

Assessment of Rural Livelihood Strategies in Taraba State, Nigeria

Oruonye, E.D. PhD, Usman Dinshiya, Anger, R.T. & Ahmed, Y.M. PhD

Department of Geography, Taraba State University, Jalingo Nigeria
Email: eoruonye@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines how different livelihood strategies used by rural households in Taraba State, Nigeria affects household resilience and wellbeing. Taraba State offers a distinctive context for examining rural lifestyles because of its varied natural zones and agricultural economy. A desk review is utilized in the study to evaluate the state's livelihood patterns. The findings of the study reveal a strong dependence on agriculture, with crop farming and livestock rearing being the predominant livelihood activities. This notwithstanding, households do also participate in a variety of non-farm pursuits, including seasonal migration to urban areas in search of employment opportunities and petty commerce. The study identifies several constraints affecting rural livelihoods, such as restricted loan availability, poor infrastructure, and the effects of climate variability. The findings also show that in order to reduce risks and improve resilience, households apply adaptive measures such as crop diversification, agroforestry, and community-based resource management. The study concludes with policy recommendations targeted at improving rural livelihoods in Taraba State. These recommendations include investing in rural infrastructure, encouraging sustainable farming methods, and facilitating better access to agricultural inputs and financing facilities.

Keywords: Households, livelihood diversifications, livelihood strategies, rural livelihood and sustainable livelihood.

Introduction

Studies has shown that rural livelihoods are complex, differentiated and adaptive and are influenced by multiple factors at differing spatial and temporal scales (Cousins, 1999; Dahlberg, 2000; Francis, 2000; Ellis, 2000; Gibson *et al*, 2000; Mortimore & Adams, 2001; McNab, 2004). Rural households have a multiple and diverse livelihood base and are managers of complex asset portfolios that are often diversified and geared towards managing risk and uncertainty (Moser, 1998; Ellis, 2000; Scherr, 2000; Shackleton *et al*, 2001; Bryceson, 2002; Campbell *et al*, 2002; Soini, 2005). Many rural households are highly dependent on the natural resource base, relying on a range of environmental goods and services which provide essential sources of food security, nutrition, income, medicines, fuel, water, building materials, and which are of cultural and spiritual importance (Cousins, 1999; Shackleton *et al*, 2001; Campbell *et al*, 2002; Van Jaarsveld *et al*, 2005).

There has been a growing recognition of the increased importance of off-farm sources of income, such as waged employment, remittances, State pensions and grants and other alternative income generating activities in rural livelihoods (Francis, 2000; Ellis, 2000; Devereux, 2001; Bryceson, 2002; McCusker, 2002; Slater, 2002; Rigg, 2006). At the same time, it is recognized that rural households are seldom able to survive solely on on-farm strategies due to multiple reasons including environmental constraints, lack of access to markets and inputs, institutional factors, population growth and land degradation (Murray, 1981; Campbell *et al*, 2002; Andrew *et al*, 2003). Rural livelihoods therefore exhibit great complexity, as highlighted by Cousins (1999), who identified five main characteristics of rural livelihoods: 1) they are multiple, diverse and dynamic (Ellis, 2000; Bryceson, 2002), 2) they bridge the rural-urban divide (Beinart, 1980; Tacoli, 1998), 3) they involve maintaining complex social and economic relationships, locally and non-locally (Campbell *et al*, 2002), 4)

they are highly differentiated by social identity, and 5) are institutionally mediated (Scoones, 1998; Lambin *et al*, 2001; Sarch, 2001).

According to Alimi *et al* (2001) about two-third of rural households earn their livelihood from subsistence agriculture, either as small-scale farmers or as low-paid farm workers while the remaining one-third engage in petty services. Understandably, agriculture for now and in the near future will remain the bedrock of the rural household economies because of their access to land (a major input in agricultural enterprises) through various forms of traditional land holdings; the potential of agriculture to readily meet their basic needs for food and to some extent cash. It is obvious that agriculture provides increased on-farm and off-farm employment opportunities capable of raising incomes of the rural households and their purchasing power. In this vein, World Bank (2006) noted that increased growth of the agriculture sector offers direct benefits to rural households such as income and food, contributes to broader food security objectives and helps to establish forward linkages with high value-added industries as well as linkages between rural and urban centres. Furthermore, agricultural activities which embrace crop and livestock farming have strong linkages with non-agricultural livelihood activities which are common among rural households. Non-agricultural activities which include hire-labour, fabrication of tools, repair services, handicrafts, tailoring, trading, masonry, carpentry, welding, blacksmithing and arts apart from serving as stop-gaps, have helped to service rural agricultural enterprises while providing the needed income to meet household needs simultaneously.

Nigeria in the last three decades have vigorously pursued different programmes on rural and agricultural development, which development experts consider as a precursor to sustainable rural livelihoods. Despite the efforts, some studies including that of the World Bank (2006) still suggest that people living in rural Nigerian communities are faced with high levels of resource limitation, material uncertainty and survival risk. Consequently, the country has continued to experience a vicious migration pattern of its nationals unprecedented in modern nation states, brain drain, kidnap/hostage taking, child labour, crises and other social problems. This is an indication that there are underlying forces against livelihood pursuits in rural areas that demand critical analysis. Some studies have identified economic, cultural, personal factors as affecting decision for a certain livelihood and/or a combination of livelihood strategies among rural dwellers (Olusi, 2001; Nwaogwugwu, 2014). Apart from the aforementioned factors, it is obvious that the social dimensions have not been given attention considering the fact that livelihood decisions in any society are essentially governed by certain social values.

Sub Saharan Africa has been considered as one of the poorest regions in the world from a socioeconomic perspective, with an estimated one in every three people living below the poverty line (Beegle & Christiaensen, 2019). Currently, poverty in sub-Saharan Africa is heavily concentrated in just 10 countries (Nigeria, D.R. Congo, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Uganda, Zambia, and Malawi), which make up over 70% of the region's poor (Beegle & Christiaensen, 2019). It has been reported by NBS that four out of every 10 Nigerian or 89.2 million Nigerians to be poor, spending less than N137,430 per year, the equivalent of N376.5 or \$1 per day (Ani, 2020). Already, real time data tracked the World's Poverty Clock places Nigeria as the poverty capital of the world, with some 102.4 million people living in extreme poverty. Using that data, 1 out of every 2 Nigerian is living below the poverty line of \$1.90 per day (Ani, 2020). Taraba State has the largest percentage of people living below the poverty line in 2019 next to Sokoto State in Nigeria with an incidence of poverty rate of 87.72% (Sasu, 2022).

Agriculture is the main sector of employment in sub-Saharan Africa, accounting for 54% (International Labour Organization, 2020). Here, and other parts of the developing world,

small-scale farmers carry out about 60% of the agricultural activities and contribute to the production of about 80% of the food, hence playing a leading role in ensuring food security not only in developing countries, but globally as well (IOM & UNCCD, 2019). Thus, in Nigeria and Taraba State in particular, agriculture was the major sources of rural livelihood. However, in recent times, livelihood from agricultural activities is becoming highly vulnerable as a result of climate change, growing insecurity, micro and macro-economic challenges in the State. Non farming and off farm activities are now important component of livelihood strategies among rural households in Taraba State and Nigeria as a whole in their struggle to survive and improve their living condition. Hence, attention is gradually shifting to non-farm livelihood activities among rural households. Exploiting these non-farm and off farm opportunities could offer pathway out of poverty in the rural areas which is endemic in the State. It is against this background that this study examined the rural livelihood strategies in Taraba State, Nigeria.

Methodology

The study employed a desk review method to gather and critically analyze existing information. This entails searching for pertinent studies on rural livelihoods in Nigeria using scholarly databases, research reports, and journals; pay particular attention to studies that concentrate on Taraba State and the northeast region. The study explores information on Taraba State's rural development, agricultural data, and poverty assessments on the websites of Nigerian government agencies, such as the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (FMAFS) and the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). Additionally, reports from NGOs and development organizations that focus on rural development in Nigeria were sought for. The study delves deeper into studies conducted by institutions such as the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which examine rural living in Nigeria, specifically in Taraba State. These literary works furnished significant insights on the prevalent means of subsistence that rural households in Taraba state engage in (such as migration, tiny trading, and subsistence farming). The desk review provided a strong foundation for the study. Content analysis method was used to analyze the collected information to identify patterns, trends, and key findings.

Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored on the theory of household development cycle which has its origin in the work of Chayanov on the Russian peasantry in 1917 (Thorner *et al.*, 1986 cited in Mcdermott, 2006). Chayanov tried to utilize the household's dependency ratio to explain variations in the quantity of land cultivated. The number of consumers in the household was found to be a determinant of the need for labor, and the number of workers in the family was found to be a determinant of the ability to work to satisfy these requirements (Heron, 1991). According to Chayanov, a household's capacity to cultivate at particular stages of its life cycle is governed by variations in the dependency ratio across the household's life cycle (Thorner *et al.*, 1986; Perz, 2001).

Household development pertains to the methods and approaches employed by households to augment their socio-economic standing, manage resources, and improve their overall well-being. This notion covers a wide range of elements, such as social capital, health, education, income creation, and service accessibility. Enhancing income, education, health, social capital, and access to resources are all parts of the multidimensional idea of household development. The various demands and circumstances of households, in addition to the larger socioeconomic and policy contexts, must all be taken into account by effective strategies for promoting household development (Mcdermott, 2006).

According to Fortes (1970), there are five main stages in the development cycle of households. The first is establishment, during which the family is formed but may still be dependent on the parental group. The new home grows increasingly autonomous during the second phase of expansion, which also sees the birth of children. Thirdly, a household reaches its most advanced stage when it reaches consolidation, which is the moment at which labor and capital are most plentiful and the family has grown to its greatest extent - children have grown into adults.

The fourth stage is one of dispersion or fission where the children of the home move out and start their own households, which means they are no longer able to provide labor and/or cash in the form of remittances on a regular basis. The fifth and final stage is one of decline, where the availability of labor, income potential, and asset base of households dropped (Fortes, 1970; Low 1986). The specifics of the phases in the development cycle can vary depending on the area, as demonstrated by the studies of Walker and Homma (1996) and Perz (2001) in the Amazon, and Murray (1980) and Heron (1991) in Southern Africa. However, they all adhere to the general pattern of expansion and later decline.

The concept of household development cycle in developing countries, particularly in regions like Africa, is influenced by a variety of factors including cultural norms, economic conditions, political dynamics, and social structures unique to these contexts. While there may be similarities with household development theories in developed countries, there are also significant differences shaped by the specific challenges and opportunities present in developing nations.

The concept of the household development cycle is shaped by a multitude of elements in developing nations, especially those in Africa. These aspects include social structures specific to these contexts, political dynamics, economic situations, and cultural norms. Although household development theories in rich countries may share certain commonalities, there are notable distinctions as well, influenced by the unique opportunities and problems that exist in developing countries. Understanding household development is therefore crucial for formulating policies aimed at poverty alleviation and sustainable development (Mcdermott, 2006).

Households in rural southern Africa are now part of the larger formal economy, and for over a century, migration in search of wage labor has been a major tactic. The majority of households now depend more on the export of labor than they did on on-farm livelihood methods (Murray, 1981). As a result, the relationship with the larger economy and the ensuing tactics used differ greatly from those mentioned by Chayanov.

When applying the household development cycle, the function of class must be taken into account because variations across families may result from causes other than the household's stage in the development cycle (Murray, 1981 and Heron, 1991). According to Murray (1981: 98), "the inequalities of income distribution...reflect the exigencies of the development cycle under conditions peculiar to the labor reserve," which emphasizes this.

Despite its benefits, Chayanov's theory has drawn criticism for assuming that agricultural practices were essentially the same in every household and for ignoring the roles of wage labor, migration, agricultural input, credit, and product markets (Murray 1991; Heron, 1991; Perz, 2001). Because the structural changes brought about by changes in the larger economy are overlooked, the development cycle has thus been criticized when employed alone as a tool for explaining household transformation (Heron, 1991). As such, a more comprehensive analysis of the household development cycle is needed (Murray, 1981).

Conceptual Framework

Concept of Rural Livelihoods

The concept of rural livelihoods refers to the ways in which people in rural areas meet their basic needs and secure a living. It encompasses the various activities, resources, and capabilities that enable them to survive and thrive. Rural livelihoods encompass the various means and strategies by which individuals and households in rural areas sustain their lives, manage resources, and cope with challenges. Understanding rural livelihoods is crucial for addressing issues of poverty, food security, and sustainable development. Research on rural livelihoods has evolved significantly over the past few decades, with a growing focus on livelihood diversification and gender and social inequality. Livelihood diversification refers to the process by which rural households engage in a variety of activities to improve their living standards and reduce risks. Many studies highlight the importance of diversification beyond traditional agriculture. This includes engaging in non-farm activities like wage labor, handicrafts, or small businesses (Barrett, Reardon & Webb, 2001). Diversification is seen as a strategy to cope with economic uncertainties and environmental stresses. Factors influencing diversification strategies include access to resources (land, education), market opportunities, and institutional frameworks (Ellis, 2000; Barrett *et al.*, 2001). Other studies have increasingly recognized the gendered nature of rural livelihoods. Gender plays a critical role in shaping livelihood strategies and outcomes. Women often have different access to resources and opportunities compared to men. Empowering women through education, property rights, and participation in decision-making processes is crucial for enhancing rural livelihoods. Women often face unequal access to resources, markets, and decision-making power. Studies explore how to bridge these gaps and promote gender equity in rural development. The key themes in rural livelihood studies include agriculture and food security, migration and remittances, impact of climate change, policy and institutional context (Godfray *et al.*, 2010; Taylor & Martin, 2001, de Haas, 2010).

Understanding rural livelihoods requires a multidisciplinary approach that considers economic, social, and environmental dimensions. Sustainable livelihood frameworks, diversification strategies, and the role of policies and institutions are central to this understanding. Future research should continue to explore the impacts of global changes, such as climate change and economic globalization, on rural livelihoods and identify effective adaptation and mitigation strategies.

Conceptual Clarifications

Household

For this study, a household was defined as a group of people living together in the same house who regularly cook and eat from the same pot. However, as Guyer (1981) points out there are many problems related to defining what constitutes a household in Africa. The above definition of a household is problematic in the case of the Ghana study settlements where, as Fortes (1970: 10) describes, household structure may be strongly influenced by matrilineal kinship ties and where cooked food may be taken by children from the houses in which their mothers live to those in which their fathers live. Another common example of confusion was in cases in which female-headed households were not identified as separate households but were grouped together with their parents. Definitions of what constitutes a household also vary over time and with local social conditions and historical circumstances (Fortes 1970: 32). This makes cross country and cross settlement comparisons of households problematic.

Livelihood Strategies (LS)

The definition of the term livelihood strategies (LS) in this study is adopted from Ashley and Carney (1999: 23), which is: the range and combination of activities and choices that people make/undertake to achieve livelihood goals including production and investment strategies. LS have been classified according to different criteria. Scoones (1998) divided rural LS into three broad types according to the nature of activities undertaken: agricultural intensification and extensification, livelihood diversification, and migration. Consequently, this study grouped the LS into farming, non-farming and diversity of LS (combination of farming and non-farming) based on the nature of livelihood activities undertaken in the study area. With this regard farming refers to all activities related to cultivation of crops and keeping of animals. Non-farming is the opposite of that. Diversification in this study is generally recognized as the process by which rural households combine activities in order to survive and to improve their standard of living as defined by Ellis (2000). Moreover, the ability of a household to pursue a meaningful diversity of livelihood strategies depends on its asset's endowment and its ability (in terms of socio-demographic characteristics) to combine them (Borras et al, 2011). Literature (Ellis, 2000; Urassa, 2010; Nombo, 2010), underscores the influence of household demographic characteristics such as period of residence in a locality, location, household head's age, sex, education level and marital status, on its ability to access resources.

Rural Livelihood Strategies

Rural livelihood strategies refer to the combination of activities and choices that rural households employ to secure their means of living. Rural livelihood strategies encompass the diverse activities and choices that rural households engage in to secure their means of living. These strategies are influenced by a multitude of factors, including available assets, institutional support, and environmental conditions. These strategies are influenced by factors such as natural resources, socio-economic conditions, and external interventions (Ellis, 2000). In Nigeria, common livelihood strategies include crop farming, livestock rearing, fishing, trading, and wage labor (Adebayo et al., 2020). This literature review examines empirical studies on rural livelihood strategies with a focus on their implications for household development, providing a foundation for the assessment of rural livelihood strategies in Taraba State, Nigeria.

Rural livelihood strategies typically include agricultural activities, non-agricultural income-generating activities, and migration. The choice and combination of these strategies depend on various internal and external factors.

- i. **Agricultural Activities:** Agriculture remains the primary livelihood strategy for many rural households. Studies have shown that access to land, quality of soil, availability of water, and agricultural inputs significantly influence the productivity and sustainability of agricultural livelihoods (Ellis, 2000; Adepaju & Obayelu, 2013).
- ii. **Non-Agricultural Activities:** Non-agricultural income-generating activities, such as petty trading, artisanal work, and wage labor, provide an essential source of income for rural households, especially during agricultural off-seasons or in regions with poor agricultural prospects. Diversifying income sources through these activities can reduce vulnerability to agricultural risks and enhance household resilience (Barrett et al., 2001).
- iii. **Migration:** Migration, both seasonal and permanent, is a common strategy employed by rural households to diversify income sources and mitigate risks associated with

agricultural livelihoods. Remittances from migrated family members can significantly contribute to household income and development (Tacoli, 2002).

Result of the Findings

Rural Livelihood Strategies in Taraba State

Rural livelihoods in Taraba State are predominantly agrarian, with agriculture serving as the primary source of income and livelihood for a majority of households (World Bank, 2019). However, challenges such as climate variability, limited access to resources, and socio-economic constraints threaten the sustainability and resilience of these livelihoods. In recent times, diverse livelihood strategies are employed by rural households to ensure their survival and enhance their development. Rural households in Taraba State employ various livelihood strategies to cope with environmental, economic, and social challenges. These strategies can be broadly categorized into agricultural and non-agricultural activities.

a. Agricultural Activities

- **Crop Production:** Many households rely on crop production as their primary livelihood strategy. Studies indicate that cassava, maize, and rice are the predominant crops cultivated in Taraba State due to favorable climatic conditions and market demand (Emaziye, 2014; Adebayo et al., 2020).
- **Livestock Rearing:** Livestock farming is another critical component of rural livelihoods. Cattle, goats, and poultry are commonly reared, providing both food and income for households (Idrisa et al., 2019).
- **Fishing and Aquaculture:** In riverine areas, fishing and aquaculture serve as vital livelihood strategies. These activities contribute significantly to household food security and income (Ajani & Onwubuya, 2013).

b. Non-Agricultural Activities

- **Trade and Commerce:** Petty trading and commerce are essential non-agricultural activities that supplement household income. Women, in particular, engage in the trading of agricultural produce and other goods (Adepoju & Obayelu, 2013).
- **Handicrafts and Artisanry:** Craftsmanship and artisanal work, such as weaving and blacksmithing, are also prevalent. These activities provide alternative income sources, especially during the off-farming season (Ali, 2015).
- **Seasonal Migration:** Seasonal migration to urban centers for employment opportunities is a common strategy among rural households. This helps to diversify income sources and reduce vulnerability to agricultural risks (Oluwatayo, 2009).

Challenges Faced by Rural Households in Taraba State, Nigeria

Rural households are the backbone of Nigeria's agricultural sector and contribute significantly to the nation's food security. However, these households face numerous challenges that hinder their development and well-being. This study examines the key challenges faced by rural households in Taraba State, Nigeria.

- i. **Socio-Economic Challenges:** Rural households in Taraba State face significant socio-economic challenges that impact their daily lives and development opportunities.

- **Poverty and Income Inequality:** Studies indicate high levels of poverty among rural households in Taraba State, with limited access to economic opportunities beyond subsistence farming (World Bank, 2019).
 - **Limited Access to Education:** Educational infrastructure is often inadequate, with low enrollment rates and high dropout rates among children due to poverty and distance from schools (Oyinloye & Alamu, 2020).
 - **Healthcare Access:** Rural communities often lack adequate healthcare facilities and services, leading to poor health outcomes and high mortality rates, especially among women and children (Bawa & Ibrahim, 2018).
- ii. **Agricultural Challenges:** Agriculture is a primary livelihood for rural households in Taraba State, but it faces various challenges that affect productivity and income generation.
- **Climate Change and Environmental Degradation:** Erratic rainfall patterns and deforestation contribute to soil erosion and reduced agricultural productivity, impacting food security and livelihoods (Ibrahim et al., 2021).
 - **Limited Access to Agricultural Inputs and Technology:** Farmers often lack access to quality seeds, fertilizers, and modern farming equipment, hindering agricultural productivity and income levels (Abdulai & Abdul-Rasheed, 2017).
 - **Land Tenure Issues:** Land ownership and access rights are often unclear or insecure, leading to disputes and inhibiting investments in land improvements (FAO, 2018).
- iii. **Infrastructure and Connectivity Challenges:** Basic infrastructure deficiencies in rural areas of Taraba State exacerbate socio-economic challenges and hinder development.
- **Road Infrastructure:** poor road networks make transportation difficult, increasing costs for farmers to access markets and limiting economic opportunities (IFAD, 2020).
 - **Electricity and Water Supply:** Many rural communities lack reliable electricity and clean water sources, affecting household productivity and quality of life (Akinbode et al., 2019).
- iv. **Social and Cultural Challenges:** Social and cultural factors also contribute to the challenges faced by rural households in Taraba State.
- **Gender Inequality:** Women often have limited decision-making power and access to resources, despite their significant contributions to agricultural production and household welfare (Adeoye et al., 2018).
 - **Traditional Beliefs and Practices:** Some traditional practices and beliefs may hinder adoption of modern agricultural techniques or access to healthcare services (Ajiboye & Ojo, 2019).
- v. **Governance and Policy Challenges:** Effective governance and policies are crucial for addressing rural development challenges in Taraba State.
- **Policy Implementation and Coordination:** Inconsistent implementation of rural development policies and lack of coordination among government agencies hinder effective service delivery and development outcomes (Umar, 2020).

- **Access to Financial Services:** Limited access to credit and financial services constrains investment in productive activities and entrepreneurship among rural households (CBN, 2021).

Rural households in Taraba State face multifaceted challenges that affect their livelihoods, well-being, and development opportunities. Addressing these challenges requires integrated approaches that consider socio-economic, agricultural, infrastructure, social, cultural, and governance dimensions. Future research and policy efforts should focus on enhancing rural resilience, improving access to resources and services, and promoting sustainable development in Taraba State. This literature review highlights the diverse challenges faced by rural households in Taraba State, Nigeria, providing a comprehensive overview supported by relevant research findings and literature sources.

The Need for Sustainable Livelihood Strategies by Rural Households in Taraba State, Nigeria

Rural households in Taraba State, Nigeria, face significant challenges in securing their livelihoods. These challenges are often interconnected and threaten long-term well-being. This study assesses the factors driving the need for sustainable livelihood strategies in Taraba State and examines the potential benefits of such approaches.

Challenges and Vulnerabilities

Several factors necessitate the adoption of sustainable livelihood strategies by rural households in Taraba State. These include:

- **Resource Depletion and Climate Change:** Dependence on rain-fed agriculture makes communities vulnerable to erratic rainfall patterns and droughts. Unsustainable agricultural practices can further deplete soil fertility, impacting future productivity.
- **Limited Infrastructure and Market Access:** Poor road networks and inadequate storage facilities hinder efficient transportation and marketing of agricultural produce, reducing income and hindering economic diversification.
- **Insecurity:** Farmer-herder conflicts and banditry disrupt agricultural activities, displace households, and create an environment that discourages investment.

Socioeconomic Considerations

Beyond resource limitations, the socio-economic context further necessitates sustainable livelihood strategies:

- **Poverty and Income Inequality:** Rural households in Taraba State are disproportionately affected by poverty, with limited access to credit and financial services hindering investment opportunities.
- **Limited Education and Skill Development:** Restricted access to quality education limits the ability of rural youth to explore alternative income sources and adapt to changing economic realities.

The Case for Sustainable Livelihood Strategies

Sustainable livelihood strategies aim to meet current needs without compromising future options. These strategies can offer several benefits for rural households in Taraba State:

- **Improved Resource Management:** Sustainable practices like crop rotation and soil conservation can enhance agricultural productivity and maintain soil health over the long term.
- **Diversification of Income Sources:** Exploring non-farm activities like handicrafts or small businesses can provide alternative income streams, buffering households from shocks and reducing dependence on weather patterns.
- **Enhanced Resilience:** Sustainable practices can increase household resilience to climate change and other environmental threats, promoting long-term food security.

Examples and Existing Initiatives

Studies suggest successful examples of sustainable livelihood strategies in similar contexts:

- **Agroforestry:** Integrating trees into agricultural systems can improve soil fertility and provide additional income sources from fruits or timber.
- **Climate-Smart Agriculture:** Techniques like water harvesting and drought-resistant crops can help communities adapt to changing weather patterns.

Government initiatives and NGO programs can play a crucial role in promoting sustainable livelihoods:

- **Extension Services:** Providing training and education on sustainable practices can empower rural households to adopt these strategies.
- **Microfinance and Credit Schemes:** Facilitating access to credit can allow households to invest in sustainable technologies and income-generating activities.

The need for sustainable livelihood strategies in Taraba State is driven by a complex interplay of environmental, economic, and social factors. These strategies hold immense potential to improve household well-being, boost resilience, and ensure long-term food security. Further research is needed to evaluate existing initiatives and identify effective ways to promote sustainable practices at the community level. Collaborative efforts between government agencies, NGOs, and local communities are crucial to foster a transition towards a more sustainable future for rural households in Taraba State.

Conclusion

This study examines rural livelihood strategies in Taraba State, Nigeria, emphasizing the variety and complexity of methods used by rural households to sustain their livelihoods. The result of the findings shows a heavy reliance on agriculture, with the primary industries being crop cultivation and animal raising. But non-farm pursuits like seasonal migration, artisanal crafts, and small-scale trading are also essential for strengthening household resilience and diversifying income streams. The study identifies a number of significant obstacles that negatively impact rural lives, such as poor infrastructure, restricted loan availability, and the unpredictable nature of the environment. In spite of these obstacles, households have improved resilience and reduced risk by using adaptive techniques like agroforestry, agricultural diversification, and community-based resource management. Emphasizing the value of local knowledge and community cohesion, livelihood strategies and coping mechanisms are found to be greatly aided by social networks and traditional institutions. The study underscores the need for policy interventions that enhance access to agricultural inputs and credit facilities, invest in rural infrastructure, and promote sustainable agricultural practices. Policymakers can help rural households achieve more resilient and sustainable lifestyles by tackling these issues with focused policies and initiatives. Thus, Taraba State's socioeconomic growth and efforts to

combat poverty may benefit from this. The study emphasizes the significance of an inclusive and comprehensive strategy for enhancing rural livelihoods and offers insightful information to stakeholders engaged in rural development.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to improve rural livelihoods in Taraba State:

- i. **Invest in Rural Infrastructure:** Increased government investment is needed in infrastructure development, particularly for areas such as rural roads, storage facilities, irrigation systems among others. This will enhance market access for agricultural produce, reduce post-harvest losses, and improve overall connectivity in rural areas.
- ii. **Strengthen Agricultural Extension Services:** Improved access to extension services can equip farmers with specific knowledge/skills in modern farming techniques, improved crop varieties and sustainable land management practices. This will enhance agricultural productivity, diversification, and resilience to climate change.
- iii. **Promote Microfinance Initiatives:** Establishing and supporting microfinance programs can provide rural households with access to credit. This will enable them to invest in income-generating activities, purchase agricultural inputs, and weather economic shocks.
- iv. **Enhance Security Measures:** Addressing security concerns in rural areas is crucial. Collaboration between government agencies, local communities, and security forces can create a safer environment for rural residents, allowing them to pursue their livelihoods without fear.
- v. **Promote Skills Development and Market Access:** Programs focused on developing vocational skills in such areas as handicraft production, processing and value addition of agricultural products can diversify income sources and empower rural communities. Additionally, initiatives to improve market access for locally produced goods can connect rural producers with wider markets and increase their earning potential.
- vi. **Address Climate Change and Environmental Challenges:** government need to implement policies and programs aimed at mitigating the impacts of climate change, such as reforestation, soil conservation, and water management projects. Government can also promote the use of renewable energy sources and efficient energy technologies to reduce environmental degradation.
- vii. **Increase Access to Education and Health Services:** Government can improve the availability and quality of education and health services in rural areas to enhance human capital development. This can be done by implementing programs that specifically target the needs of vulnerable groups, including women and youth, to ensure inclusive development.
- viii. **Strengthen Social Networks and Community-Based Organizations:** The government need to support the formation and capacity-building of farmer cooperatives and community-based organizations to foster collective action and resource sharing. Government can also promote community-based resource management initiatives to sustainably manage natural resources and enhance community resilience.

References

- Abdulai, A., & Abdul-Rasheed, A. (2017). Agricultural productivity and poverty reduction in Nigeria: Issues and policies. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics*, 9(5), 94-103.
- Adebayo, K., Adeola, R. G., & Adefalu, L. L. (2020). Land Tenure Systems and Agricultural Production in Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 12(1), 56-64.
- Adepoju, A. O., & Obayelu, O. A. (2013). Livelihood diversification and welfare of rural households in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics*, 5(12), 482-489.
- Adeoye, I. B., Akinbode, S., & Oladejo, J. A. (2018). Women empowerment through Agriculture in rural Nigeria: A case study of Taraba State. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 13(3), 110-121.
- Ajani, E. N., & Onwubuya, E. A. (2013). Agricultural extension services for rural development and poverty alleviation in Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 17(1), 107-115.
- Ajiboye, T. A., & Ojo, T. O. (2019). Traditional institutions and agricultural development in Nigeria: A case study of Taraba State. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 23(2), 38-49.
- Akinbode, S., Adeoye, I. B., & Omonona, B. T. (2019). Impact of rural infrastructure on agricultural productivity in Nigeria: A review. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 14(31), 1446-1456.
- Ali, I. A. (2015). Non-farm income and employment among rural households in North Central Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development*, 7(1), 25-34.
- Andrew, M., Ainslie, A., & Shackleton, C. (2003). "Land use and livelihoods", Evaluating land and agrarian reform in South Africa 8, PLAAS, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, pp 1-36.
- Ani, M. (2020). Sokoto, Taraba, Jigawa record highest poverty rates as Nigeria's poor now. Business Day, May 5, 2020. [Updated: Sokoto, Taraba, Jigawa record highest poverty rates as Nigeria's poor now 82.9m - Businessday NG](#)
- Ashley, C. & Carney, D. (1999). Sustainable Livelihoods: Lessons from Early Experience. Department for International Development, London. 64pp.
- Ayoade, J. O., Ogunleye, A. O., & Akinwale, A. (2019). Land Tenure Systems and Agricultural Production in Nigeria. *Journal of Land Use Science*, 14(1), 56-64.
- Barrett, C. B., Reardon, T., & Webb, P. (2001). Nonfarm income diversification and household livelihood strategies in rural Africa: Concepts, dynamics, and policy implications. *Food Policy*, 26(4), 315-331.
- Beegle, K. & Christiaensen, L. (2019). Accelerating Poverty Reduction in Africa. Washington, DC: World Bank
- Beinart, W. (1980). "Labour, migrancy and rural production in Pondoland," in Black villagers in an industrial society: anthropological perspectives on labour migration in South Africa, P. Mayer, ed., Oxford University Press, Cape Town, pp. 81-108.
- Borras, Jr, S. M., Hall, R., Scoones, I., White, B. and Wolford, W. (2011). Towards a Better Understanding of Global Land Grabbing: An editorial introduction. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38(2): 209–216
- Bryceson, D. F. (2002). "Multiplex livelihoods in rural Africa: recasting the terms and conditions of gainful employment", *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 40(1), 1-28.
- Campbell, B. M., Jeffrey, S., Kozanyi, W., Luckert, M., Mutamba, M., & Zindi, C. (2002). Household livelihoods in semi-arid regions: options and constraints, CIFOR, Jakarta,

- Indonesia.
- Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). (2021). Annual report and statement of accounts for the year ended 31st December. CBN. Retrieved from <https://www.cbn.gov.ng/Out/2022/CCD/annual%20report%202021.pdf>
- Cousins, B. (1999). "Invisible capital: the contribution of communal rangelands to rural livelihoods in South Africa", *Development Southern Africa*, 16(2), 299-315.
- Dahlberg, A. C. (2000). "Landscape(s) in transition: an environmental history of a village in North east Botswana", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 26(4), 759- 783.
- de Haas, H. (2010). "Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective." *International Migration Review* 44 (1): 227-264.
- Devereux, S. (2001). "Livelihood insecurity and social protection: a re-emerging issue in rural development", *Development policy review*, 19(4), 508-519.
- Ellis, F. (2000). Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries. Oxford University Press.
- Emaziye, P. O. (2014). Agricultural productivity in rural Nigeria: The role of education. *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 4(1), 75-84.
- Fortes, M. (1970). Time and Social Structure and other Essays. New York: Athlone Press
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)(2018). State of food and agriculture: Innovation in family farming. FAO. Retrieved from <http://www.fao.org/3/i8314en/I8314EN.pdf>
- Francis, E. (2000). Making a living: Changing livelihoods in rural Africa, Routledge, London and New York.
- Gibson, C. C., Ostrom, E., & Ahn, T. K. (2000). "The concept of scale and the human dimensions of global change: a survey", *Ecological economics*, vol. 32, pp. 217-239.
- Godfray, H., Charles, J., Beddington, J. R., Crute, I. R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J. F., Pretty, J., Robinson, S., Thomas, S. M. and Toulmin, C. (2010). Food Security: The challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science*, 327(5967): 812 – 818.
- Guyer, J.I. (1981) Household and community in African studies. *African Studies Review* 24 (3/4): 87- 137.
- Heron, G. S. (1991). "The household, economic differentiation and agricultural production in Shixini, Transkei", *Development Southern Africa*, 8(1), 47-60.
- Ibrahim, U. G., Bawa, H. S., & Ibrahim, M. (2021). Climate variability and food security among rural households in Taraba State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 13(1), 69-84.
- Idrisa, Y. L., Ogunbameru, B. O., Ibrahim, A., & Bawa, D. B. (2019). Analysis of farmers' access to extension services in North-Eastern Nigeria: A case study of Borno State. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 3(5), 79-82.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2020). Rural poverty in Nigeria. IFAD. Retrieved from <https://www.ifad.org/en/web/knowledge/publication/asset/42136578>
- International Labour Organization (ILO)(2020). "ILO modelled estimates database" ILOSTAT. 2020. Accessed February 7, 2024. Available at <https://ilostat.ilo.org/data>
- IOM & UNCCD. (2019). Addressing the Land Degradation – Migration Nexus: The Role of the UNCCD. [Open Knowledge Repository \(worldbank.org\)](https://www.worldbank.org)
- Lambin, E. F., Turner, B. L., Geist, H. J., Agbola, S. B., Angelson, A., Bruce, J.W, Coomes, O. T., Dirzo, R., Fisher, G., Folke, C., George, P. S., Homewood, K., Imbernon, J., Leemans, R., Li, X., Moran, E. F., Mortimore, M., Ramakrishnan, P. S., Richards, J. F., Skanes, H., Steffen, W., Stone, G. D., Svedin, U., Veldkamp, T. A., Vogel, C., & Xu, J. (2001). "The causes of land-use and land-cover change: moving beyond the myths", *Global environmental change*, 11, 261-269.

- Low, A. (1986). *Agricultural development in Southern Africa: Farm-household economics and the food crisis*, James Currey, London.
- Mcdermott, L. (2006). *Contrasting Livelihoods in the Upper and Lower Gariep River Basin: A Study of Livelihood Change and Household Development*. A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts of Rhodes University.
- McCusker, B. (2002). "The impact of membership in communal property associations on livelihoods in the Northern Province, South Africa", *Geo Journal*, 56, 113-122.
- McNab, D. (2004). *Livelihood enhancement in the new South Africa: Public expectation, environmental dynamics and 'muddling through'*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, UK.
- Mortimore, M. & Adams, W. A. (2001). "Farmer adaptation, change and 'crisis' in the Sahel", *Global Environmental Change*, 11, 49-57.
- Moser, C. O. (1998). "The asset vulnerability framework: reassessing urban poverty reduction strategies", *World Development*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp 1-19.
- Murray, C. (1981). *Families divided: the impact of migrant labour in Lesotho*, Ravan Press, Johannesburg.
- Nombo, C. I. (2010). *Sweet cane, bitter realities: The complex realities of AIDS in Mkamba, Kilombero District, Tanzania*. In: *Aids and Rural Livelihoods: Dynamics and Diversity in Sub-Saharan Africa*. (Edited by A. Niehof, A., Rugalema, G. and Gillespie, S.). Earthscan Publisher, London. pp. 61 – 76.
- Olusi, J.O. (2001). "Poverty Alleviation in the Nigerian Economy: Policy Issues and Prospects". In Afonja, S.; Adelekan, D.; Soetan, F.; Alimi, T. and Ayanwale, B. (eds.). *Research and Policy Directions on Poverty in Nigeria*. Ile – Ife, Centre for Gender and Social Policy Studies. Pp. 73 – 184.
- Oluwatayo, I.B. (2019). *Agricultural Risk Management and Food Security in Rural Nigeria*. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 10(2), 231-248.
- Oyinloye, O.E., & Alamu, J.F. (2020). *Determinants of agricultural productivity among smallholder farmers in Taraba State, Nigeria*. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development*, 6(1), 1-11.
- Nwaogwugwu, O.N. (2013). *Analysis of Factors affecting choice of Rural Livelihood Strategies in Southeast Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Department of Agricultural Extension, Federal University of Technology, Owerri.
- Perz, S.G. (2001). "Household demographic factors as life cycle determinants of land use in the Amazon", *Population Research and Policy Review*, 20, 159-186.
- Rigg, J. (2006). "Land, farming, livelihoods and poverty: Rethinking the links in the rural South", *World Development*, 34(1), 180-202.
- Sarch, M.T. (2001). "Fishing and farming at Lake Chad: Institutions for access to natural resources", *Journal of Environmental Management*, 62, 185-199.
- Sasu, D.D. (2022). *Poverty headcount rate in Nigeria 2019, by state*. [Statista. https://www.statista.com/statistics/1121438...](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1121438...)
- Scoones, I. (1998). *Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis*. IDS Working Paper 72. Institute of Development Studies.

- Scherr, S. J. 2000, "A downward spiral? Research evidence on the relationship between poverty and natural resource degradation", *Food Policy*, 25, 479-498.
- Shackleton, C. M., Shackleton, S. E., & Cousins, B. 2001, "The role of land-based strategies in rural livelihoods: the contribution of arable production, animal husbandry and natural resource harvesting in communal areas in South Africa", *Development Southern Africa*, 18(5), 581-599.
- Slater, R. (2002). "Differentiation and diversification: changing livelihoods in Qwaqwa, South Africa, 1970-2000", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 28(3), 599- 614.
- Soini, E. (2005). "Land use change patterns and livelihood dynamics on the slopes on Mt. Kilimanjaro, Tanzania", *Agricultural Systems*, 85(3), 306-323.
- Tacoli, C. (1998). "Rural- urban linkages and sustainable rural livelihoods," in Sustainable Rural livelihoods: What contribution can we make? D. Carney, ed., DFID, London, pp. 67-80.
- Taylor, J.E. & Martin, P.L. (2001). "Human Capital: Migration and Rural Population Change." In *Handbook of Agricultural Economics*, edited by Bruce L. Gardner and Gordon C. Rausser, Vol. 1, Part A, 457-511. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science/North-Holland
- Thorner, D., Kerblay, B., & Smith, R. E. F. 1986, A.V. Chayanov on the theory of peasant economy University of Manchester Press, Manchester.
- Umar, M. F. (2020). Rural development challenges and strategies in Nigeria: A review. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 15(1), 23-35.
- Urassa, J. K. (2010). Rural household livelihoods, crop production and well-being after a period of trade reforms: A Case Study of Rukwa, Tanzania. Thesis for Award of PhD Degree at University of Sussex, 247pp.
- van Jaarsveld, A. S., Biggs, R., Scholes, R. J., Bohensky, E., Reyers, B., Lynam, T., Musvoto, C., & Fabricius, C. (2005). "Measuring conditions and trends in ecosystem services at multiple scales: the Southern African Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (SAfMA) experience", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 360, 424- 441.
- Walker, B. & Homma, A. K. O. 1996, "Land use and land cover dynamics in the Brazilian Amazon: an overview", *Ecological economics*, 18, 67-80.
- World Bank. (2006). Agriculture and Achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Washington, D.C. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). Pp.1- 10.
- World Bank (2019a). Agricultural Development Programs in Nigeria: Impact and Sustainability. World Bank Group