

6-2019

## Asset, Property Rights and Forest Dependency: Evidence From Machine Learning Analysis - June 2019

Dambala Gelo  
*University of Pretoria*

Daniela Lamparelli  
*University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg*

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/fc\\_research](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/fc_research)



Part of the [Environmental Policy Commons](#), and the [Environmental Studies Commons](#)

---

### Citation Details

Gelo, Dambala and Lamparelli, Daniela, "Asset, Property Rights and Forest Dependency: Evidence From Machine Learning Analysis - June 2019" (2019). *Forest Collaborative Research*. 14.  
[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/fc\\_research/14](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/fc_research/14)

This Spring 2019 Meeting Presentation - Manchester, England is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Forest Collaborative Research by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).



# Asset, property rights and forest dependency: Evidence from machine learning analysis

Dambala Gelo and Daniela Lamparelli

---

EfD-FC Talk

26 June 2019

Manchester University

Manchester



# Introduction

- In many poor regions, the poor heavily depend on the income derived from the natural resource base, such as village forests, grazing land and fisheries
  - These resource typically managed openly, its lower entry costs relative to that of alternative income earning sources,
  - The poor often lack access to other income generating resources, such as land, human capital and physical capital.
  - Compared to alternative income sources, natural resource earns low yet less risky income (forests as insurance source)
  - Major cause of overuse (degradation) of the resource



# Introduction

- In fact, the key hypothesis of the poverty-environment nexus
  - The poor are both agents and victims of environmental degradation (Wunder, 2001, Fisher, 2004 and Angelsen, 1999).
- Major implications
  - asset poverty alleviation ameliorates environmental outcomes, and vice versa
  - development of financial (credit and insurance) markets or lack of for reliance on forests
  - well-defined property right for breaking the poverty-environment trap by installing restriction and spurring incentives




# Introduction contd

- Anecdotal empirical evidences of African and Asian studies on some of these propositions
  - Determination of the forest dependency level (Monica, 2004, Malmo et.al, 2008 and Cavendish, 1999)
  - Asset poor households depend on forest than asset rich households (Monica, 2004; Beyene and Koch 2011)
  - Education deters dependency of on forest (Garekae, 2017 and Jannat, 20018)
  - Forest dependency encourage participation in community forest management (Jumbe and Angelsen, 2007)
  - The rich collects more forest products than the poor (Adhikari, 2005)



# Motivation

- 
- Major gaps in this literature
    - Didn't accounted for asset heterogeneity
    - Rarely investigated the effects of credit constraint on forest dependency
    - Rarely accounted for typology of forest property right
    - Nearly all the studies suffered from weaker identification strategies and model uncertainty



## Motivation

- In this paper, we respond to these paucities in literature as follows
  - We test the forest-dependency-asset poverty hypotheses while accounting for differentiated form of assets (liquid wealth, agricultural productive asset and human capital) and typology of forest property rights
  - We ascertain the impacts of credit constraint on forest dependency
  - Using machine learning approach we resolves the problems of model selection uncertainty and structural parameters identification
  - Our study is based on data collected from 377 randomly selected households (200 PFM and 177 non-PFM) and five villages for each



# Econometrics

- Common property right as an endogenous treatment
  - Non-random assignment mechanism of the treatment
  - Model selection dilemma; which available to include in the model
    - as controls
    - as instruments
  - this question presents us with a difficult choice
  - researchers traditionally include all available variable (“kitchen sink” approach) or employ stepwise regression of progressively including or dropping variables
    - select few controls; model suffers from **omitted variable bias**
    - select too many variables; the model suffers from **overfitting**





## Econometrics contd

- Recent years has seen machine leaning approach to resolve this problem
- 
- Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection (LASSO) regressions method of machine learning, recently developed by Belloni et.al, (2012 & 2014), Belloni et.al, (2016) and Chernozhukov and Hansen, 2015)
  - These methods are increasingly being used as a practical solution to the problem of variable/model selection as well as controlling for endogeneity.
  - We followed this approach to resolve model uncertainty in our analysis
    - Selection of relevant determinants of forest dependency
    - Selection of instruments for endogenous treatment variable



# Data

- Forest dependency: share of income derived from non-timber forest products (NTFPs),
- Different controls of forest dependency; household covariates; assets and demography, institutional (property right) and market access
- Assets; three majors asset categories
  - Agricultural productive assets
  - Human capital
  - Liquid/illiquid unproductive



# Data

- Measures of assets.
  - index of household education; max education in a household and hh education,
  - index of agricultural asset; land holding and livestock holding
  - measure of liquid wealth (corrugated house ownership)
- Property right as an endogenous treatment
- Instruments; distance to PFM, collection action experience household age labour force, land holding and Menja

## The data

Variables	Mean	sd	min	max
forest depend	0.1167	0.1644	0	0.859
treatment	0.582	0.494	0	1
dstpfm (minutes)	31.45	38.80	3	215
othpartcp	0.0713	0.257	0	1
hhage_b	36.24	13.55	22	62
fmlfrc_b	1.270	0.498	0	3
mlfrc_b	1.189	0.510	0	3
lndsz_b	1.946	1.401	0	4.5
offrm_b	0.0430	0.203	0	1
crdtdd	0.137	0.344	0	1
hhsz	5.531	1.822	2	13
menja	0.581	0.494	0	1
corr_roof	0.229	0.420	0	1
agric_cap	3.90e-09	1.105	-1.742	3.015
human_cap	3.39e-09	1.284	-2.347	2.804
human_cap_sqr	1.647	2.019	0.000196	7.862

# Results

Variable	Common property		open_access
corr_roof	-0.0192 (0.0158)		-0.0490*** (0.0143)
agric_cap	-0.00592 (0.00429)		0.0600*** (0.00843)
human_cap	-0.0328** (0.0150)		-0.000115 (0.00332)
crtdtd	0.0324 (0.0251)		0.0115 (0.0146)
sex	-0.00422 (0.0290)		-0.0805*** (0.0192)
hhdstroadmin	0.000110 (0.000390)		-0.00117*** (0.000185)
hhdstwnmin	-0.000814*** (0.000168)		0.000353 (0.000226)
dstpfm	0.000313 (0.000296)		0.000547*** (0.000134)
agea	-0.000968 (0.00117)		0.000879*** (0.000300)
human_cap_sqr	-0.00133 (0.0152)		-0.00459*** (0.00173)
ATT		-0.0453** (0.0160)	
Constant	0.172* (0.0896)		0.126*** (0.0325)
Observations			532



## Results

Variables	Lasso_IV
Treatment	-0.0659*** (0.00917)
corr_roof	-0.0160** (0.00797)
agric_cap	0.0272*** (0.00303)
human_cap_sqr	-0.00354* (0.00221)
credit_constraint	0.0513*** (0.0118)
Constant	0.107*** (0.00560)
Observations	375



# Conclusion



## ■ Observations

- Forest dependency varies with asset types and property right regimes
- Income risk in agriculture drives forest dependency both as part of income smoothing or consumption smoothing or both
- Forests as source of liquidity signifying the importance of credit market imperfection in the region