meatquality.eu



A slow-growing broiler strain has more beneficial effects on broiler welfare than providing environmental enrichment



Ingrid C. de Jong, Henk Gunnink, Theo van Hattum, Stephanie Melis, Jerine A.J. van der Eijk

Wageningen Livestock Research



"This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research And Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 101000344".







Extensive broiler production systems include common housing and management factors:

- Reduction in stocking density
- A slower-growing broiler strain
- Environmental enrichment
- Outdoor area
- Roughage or low-protein/energy diets

These are considered to be beneficial for broiler welfare and to affect meat quality aspects





Aim of the project and experiment

In mEATquality, we aim to determine the effect of **extensification factors** on **animal welfare, other sustainability aspects and meat quality**

Aim of this study was to determine the effect of two extensification factors, i.e., **a slower-growing breed and environmental enrichment**, on broiler welfare and meat quality

We here report the effects on **broiler welfare**





Enrichment: Perch, dustbath & lucerne bale No enrichment

Stocking density: 31 kg/m²



Funded by the European Union

mEAT quality



Environmental enrichment

mEAT quality

Peat dustbath

Barrier perch





Lucerne bale



Funded by the European Union

5

Measurements

- Performance
- Behavioural observations (0.5, 1.1, 1.9 kg)
- Behavioural tests (fearfulness, play) (0.5, 1.1, 1.9 kg)
- Use of roughage (0.5, 1.1, 1.9 kg)
- Feather corticosterone (10 birds/pen)
- Litter quality (0.5, 1.1, 1.9 kg)
- Clinical welfare indicators: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hock burns, cleanliness and injuries (1.9 kg)
- Slaughter yield, sensory & chemical meat quality aspects (at appr. 2 kg)



mEAT quality

Measurements

mEAT quality

- Performance
- Behavioural observations (0.5, 1.1, 1.9 kg)
- Behavioural tests (fearfulness, play) (0.5, 1.1, 1.9 kg)
- Use of enrichment (0.5, 1.1, 1.9 kg)
- Feather corticosterone (10 birds/pen)
- Litter quality (0.5, 1.1, 1.9 kg)
- Clinical welfare indicators: gait score, footpad dermatitis, hock burns, cleanliness and injuries (1.9 kg)
- Slaughter yield, sensory & chemical meat quality aspects (at appr. 2 kg)



Results: home pen behaviour





Breed effect

No effect of environmental enrichment, or interaction breed * enrichment

S757N \uparrow locomotion, standing and foraging and \downarrow inactive as compared to JA787

No breed effect on ingestion & comfort behaviour



Results: Free space test (play behaviour)

mEAT quality



Breed effect: JA787 ↑ running vs. S757N at 1.9 kg JA787 ↑ frolicking vs. S757N at 0.5 and 1.9 kg

Indicates JA787 ↑ play behaviour vs. S757N



Free space test (play behaviour)

Breed effect: JA787 ↑ sparring vs. S757N

Enrichment effect:

Control \downarrow frolicking and sparring vs. enrichment



Funded by the European Union



Results: enrichment use

mEAT quality





JA787 ↑ bale use vs. S757N



Funded by the European Union

JA787 \downarrow perch use vs. S757N at 0.5, 1.1 and 1.9 kg

No differences between breeds for dustbath

Results: clinical welfare indicators

mEAT quality

Breed effect: JA787 ↑ (= worse) gait score, cleanliness, footpad dermatitis and hock burn vs. S757N







Discussion & conclusions



- Using a slow-growing breed improved welfare indicators more than
 environmental enrichment
- But more play in the fast-growing breed
- To have a significant welfare improvement, including a slow-growing breed in extensive systems is advised
- Environmental enrichment offers choice and opportunities for natural behaviours but has a relatively smaller contribution to broiler welfare when slow-growing breeds are applied
- Preferably, different extensification factors are combined to promote welfare



mEAT quality

Thank you for your attention



- questions?

Ingrid.dejong@wur.nl



Funded by the European Union

Thanks to Hubbard Breeders for providing the chickens

