

Impact of Rising International Market Prices of Rice on Welfare and Poverty in Senegal

Shéïtan Sossou^{1,2*} and Charlemagne Babatounde Igue²

¹*Faculty of Economics and Management, Cheikh Anta Diop University, B.P. 5683 - Dakar-Fann, Senegal.*

²*Faculty of Economics and Management, University of Abomey Calavi, Cotonou, Benin.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2019/46688

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Jurislav Babic, Professor, Faculty of Food technology, University of Osijek, Croatia.

Reviewers:

(1) Romer C. Castillo, Batangas State University, Philippines.

(2) İsmail Ukav, Adiyaman University, Turkey.

(3) Acaye Genesis, Programmes, Send a Cow Uganda, Uganda.

(4) Lawal Mohammad Anka, Nigeria.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/46688>

Original Research Article

Received 26 October 2018
Accepted 16 January 2019
Published 11 February 2019

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the impact of rising international market prices of rice on real household income and poverty in Senegal. Net benefit ratio indicator developed by Deaton (1989) to assess the impact of a change in the international rice price on household welfare were used in the analysis. The data came from the second poverty monitoring survey in Senegal. Using two indicators: (i) per capita spending and (ii) expenditure per adult equivalent, the results showed that rising international rice prices negatively affect real income and poverty. This negative effect were more pronounced in urban areas and in areas with high rice consumption. Poverty also increased by 3.5% when the first indicator was used. However, it increased by 4.25% when the second indicator was used. Statistics showed that 37% of the richest households consume rice compared to 7% of the poorest households. In addition, urban households allocate 25% of their budget to rice consumption, compared to 24.4% for rural households. To reduce Senegal's vulnerability, governments need to take steps to limit the country's dependence on rice imports. Therefore, it would be essential to invest more in the production and consumption of local rice.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: sossousheitan@gmail.com, sheitan.sossou@ucad.edu.sn;

Keywords: Poverty analysis; agricultural household; Net Benefit Ratio (NBR); rice; Senegal.

1. INTRODUCTION

Africa is the poorest continent in the world with more than half of its population living on less than \$1.9 per day [1]. In Senegal, poverty is a phenomenon that affects about 56.5% of the population with an increase in the number of poor, from 6.3 million in 2011 to 6.8 million in 2016 [2]. On the other hand, in urban areas, one in four people live in poverty, while in rural areas, two in three people live in poverty. The country's situation worsened in the aftermath of the 2007-08 food crisis, which was manifested by a significant increase in international prices for staples such as maize, rice and wheat. For instance, rice prices tripled between November 2007 and May 2008 [3]. This is the main source of food for Senegalese, contributing 30% in terms of calorific inputs from cereals.

In addition, comparing the 27 years (1980-2006) that preceded the crisis with the 4 years (2007-2010) that followed it, there was an increase in international monthly prices of 52% for maize, 87% for rice and 102% for wheat [3]. This price escalation has contributed significantly to the increase in poverty in food importing countries [4], [5] and [6]. Several reasons were cited for this price increase: export restraint policies in some emerging countries, the depreciation of the US dollar relative to the euro, and the rise in oil price¹ [7] and [8].

Senegal is also one of the largest consumers of rice in West Africa with a consumption of 90 kg per capita [9]. However, due to its rice cultivation predominantly practiced by small farmers, domestic production capacity (around 30%) remains low to meet national demand. As a result, the country is becoming increasingly dependent on food imports including rice [10]. However, as indicated by Diaz-Bonilla [11], the transmission of higher international prices to domestic markets in developing countries can have a high impact on farmers as well as low-income consumers. Low-income consumers spend a large part of their income on the consumption of foodstuffs, making them more vulnerable to volatile food prices [4]. Thus, rising rice prices can negatively affect urban households (which are largely consumers) and positively rural households (which are largely producers and sellers of foodstuffs).

Analysis of the effects of rising food prices on welfare depends on the net position of households (net consumers or net producers). In the event of a rise in food prices, the household considered as a net producer wins while the net consumer loses. The issue of the impact of price shocks on household welfare has been the subject of considerable literature. Many studies showed that most households are net buyers. For example, [12] showed that 58% of Thai rural households are net buyers of rice while [13] indicated a rate of 51% in Vietnam. For Ghana, [14] showed that 46% of households are net buyers of maize. In addition, other analyses highlight the impact of rising food prices on the distribution of poverty. Some authors showed that a 50% increase in the prices of some food items increases the poverty rate by an average of 2.5% to 4.4% [15]. Similarly, in low-income countries, [16] showed that a 10% rise in food prices leads to a 0.4% increase in the incidence of poverty. In addition, [17] used 2006-2013 household survey data to study the dynamics of poverty in the Delta region of the Senegal River. Their results showed that when average household income increased by 4.3%, poverty and inequality decreased by 29.5% and 4.2%, respectively.

For some African markets, [14] showed that a 36% increase in rice prices increases poverty at the national level by 0.4%, while an 81% increase in maize prices increased it by 0.6%. The author said that the increase in rice prices has a higher negative effect than maize prices when the same simulation rate is used. A recent study of Burkina Faso showed that rising international rice prices have a negative effect on poverty [18]. The authors indicated that the poverty line in Burkina Faso has increased by about 3%. For Kenya, [19] showed that a 25% increase in maize prices leads to an increase in rural poverty by 1% and urban poverty by 0.5%. The authors point out that poor households (rural households without arable land) are more vulnerable than wealthy households (households with 5 hectares). For Ethiopia, [20] showed that the recent surge in food prices has led to a 14% decline in urban household consumption. But in Chile, this price surge has led to a 2% increase in poverty [21]. Based on previous works, it can be seen that rising food prices would decrease the level of well-being of households and increases their level of poverty.

¹The price of oil rose from US\$30 per barrel in 2003 to more than US\$140 per barrel in July 2008.

Overall, several studies addressed the issue of the impact of the increase in the international price of rice, but few focus on the specific case of Senegal. This study filled this void by assessing the impact of rising international rice prices on the well-being of Senegalese households. The empirical analysis uses the net profit ratio (NBR) indicator developed by Deaton [22].

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the methodology and data of the study. Empirical results are presented and discussed in Section 3 and Section 4 concludes.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Study Area

Senegal is a West African country bordered by Mauritania in the North, Mali in the East and Guinea and Guinea Bissau in the South. With an area of 196712 square kilometers, the country currently has a population of 14 million people and a Sahelian Sudano climate. The climate is tropical in the south, semi-desert in the north and is characterized by the alternation of a dry season from November to mid-June and a wet and warm season from mid-June to October. The average annual rainfall is 1200 mm in the south to 300 mm in the north, with year-over-year variations. Three main rainfall zones corresponding to three climatic zones are thus determined: a forest zone in the south, a savannah with a central tree and a semi-desert zone in the north. Poverty is a phenomenon that


affects about 56.5% of the population with an increase in the number of poor, from 6.3 million in 2011 to 6.8 million in 2016 [2]. Rural households are more affected than urban households. There are significant regional disparities classified into three (03) groups: (i) regions that are highly poor (Kolda, Sédhiou, Kédougou, Tambacounda, Kaffrine, Ziguinchor, Fatick and Kaolack), (ii) medium-poor regions (Diourbel, Matam and Thiès) and (iii) low-poor regions (Dakar, Louga and Saint-Louis).

2.2 Data

The data came from the second poverty monitoring survey in Senegal (ESPS-II, 2011). The survey was carried out by the National Agency for Statistics and Demography and covered 17,891 households in 14 regions of Senegal. This survey had information on the income and consumption expenditure of different households, which allows us to simulate the impact of the increase in the rice price on real income and poverty in Senegal.

2.3 Method of Analysis

To properly assess the impact of price shocks on households, it is important to know their net position. To do this, we used the NBR indicator developed by [22] which is defined as the value of net sales of an asset as a percentage of income (total consumption expenditure). For a given asset, the NBR indicator is the difference



Map 1. Map of poverty in Senegal

Source: [2]

between the production ratio² and the consumption ratio³. In other words, this indicator makes it possible to distinguish the net producer from the net consumer of a given property.

2.3.1 Assessing the impact of rice price shocks on real income

The concept of a household includes not only consumers but also producers. The study carried out the assessment of the impact of rice price shocks on real income for both the consumers and the producers.

2.3.1.1 Impact on consumers

Generally, three (03) measures of variation in welfare were used to capture the impact of price shocks on consumers. We had, among other, consumer surplus, compensatory variation and equivalent variation⁴. But due to the limits of the equivalent variation and the consumer surplus, the compensatory variation was considered to be the most relevant measure of variation in well-being following a price increase. Indeed, this measure enabled the income variation to be captured, allowing the consumer to achieve the same level of utility with different price vectors. In addition, it represents the difference between the consumer's expenditure functions assessed respectively at the prices of the final and initial situation, the reference level of usefulness being that of the initial situation. Thus, like [18], we use the concept of compensatory variation to assess the impact of price shocks on consumers. The expression is as follow:⁵

$$CV = e(p_1, u_0) - e(p_0, u_0) \quad (1)$$

Where CV is the compensatory variation, $e(\cdot)$ the expense function, p the price vector, P_0 and P_1 prices before and after changes, u the utility function. Taylor's second-order expansion of

$e(p_1, u_0)$ around $e(p_0, u_0)$ will be used to assess the impact of price changes on household welfare. We have:

$$e(p_1, u_0) = e(p_0, u_0) + \frac{\partial e(p_0, u_0)}{\partial p_0} \Delta p_r + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 e(p_0, u_0)}{\partial p_0^2} \Delta p_r^2 \quad (2)$$

We deduced the compensatory variation as follows:

$$CV = \frac{\partial e(p_0, u_0)}{\partial p_0} \Delta p_r + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 e(p_0, u_0)}{\partial p_0^2} \Delta p_r^2 \quad (3)$$

Then the expression of the compensatory variation was substantially equal:

$$CV \cong q_r(p_0, x_0) \Delta p_r + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_d \frac{q_r(p_0, x_0)}{p_{0r}} \Delta p_r \Delta p_r \quad (4)$$

Where q_r and p_r are respectively the quantity requested and the purchase price of the property, x_0 the initial income of the household and ε_d the price elasticity of the demand. Considering equation (2), when we divide the left and right hand side elements by x_0 and multiplying the numerators and denominators of the right hand side element by p_{0r} , we get:

$$\frac{CV}{x_0} \cong \frac{p_{0r} q_r(p_0, x_0)}{x_0} \frac{\Delta p_r}{p_{0r}} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_d \frac{p_{0r} q_r(p_0, x_0)}{x_0} \left(\frac{\Delta p_r}{p_{0r}} \right)^2 \quad (5)$$

Equation (3) can be rewritten in reduced form:

$$\frac{CV}{x_0} \cong CR_r \frac{\Delta p_r}{p_{0r}} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_d CR_r \left(\frac{\Delta p_r}{p_{0r}} \right)^2 \quad (6)$$

$$\text{with } CR_r = \frac{p_{0r} q_r(p_0, x_0)}{x_0} \quad (7)$$

Where CR_r is the ratio of consumption of the good, that is, the ratio of the budgetary share attributed to consumption of the good over household income (approximated by total consumption expenditure).

2.3.1.2 Impact on producers

The impact of price shocks on the household as a producer was determined from the change in profit such as:

² Production ratio is equal to the share of income from the production of an asset

³ Consumption ratio is equal to the budgetary share devoted to consumption of an asset

⁴ Equivalent variation is the consumer's willingness to pay. It captures the maximum amount that the consumer is willing to pay in the event of a price increase.

⁵ The main limitation of the consumer's surplus is that its calculation is based on the implicit assumption of constancy of the marginal usefulness of the currency along the integration path [23]. Equivalent variation is more complex because of the large number of assumptions it requires. It uses as a reference utility level, the final situation while the compensatory variation uses the initial situation.

$$\Delta\pi = \pi(p_1, w_0, z_0) - \pi(p_0, w_0, z_0) \quad (8)$$

With $\Delta\pi$ variation, $\pi(\cdot)$ profit function, p a vector of output prices, p_0 and p_1 prices before and after changes, w a vector of input prices, z a vector of fixed factors. Using Taylor's second order expansion of $\pi(p_1, w_0, z_0)$ around $\pi(p_0, w_0, z_0)$, we have:

$$\pi(p_1, w_0, z_0) = \pi(p_0, w_0, z_0) + \frac{\partial\pi(p_0, w_0, z_0)}{\partial p_0} \Delta p_r + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2\pi(p_1, w_0, z_0)}{\partial p_0^2} \Delta p_r^2 \quad (9)$$

We deduced compensatory variation as follows:

$$\Delta\pi = \frac{\partial\pi(p_0, w_0, z_0)}{\partial p_0} \Delta p_r + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2\pi(p_1, w_0, z_0)}{\partial p_0^2} \Delta p_r^2 \quad (10)$$

Otherwise:

$$\Delta\pi \cong s_r(p_0, w_0, z_0) p_r + \frac{1}{2} \frac{s_r(p_0, w_0, z_0)}{p_{or}} \Delta p_r \Delta p_r \quad (11)$$

Where s_r and p_r were respectively the supply and price of the property; ε_s is the supply elasticity. When dividing the left and right members of equation (7) by the initial household income (x_0) and multiplying the numerators and denominators of the right member by p_{or} , we have:

$$\frac{\Delta\pi}{x_0} \cong \frac{p_{or} s_r(p_0, w_0, z_0)}{x_0} \frac{\Delta p_r}{p_{or}} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_s \frac{p_{or} s_r(p_0, w_0, z_0)}{x_0} \left(\frac{\Delta p_r}{p_{or}} \right)^2 \quad (12)$$

A reduced form of equation is:

$$\frac{\Delta\pi}{x_0} \cong PR_r \frac{\Delta p_r}{p_{or}} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_s PR_r \left(\frac{\Delta p_r}{p_{or}} \right)^2 \quad (13)$$

$$PR_r = \frac{p_{or} s_r(p_0, w_0, z_0)}{x_0} \quad (14)$$

with

Where PR_r is the ratio of production of the good, that is, the ratio of income from the production of

the good to the household income (total consumption expenses). From the combination of equations (4) and (9), we have:

$$\frac{\Delta w^2}{x_0} \cong \frac{\Delta p_r^p}{p_{or}^p} PR_r + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\Delta p_r^p}{p_{or}^p} \right)^2 PR_r \varepsilon_s - \frac{\Delta p_r^c}{p_{or}^c} CR_r - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\Delta p_r^c}{p_{or}^c} \right)^2 CR_r \varepsilon_d \quad (15)$$

Where Δw^2 is the second-order approximation of the effect of net welfare of price shocks on the household, p^c and p^p are respectively the consumer price and the producer price. Equation (11) took into account the response of consumers and producers after price change and was considered the long term effect. The impact of price shock on household welfare was short-term, when supply and demand elasticities were equal to zero (0).

$$\frac{\Delta w^1}{x_0} \cong \frac{\Delta p_r^p}{p_{or}^p} PR_r - \frac{\Delta p_r^c}{p_{or}^c} CR_r \quad (16)$$

where Δw^1 is the first order approximation of the net impact of price changes on household welfare.

Two methodological problems emerged: (i) the existence of the relationship between producer price and consumer price and (ii) the use of the price elasticity of supply and the price elasticity of demand. Due to the difficulty in obtaining producer price data, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, several studies have assumed that consumer price and producer price increase by the same proportion, i.e., the producer's profit margin is a consistent proportion of the consumer price [24]. Regarding the problem of price elasticities of supply and demand, several studies made the assumption that consumers and producers do not respond to the increase in prices, that is to say that the elasticities take the value of zero. This assumption may be accepted in the short term but not in the long term. In the long term, households (producers and consumers) are able to respond to rising prices. For example, we have two assumptions in this study: (1) in the short term, supply and demand elasticities are zero and (2) in the long term, elasticities are not zero, which corresponds to the context of the countries of sub-Saharan Africa. We assumed that demand elasticities vary between -0,20 and -0,40 and supply elasticities vary between 0,20 and 0,40. Then, from the law

of uniform probability, we draw the averages of supply and demand elasticity as an element of analysis.

To estimate the impact of price shocks, four (04) simulations were conducted, with the same percentage increase in producer and consumer prices (15%) and households not responding to price increases (**Simulation 1**); the percentage increase in producer price of 30% and the increase in consumer price was 15% and households did not respond to the increase in prices (**Simulation 2**); the percentage increase in producer and consumer prices was the same (15%) and households responding to price increases (demand elasticity ranging from -0.20 to -0.40 and supply elasticity from 0.20 to 0.40) (**Simulation 3**) and the percentage increase in producer price of 30% and consumer price of 15% and households responding to price increases (demand elasticity ranging from -0.20 to -0.40 and supply elasticity from 0.20 to 0.40) (**Simulation 4**).

2.3.2 Assessing the impact of rice price shocks on poverty

To assess the impact of price shocks on poverty in Senegal, we consider the above simulations and household characteristics. Our basic relationship was as follow:

$$x_{i1} = x_{i0} + \Delta\pi - CV \quad (17)$$

Where x_{i1} was the consumption expenditure of the household i after the price rise, x_{i0} consumption expenditure of the household i before the rise, $\Delta\pi$ and CV are respectively the function of the change in profit and the compensatory function defined above. When we replace $\Delta\pi$ and CV by their expressions in equation (17), we have:

$$x_{i1} = x_{i0} + s_r(p_0, w_0, z_0)p_r + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_s \frac{s_r(p_0, w_0, z_0)}{p_{0r}} (\Delta p_r)^2 - \left[q_r(p_0, x_0) \Delta p_r + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_d \frac{q_r(p_0, x_0)}{p_{0r}} (\Delta p_r)^2 \right] \quad (18)$$

To assess the impact of price shocks on Senegalese household poverty, we used the poverty measures defined by [25] as follows:

$$P_\alpha = \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \left[\frac{\bar{x} - x_i}{\bar{x}} \right]^\alpha \quad (19)$$

Where P_α was the measure of poverty, N the total number of households, \bar{x} was the poverty line, x_i represented the consumption expenditure of the poor household i of the equation (14).

- For $\alpha = 0$, we had P_0 that represented the incidence of poverty. This was the proportion of households with spending levels below the poverty line. It covered only the number of poor and did not take into account the severity of their poverty.
- We had $\alpha = 1$ and P_1 which represented the poverty gap, which is the incidence of poverty multiplied by the average distance between the poverty line and the level of spending of the poor household, expressed as a percentage of the poverty line. This measure did not take into account the severity of poverty, but it was able to determine the amount of resources needed to eliminate poverty if it was possible to identify each poor and bring their spending level back to the poverty line.
- Finally, for $\alpha = 2$ and P_2 which were the square of the poverty gap. This measure of poverty took into account inequalities between the poor and focuses on the poorest.

Our task will be to compare levels of poverty before and after shocks. But the choice of the variable of interest to be used to determine the poverty indicator is tedious. The variables frequently used in the empirical poverty literature are total household consumption, per capita consumption and equivalent per adult consumption. Due to criticisms⁶ of total household consumption, we use two types of indicators in this paper: per capita consumption and consumption per adult equivalent.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 showed that rice consumption in Senegal varied by income category (from the poorest to

⁶ The use of total household consumption does not take into account the size of households and this will tend to overestimate the well-being of individuals living in large households.

the richest). The richest households consume more rice than the poorest households. Rice is therefore a cereal heavily consumed by the rich class in Senegal. Indeed, the poorest are about 7% of those who consume rice, while the richest are around 37%. The other income categories are around 56%.

Table 1. Share of rice consumers by income category

Class of income	Share of rice consumers (%)
1 st quintile (20% poorest)	6.6
2	13.0
3	18.4
4	24.6
5th quintile (20% richer)	37.4

Source: Calculated from household survey data in Senegal (ESPS-II, 2011)

Table 2 shows the percentages of rice consumption expenditure in relation to total consumption expenditure by income category and region. An analysis by income category revealed that the richest households allocate more resources to rice consumption than the poorest households. For example, in urban areas the richest affect 36.4% of rice consumption, while the poorest affect only 6.3%. In rural areas, the richest spend 37.7% of their income on rice, while the poorest spend only 6.8%. The consumption of rice in Senegal is more attributed to the rich class. An analysis by area of residence showed that households living in urban areas spend on average more on rice (25.0%) than households living in rural areas (24.4%).

Table 2. Budgetary shares of rice consumption by income category and region

Class of income	Share of rice consumption in total expenditure (%)	
	Urban areas	Rural areas
1 st quintile (20% poorest)	6.3	6.8
2	13.4	12.9
3	18.7	18.2
4	25.0	24.4
5th quintile (20% richer)	36.4	37.7

Source: Calculated from household survey data in Senegal (ESPS-II, 2011)

Fig. 1 revealed the proportion of Senegalese households living below the poverty line in 2011. Analysis of the figure confirm that poverty affects more than half the population of the regions of Fatick, Kolda, Louga and Tambacounda. On the other hand, poverty affects about a quarter (1/4) of the population of the Dakar and Saint Louis regions. From the figure, it stand out that rural households are more affected than urban households.

A regional analysis showed that there were significant disparities among the regions. From analysis. 46.7% of households in Senegal live below the poverty line. Disparities at regional level were classified into three (03) groups. The first group was made up of regions with very high poverty (more than 60%). The regions were Kolda, Sédhiou, Kédougou, Tambacounda, Kaffrine, Ziguinchor, Fatick and Kaolack. The second group comprise the regions where the incidence of poverty varied between 40 and 60%.




Fig. 1. Households living below the poverty line in 2011
Source: Built from household survey data in Senegal (ESPS-II, 2011)

Table 3. Evolution of household poverty by residential setting and region

Class of households	Index of poverty			Contribution to poverty
	P0	P1	P2	
National level	46.7	14.5	6.6	100
Area of residence				
urban areas	30.8	8.5	3.5	13.3
Rural environment	55.6	18.8	8.9	70.1
Regions				
Dakar	26.1	4.7	2.1	
Ziguinchor	66.8	19.7	13.5	
Diourbel	47.8	10.2	5.1	
Saint-Louis	39.5	11.8	4.9	
Tambacounda	62.5	21.7	9.9	
Kaolack	61.7	18.5	8.1	
Thiès	41.3	9.5	4.3	
Louga	26.8	5.6	2.1	
Fatick	67.8	18.73	9.5	
Kolda	76.6	29.5	20.8	
Matam	45.2	11.1	6.4	
Kaffrine	63.8	17.21	10.5	
Kédougou	71.3	21.42	14.1	
Sédhiou	68.3	19.5	11	

Source: Calculated from household survey data in Senegal (ESPS-II. 2011)

Table 4. Impact of rising rice prices on real income

Class of households	NBR initial	Impact of the short term		Impact of long term	
		Simulation 1	Simulation 2	Simulation 3	Simulation 4
National level	-4.7	-0.51	-0.49	-0.49	-0.49
Area of residence					
Urban Areas	-5.2	-0.67	-0.63	-0.62	-0.6
Rural environment	-3.05	-0.48	-0.44	-0.4	-0.36
Regions					
Dakar	-5.21	-0.62	-0.59	-0.55	-0.55
Ziguinchor	-2.5	-0.33	-0.31	-0.29	-0.28
Diourbel	-2.72	-0.36	-0.35	-0.33	-0.3
Saint Louis	-5.36	-0.52	-0.5	-0.45	-0.44
Tambacounda	-3.88	-0.57	-0.56	-0.52	-0.51
Kaolack	-2.77	-0.44	-0.41	-0.39	-0.35
Thiès	-4.44	-0.52	-0.49	-0.49	-0.49
Louga	-5.09	-0.61	-0.55	-0.45	-0.38
Fatick	-2.97	-0.51	-0.39	-0.35	-0.29
Kolda	-4.13	-0.38	-0.33	-0.30	-0.30
Matam	-4.07	-0.32	-0.31	-0.29	-0.27
Kaffrine	-3.34	-0.28	-0.25	-0.23	-0.21
Kédougou	-4.57	0.50	-0.48	-0.4	-0.4
Sédhiou	-3.46	-0.31	-0.29	-0.22	-0.18

Source: Simulations calculated from household survey data in Senegal (ESPS-II. 2011)

They were Diourbel, Matam and Thiès. The third group included regions where the incidence of poverty was below the national average (less than 40%). These are the regions of Dakar,

Louga and Saint Louis. Among the regions, Dakar was the least poor in Senegal because of the development advantages it enjoys as the country's historical and economic capital.

Table 5. Impact of rising rice prices on poverty: Expenditure per capita

Class of households	Initial poverty rate	Impact of the short term		Impact of long term	
		Simulation 1	Simulation 2	Simulation 3	Simulation 4
National level	46.7	3.61	3.36	3.64	3.25
Area of residence					
Urban areas	30.8	3.97	3.63	3.45	3.88
Rural environment	55.6	2.05	2.04	3.01	2.25
Regions					
Dakar	26.1	4.02	4.0	3.78	3.77
Ziguinchor	66.8	3.13	2.89	3.5	3.14
Diourbel	47.8	2.45	2.86	2.55	2.32
Saint Louis	39.5	3.55	3.48	3.85	3.77
Tambacounda	62.5	3.08	3.05	3.12	3.09
Kaolack	61.7	2.75	2.68	2.77	2.86
Thiès	41.3	3.12	3.08	3.22	3.15
Louga	26.8	3.22	2.98	3.29	3.33
Fatick	67.8	3.15	3.19	3.05	3.07
Kolda	76.6	2.96	2.92	2.52	2.44
Matam	45.2	3.30	3.28	3.25	3.18
Kaffrine	63.8	3.21	3.17	3.10	3.05
Kédougou	71.3	3.22	3.20	3.21	3.05
Sédhiou	68.3	3.18	3.22	3.21	3.19

Source: Simulations computed from household survey data in Senegal (ESPS-II. 2011)

Table 6. Impact of rising rice prices on poverty: Expenditure per adult equivalent

Class of households	Initial poverty rate	Impact of the short term		Impact of long term	
		Simulation 1	Simulation 2	Simulation 3	Simulation 4
National level	38.7	4.35	4.29	4.26	4.23
Area of residence					
Urban Areas	27.8	5.28	5.15	5.66	5.47
Rural environment	35.2	2.75	2.70	2.55	2.48
Regions					
Dakar	23.1	4.33	4.12	4.25	4.10
Ziguinchor	48.2	5.12	5.09	4.89	4.55
Diourbel	39.8	4.11	4.1	4.03	4.01
Saint Louis	28.3	4.52	4.4	4.35	4.31
Tambacounda	52.1	3.75	3.66	3.22	3.21
Kaolack	53.23	3.44	3.41	3.39	3.35
Thiès	41.3	4.22	4.2	4.19	4.12
Louga	23.3	4.61	4.55	4.45	4.32
Fatick	58.5	2.51	2.39	2.35	2.29
Kolda	67.6	3.78	3.72	3.69	3.68
Matam	34.2	4.32	4.31	4.29	4.27
Kaffrine	48.8	3.81	3.55	3.5	3.5
Kédougou	71.3	4.50	3.28	3.27	3.25
Sédhiou	57.01	4.61	4.22	4.2	4.12

Source: Simulations computed from household survey data in Senegal (ESPS-II. 2011)

3.2 Impact of Rising Rice Prices on Household Welfare

The impact on household welfare was on twofold. First, we assessed the impact of rising rice prices on the real income of Senegalese households and secondly, measured their impact on the incidence of household poverty.

3.2.1 Impact on real household income

Table 4 is displaying the net benefit ratio (NBR) values as well as the different simulations of the impact of rising rice prices on real income of Senegalese households. The first two simulations (1 and 2) assessed the short-term impact and the last two simulations (3 and 4) assessed the long-term impact. Equations (11) and (12) were used for simulations. Analysis of net benefit ratio (NBR) values showed that Senegalese households are net importers of rice. At national level, this ratio has a negative value of (-4.7). In urban areas, the value of the NBR ratio was (-5.2), so it can be concluded that urban households are net buyers of rice because the value of the ratio being negative. This result confirmed the assumption that rice was more consumed in urban areas of Senegal. The ratio in rural areas (-3.05) was lower in absolute terms than in urban areas (-5.2), so rural households were also net purchasers of rice but are less consumer than urban households. Analysis of the short-term and long-term simulations showed that the increase in the international rice price negatively affected the well-being of Senegalese households. This negative effect is more pronounced in urban areas than in rural areas. Indeed, since Senegalese households are net consumers, they are subject to the rise in the international rice price. These results confirmed that of many researchers [14,4,18,11,6] for who agreed that the rise in food prices negatively affects the well-being of households in developing countries.

3.2.2 Impact of rising rice prices on poverty

To capture the impact of rising rice prices on poverty indices (Incidence of Poverty (P0), depth of poverty (P1) and severity of poverty (P2)), we use equation (14) and (15). Our various simulations were based essentially on the incidence of poverty. It was a question of assessing the impact of the increase in rice prices on the incidence of poverty in Senegal. These were done by adjusting the real income of each household and share of households with an income below the poverty line. Table 5 below

presented the results of the rise in rice prices on the incidence of poverty, taking into account consumption per capita expenditure as a measure of poverty. The analysis showed that, on average in Senegal, the increase in rice price causes an increase in the poverty rate of about 3.50%. This increase is greater in urban areas than in rural areas. This result is consistent with that of [4] but contrary to the work of [19] then [20]. According to the various simulations in the short term or in the long term, the poverty rate was increasing throughout Senegal, varying between 2.04 and 3.97%.

Table 6 presented the results of the increase in rice prices on the incidence of poverty, taking into account consumption expenditure per adult equivalent as a measure of poverty. The results of this table were more alarming in terms of increasing poverty than in the previous tables. Whatever the time periods (short term and long term), the impact of rising rice prices on poverty is very high. Poverty is more prevalent in urban areas than in rural areas. The rate of increase in poverty is around 4.25% at national level and 5% in urban areas. In rural areas, rising rice prices cause poverty to increase by about 3%. These results confirm those of Wodon and Zaman [15] and Badolo and Traore [18] for whom rising food prices increase poverty in developing countries. On the other hand, our results infirm those of [20] which showed that rural poverty was higher than urban poverty.

4. CONCLUSION

This study aimed at assessing the impact of rising international rice prices on real household income and poverty in Senegal. Using two indicators: (i) per capita spending and (ii) expenditure per adult equivalent, the results showed that rising international rice prices negatively affect real income and poverty. This negative effect was more pronounced in urban areas and in areas with high rice consumption. Poverty also increases by 3.5% when the first indicator is used. However, it increases by 4.25% when the second indicator was used. Statistics showed that 37% of the richest households consume rice compared to 7% of the poorest households. In addition, urban households allocate 25% of their budget to rice consumption, compared to 24.4% for rural households. To reduce Senegal's vulnerability governments need to take steps to limit the country's dependence on rice

imports. Therefore it would be key to investing more in the production and consumption of local rice.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. World Bank. Poverty and Shared Prosperity; 2018. Available:<http://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/poverty-and-shared-prosperity> (Accessed 8 November 2018)
2. ANSD. Pauvreté et condition de vie des ménages. Rapport national; 2015. Available:<http://www.ansd.sn/> (Accessed on 24 July. 2017)
3. FAO. Aperçu du développement rizicole au Sénégal. Rapport FAO région Afrique de l'Ouest; 2015. Available:http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/spid/docs/Senegal/Riziculture_eta_tdeslieux_SN.pdf (Accessed on 9 January 2017)
4. Ivanic M, Martin W, Zamman H. Estimating the short-run poverty impacts of the 2010–11 surge in food prices. *World Development*. 2012;40(11):2302–2317.
5. Wood BDK, Nelson CH, Nogueira L. Poverty effects of food price escalation: The importance of substitution effects in Mexican households. *Food Policy*. 2012; 37(1):77-85.
6. Bekkers E, Brockmeier M, Francois J, Yang F. Local Food Prices and International price transmission. *World Development*. 2017;96:216-230.
7. Abbott P, de Battisti AB. Recent global food price shocks: Causes. Consequences and lessons for African Governments and donors. *Journal of African Economies*. 2011;20(1):12–62.
8. Garrido A, Brummer B, M'Barek R, Meusissen MPM, MoralesOpazo C. (Eds) *Agricultural markets instability: Revisiting the recent food crises*. Oxon. UK: Routledge Press; 2016.
9. FAOSTAT. Rome. Italy. Food and Agriculture Organization; 2013. Available:<http://faostat.fao.org/> (Accessed on 13 October 2016)
10. Elbehri AJ, Kaminski S, Koroma M, lafrate M, Benali. Systèmes alimentaires de l'Afrique de l'Ouest: Un aperçu des tendances et des indicateurs de demande. de l'offre et la compétitivité des filières alimentaires de base. Rapport FAO/FIDA. Reconstruire le potentiel alimentaire de l'Afrique de l'Ouest; 2014.
11. DiazBonilla E. Volatile volatility: Conceptual and measurement issues related to price trends and volatility. *Food Price Volatility and its implications for Food Security and Policy*. 2016;35-57.
12. Trairatvorakul P. The effects on income distribution and nutrition of alternative rice price policies in Thailand. Research Report 46. Washington. D.C. International Food Policy Research Institute; 1984.
13. Minot N, Goletti F. Rice market liberalization and poverty in Vietnam. Research report 114. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). Washington. DC; 2000.
14. Minot N. Transmission of World Food Price Changes to African Markets and its Effect on Household Welfare. Paper presented at the Comesa policy seminar "Food price variability: Causes. Consequences. And policy options. On 25-26 January 2010 in Maputo. Mozambique. Under the Comesa-MSU-IFPRI African Agricultural Markets Project (AAMP); 2010.
15. Wodon Q, Zaman H. Rising food prices in Sub-Saharan Africa: Poverty impact and policy responses. Policy Research Working Paper 4738. The World Bank. Washington. DC; 2008.
16. Ivanic M, Martin W. Implications of higher global food prices for poverty in low-income countries. *Agricultural Economics*. 2008;39(1):405–416.
17. Broeck GV, Maertens M. Moving up or moving in? Insights into Rural Development and Poverty Reduction in Senegal. *World Development*. 2017;99: 95-109.
18. Badolo F, Traore F. Impact of rising world rice prices on poverty and inequality in Burkina Faso. *Development Policy Review*. 2015;33(2):221-244.
19. Levin J, Vimefall E. Welfare impact of higher maize prices when allowing for heterogeneous price increases. *Food Policy*. 2015;57:1-12.
20. Hill RV, Porter C. Vulnerability to drought and food price shocks: Evidence from Ethiopia. *World Development*. 2017;96:65-77.
21. Alvarez R, Ilabaca S. Commodity price shocks and poverty reduction in Chile. *Resources Policy*. In Press; 2018.

22. Deaton A. Rice prices and income distribution in Thailand: A non-parametric analysis. *Economic Journal* 1989;99(395): 1–37.
23. Deaton A, Muellbauer J. An almost ideal demand system. *The American Economic Review*. 1980;70(3):312-326.
24. Dave D, Maltoglou I. Analyzing the impact of food price increases: Assumptions about marketing margins can be crucial. ESA working paper N°.09-02. Food and agriculture organization. Rome; 2009.
25. Foster J, Greer J, Thorbecke E. A class of decomposable poverty measures. *Econometrica*. 1984;3(52): 761–766.

© 2019 Sossou and Igue; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/46688>