

The Effect of Livestock Pilferage on Household Poverty in Developing Countries: Theoretical Evidence from Nigeria

Olatomide Waheed Olowa*

Abstract

While livestock pilferages in Nigeria primarily caused by increased poverty among unemployed workers and drought stricken crop farmers, its effect on stock farmers can be devastating. It reduces the affected households' own consumption of both the "returns" on their wealth, e.g. milk and wool, and of wealth itself, e.g. meat and hides. In addition, it restricts their ability to sell their returns and wealth in the market place and use the proceeds to acquire other food and non-food products. Some policy implications are also highlighted.

1. Introduction

Pilfering is petty theft or stealing in small quantities of variable items (Olubanjo, 1995). It is a predatory crime in which a person deliberately takes someone else's property in a clever way on a continuous basis with a view of making the owner unsuspecting of the loss (Laseinde, 1994, Olusanya, et al, 1995). Pilfering could be in different forms based on the place of occurrence, the extent of occurrence, the background and status of the pilfers and the extent on the victims (Torimiro, 1995).

Livestock contributes significantly to the livelihoods of people living in the rural areas of developing countries (Cornelis et al, 2001). Nigeria is no exception. Majority of stock owners reside in the rural areas, while only few stay in urban areas. Since poverty is a rural phenomenon it is also not totally wrong to say that rural people earn substantial proportion of their incomes from livestock, while the opposite is true of the rich. This suggests that stock pilferage presents a much more serious poverty related challenge for the poor than for the rich. Stock theft has been a problem in Nigeria for some decades but it has recently intensified, this triggered the first National seminar on pilferage in agriculture at the then Ogun State University, Nigeria November 13th- 16th, 1995. The outcome of this seminar revealed that livestock theft has become a national crisis in Nigeria. Stock theft occurs more frequently than other types of crime. Possible causes of pilfering include protests from aggrieved relation or workers, hunger or economic depression, attempt to seek compensation or redress for some perceived loses like underpayment, wage deduction or deprived rest or a tendency for wilful damage, unemployment, laziness, greed, bad company, in-born traits/kleptomania. The major reason behind the increase in livestock pilferage thus appears to be poverty (Olusanya et al, 1995; Olubanjo, 1995; Anonguku et al, 2008). It was also pointed out that some of the stock pilfering cases involve a high degree of organization coupled with sound financial and asset backing. For example, there are instances where trucks were used to move the stolen animals. Stock pilferage is also encouraged by the ease with which stolen animals can be traded. Stolen stock is sold without the necessary documentation to individuals for immediate use in communal celebrations as well as funerals and to butchers at very low prices (Nasir, 1995). Whilst stock theft is mainly caused by poverty, as indicated above, it also has the effect of impoverishing livestock farmers. It thus involves a redistribution of poverty

* Department of Agricultural Education, Federal College of Education(Tech.). Nigeria. Email:olowa1@yahoo.com

insofar as those who commit stock pilfering enrich themselves (illegally) in the process. Most instances of crime naturally have a similar redistributive effect, irrespective of whether the losers and beneficiaries are rich and poor people respectively, or whether they are all either relatively poor or relatively rich. In this paper we focus on the economic effects of livestock theft on rural households in Nigeria. Apart from section 1 which is introductory, Section 2 discusses the role of agriculture, particularly livestock farming, in boosting the livelihoods of relatively poor rural households. Section 3 uses a simple microeconomic model to illustrate the impact of livestock theft on household poverty, and gives several examples from the Nigerian experience. Section 4 raises a few policy implications, while section 5 concludes.

2. The Role of Livestock in Household Poverty

There are different ways in which livestock farming contributes to the livelihoods of poor households. It can be a significant source of nourishment and protection against nature as households consume (part of) the returns on their livestock wealth, e.g. milk and its derivative products, wool and mohair. They may also replenish part of their wealth to satisfy their need for meat and hides. Part of the returns on stock wealth, and livestock itself, may also be sold for cash that can be used to purchase other food and non-food goods and services. The standard household utility function can thus be extended as follows:

$$U = U(C^o, F^t, N^t, W) \quad [1]$$

Where C^o represents goods consumed from the household's own resources, or wealth; F^t and N^t are the quantities consumed of food and non-food products acquired in the market place; and W is a measure of the household's wealth. W is assumed to enter the utility function both as an independent variable and indirectly through its impact on other independent variables, as we show below. Own consumption, C^o can be further specified as follows:

$$C^o = \pi W + W(1 - \sigma) = (\pi + 1 - \sigma)W \quad [2]$$

Where π is that part of the *return* to household wealth used for own consumption (e.g. milk, wool, vegetables and fruit); and σ is the percentage of the prevailing wealth used for consumption purposes (e.g. meat and hides). Whereas πW does not reduce household wealth, σW evidently does. The corresponding budget constraint is given by:

$$Y + \alpha W + W(1 - \beta) = Y + (\alpha + 1 - \beta)W = P_f F^t + P_n N^t \quad [3]$$

where Y is wage income and transfers; α is that part of the *return* on household wealth that is sold in the market place, with the total return being $(\pi + \alpha)W$; β is the percentage of wealth sold in the market place; and P_f and P_n are the market prices of food and non-food products. As implied by equation [2], the value added by livestock farming goes beyond the consumption and sale of animal products. In some part of Nigeria, cow dung is used as fuel for cooking and warming the house, particularly by poor households residing in the rural areas. Horses, donkeys and mules are used for transport in the northern part of Nigeria. This is particularly the case in the Sudan Sahel Zone where modern transportation goes *pari Paso* with traditional ones. Similarly, livestock provides non-human power to poor farmers who cannot afford modern means of ploughing their fields (Otte et al, 2005). Stocks, especially cattle, are used for ploughing the fields and livestock manure is still very much used to enhance soil fertility by farmers who cannot afford expensive chemical fertilizers. Utilising livestock in this manner enables farmers to plant vegetables, fruit and other food products, thus diversifying their farming activities.

Livestock is also a source of both physical and human capital investment. Households may sell livestock and use the proceeds to build or extend a dwelling and acquire capital equipment for


farming purposes. Livestock can thus be viewed as a capital asset that provides insurance to poor households who for various reasons do not have access to formal financial services. Finally, there is evidence showing that the proceeds from Selling livestock are often used to pay for health expenses (Holmann *et al*, 2005) and school fees (Cornelis *et al*, 2001). In these instances livestock clearly serves as a source of human capital investment.

3. The impact of Stock Theft on Household Poverty

From the previous section on the role of livestock in the livelihoods of rural households it is quite apparent that stock theft could affect the poor very adversely. Adding a conventional budget line to the above model,

$$F^t = \{Y + (\alpha + 1 - \beta) W\} / P_f - P_n N^t / P_f \quad [4]$$

a stock theft will reduce wealth from W_2 to W_1 in Figure 1 below, and also the monetary return on wealth from αW_2 to αW_1 , shifting the budget line inwards as indicated. Similarly, the fall in utility from U_2 to U_0 is caused by both the loss of wealth and the drop in own food consumption from C_2^o to C_1^o .



Livestock pilfering has recently become one of the major factors resulting in poverty in the rural areas of Nigeria (Anonguku, 2008). The entire wealth and livelihood of a household could be wiped out in one attack and experience has shown that chances of recovery are quite minimal, if not non-existent (Olubanjo,1995). In terms of the above model, a loss of livestock through theft means that the affected household loses the benefits from own consumption as well as the earnings that it used to get from the sale of animal products, livestock and other agricultural products partly produced by livestock. Many of the relatively rich households have been impoverished as thieves have stolen a large part of their livestock. This suggests that stock theft affects poor households in two different ways: firstly, poor households lose the stock that they have to the thieves; and secondly, they are no longer able to accumulate livestock by hiring out their services to the rich as the thieves have also left many of the formerly rich with none.

(Anonguku et al, 2008) show that rural-urban migration has increased as affected household members have to find jobs. This is in response to the increase in agricultural unemployment, which is attributable to stock theft among other factors. As a result of stock theft many children leave school early because parents cannot afford to pay for their schooling. Due to the implementation of the policy of free primary education in Nigeria, which now covers the entire primary school system, every Nigerian child can complete primary education. The problem is at the secondary, high school and University levels, where government subsidizes a significant portion of the school fees but parents still bear a relatively substantial share of the total costs. Those whose parents cannot afford paying for their secondary and high school education are not able to benefit from this opportunity. The free primary education could have certain benefits. As argued by Black (2004) it may provide children with the necessary skills to get employment in the informal sector or to carry out essential household activities when they leave school. Informal employment could reduce poverty levels to a certain extent. Those working in the informal sector are highly likely to be better off compared to those who are not employed at all. However, some of the unemployed may not be able to enter the informal sector. Kingdon and Knight (2004) contend that entry into the informal sector by the poor could be deterred by such factors as a lack of skills, experience and the necessary capital, and in some cases a lack of government support in providing infrastructure and preventing crime. The implication is that a lack of resources to educate children due to stock pilferage could have the effect that affected children cannot get employed at all.

The loss of income is likely to increase the consumption of inferior as opposed to normal goods by the affected household. Coupled with the loss of milk and meat for family consumption due to stock theft, such a loss of income implies deterioration in the nutritional status of the household. This could in turn affect the health status of the household. According to Black (2004), the household's level of health may deteriorate as a result of an exogenous decrease in household income and thus consumption, coupled with the simultaneous Substitution of low for high nutrition food and other necessities. Holmann *et al* (2005) point out that households sometimes sell their animals to raise money to pay medical bills of sick household members. This is relevant to HIV/AIDS stricken developing countries and Nigeria in particular. Booyesen (2002) finds that in South Africa, to cope with increased medical care expenses, HIV/AIDS affected households use their savings following the depletion of which they resort to selling their assets. When the assets are finished they borrow from friends and relatives. It makes sense to assume that the same thing would apply to poor rural households in Nigeria, with relatively low income and where the main assets are livestock. Wason and Hall (2004) indicate that very few households in the rural areas of Nigeria own physical assets such as radios, televisions, stoves, agricultural equipment and vehicles. Thus stock pilferage leaves these households with limited strategies for coping with the effects of the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

4. Policy Implications

Evidence suggests that livestock pilfering is largely caused by poverty, e.g. among the unemployed and drought stricken crop farmers, while we have argued that it also has the effect of (further) impoverishing stock farmers. Policy should thus ideally be directed at both the cause(s) of the problem and its consequences. Attacking the source of the problem calls for an intensification of government's efforts at addressing the problem of poverty in the country as a whole. Rapid and sustainable growth that could lead to increased employment is essential for poverty reduction and its ultimate eradication. But this is clearly easier said than done, especially in a time of prolonged recession. Sustained economic growth can at best be viewed as a long term objective. Thus some short to medium term measures for enabling households to survive

should be considered. These could include increased state unemployment benefits and other forms of social security; an increase in the subsidy on secondary, high school and university education, or providing it freely to the poor through an appropriate means tested system; and better policing of the rural areas generally and livestock farming in particular. Given Nigeria's level of economic development, however, such measures are bound to be too costly and difficult if not impossible to implement. A case may thus be made for securing foreign aid aimed specifically at eliminating livestock pilfering in Nigeria.

5. Conclusion

The literature indicates that livestock plays a significant role in the livelihoods of the rural poor in developing countries. Thus stock pilfering, which has taken on alarming proportions in Nigeria, has exacerbated the problem of poverty, especially among rural households. The effects of stock pilfering on households include an enforced cut back in the own consumption of and the sale of animal products – defined here as (part of) the returns to household wealth. It also removes their ability to sell livestock itself and use the proceeds to acquire other food and non-food products or expand and diversify their farming activities. Alarming, livestock pilfering often prevents household heads from investing in the human capital development of their children, and may also result in a deterioration of the household's nutritional status adding to health expenses. The loss of livestock limits the coping strategies available to HIV/AIDS affected households

References

- Anongoku, C.P.O.Obinbe and S. Daudu, (2008), A Socio-Economic Analysis of Livestock Pilferage in Rural and Urban Areas of Benue State, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 17(2): 169-172
- Black, P.A (2004), "Poverty at the Household Level: A Review of Theory and South African Evidence", *South African Journal of Economics*, 73, 3:413-436
- Booyesen, f. Le r (2002), "Financial Responses of Households in the Free State Province to HIV/AIDS-related Morbidity and Mortality", *South African Journal of Economics*, 70, 7:1193-1215.
- Cornelis, de Haan et al (2001), "Livestock Development: Implications for Rural Poverty, the Environment and Global Food Security", *Directions in Development*, 23241, *The World Bank*, Washington, D.C.
- Delgado, C et al (1999). "Livestock to 2020: The Next Food Revolution", Food, Agriculture and the Environment *Discussion Paper*, 28, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Holmann, F. et al (2005), "The Role of Live Stock in Poverty Alleviation: An analysis of Colombia", *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 17, 11. Available on <http://www.cipav.org>
- Kingdon, G and knight, J. (2004), "Unemployment in South Africa: The Nature of the Beast", *World Development*, 32, 3:391-408.
- Laseinde,L.A.O,(1994),"The Nigerian Poultry Attendant: Problems and Solutions." *Tropical Poultry Production Series*. Ile-Ife, Nigeria: Delar Tertiary Publisher
- Nasir, A.L, (1995)"Pilferage on Farms and its roles on Food Availability. *Paper and Proceedings Presented at Ogun state University, Nigeria. November, 13-16, 1995*
- Olubanjo,O.O, (1995), Pilferage: Concept, Dimesion and Likely Motivation and Effect on Private Agricultural Venture in Nigeria." *Paper and Proceedings Presented at Ogun state University, Nigeria. November, 13-16, 1995*
- Olusanya,T.P, B.O Adefuye and A.A Adekunmisi,(1995), Causes and Effects of Pilferage in Livestock Enterprises." *Nigeria."Paper and Proceedings Presented at Ogun state University, Nigeria. November, 13-16, 1995*
- Otte, J. et al (2005), "Integrated Poverty Assessment of Livestock Promotion: The Case of Viet Nam", *Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative Research Report*, Food and Agricultural Organisation.
- Torimiro,D.O(1995), The Role of Youths in Pilferage of fruit/trees Crops in Nigerian Rural Communities" *Paper and Proceedings Presented at Ogun state University, Nigeria. November, 13-16, 1995*
- Wason, D. and hall, D. (2002), "Poverty in Lesotho 1993-2002: An Overview of Household economic Status and Government Policy", *CPRC Working Paper, No 40*, Available on <http://www.chronicpoverty.org>