

## Economic analysis of Red Chittagong Cattle farming system in some selected areas of Chittagong district

M. A. Halim<sup>1</sup>, M. A. Kashem<sup>2</sup>, J. U. Ahmed<sup>3</sup> and M. Hossain<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, <sup>2</sup>Department of Microbiology, Chittagong Veterinary and Animal Sciences University (CVASU), Chittagong, <sup>3</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics, Sylhet Agricultural University, Sylhet and <sup>4</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics, PSTU, Patuakhali

### Abstract

The study was carried out in 5 Upazilas under Chittagong district with a view to analyze the present socio-economic status of RCC farming practices on 100 RCC rearers (Potiya, Raujan, Chandanaish, Anowara and Satkania Upazila). The study showed that, about 39.00 percent of RCC farm owners were landless, 31.00 percent were small and marginal farmers, 17.00 percent were medium and 13.00 percent were large farmers according to their landholding sizes. The cost of rearing RCC per cattle per year was found to be Tk. 17503.76, Tk. 15540.27, and Tk. 33044.03 as cash cost, non cash cost and total cost respectively. The study also revealed that, average daily milk yield, lactation yield and lactation length of RCC were found to be 2.71 liters, 581.61 liters and 215.41 days, respectively. The average per year per cattle gross return of RCC was found Tk. 25390.41. The gross returns over cash cost and full cost basis of rearing per lactation per cattle of RCC were found at Tk 8058.642 and Tk.-7501.53, respectively. The benefit cost ratio on the basis of cash cost and full costs per year per cattle was found 1.47 and 0.77, respectively. The study also revealed that, the rural farmers prefer RCC farming than other breeds due to high conception rate, each year calving, disease resistance, high milk fat per cent and cost effective farming.

**Keyword:** RCC, Cost, Return, Profitability, Disease Occurrences

### Introduction

Livestock plays an important role in the agricultural economy of Bangladesh. The non-crop agriculture sector has registered significantly higher growth rate over the last few years. The share of this sector was 2.90 percent of GDP, which was 17.7 percent of agriculture and forestry sector in FY 2006-07. Among the sub-sectors of the broad agriculture sector, the growth of the livestock sub-sector was the highest. Though the share of the live-stock sub-sector in GDP is small, but it has immense contribution to meeting the daily protein requirements, cultivation, production and export of leather and leather goods. According to the estimates by the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock the number of the livestock and poultry raised to 4 crore 75 lakh and 24 crore 60 lakh respectively in 2006-07. The production of milk, meat (beef, mutton and chicken) and egg have been on the increase over the past several years. In the year 2006-07, production of milk and meat were 2.28 and 1.03 million ton respectively (Bangladesh Economic Review, 2007). In terms of high density of livestock, the country suffers from an acute shortage of livestock products. The Government of Bangladesh therefore applied special emphasis on development of livestock sectors. In fact, about 90% of the cattle population in Bangladesh termed as low producing indigenous cattle. Among them some improved varieties such as Red Chittagong Cattle, Pabna Cattle, Munsiganj Cattle, Manikganj Cattle and North Bengal Grey Cattle are potential producers of milk, meat and are found in different localities of the country. The Red Chittagong Cattle is one of the improved and promising domestic animal genetic resource found all over the Chittagong district at varying concentrations. The Red Chittagong Cattle have distinct phenotypic characteristics (Hossain, 2005). The Red Chittagong Cattle are well adapted to adverse climatic condition and developed in disease resistance power, service per conception, lactation length, one calf per year production etc (Akhter *et al.*, 2002). Other breeds are well developed to meat and milk production (Deb, 2005). Most of the available studies of RCC rearing related to productive and reproductive performance based, the socio-economics of RCC farming practices are limited. Thus, the present study is the modest effort whether the RCC farming practices has any positive impact for improving livelihood of rural poor in Bangladesh. The objectives of the study are as follows: i) To describe the socio-economic characteristics of the RCC farm owners, ii) To estimate per lactation cost and return of the RCC farming, iv) To identify some reasons for preference of rearing RCC and give some recommendations for improving Red Chittagong Cattle in Bangladesh.

## Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted at five upazilas of Chittagong district viz, Potiya, Chandanaish, Raujan, Anowara and Satkania. Data were collected during December 2007 to June 2008 covering 100 RCC farm owners from 5 Upazilas equally selected by using purposive sampling technique and questionnaire survey method having one dairy cattle was under milking per household. Collected data were organized, structured and analyzed by using tabular method as well as using simple descriptive statistical tools and techniques by using Microsoft Excel and SPSS program.

## Results and Discussion

### Socio economic profiles of RCC rearers

**Age:** Members of the whole family were classified into 4 age groups of less than 10 years, 11-30 years, 31-50 years and 50 years and above. Considering all the age groups, Table 1 showed that, maximum male and female members were belong in 11-30 years age groups and the lowest number of farm family members lies in 50 and above year's age group.

**Literacy level:** Table 1 shows the literacy level of the family members of the RCC farm owners. Literacy level was classified into Illiterate, Primary, Secondary, Higher secondary, Honors and above respectively. Maximum 31.16 percent of the family member lies in secondary level and lowest 1.76 percent of the family member lies in Honors and above level.

**Occupation:** Occupation of the RCC farm family members was classified into five categories, which was also showed in the Table 1. It was showed that, highest 35.56 percent farmers involved in RCC farming with crop agriculture and lowest 13.89 percent farmers involved in RCC farming and others actives.

**Table 1. Distribution and Socio Economic Profiles of RCC farm Families**

| General Characteristics | Categories                        | Number     | Percentage    |       |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------|-------|
| Age                     | <10 years                         | Male       | 21            | 5.27  |
|                         |                                   | Female     | 25            | 6.28  |
|                         | 11-30 years                       | Male       | 90            | 22.61 |
|                         |                                   | Female     | 78            | 19.60 |
|                         | 31-50 years                       | Male       | 73            | 18.34 |
|                         |                                   | Female     | 63            | 15.83 |
|                         | 50 and above                      | Male       | 28            | 7.04  |
|                         |                                   | Female     | 20            | 5.03  |
| <b>Total</b>            |                                   | <b>398</b> | <b>100.00</b> |       |
| Literacy level          | Illiterate                        | 34         | 8.54          |       |
|                         | Primary                           | 124        | 31.16         |       |
|                         | Secondary                         | 155        | 38.94         |       |
|                         | Higher Secondary                  | 78         | 19.59         |       |
|                         | Honors and Above                  | 7          | 1.76          |       |
|                         | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>398</b> | <b>100.00</b> |       |
| Occupation              | RCC farming with crop agriculture | 64         | 35.56         |       |
|                         | RCC farming with service          | 52         | 28.89         |       |
|                         | RCC farming with business         | 39         | 21.67         |       |
|                         | RCC farming and others            | 25         | 13.89         |       |
|                         | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>180</b> | <b>100.00</b> |       |
| Land Ownership          | Land less farmers (0- 0.50 acres) | 39         | 39.00         |       |
|                         | Small (0.51- 1.50 acres)          | 31         | 31.00         |       |
|                         | Medium sized (1.51-2.5acres)      | 17         | 17.00         |       |
|                         | Large farmers (above 2.50 acres)  | 13         | 13.00         |       |
|                         | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>100</b> | <b>100.00</b> |       |
| Yearly Income           | Below Tk. 50,000                  | 21         | 23.00         |       |
|                         | Tk. 50,001- Tk.1,00000            | 25         | 25.00         |       |
|                         | Tk. 1,00001- Tk.1,50000           | 24         | 24.00         |       |
|                         | Above Tk. 150,000                 | 30         | 30.00         |       |
|                         | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>100</b> | <b>100.00</b> |       |

Source: Field Survey, 2008

**Land ownership:** According to the size of land holdings, the RCC farm owners were classified into 4 groups. Table 1 shows that highest 39.00 percent of the farm owners were landless and the lowest 13.00 % farm owners were large farm sized.

**Yearly income level:** Yearly income level of RCC farm owners were shown in the Table 1. It revealed that, maximum 30 percent of the farmer's income above Tk.150,000 and the lowest 23 percent of the farmer's income below TK. 50,000.

### Cost of rearing Red Chittagong Cattle

Cost may be classified as cash cost where direct cash expenditure incurred were calculated from daily records and non-cash costs were fixed and family supplied input costs. The cost and return were estimated from the collected data from 5 Upazila under Chittagong district. Table 2 showed that, yearly estimated total cost of the different groups of RCC farm owners. Total estimated full cost of rearing RCC per year at Potiya, Raujan, Chandanaish, Anowara, Satkania and all average from five Upazila were Taka 31520.51, 33450.56, 30448.73, 35333.51, 34466.88 and 33044.03 respectively which indicate that costs of rearing RCC at Anowara was highest because of lack of fodders and high prices of concentrate feeds knowing through close survey of the market price and land status of the study area during data collection.

Table 2 indicated that cash cost of all average from five upazilas, the major expenditure incurred by concentrate feed which was 38.40 percent and out of non-cash cost the maximum cost incurred by labour cost which was 14.80 percent of total cost.

**Table 2. Rearing cost of Red Chittagong Cattle**

| Particulars                  | Upazila wise per year per cattle cost |               |                  |               |                       |               |                   |               |                  |               |                 |               |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
|                              | Potiya<br>(n=20)                      |               | Raujan<br>(n=20) |               | Chandanaish<br>(n=20) |               | Anowara<br>(n=20) |               | Satkania<br>n=20 |               | All<br>n=100    |               |
|                              | In Taka                               | %             | In Taka          | %             | In Taka               | %             | In Taka           | %             | In Taka          | %             | In Taka         | %             |
| <b>Cash cost</b>             |                                       |               |                  |               |                       |               |                   |               |                  |               |                 |               |
| Straw                        | 2506.1                                | 7.99          | 3511.4           | 10.54         | 3043.45               | 10.02         | 3275.65           | 9.32          | 3550.12          | 10.37         | 3177.34         | 9.66          |
| Concentrate                  | 14267.95                              | 45.50         | 11738.5          | 35.22         | 10913.5               | 35.92         | 14591.4           | 41.50         | 11711.35         | 34.20         | 12644.54        | 38.40         |
| Vet. Care                    | 760                                   | 2.42          | 1087.5           | 3.26          | 772.73                | 2.54          | 755.55            | 2.15          | 850.72           | 2.48          | 845.3           | 2.57          |
| A.I Cost                     | 150                                   | 0.48          | 120              | 0.36          | 170                   | 0.56          | 200               | 0.57          | 220              | 0.64          | 172             | 0.52          |
| Others                       | 501.45                                | 1.60          | 920.5            | 2.76          | 524.5                 | 1.73          | 624.95            | 1.78          | 751.51           | 2.19          | 664.58          | 2.02          |
| <b>Total<br/>(cash cost)</b> | <b>18185.5</b>                        | <b>57.70</b>  | <b>17377.9</b>   | <b>52.14</b>  | <b>15424.18</b>       | <b>50.77</b>  | <b>19447.55</b>   | <b>55.00</b>  | <b>17083.7</b>   | <b>49.88</b>  | <b>17503.76</b> | <b>53.22</b>  |
| <b>Non-cash cost</b>         |                                       |               |                  |               |                       |               |                   |               |                  |               |                 |               |
| Straw                        | 3252.65                               | 10.40         | 4286.1           | 12.86         | 3770.93               | 12.41         | 4016.23           | 11.40         | 4573.06          | 13.35         | 2432.44         | 7.40          |
| Green Grass                  | 2212.5                                | 7.05          | 2196.5           | 6.59          | 2790.54               | 9.19          | 2919.5            | 8.31          | 3080.62          | 8.99          | 1505.31         | 4.58          |
| Labor cost                   | 7350.54                               | 23.40         | 8352.62          | 25.06         | 7378.96               | 24.29         | 8156.5            | 23.20         | 8581.46          | 25.06         | 4877.02         | 14.80         |
| Depreciation on housing      | 419.32                                | 1.340         | 1102.15          | 3.31          | 996.49                | 3.28          | 695.5             | 1.98          | 1052.42          | 3.07          | 516.98          | 1.57          |
| Dairy equipment cost         | 100                                   | 0.32          | 135.29           | 0.41          | 87.63                 | 0.29          | 98.23             | 0.28          | 95.62            | 0.27          | 66.42           | 0.20          |
| <b>Total (Non cash cost)</b> | <b>13335.01</b>                       | <b>42.30</b>  | <b>16072.66</b>  | <b>48.22</b>  | <b>15024.55</b>       | <b>49.33</b>  | <b>15885.96</b>   | <b>45.00</b>  | <b>17383.18</b>  | <b>50.12</b>  | <b>15540.27</b> | <b>47.00</b>  |
| <b>Full cost</b>             | <b>31520.51</b>                       | <b>100.00</b> | <b>33450.56</b>  | <b>100.00</b> | <b>30448.73</b>       | <b>100.00</b> | <b>35333.51</b>   | <b>100.00</b> | <b>34466.88</b>  | <b>100.00</b> | <b>33044.03</b> | <b>100.00</b> |

**Source:** Field survey, 2008

### Return of rearing Red Chittagong Cattle

The cost and return of Red Chittagong Cattle rearers were estimated from collected data at 5 Upazilas under Chittagong district. Table 3 showed that, yearly estimated total return of the RCC farm owners per year in Potiya, Raujan, Chandanaish Anowara, Satkania and all average from five upazilas were Tk. 27070.84, Tk. 23862.23, Tk. 25077.15, Tk. 24460.17 Tk. 26481.65 and Tk 25390.41 respectively which indicate per year per lactation per cattle returns was highest at Potiya because of higher milk yield and milk prices. It was evident from the table that major portion of the income come from milk which was 69.45 percent and lowest income come from cow dung which was 8.18 percent of total return. Estimated benefit cost ratio on the basis of cash cost for Potiya, Raujan, Chandanaish, Anowara, Satkania and all average from five upazilas were 1.50, 1.38, 1.64, 1.27, 1.57 and 1.47 respectively. Benefit cost ratio on the basis of full cost for Potiya, Raujan, Chandanaish, Anowara, Satkania and all average from five Upazila were 0.86, 0.72, 0.83, 0.70, 0.77 and 0.78, respectively.

**Table 3. Returns of rearing of Red Chittagong Cattle**

| Particulars of Return | Upazila  |        |          |        |             |        |           |        |          |        |               |        |
|-----------------------|----------|--------|----------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|----------|--------|---------------|--------|
|                       | Potiya   |        | Raujan   |        | Chandanaish |        | Anowara   |        | Satkania |        | All( average) |        |
|                       | In Taka  | %      | In Taka  | %      | In Taka     | %      | In Taka   | %      | In Taka  | %      | In Taka       | %      |
| Income from milk      | 19490.29 | 71.99  | 16801.98 | 70.41  | 17162.38    | 68.44  | 16129.90  | 65.59  | 18581.45 | 70.17  | 17633.2       | 69.45  |
| Income from calf      | 5450.00  | 20.14  | 5200.00  | 21.79  | 5650.00     | 22.53  | 6250.00   | 26.19  | 5850.00  | 22.09  | 5680          | 22.37  |
| Income from cow dung  | 2130.55  | 7.87   | 1860.25  | 7.80   | 2264.77     | 9.03   | 2080.27   | 8.22   | 2050.20  | 7.74   | 2077.21       | 8.18   |
| Total return          | 27070.84 | 100.00 | 23862.23 | 100.00 | 25077.15    | 100.00 | 24460.17  | 100.00 | 26481.65 | 100.00 | 25390.41      | 100.00 |
| Return over cash cost | 9035.34  | -      | 6604.33  | -      | 9822.97     | -      | 5212.62   | -      | 9617.95  | -      | 8058.642      | -      |
| Return over full cost | -4299.17 | -      | -9468.33 | -      | -5301.58    | -      | -10673.34 | -      | -7765.23 | -      | -7501.53      | -      |
| BCR (Cash cost basis) | 1.50     | -      | 1.38     | -      | 1.64        | -      | 1.27      | -      | 1.57     | -      | 1.472         | -      |
| BCR (Full cost basis) | 0.86     | -      | 0.72     | -      | 0.83        | -      | 0.70      | -      | 0.77     | -      | 0.776         | -      |

**Source:** Field survey, 2008

### Reasons for preference of rearing RCC farming practices

The Red Chittagong Cattle are one of the improved and promising varieties of domestic animal found in greater Chittagong district of Bangladesh. It is very nice looking variety of cattle of red body color which is known as Red Chittagong Cattle, cows of this variety are potentially good producer.

Table 4 showed that the highest (95%) farmers preferring of rearing RCC for high fat percentage of milk. The next important reasons for preferring RCC are calving every year, high milk price, looking very nice, high market price of cattle and less disease incidence. The farmer also prefer rearing RCC due to the following reasons: delicious milk, higher adaptability of local environment, low death rate of calf, higher lactation period, cost saving farming and higher conception rate.

### Disease Incidence of RCC

Table 5 showed that many diseases affected the Red Chittagong Cattle. It is evident from the table that foot and mouth disease was the main disease affected the different breeds. The next diseases affected the different breeds were mastitis, parasitic infestation, dystocia, pyometra, milk fever, uterine prolapse, abortion and black quarter etc.

**Table 4. Reasons for preference of rearing RCC farming practices**

| Particulars of Preference          | Number of farmers responds<br>( N =100) | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|---|------------|
| Looking very nice                  | 92                                      | 92.00      |
| Less Disease incidence             | 90                                      | 90.00      |
| Cost saving farming                | 75                                      | 75.00      |
| Delicious of Milk                  | 82                                      | 82.00      |
| High fat % of milk                 | 95                                      | 95.00      |
| Low death rate of calf             | 80                                      | 80.00      |
| Calving every year                 | 94                                      | 94.00      |
| High lactation period              | 75                                      | 75.00      |
| High conception rate               | 70                                      | 70.00      |
| High Market Price of Cattle        | 91                                      | 91.00      |
| High Milk Price                    | 93                                      | 93.00      |
| High adoption on local environment | 85                                      | 85.00      |

**Source:** Field Survey, 2008

**Table 5. Comparative Disease Incidence of Red Chittagong Cattle**

| Particulars of Disease | Number of Cases | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| Black Quarter          | 01              | 1.49       |
| Foot and Mouth disease | 37              | 55.22      |
| Milk fever             | 02              | 2.99       |
| Mastitis               | 08              | 11.94      |
| Uterine prolapse       | 02              | 2.99       |
| Dystocia               | 04              | 5.98       |
| Abortion               | 01              | 1.49       |
| Pyometra               | 02              | 2.99       |
| Parasitic infestation  | 10              | 10.00      |
| Total                  | 67              | 100.00     |

**Source:** Field Survey, 2008

## Conclusion and Recommendations

The study revealed that BCR on the basis of cash cost in Potiya, Raujan, Chandanaish, Anowara at Satkania were 1.22, 1.14, 1.47 and 1.00 respectively, which shows that the RCC farming is profitable. On the other hand, BCR on the basis of full cost in Potiya, Raujan, Chandanaish, Anowara were 0.39, 0.25, 0.33 and 0.27 respectively, BCR in full cost basis are lower than 1, which indicate that the RCC farming is not profitable but traditionally this is going on as a subsistence farming by using low cost easily available inputs of farm families and the farmer gave labour for their farm without any remuneration. Incase of full cost as we included cost of family labour and family supplied green fodder as per local market rate, so it comes as negative impact on return. If we exclude the costs of these two items then we may conclude the RCC farming will be a profitable subsistence farm business at rural condition under Chittagong district. Some recommendations were giving for better rearing of RCC.

- The Directorate of Livestock Services should expand their veterinary services and other facilities. Veterinary treatment facilities should be extended up to union level.
- The shortage of feeds and fodder may partially overcome by introducing high yielding variety fodder cultivation. The government and non-government organizations should play a vital role in disseminating HYV fodder cultivation.

**References**

- Akhter, S., Haque, K.S., Jalil, M.A. and Miah, G. 2002. Characterization, Selection and Conservation of Red Chittagong Cattle, Annual Research Review Workshop on 25 to 26<sup>th</sup> June, held in Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute, Savar, Dhaka.
- BER (Bangladesh Economic Review). 2007. Economic Adviser's Wing, Finance Division, Ministry of Finance, Bangladesh. p.92-94
- Deb, G.K. 2005. Genetic study of birth weight of Pabna cattle and BULP base Sire evaluation, Annual Research review workshop on 25 to 26<sup>th</sup> April, held in Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute, Savar, Dhaka.
- Hossain, M.M., 2005. Characterization and distribution pattern of Red Chittagong cattle of Bangladesh. MS Thesis. Department of Animal Breeding and Genetics, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh.