27	10
Sto Nino	15	8
Gandara	32	15
Pagsanghan	15	8
Matuguinao	25	10
Sub-total	**196**	**86**
District II		
Motiong	15	7
Pinabacdao	20	6
Calbiga	33	12
Jiabong	15	8
Villareal	22	10
Catbalogan	45	18
Paranas	20	9
Sub-total	**170**	**70**
Total	**266**	**156**

Data Gathering

To gather information, interviews with consumer/farmer respondents was carried out by using methods of participatory observation or focus group discussion, in-depth interviews and a survey using structured and open-ended questionnaire.

To obtain the data, the researchers called up some respondents with in the province, convened them in the school for one day in a form of seminar, providing some inputs on improving the native chicken production, and have them filled up the structured questionnaire. Additional respondents were taken through actual survey and riding on some gatherings sponsored by the LGUs to farmers and other group of individuals. Student respondents were taken from different schools within the studied districts of the province.

Instrumentation

The data collection tools used in the study are questionnaire and interview schedule. Questionnaire for demographic information's of respondents were adapted from Bejar, et al. (2010); Items in the questionnaire relative to respondents preferences was patterned from Neufeld (2002), Tam Giac and Thiem (2008_; and the economic profitability was adapted from Chang (2007).

For the interview schedule, it had the following sections; profile of the respondents; their preferences in consuming chicken available in the province, its preferred parts; factors

ISSN 2449-4577 (online) 2408-283X (print)

affecting their preferences; constraints in the production and marketing of different types of chicken available in Samar. The respondents were asked relative to the economic profitability of the chicken on the basis of their production system employed.

.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Respondents' Profile Data

Respondents for the consumer's preference study were taken randomly from the two districts of Samar, in which they were classified into three groups; the marginal farmers, professionals and students or out of school youth (Table 2). As indicated, selected respondents in all groups were dominated by females both in district 1 and 2 with 64.15 percent for marginal farmers, 55.56 percent for professional group, and 64.47 percent for student or out of school youth group. This result is attributed of the fact that females are the one who decides for the purchases of food for the family. This is confirmed in the study of Wang, Naidoo, Ferzacca, Reddy, and Dam (2014), they accentuated that one of the roles of women in the society is on the food provisions and choices.

Most interviewees in all groups were in ages between 20 and 40 years old (Table 3). It can be observed that both marginal farmers and professionals were in the ages ranging from 31-40 years old. While the students group are generally at the range of 20-30 years of age. The first district respondents are mostly married with 63.78 percent, single respondent were 33.16 percent.

The second district respondents showed a closer trend with the single and married group, 50.0 and 48.24 percent respectively. Married respondents are being shown by marginal farmers and professionals while single status was being manifested by the students or out of school youth group. The illiteracy rate in both districts is zero percent in both sites, and most of the consumer respondents are high school level for the first district and close to high school and college graduate, 25.29 and 27.64 percent respectively for the second district respondents. Groups of the respondents are dominated by the students having the highest number of interviewees in both districts. However, profession corresponds to the type of respondents, which means that marginal farmers are generally in the profession of farming, professionals are employed people in which government was the main source of employment.

The household number of the family in both districts composed merely of 4-6 members. Main source of income are generally coming from crop farming with 37.43 percent, while the employed people composed of few farmers and professional levels is 34.97 percent of the respondents takes also their income from the job obtained (Table 4). Student respondents are generally jobless for which their source of subsistence and financial support for their studies are derived mainly from their parents. As to the monthly income of respondents, it can be observed that majority of them have less than 10,000 pesos for farmers and student respondents, while between 15,000 and 20,000 pesos for the employed respondents.

Chicken Preferences and Consumption Data

The overall experience of purchasing chicken by all groups of respondents in both districts of Samar, obtaining 88.25% of the respondents with positive response of purchasing chicken for their family needs, preferably native chicken (46.13 %). For the respondents who did not experienced purchasing any type of chicken, they were able to obtain them through their own backyard raising.

Overall response of the respondents as to how often they eat chicken whether as main dish or as ingredients, most (42.08%) of them responded twice a week especially those in the professionals and students group of respondents. Dressed chicken was the most preferred form by the students group of respondents (Table 6). This is due to fact that commercial broilers are most preferred by young people (45.20%). However, marginal farmers and professional consumer respondents in both districts showed similar trend of preferring the live (54.80%) chicken over the dressed one. Asking the reasons why they preferred the live, majority (71.75%) liked to obtain a fresh meat. For those who liked dressed chicken, their reasons were getting out of primary processing, immediate cooking and less work advantages that they could get. However, fresh (73.97%) dressed chicken was most preferred by them.

Responses of the consumers with respect to their choice of buying and reasons of not buying the three types of chicken irrespective of the type of consumers. The results revealed that whole chicken (69.97%) is the most preferred by the respondents from both districts of Samar (Table 7). The reasons why sometimes they don't buy chicken was due to being "available only as whole chicken" as perceived by 37.15 percent of respondents in districts 1 and 2 of Samar province.

Table 2. Type of Consumer Respondents Surveyed and Their Location

Type of Consumers	Sex	District I		District II		Total	
		N=196	%	N=170	%	N=366	%
Marginal Farmer (N=106)	M	18	9.18	20	11.76	38	35.85
	F	38	19.39	30	17.65	68	64.15
Professionals (N=108)	M	30	15.31	18	10.59	48	44.44
	F	36	18.37	24	14.12	60	55.56
Students/OYS (N=152))	M	32	16.33	28	16.47	54	35.53
	F	42	21.42	50	29.41	98	64.47

Table 3. Distribution of Consumer-Respondents' Personal Data

Variables	District I				District II			
	M.F. (56)	Prof. (66)	S./OSY (74)	Total (%)	M .F. (50)	Prof. (42)	S./OSY (78)	Total (%)
Ages (years old)								
Below 20	0	0	11	11 (5.61)	0	0	8	8 (4.71)
20-30	6	12	46	64 (32.65)	10	7	51	68 (40.0)
31-40	37	33	17	87 (44.39)	26	20	19	65 (38.24)
41-50	7	20	0	27 (13.78)	4	6	0	10 (5.88)
51-60	6	1	0	7 (3.57)	10	9	0	19 (11.18)
Status								
Single	8	5	52	65(33.16)	14	4	67	85 (50.0)
Married	46	57	22	125 (63.78)	33	38	11	82 (48.24)
Widow	2	4	0	6 (3.06)	3	0	0	3 (1.76)
Educational level								
No education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elem. Level	11	0	0	11 (5.61)	8	0	0	8 (4.71)
Elem. Grad.	5	0	0	5 (2.55)	11	0	3	14 (8.24)
Sec. Level	31	0	27	58 (29.59)	17	0	26	43 (25.29)
Sec. Grad.	3	4	15	22 (11.22)	5	2	11	18 (10.59)
Col. Level.	3	10	32	45 (22.96)	3	6	38	47 (27.64)
Col. Grad.	2	49	0	51 (26.02)	6	29	0	25 (14.71)
Post Grad.	1	3	0	4 (2.05)	0	5	0	5 (2.94)
Profession								
Farmer	36	7	6	49 (25.0)	36	0	14	50 (29.41)
Student	0	0	68	68 (34.69)	0	0	64	64 (37.65)
Employed								
Government	18	54	0	72 (36.73)	10	35	0	45 (26.47)
Private	2	5	0	7 (3.57)	4	7	0	11 (6.47)

Table 4. Distribution of Consumer-Respondents' Economic Data

Variables	District I			District II			Total	
	M .F. (56)	Prof. (66)	S./OSY (74)	M .F. (50)	Prof. (42)	S./OSY (78)	N=366	Percent
Household number								
1-3	8	11	5	10	7	4	**45**	**12.30**
4-6	34	33	46	20	20	48	**201**	**54.92**
7 -8	11	18	11	12	6	21	**79**	**21.58**
9 & above	3	4	12	8	9	5	**41**	**11.20**
Main source of family income								
Crop Farm.	19	4	36	27	3	48	**137**	**37.43**
Livestock	2		2	1	0	3	**8**	**2.19**
Poultry	6	1	13	3	0	11	**34**	**9.28**
Fishing	4	0	6	2	1	4	**17**	**4.64**
Sari-Sari/ Business	3	2	12	3	2	10	**32**	**8.75**
J/T driver	2		5	0	1	2	**10**	**2.74**
Employment	20	59	0	14	35	0	**128**	**34.97**
Monthly Income								
<10,000	38	4	43	34	5	39	**163**	**44.54**
10,000-<15,000	11	3	24	9	3	23	**73**	**19.95**
15,000-<20,000	4	24	6	2	19	12	**67**	**18.31**
20,000-<25,000	2	19	1	3	8	4	**37**	**10.11**
25,000-<30,000	1	13	0	2	5	0	**21**	**5.74**
≥30,000	0	3	0	0	2	0	**5**	**1.37**

ISSN 2449-4577 (online) 2408-283X (print)

Table 5. Distribution of Consumer-Respondents' Purchase and Chicken Preferences

Questions	District I			District II			Total	
	M.F. (56)	Prof. (66)	S./OSY (74)	M .F. (50)	Prof. (42)	S./OSY (78)	n=366	Percent
Have you tried to purchase chicken?								
Yes	48	60	67	42	36	70	**323**	**88.25**
No	8	6	7	8	6	8	**43**	**11.75**
If yes, What type of chicken preferred to buy? (n=323)								
Native	24	32	19	29	22	23	**149**	**46.13**
Upgrade	6	11	13	2	8	14	**54**	**16.72**
Commercial	18	17	35	11	6	33	**120**	**37.15**
If no, how did they get chicken? (n=43)								
Grown personally	7	4	6	5	6	6	**34**	**79.07**
Given by Neighbors/rel.	1	2	1	3	0	2	**9**	**20.93**
Others	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**

Table 6. Consumers' Preference on the Type of Chicken

Questions	District I			District II			Total	
	M.F. (56)	Prof. (66)	S./OSY (74)	M .F. (50)	Prof. (42)	S./OSY (78)	N=366	Percent
How often do they eat chicken whether main dish or ingredient? (n=366)								
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Once/week	35	18	21	32	15	19	**140**	**38.25**
Twice /week	13	39	29	12	23	38	**154**	**42.08**
Three or more	8	9	24	6	4	21	**72**	**19.67**
Which do they prefer most? (n=323)								
Live	39	41	14	34	21	28	**177**	**54.80**
Dressed	9	19	53	8	15	42	**146**	**45.20**
Why Live? (n=177)								
To obtain fresh meat	30	27	8	25	16	21	**127**	**71.75**
They can select the sex of chicken they want	2	8	2	7	1	1	**21**	**11.86**
One can have all the parts you want	7	6	4	2	4	6	**29**	**16.38**
Why dressed? (n=146)								
Less work	2	3	22	3	5	11	**46**	**31.51**
For outright cooking	2	9	18	2	4	19	**54**	**36.98**
To economize primary processing/cost	5	7	13	3	6	12	**46**	**31.51**
If dressed, which do they like? (n=146)								
Fresh	8	16	38	7	10	29	**108**	**73.97**
Chilled/frozen	1	2	9	1	3	9	**25**	**17.12**
Packed	0	1	6	0	2	4	**13**	**8.91**

Table 7. Consumers Preferred Chicken Parts and Reasons for Not Purchasing the Types of Chicken

Questions	District I			District II			Total	
	M.F. (56)	Prof. (66)	S./OSY (74)	M .F. (50)	Prof. (42)	S./OSY (78)	N=366	Percent
How often do they eat chicken whether main dish or ingredient? (n=366)								
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	**0**
Once/week	35	18	21	32	15	19	**140**	**38.25**
Twice /week	13	39	29	12	23	38	**154**	**42.08**
Three or more	8	9	24	6	4	21	**72**	**19.67**
Which do they prefer most? (n=323)								
Live	39	41	14	34	21	28	**177**	**54.80**
Dressed	9	19	53	8	15	42	**146**	**45.20**
Why Live? (n=177)								
To obtain fresh meat	30	27	8	25	16	21	**127**	**71.75**
They can select the sex of chicken they want	2	8	2	7	1	1	**21**	**11.86**
One can have all the parts you want	7	6	4	2	4	6	**29**	**16.38**
Why dressed? (n=146)								
Less work	2	3	22	3	5	11	**46**	**31.51**
For outright cooking	2	9	18	2	4	19	**54**	**36.98**
To economize primary processing/cost	5	7	13	3	6	12	**46**	**31.51**
If dressed, which do they like? (n=146)								
Fresh	8	16	38	7	10	29	**108**	**73.97**
Chilled/frozen	1	2	9	1	3	9	**25**	**17.12**
Packed	0	1	6	0	2	4	**13**	**8.91**

Table 8. Consumers Preferred Chicken Parts and Reasons for Not Purchasing the Types of Chicken

Factors/Reasons of purchasing chicken? Because of:	District I			District II			Total	
	Native (76)	Upgraded (30)	Commercial (70)	Native (74)	Upgraded (24)	Commercial (50)	(n=323)	Percent
Low price	7	2	9	4	2	6	**30**	**9.29**
Taste	46	18	12	42	11	9	**138**	**42.72**
Availability as whole chicken	22	10	23	25	9	17	**106**	**32.82**
Available in different cuts	0	0	24	1	2	18	**45**	**13.93**
Differences in each type/group	1	0	1	2	0	0	**4**	**1.24**

Table 9. Consumers Different Recipes of the Types of Chicken

Factors/Reasons of purchasing chicken? Because of:	District I			District II			Total	
	Native (76)	Upgraded (30)	Commercial (70)	Native (74)	Upgraded (24)	Commercial (50)	(n=323)	Percent
Low price	7	2	9	4	2	6	**30**	**9.29**
Taste	46	18	12	42	11	9	**138**	**42.72**
Availability as whole chicken	22	10	23	25	9	17	**106**	**32.82**
Available in different cuts	0	0	24	1	2	18	**45**	**13.93**
Differences in each type/group	1	0	1	2	0	0	**4**	**1.24**

ISSN 2449-4577 (online) 2408-283X (print)

Table 10. Producers' Type of Chicken, Purpose and Profitability

Type of chicken raised?	District I N=86	%	District II N=70	%	Total N=156	%
Native	55	35.26	41	26.28	96	61.5
Upgraded	22	14.10	24	15.38	46	29.5
Commercial	7	4.49	5	3.2	12	7.7
Others (egg type)	2	1.28	0	0	2	1.3
Was it profitable?						
Yes	54	34.62	48	30.77	102	65.4
No	32	20.51	22	14.10	54	34.6
Which is more profitable?						
Native	40	25.64	30	19.23	70	44.9
Upgrade	16	10.26	20	12.82	36	23.1
Commercial	30	19.23	20	12.82	50	32.1
Others					0	
Purpose of raising the chicken?						
For home consumption	22	14.10	19	12.18	41	26.3
For market	15	9.62	13	8.33	28	17.9
For both home and market	40	25.64	35	22.44	75	48.1
Others	9	5.77	3	1.92	12	7.7
Number of chicken raised						
20 and below	55	35.26	49	31.41	104	66.7
21-40	15	9.62	13	8.33	28	17.9
41-60	4	2.56	2	1.28	6	3.8
61-80	2	1.28	2	1.28	4	2.6
81-100	4	2.56	2	1.28	6	3.8
100 and above	6	2.56	2	1.28	8	5.1
Cost of raising per head basis						
50-100	60	38.46	54	34.62	114	73.1
101-150	24	15.38	16	10.26	40	25.6
151-200	2	1.28	0	0	2	1.3
201 and above	0	0	0	0	0	
Cost of raising per 100 basis						
below 10 K	58	37.18	52	33.33	110	70.5
10 K - <15K	23	14.74	15	9.62	38	24.4
15K- <20K	2	1.28	2	1.28	4	2.6
20K - <25K	2	1.28	0	0	2	1.3
>25K	1	.64	1	.64	2	1.3

The same respondents were also asked on their reason of purchasing any type of chicken (Table 8), according to the respondents, taste is the major factor or reason of buying the chicken which comprise 42.72 percent of the respondents. It appears that native, upgrade or commercial chicken taste is the basis of buying the chicken to be cooked and eaten. Availability as whole chicken (32.82%) was considered the second reason for purchasing especially for native and upgrade, and availability of different cuts (13.93) for commercial breeds especially the broiler chickens.

It is noted that for all types of chicken, the respondents recipes are mostly cooked through "tinola or sinigang" with 35.60%, it is the accepted preparation for farmers, professionals and even students provided those chickens are freshly dressed (Table 9). Adobo was the next priority recipe for the chicken meat among consumers in both districts of Samar. Others with almost equal distribution are the "stofado", "roasted", "fried", "barbecue", "grilled" and "chicken curry". The least preferred was the chicken roll with only 3.40 percent preparation acceptability for consumers of chicken meats.

Profitability of Native and Upgraded Chickens

Native chicken was the breed or strain commonly raised by all chicken raisers in districts 1 and 2 in Samar province, with a total proportion of 61.5 percent of the respondents (Table 10). Very minimal percentage of commercial breeds (broilers, sasso, kabir etcetera) and layers are raised in the province, probably due to the low average income of the family to support the production of commercial breeds or strains. The backyard sector, which is associated with the native chicken raised a small number of heads from 5 -10 hens and 1-2 roosters to supplement the household income and nutritional needs (Lambio, 2005).

Table 11. Factors influencing easy of marketing chicken by Raiser in Samar.

Factors	Native	Upgrade	Commercial	Total	Rank
Contract buyers	49	40	20	109	1
Availability of outside buyers	56	39	6	101	2
Availability of local consumers	41	32	8	81	3
Others (peddlers, food stall owners)	44	28	8	80	4
Middlemen/retailers	44	23	11	78	5
Contracted carenderias	45	26	4	75	6

Table 11. Factors influencing easy of marketing chicken by Raiser in Samar.

Constraints/Problems	Native	Upgrade	Commercial	Total	Rank
Diseases/Health Problems	76	29	8	113	1
Capital/Financial Problem	63	36	4	103	2
Area / Insufficient space	55	40	6	101	3
Housing	51	35	12	98	4
Predation	54	31	10	95	5
Lack of transportation	58	24	8	90	6
Market	51	30	7	88	7
Peace & order/stealing	45	35	6	86	8
Lack of gov't & NGO support	43	34	8	85	9
Technical know-how	36	40	5	81	10
Middleman exploitation	44	30	6	80	11
Feeds Problem	37	26	13	76	12
Labor Problem	45	23	5	73	13

Native chicken heads for the rural households are regarded as component of security assets of the family wherein unexpected financial discomfort can be attenuated by the cash earned from selling the flock. In this sector, minimal inputs are required to rear the flock as compared to the capital-intensive commercial sector (Lizada, et.al, 2013).

Asking the farmers whether they are profitably raising their chicken, over all response was positive with 64.5 percent of the chicken raisers favoring native chicken as more profitable (45%) over other types. It can be noted further that almost 67 percent of the farmers in the whole province owned below 20 heads of chicken which is intended for supplying family and market needs as responded by 48.1 percent of the respondents.

The chicken farmers for both district 1 and 2 revealed almost similar response on possible cost of raising native chicken amounting to 50-100 pesos per head basis and not more than 10,000.00 per hundred head basis. This figure can be accounted for the indigenous way of management which requires local feeding and supplementation.

It resulted in the survey that both upgrades and commercial chickens are easily bought by contracting individuals, while native chicken was sold to buyers outside their own community by bringing them in livestock market or in neighboring community (Table 11). Over all factors influencing easy marketing of chicken in Samar were; availability of contract buyers ranked number 1, outside buyers ranked second and local consumers was considered number 3 expected buyers of the chicken.

Constraints influencing chicken production were also surveyed among those chicken raisers in Samar (Table 12), overall result showed that diseases or health problems found to be the first concern of the farmers. Other problems or constraints which require financial requirements can be sufficed by the second ranked problem which was due to limited capital. It can be noted that these problems are prevalent and can be observed throughout different areas, only that the degree of importance may vary among chicken raisers capability and know-how. These factors were similarly observed by Lizada, 2013 in their study on native chicken in Western Visayas.

IV. CONCLUSION

For consumer's preference study, it can be concluded that marginal and professional consumers preferred whole native chicken over commercial chickens, while the students prefer dressed commercial chicken. All respondents

ISSN 2449-4577 (online) 2408-283X (print)

prefer “Tinola” as the main recipe for all types of chicken, provided they are freshly dressed.

As to the profitability aspect of the study, chickens are generally raised by backyard raisers with native and upgrade chicken dominating in both districts of Samar. It can be concluded that chicken production of any type can be profitably raised in Samar province considering the high demand of meat and eggs.

Since chicken meat either native, improved and commercial breeds are highly demanded by all groups of consumers, increase and sustainable production and genetic resource conservation is necessary, thus government interventions and support in line with diseases control and prevention, improved management capability trainings to farmers, as well as marketing and financial supports be given emphasis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the Department of Agriculture-Bureau of Agricultural Research and the Northwest Samar State University for the financial support of this project.

REFERENCES

Apostolidis, C., & Mcleay, F. (2016). Should we stop meating like this? Reducing meat consumption through substitution. *Food Policy*, *65*, 74–89. doi: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2016.11.002

Bejar, F. R., Aquino R. R, Baylon, M. J. Mante, L.E.B., Fabillar, J. B., Ultra, A.A. & Bejar, E. T. (2012). “Management Practices and Morphological Characterization of Indigenous (Native) in Samar Province”. SEARCA Agriculture and Development Discussion Paper Series No. 2012-3.

Bureau of Agricultural Statistics-BAS. (1987). *Backyard Livestock and Poultry Survey: Manual of Operations*. Department of Agriculture. Diliman, Quezon City.

Bureau of Agricultural Statistics- BAS (2006). Chicken Industry Performance Report, January-December 2005. Livestock and Poultry Statistics Division, BAS, Department of Agriculture, May 2006 http://www.bas.gov.ph/downloads_view.php?id=167

Delgado, C., M., Rosegrant, H., Steifeld, S., Ehui, C. & Courbois, C. (1999). Livestock to 2020 – The Next Food Revolution. Food, Agriculture and Environment Discussion Paper 28. IFPRI/FAO/ILRI.

Landes, M., S. Persand, D. & Dyck, J. (2004). India’s Poultry Sector: Development and Prospects. ERS, USDA, Agricultural and Trade Report WRS-04-03.

Chang, H.S. (2007). Analysis of the Philippine Chicken Industry: Commercial versus Backyard Sectors”. University of New England, Australia. AJAD, Vol.4, No. 1.

Conroy, C. (2004). Livestock Sector Growth and Poverty, with Particular Reference to India. Natural Resource Institute http://dfid-agriculture-consultation.nri.org/theme1/keypaper/livestockrevolution.pdf

Fabiosa, J.F., Jensen, H.H., & Yan, D. (2004). Output Supply and Input Demand System of Commercial and Backyard Poultry Producers in Indonesia. Working Paper 04-WP 363. Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University.

FAO. (2004). FAO Recommendations on the Prevention, Control and Eradication of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza in Asia.” FAO Position Paper. FAO, Rome. http://fao.org/eims/upload/65186/FAO recommendation/PHAI.pdf.

Lambio, A.L. (2005). The Future Prospects for Smallholder Native Chicken Producers in the Philippines”. Elpidio Quirino Professorial Chair Lecture. 24 June 2005. ADSC Lecture Hall, UPLB-CA.

Olarte, A. (2017, August 18). 10 reasons Pinoys can't let go of chicken. Retrieved January 13, 2018, from https://cnnphilippines.com/news/2017/08/18/Chicken-bird-flu-Philippines.html.

Philippine Statistics Authority. (2018). *Food Consumption And Nutrition*. *FOOD CONSUMPTION AND NUTRITION* (pp. 1`-16). Quezon: Agricultural Indicator System (AIS).

Salazar, T. R. (2016). PH among world's fastest growing meat consumers, say experts. Retrieved December 12, 2017, from https://business.inquirer.net/211357/ph-among-worlds-fastest-growing-meat-consumers-say-experts.

Tomacruz, S. (2017, April 14). FAST FACTS: How much meat does the Filipino consume? Retrieved January 12, 2018, from https://www.rappler.com/business/166870-

fast-facts-meat-chicken-pork-filipino-consumption.

Taha, F.A. (2003). The Poultry Sector in Middle-Income Countries and its Feed Requirements: The Case of Egypt". Outlook Report No. WRS03-02. Economic Research Service, USDA. http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/WRS03/ dec03/wrs0302

Tam Giac, P.T and Thiam, O. (2008). Consumer Preferences for Poultry Products in Vietnam. *GCP/RAS/228/GER Working Paper No. 8.* Rome.

Wang, M. C., Naidoo, N., Ferzacca, S., Reddy, G., & Dam, R. M. V. (2014). The Role of Women in Food Provision and Food Choice Decision-Making in Singapore: A Case Study. *Ecology of Food and Nutrition*, *53*(6), 658–677. doi: 10.1080/03670244.2014.911178

ISSN 2449-4577 (online) 2408-283X (print)