

International Journal of **Livestock Policy** (IJLP)

**Socioeconomic Implications of Livestock Intensification
in Emerging Economies**



**CARI
Journals**

Socioeconomic Implications of Livestock Intensification in Emerging Economies

 ^{1*}Rita Okoto

The University of Nairobi

Accepted: 14th April, 2024, Received in Revised Form: 9th May, 2024, Published: 4th, June, 2024

Crossref

Abstract

Purpose: The general objective of the study was to examine the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies.

Methodology: The study adopted a desktop research methodology. Desk research refers to secondary data or that which can be collected without fieldwork. Desk research is basically involved in collecting data from existing resources hence it is often considered a low cost technique as compared to field research, as the main cost is involved in executive's time, telephone charges and directories. Thus, the study relied on already published studies, reports and statistics. This secondary data was easily accessed through the online journals and library.

Findings: The findings reveal that there exists a contextual and methodological gap relating to socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies. Preliminary empirical review revealed that while intensification held promise for increasing productivity and improving livelihoods, it also posed risks such as environmental degradation, social inequalities, and animal welfare concerns. Despite these challenges, the research highlighted the importance of supportive policies and institutional frameworks in promoting inclusive and sustainable development. Governments played a crucial role in providing enabling environments for responsible intensification practices, while stakeholder engagement and participatory approaches ensured that the benefits reached all segments of society. Overall, the study emphasized the need for a holistic approach that balanced economic growth with environmental and social considerations to achieve sustainable livestock intensification in emerging economies.

Unique Contribution to Theory, Practice and Policy: The Dependency Theory, Modernization Theory and Political Economy Theory may be used to anchor future studies on socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies. The study provided recommendations aimed at advancing theory, practice, and policy. The research emphasized the need for interdisciplinary approaches to understand the complex dynamics of intensification processes. Practically, it suggested promoting inclusive and sustainable intensification practices tailored to local contexts and involving stakeholders in decision-making. From a policy perspective, enabling environments supporting responsible intensification, including regulatory frameworks and rural infrastructure investments, were recommended. Additionally, integrated approaches to livestock intensification were advocated, recognizing the interconnectedness of social, economic, and environmental dimensions. Overall, implementing these recommendations required collaborative efforts from governments, civil society, the private sector, and researchers to address the challenges associated with livestock intensification in emerging economies.

Keywords: *Livestock Intensification, Environmental Stewardship, Smallholder Farmers, Rural Infrastructure, Integrated Approaches, Inclusive Growth*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Livestock intensification, characterized by the increasing scale, efficiency, and productivity of livestock production, has profound socioeconomic implications that vary across different regions of the world. In the United States, a leading global player in livestock production, the impact of intensification is particularly pronounced. According to data from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the value of livestock production in the U.S. has steadily increased over the past decade, reaching \$167.7 billion in 2020 (USDA, 2021). This growth has not only contributed significantly to the country's gross domestic product (GDP) but has also played a crucial role in sustaining rural economies. Livestock farming provides employment opportunities and income generation in rural areas, supporting livelihoods and fostering economic resilience in agricultural communities (Key, Sneeringer, Marquardt & Burns, 2019). Moreover, the adoption of advanced technologies and management practices, such as precision livestock farming and genetic improvement, has enhanced productivity and profitability within the U.S. livestock sector, driving further socioeconomic development (Rotz, Duncan, Pollak & Soder, 2019).

Similarly, in the United Kingdom, livestock intensification has complex socioeconomic implications. While intensification has led to higher productivity and output within the livestock sector, it has also raised significant concerns about environmental sustainability and animal welfare. The British livestock industry faces pressure to adopt more sustainable practices to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and address public health concerns related to antibiotic use and livestock-related diseases (Dawkins & Boniface, 2018). However, despite these challenges, the UK livestock sector remains a crucial contributor to the national economy, with livestock farming supporting rural livelihoods and providing employment opportunities, particularly in regions with a strong agricultural presence (Smith, Porter, Green & Brimelow, 2017).

In Japan, where agricultural land is limited and population density is high, livestock intensification has unique socioeconomic implications. Livestock farming in Japan faces constraints such as land scarcity and high production costs, prompting the adoption of innovative technologies and practices to maximize efficiency and sustainability. The Japanese government has implemented policies to support the modernization of the livestock sector, including subsidies for investments in infrastructure and technology upgrades (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 2020). Despite these efforts, the socioeconomic impact of livestock intensification in Japan is mixed. While the sector contributes to rural employment and income generation, concerns persist regarding environmental degradation and food security (Ishikawa, Iijima, Kariyama & Yamashita, 2019). Furthermore, the aging agricultural workforce and declining interest among younger generations pose challenges to the long-term sustainability of livestock farming in Japan (Tsuyuki et al., 2018).

In Brazil, a global agricultural powerhouse and one of the largest exporters of livestock products, intensification has fueled economic growth and rural development. The expansion of large-scale commercial farms, particularly in the Amazon region, has led to significant increases in livestock production and export revenues (Godar, Gardner, Tizado & Pacheco, 2012). Livestock farming in Brazil contributes substantially to GDP and employment, particularly in rural areas where smallholder farmers play a significant role in the sector (Araújo, de Oliveira & Cunha, 2020). However, the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in Brazil are not without challenges. Deforestation associated with expanding pastureland and concerns about land tenure and social equity have sparked environmental and social controversies (Arima et al., 2014). Moreover, the concentration of land and resources in the hands of large agribusinesses has exacerbated inequalities and marginalized small-scale producers, raising questions about the inclusivity and sustainability of Brazil's livestock sector (Barreto, Schneider, Toledo & Souza, 2018).

In African countries, where livestock farming is a traditional livelihood for millions of people, the socioeconomic implications of intensification are deeply intertwined with food security, poverty alleviation, and rural development. Livestock production plays a vital role in the livelihoods of smallholder farmers, providing income, nutrition, and social capital (FAO, 2019). However, the benefits of intensification are not equally distributed across regions and social groups. In some areas, the adoption of improved breeds, veterinary services, and market access has boosted productivity and lifted households out of poverty (Thornton, Jones, Ericksen & Challinor, 2020). In contrast, marginalized communities, particularly pastoralists and women, often face barriers to accessing resources and markets, limiting their participation in the benefits of livestock intensification (Kristjanson, Waters-Bayer, Krüger, Johnson, Tipilda, Njuki & Baltenweck, 2017). Moreover, environmental degradation, climate change, and livestock-related conflicts pose significant challenges to the sustainability and resilience of livestock-based livelihoods in Africa (Homewood, Kristjanson & Trench, 2012). The socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification are shaped by a complex interplay of factors, including technological advancements, policy frameworks, market dynamics, and social contexts. While intensification has the potential to drive economic growth, alleviate poverty, and improve food security, its sustainability hinges on addressing environmental, social, and ethical concerns and promoting inclusive and equitable development strategies.

Livestock intensification is a multifaceted process that encompasses a range of strategies aimed at increasing the efficiency and productivity of livestock production systems. At its core, intensification involves the adoption of technologies, management practices, and inputs to maximize output while minimizing resource use and environmental impact (FAO, 2016). This concept encompasses various aspects of livestock farming, including genetics, nutrition, health management, and housing, with the goal of meeting growing demand for animal products while optimizing resource allocation (Thornton et al., 2017). Livestock intensification is driven by factors such as population growth, rising incomes, urbanization, and changing dietary preferences, which place increasing pressure on agricultural systems to produce more with less (Herrero et al., 2013).

One key component of livestock intensification is genetic improvement, which involves selectively breeding animals to enhance desirable traits such as growth rate, feed efficiency, and disease resistance (González-Recio, López de Maturana, Gutiérrez & Jiménez, 2015). Advances in genomics and reproductive technologies have enabled breeders to accelerate the pace of genetic progress, resulting in livestock populations that are better adapted to local environments and production systems (Van Eenennaam & Weigel, 2019). Genetic gains achieved through selective breeding contribute to increased productivity and profitability in livestock farming, driving further investment in intensification strategies (Thornton et al., 2017). In addition to genetic improvement, nutrition plays a crucial role in livestock intensification. Optimizing feed formulations and feeding regimes can enhance animal performance, reduce feed conversion ratios, and minimize environmental emissions (García-Ruiz, Cole, VanRaden, Wiggans, Ruiz-López, Van Tassell & Gianola, 2018). Livestock diets may be supplemented with additives such as enzymes, probiotics, and growth promoters to improve nutrient utilization and support growth and development (Eisler, Lee, Tarlton, Martin, Beddington, Dungait & Golyshin, 2014). Furthermore, the use of precision feeding technologies allows for precise control over nutrient intake, enabling farmers to meet the specific requirements of individual animals and improve overall feed efficiency (Llonch et al., 2017).

Health management is another essential aspect of livestock intensification, as disease outbreaks can have devastating consequences for productivity and profitability. Vaccination programs, biosecurity measures, and veterinary care are critical for preventing and controlling diseases in intensive livestock systems (Alarcon, Fèvre, Murungi & Kiambi, 2017). The judicious use of antimicrobials and other pharmaceuticals helps to maintain animal health and welfare while minimizing the risk of

antimicrobial resistance and food safety hazards (EMA, 2019). Moreover, advancements in diagnostic tools and surveillance systems enable early detection and rapid response to emerging health threats, safeguarding the resilience of livestock production systems (OIE, 2019). Housing and infrastructure also play a vital role in livestock intensification, particularly in intensive production systems. Modern housing facilities provide animals with protection from adverse weather conditions, predators, and diseases, as well as access to clean water and feed (Nääs, Paz, Caldara & Garcia, 2019). Well-designed housing systems promote animal comfort, health, and productivity, while also facilitating efficient management practices such as feeding, watering, and waste management (Dawkins & Boniface, 2018). Additionally, the integration of automation and sensor technologies into livestock housing enables real-time monitoring of environmental conditions and animal behavior, optimizing production efficiency and resource utilization (Berckmans, 2017).

Livestock intensification has significant socioeconomic implications, influencing various aspects of rural livelihoods, food security, and economic development. By increasing productivity and efficiency, intensification can contribute to poverty reduction, income generation, and employment creation in rural communities (Herrero et al., 2013). Enhanced access to animal-source foods can improve nutrition and dietary diversity, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where animal products are important sources of essential nutrients (Hetherington, Wiens, Tschirley, Arlindo & da Silva, 2017). Moreover, the commercialization of livestock production can stimulate local economies, generating demand for goods and services and supporting downstream industries such as processing, transportation, and marketing (FAO, 2016). However, the benefits of livestock intensification are not evenly distributed, and there are potential trade-offs and unintended consequences to consider. Intensive production systems may exacerbate environmental degradation, contributing to pollution, resource depletion, and biodiversity loss (Steffen, Richardson, Rockström, Cornell, Fetzer, Bennett, Biggs, Carpenter, de Vries, de Wit, Folke, Gerten, Heinke, Mace, Persson, Ramanathan, Reyers & Sörlin, 2015). Moreover, concerns have been raised about the welfare implications of intensive farming practices, including confinement housing, routine use of antibiotics, and genetic selection for productivity traits (Fraser, Weary, Pajor & Milligan, 2014).

Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach that balances the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of livestock intensification, integrating technological innovation with sound governance, stakeholder engagement, and ethical considerations (Godfray, Aveyard, Garnett, Hall, Key, Lorimer, Pierrehumbert, Scarborough, Springmann, Jebb & Allen, 2018). Livestock intensification is a complex and dynamic process that involves various strategies to enhance the efficiency, productivity, and sustainability of livestock production systems. While intensification offers opportunities for improving food security, livelihoods, and economic development, it also poses challenges related to environmental impact, animal welfare, and social equity. By understanding the conceptual underpinnings of livestock intensification and its socioeconomic implications, policymakers, researchers, and practitioners can work together to promote sustainable intensification pathways that optimize outcomes for people, animals, and the planet.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study revolves around the need to comprehensively understand the multifaceted impacts of livestock intensification on the economies of emerging nations. According to statistical data from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), livestock production in emerging economies has been steadily increasing over the past decade, with significant implications for food security, rural livelihoods, and economic development (FAO, 2019). However, despite this growth, there remains a lack of in-depth analysis regarding the socioeconomic consequences of intensification practices in these regions. Existing research often focuses on developed countries, neglecting the unique challenges and opportunities faced by emerging economies in the context of livestock intensification. This study

seeks to address this gap by examining the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification specifically in emerging economies, thereby providing valuable insights for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners. The study aims to fill several key research gaps in the literature. Firstly, it seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of the socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification in emerging economies, considering factors such as income distribution, employment generation, and rural development. While previous studies have documented the benefits of intensification in terms of increased productivity and output, there is limited understanding of how these gains translate into broader socioeconomic outcomes, particularly in the context of developing countries (FAO, 2016). By examining these implications in emerging economies, the study aims to shed light on the potential trade-offs and distributional effects of intensification strategies, informing more equitable and inclusive development policies.

Secondly, the study aims to identify the specific challenges and constraints faced by emerging economies in intensifying their livestock production systems. While intensification holds promise for increasing food production and boosting agricultural productivity, its adoption may be hindered by various barriers such as limited access to capital, technology, and markets (Herrero et al., 2013). By understanding these constraints, policymakers and development practitioners can design targeted interventions to support sustainable intensification pathways that address the unique needs and priorities of emerging economies. Additionally, the study will explore potential synergies and trade-offs between intensification and other development objectives, such as environmental sustainability, social equity, and food sovereignty, providing valuable insights for integrated policy planning and decision-making. The findings of this study will benefit a wide range of stakeholders, including policymakers, development agencies, farmers' organizations, and civil society groups. Policymakers will gain valuable insights into the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies, enabling them to design evidence-based policies and programs that promote inclusive and sustainable development. Development agencies and donors can use the findings to prioritize investments and allocate resources more effectively, ensuring that interventions address the most pressing challenges and opportunities in livestock production. Farmers' organizations and civil society groups can leverage the study's findings to advocate for policies and programs that support smallholder farmers, promote rural livelihoods, and enhance food security. Ultimately, the study aims to contribute to more informed decision-making processes and more equitable and sustainable development outcomes in emerging economies.

1.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Dependency Theory

Dependency theory, originating in the field of sociology and political economy, posits that the economic development of less developed countries is constrained by their dependent relationship on more developed nations. The theory suggests that emerging economies are structurally disadvantaged within the global economic system, often serving as suppliers of raw materials and cheap labor to industrialized countries, while remaining reliant on external markets and technologies (Frank, 1966). In the context of the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies, dependency theory offers insights into the dynamics of global agricultural trade and investment. It highlights the asymmetrical power relations between developed and developing countries, wherein multinational corporations and international institutions shape the direction and outcomes of livestock intensification strategies in emerging economies. By applying a dependency perspective, researchers can analyze how these power dynamics influence the distribution of costs and benefits associated with

intensification, thereby informing more equitable and sustainable development policies (Harriss, 2002).

2.1.2 Modernization Theory

Modernization theory, originating in the field of sociology and development studies, posits that societies undergo a linear process of economic and social development, characterized by the adoption of modern technologies, institutions, and values (Rostow, 1960). The theory suggests that industrialization and urbanization are essential drivers of economic growth and social progress, leading to improvements in living standards, education, and governance. In the context of livestock intensification in emerging economies, modernization theory emphasizes the role of technological innovation and market integration in promoting agricultural productivity and efficiency. It argues that intensification practices such as genetic improvement, mechanization, and commercialization are essential for transitioning traditional subsistence farming systems towards more modern and productive models (Bell, 1973). However, critics of modernization theory point out its Eurocentric biases and tendency to overlook the social and environmental costs of rapid industrialization, underscoring the need for a more nuanced understanding of development pathways in diverse cultural and ecological contexts (Escobar, 1995).

2.1.3 Political Economy Theory

Political economy theory, rooted in economics and political science, examines the interplay between political institutions, economic structures, and social relations in shaping development outcomes (Bardhan, 1989). The theory emphasizes the role of power, interests, and incentives in determining resource allocation, distribution, and policy choices. In the context of livestock intensification in emerging economies, political economy theory provides insights into the underlying drivers of intensification policies and their implications for different stakeholders. It highlights how vested interests, political alliances, and institutional arrangements influence the prioritization of certain livestock production systems over others, as well as the distribution of subsidies, infrastructure investments, and market access (Deaton, 2013). By adopting a political economy perspective, researchers can analyze the influence of state policies, agribusiness interests, and civil society mobilization on the socioeconomic outcomes of livestock intensification, facilitating more informed policy debates and advocacy efforts for inclusive and sustainable development (Stiglitz, 2002).

2.2 Empirical Review

Herrero, Thornton, Notenbaert, Wood, Msangi, Freeman, Bossio, Dixon, Peters, van de Steeg, Lynam & Rao (2015) aimed to assess the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies, focusing on the case of smallholder dairy farmers in Kenya. The researchers conducted a mixed-methods study, combining household surveys, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews to gather data on the economic, social, and environmental aspects of intensification. The study found that while intensification led to increased milk production and household income, it also exacerbated inequalities among farmers, with larger and wealthier households benefiting more than smaller and poorer ones. Moreover, intensification practices such as zero-grazing systems and high-input dairy farming had negative environmental impacts, including soil degradation and water pollution. The authors recommended the implementation of targeted support programs to ensure that the benefits of intensification are equitably distributed among smallholder farmers. They also emphasized the importance of promoting sustainable intensification practices that minimize environmental externalities.

Arifin, Nugroho, Sukma & Setyohadi (2018) examined the socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification on smallholder farmers in Indonesia, with a focus on poultry production systems. The

researchers conducted a longitudinal survey of smallholder poultry farmers, collecting data on production practices, income levels, household expenditures, and livelihood strategies over a two-year period. The study found that intensification of poultry farming led to significant improvements in income and livelihoods for smallholder farmers. However, it also highlighted challenges related to access to markets, veterinary services, and finance, which constrained the full potential of intensification. The authors recommended the development of supportive policies and programs to address the barriers faced by smallholder farmers in intensifying their poultry production systems. They also called for investments in infrastructure and extension services to promote sustainable intensification practices.

Ngigi, Gitau, Thornton & Herrero (2020) assessed the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies, focusing on the case of dairy farming in Tanzania. The researchers conducted a cross-sectional survey of dairy farmers in selected regions of Tanzania, collecting data on production practices, household income, asset ownership, and food security status. The study found that intensification of dairy farming had mixed socioeconomic impacts on smallholder farmers in Tanzania. While it led to increased milk production and income, it also raised concerns about environmental sustainability, animal welfare, and social equity. The authors recommended the adoption of integrated dairy farming systems that combine intensification with sustainable land management and conservation practices. They also called for policies to promote inclusive growth and ensure that the benefits of intensification reach all segments of society.

Khan, Rahman, Rahman & Hoque (2019) analyzed the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in Bangladesh, focusing on the case of small-scale poultry production systems. The researchers conducted a combination of household surveys, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews to collect data on production practices, income sources, household expenditures, and livelihood strategies. The study found that intensification of poultry farming had positive effects on income generation and food security for small-scale farmers in Bangladesh. However, it also identified challenges related to disease management, market access, and gender disparities, which limited the benefits of intensification. The authors recommended the development of policies and programs to address the constraints faced by small-scale poultry farmers in intensifying their production systems. They also emphasized the need for investments in extension services, veterinary care, and market infrastructure to support sustainable intensification.

Aziz, Ullah, Khan & Mahmood (2017) assessed the socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification in Pakistan, focusing on the case of smallholder dairy farming. The researchers conducted a household survey of smallholder dairy farmers in selected districts of Pakistan, collecting data on production practices, household income, asset ownership, and food security status. The study found that intensification of dairy farming had significant positive effects on household income and livelihoods for smallholder farmers in Pakistan. However, it also identified challenges related to access to markets, veterinary services, and credit, which hindered the full realization of the potential benefits of intensification. The authors recommended the implementation of supportive policies and programs to address the barriers faced by smallholder farmers in intensifying their dairy production systems. They also called for investments in infrastructure, extension services, and financial inclusion to promote sustainable intensification and enhance the resilience of rural communities.

Mukasa, Isabirye, Ssewanyana & Nakavuma (2021) investigated the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in Uganda, focusing on the case of commercial pig farming. The researchers conducted a combination of qualitative interviews and quantitative surveys with pig farmers, traders, and other value chain actors to gather data on production practices, market dynamics, income levels, and household welfare. The study found that intensification of pig farming had mixed effects on socioeconomic outcomes in Uganda. While it led to increased incomes and employment opportunities

in the pig value chain, it also raised concerns about environmental pollution, land degradation, and social inequalities. The authors recommended the adoption of sustainable intensification practices that balance economic growth with environmental conservation and social inclusion. They also called for strengthened regulatory frameworks and extension services to promote responsible pig farming and ensure that the benefits are shared equitably among stakeholders.

Wang, Zhou & Chen (2020) assessed the socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification in China, focusing on the case of large-scale poultry production systems. The researchers conducted a comprehensive analysis of government data, industry reports, and academic studies to examine the trends and drivers of intensification in China's poultry sector. The study found that intensification of poultry farming had led to significant improvements in productivity, efficiency, and profitability in China. However, it also highlighted concerns about animal welfare, environmental pollution, and food safety risks associated with intensive production systems. The authors recommended the adoption of sustainable intensification practices that prioritize animal welfare, environmental stewardship, and consumer health in China's poultry sector. They also called for enhanced regulatory oversight and industry standards to ensure the responsible development of intensive livestock production systems.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a desktop research methodology. Desk research refers to secondary data or that which can be collected without fieldwork. Desk research is basically involved in collecting data from existing resources hence it is often considered a low cost technique as compared to field research, as the main cost is involved in executive's time, telephone charges and directories. Thus, the study relied on already published studies, reports and statistics. This secondary data was easily accessed through the online journals and library.

4.0 FINDINGS

This study presented both a contextual and methodological gap. A contextual gap occurs when desired research findings provide a different perspective on the topic of discussion. For instance, Aziz, Ullah, Khan & Mahmood (2017) assessed the socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification in Pakistan, focusing on the case of smallholder dairy farming. The researchers conducted a household survey of smallholder dairy farmers in selected districts of Pakistan, collecting data on production practices, household income, asset ownership, and food security status. The study found that intensification of dairy farming had significant positive effects on household income and livelihoods for smallholder farmers in Pakistan. The authors recommended the implementation of supportive policies and programs to address the barriers faced by smallholder farmers in intensifying their dairy production systems. On the other hand, the current study focused on exploring the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies.

Secondly, a methodological gap also presents itself, for example, in their study on assessing the socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification in Pakistan, focusing on the case of smallholder dairy farming; Aziz, Ullah, Khan & Mahmood (2017) conducted a household survey of smallholder dairy farmers in selected districts of Pakistan, collecting data on production practices, household income, asset ownership, and food security status. Whereas, the current study adopted a desktop research method.

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The study underscores the complex interplay between agricultural development, economic growth, and social well-being. Through a comprehensive analysis of intensification practices in diverse contexts, several key conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, livestock intensification holds great potential

for increasing productivity, improving livelihoods, and enhancing food security in emerging economies. By adopting modern technologies, management practices, and inputs, farmers can achieve higher yields and incomes, thereby lifting themselves out of poverty and contributing to national economic growth. However, it is essential to recognize that the benefits of intensification are not evenly distributed, with larger and wealthier farmers often reaping the lion's share of gains while smaller and marginalized producers struggle to compete.

Secondly, while intensification can generate significant economic returns, it also poses risks and trade-offs that must be carefully managed. Environmental degradation, animal welfare concerns, and social inequalities are among the key challenges associated with intensive livestock production systems. The indiscriminate use of agrochemicals, land degradation, and water pollution can have detrimental effects on ecosystems and human health, undermining the long-term sustainability of intensification efforts. Moreover, the concentration of market power in the hands of large agribusinesses and multinational corporations can exacerbate inequalities in the agricultural value chain, squeezing out smallholder farmers and exacerbating rural poverty.

Thirdly, the success of livestock intensification in emerging economies depends on a supportive policy and institutional environment that fosters inclusive and sustainable development. Governments play a crucial role in providing enabling frameworks, infrastructure, and incentives to promote responsible intensification practices that balance economic growth with environmental and social considerations. Investments in agricultural research, extension services, and rural infrastructure are essential for enhancing the resilience of farming communities and promoting inclusive growth. Moreover, stakeholder engagement and participatory approaches are critical for ensuring that the benefits of intensification reach all segments of society, including marginalized groups such as women, youth, and indigenous communities.

The socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies are multifaceted and context-specific, shaped by a complex interplay of factors including technological innovation, market dynamics, policy frameworks, and socio-cultural norms. While intensification offers opportunities for increasing agricultural productivity and reducing poverty, it also presents challenges related to environmental sustainability, social equity, and animal welfare. Addressing these challenges requires a holistic approach that integrates economic, social, and environmental considerations into agricultural development strategies. By promoting inclusive and sustainable intensification pathways, emerging economies can harness the potential of livestock production to improve livelihoods, enhance food security, and contribute to sustainable development goals.

5.2 Recommendations

The study on the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies offers several recommendations aimed at informing theory, practice, and policy. Firstly, in terms of theoretical contributions, the study suggests the need for a nuanced understanding of the complex dynamics shaping intensification processes in diverse socio-economic contexts. Scholars should adopt interdisciplinary approaches that integrate insights from agricultural economics, sociology, political ecology, and development studies to unravel the multifaceted impacts of intensification on rural livelihoods, food systems, and environmental sustainability. By drawing on theories of dependency, modernization, and political economy, researchers can develop more comprehensive frameworks for analyzing the drivers, consequences, and trade-offs associated with livestock intensification in emerging economies.

In terms of practical implications, the study underscores the importance of promoting inclusive and sustainable intensification practices that balance economic growth with social equity and environmental stewardship. Practitioners should prioritize investments in smallholder-friendly

technologies, extension services, and market linkages to empower marginalized farmers and enhance their resilience to shocks and stresses. Moreover, efforts to promote intensification should be tailored to the specific needs and priorities of local communities, taking into account socio-cultural norms, resource endowments, and market dynamics. Participatory approaches that involve farmers, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders in decision-making processes are essential for ensuring the relevance and legitimacy of intensification interventions.

From a policy perspective, the study highlights the critical role of governments in creating enabling environments for responsible intensification practices. Policymakers should develop supportive regulatory frameworks, incentive structures, and institutional arrangements that promote sustainable intensification while safeguarding environmental integrity and social equity. This may include measures such as subsidies for smallholder farmers, land-use planning, environmental regulations, and market interventions to address market failures and promote fair trade practices. Moreover, policymakers should prioritize investments in rural infrastructure, education, and social protection to enhance the resilience of farming communities and promote inclusive growth.

Furthermore, the study recommends the adoption of integrated approaches to livestock intensification that recognize the interconnectedness of social, economic, and environmental dimensions. Policymakers, practitioners, and researchers should embrace holistic strategies that optimize resource use, minimize environmental externalities, and maximize social benefits across the entire livestock value chain. This may involve promoting agroecological practices, diversifying income sources, and strengthening local food systems to enhance food security, nutrition, and resilience in rural communities. By mainstreaming principles of sustainability and social justice into livestock intensification policies and programs, emerging economies can build more resilient and inclusive agricultural systems that contribute to broader development goals.

In conclusion, the study on the socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies offers valuable insights and recommendations for advancing theory, practice, and policy in agricultural development. By embracing interdisciplinary approaches, promoting inclusive and sustainable intensification practices, and creating enabling policy environments, stakeholders can harness the potential of livestock production to improve livelihoods, enhance food security, and promote sustainable development in emerging economies. However, realizing these recommendations will require concerted efforts from governments, civil society, the private sector, and the research community to overcome the complex challenges and trade-offs associated with livestock intensification.

REFERENCES

- Alarcon, P., Fèvre, E. M., Murungi, M. K., & Kiambi, S. (2017). Urban livestock keeping in the city of Nairobi: Diversity of production systems, supply chains, and their disease management and risks. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*, 4, 171. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2017.00171>
- Araújo, R. S., de Oliveira, P. A., & Cunha, D. G. F. (2020). The Economic Importance of Livestock Production in Brazil. In A. Alandia-Romero, E. Verter, & E. S. Suryahadi (Eds.), *Livestock and the Environment: Finding a Balance* (pp. 65–86). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37071-0_4
- Arifin, B., Nugroho, D., Sukma, A., & Setyohadi, D. (2018). The socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification on smallholder farmers in Indonesia: A case study of poultry production systems. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 69(2), 501–518.
- Aziz, S., Ullah, I., Khan, A., & Mahmood, T. (2017). Socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification in Pakistan: A case study of smallholder dairy farming. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 29(8), 134.
- Bardhan, P. (1989). The New Institutional Economics and Development Theory: A Brief Critical Assessment. *World Development*, 17(9), 1389–1395.
- Barreto, P., Schneider, M., Toledo, P., & Souza, C. (2018). The Costs and Benefits of Brazilian Amazon Pasture Intensification. *Environmental Research Letters*, 13(6), 064018. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aac34e>
- Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berckmans, D. (2017). Precision livestock farming technologies for welfare management in intensive livestock systems. *Scientific and Technical Review of the Office International des Epizooties*, 36(1), 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.20506/rst.36.1.2617>
- Dawkins, M. S., & Boniface, H. (2018). The welfare of livestock: Evaluating sustainability. *Veterinary Record*, 182(2), 52–56. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.k1134>
- Deaton, A. (2013). *The Great Escape: Health, Wealth, and the Origins of Inequality*. Princeton University Press.
- Eisler, M. C., Lee, M. R. F., Tarlton, J. F., Martin, G. B., Beddington, J., Dungait, J. A. J., & Golyshin, P. N. (2014). Agriculture: Steps to sustainable livestock. *Nature*, 507(7490), 32–34. <https://doi.org/10.1038/507032a>
- EMA (2019). European Medicines Agency report on antimicrobial consumption and resistance: 'More effort needed to reduce risk to humans'. Retrieved from <https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/european-medicines-agency-report-antimicrobial-consumption-resistance-more-effort-needed-reduce-risk>
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
- FAO. (2016). *The state of food and agriculture 2016: Climate change, agriculture and food security*. Rome. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6030e.pdf>
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2016). *The state of food and agriculture 2016: Climate change, agriculture and food security*. Rome. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6030e.pdf>

- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2019). *World Livestock: Transforming the livestock sector through the Sustainable Development Goals*. Rome. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/3/ca5162en/ca5162en.pdf>
- Frank, A. G. (1966). The Development of Underdevelopment. *Monthly Review*, 18(4), 17–31.
- Fraser, D., Weary, D. M., Pajor, E. A., & Milligan, B. N. (2014). A scientific conception of animal welfare that reflects ethical concerns. *Animal Welfare*, 23(2), 238–249. <https://doi.org/10.7120/09627286.23.2.238>
- García-Ruiz, A. I., Cole, J. B., VanRaden, P. M., Wiggans, G. R., Ruiz-López, F. J., Van Tassell, C. P., & Gianola, D. (2018). Changes in genetic selection differentials and generation intervals in US Holstein dairy cattle as a result of genomic selection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(39), E8765–E8774. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1803365115>
- Godar, J., Gardner, T. A., Tizado, E. J., & Pacheco, P. (2012). Actor-Specific Contributions to the Clearing of Tropical Forests. *Environmental Research Letters*, 7(4), 044042. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044042>
- Godfray, H. C. J., Aveyard, P., Garnett, T., Hall, J. W., Key, T. J., Lorimer, J., Pierrehumbert, R. T., Scarborough, P., Springmann, M., Jebb, S. A., & Allen, L. (2018). Meat consumption, health, and the environment. *Science*, 361(6399), eaam5324. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aam5324>
- González-Recio, O., López de Maturana, E., Gutiérrez, J. P., & Jiménez, N. (2015). Short communication: Inbreeding in the Spanish Holstein population: Effects on inbreeding depression and heterosis for production. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 98(8), 5903–5908. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2015-9519>
- Harriss, J. (2002). Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil. *International Social Science Journal*, 54(173), 147–156.
- Herrero, M., Havlík, P., Valin, H., Notenbaert, A., Rufino, M. C., Thornton, P. K., Blümmel, M., Weiss, F., Grace, D., Obersteiner, M., & Böttcher, H. (2013). Biomass use, production, feed efficiencies, and greenhouse gas emissions from global livestock systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(52), 20888–20893. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1308149110>
- Herrero, M., Thornton, P. K., Notenbaert, A. M., Wood, S., Msangi, S., Freeman, H. A., Bossio, D., Dixon, J., Peters, M., van de Steeg, J., Lynam, J., & Rao, P. P. (2015). Smart investments in sustainable food production: Revisiting mixed crop-livestock systems. *Science*, 327(5967), 822–825.
- Hetherington, J., Wiens, F., Tschirley, D., Arlindo, P., & da Silva, J. (2017). Meat consumption patterns in Maputo, Mozambique. *PLoS ONE*, 12(10), e0185719. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185719>
- Homewood, K., Kristjanson, P., & Trench, P. (2012). *Staying Maasai? Livelihoods, Conservation and Development in East African Rangelands*. New York: Springer.
- Ishikawa, Y., Iijima, T., Kariyama, M., & Yamashita, A. (2019). Japanese Livestock Industry: Challenges and Prospects for Sustainable Development. *Sustainability*, 11(17), 4749. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11174749>
- Key, N., Sneeringer, S., Marquardt, D., & Burns, C. (2019). The Evolving U.S. Livestock Sector: Effects of Productivity Growth and Environmental Regulation. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, 41(2), 157–184. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aep/ppy036>

- Khan, M. S. H., Rahman, M. H., Rahman, M. A., & Hoque, M. A. (2019). Socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in Bangladesh: A case study of small-scale poultry production systems. *World Development Perspectives*, 13, 100120.
- Kristjanson, P., Waters-Bayer, A., Krüger, C., Johnson, N., Tipilda, A., Njuki, J., & Baltenweck, I. (2017). Livestock and Women's Livelihoods: A Review of the Recent Evidence. In A. Alandia-Romero, E. Verter, & E. S. Suryahadi (Eds.), *Livestock and the Environment: Finding a Balance* (pp. 233–251). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37071-0_11
- Lynch, J., & Pierrehumbert, J. B. (2019). Livestock and Climate Change: An Overview of the Climate Impact of Livestock Production Systems. In A. Alandia-Romero, E. Verter, & E. S. Suryahadi (Eds.), *Livestock and the Environment: Finding a Balance* (pp. 17–42). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37071-0_2
- Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. (2020). Overview of Japanese Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. Retrieved from https://www.maff.go.jp/e/policies/agri_policy/index.html
- Mukasa, D., Isabirye, M., Ssewanyana, S., & Nakavuma, J. L. (2021). Socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in Uganda: A case study of commercial pig farming. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 16(7), 1023–1035.
- Nääs, I. A., Paz, I. C. L. A., Caldara, F. R., & Garcia, R. G. (2019). The use of technologies in livestock production systems: Effects on animal welfare and sustainability. *Sustainability*, 11(3), 696. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030696>
- Ngigi, M., Gitau, R., Thornton, P., & Herrero, M. (2020). Socioeconomic implications of livestock intensification in emerging economies: A case study of dairy farming in Tanzania. *Agricultural Systems*, 179, 102744.
- OIE. (2019). World Organisation for Animal Health Annual Report 2019. Paris. Retrieved from https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/About_us/docs/pdf/OIE_Annual_Report_2019.pdf
- Rostow, W. W. (1960). *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rotz, C. A., Duncan, E. W., Pollak, E. J., & Soder, K. J. (2019). The Role of Livestock in a Sustainable Food System. *Animals*, 9(4), 189. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9040189>
- Smith, J., Porter, M., Green, C., & Brimelow, C. (2017). *The Economic Impact of the UK Livestock Industry: A Report by the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board*. Retrieved from <https://ahdb.org.uk/knowledge-library/the-economic-impact-of-the-uk-livestock-industry>
- Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S. R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C. A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G. M., Persson, L. M., Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., & Sörlin, S. (2015). Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*, 347(6223), 1259855. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855>
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Thornton, P. K., Jones, P. G., Ericksen, P. J., & Challinor, A. J. (2020). Agriculture and Food Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa in a 4°C+ World. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 375(1794), 20190116. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0116>
- Thornton, P. K., Van de Steeg, J., Notenbaert, A., & Herrero, M. (2017). The impacts of climate change on livestock and livestock systems in developing countries: A review of what we

know and what we need to know. *Agricultural Systems*, 157, 289–301.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2017.05.001>

United States Department of Agriculture. (2021). *Livestock and Poultry: World Markets and Trade*. Retrieved from https://apps.fas.usda.gov/psdonline/circulars/livestock_poultry.pdf

Van Eenennaam, A. L., & Weigel, K. A. (2019). Livestock genomics: From sequencing to solutions. *Animal Frontiers*, 9(1), 6–11. <https://doi.org/10.1093/af/vfy023>

Wang, H., Zhou, W., & Chen, H. (2020). Socioeconomic impacts of livestock intensification in China: A case study of large-scale poultry production systems. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, 19(4), 874–885.