Studies in African livelihoods: current issues and future prospects

Leo J. de Haan

Introduction

In the 1990s, the analysis of poverty in Africa became susceptible to a livelihood approach, with an actor-oriented perspective of putting people at the centre and pointing out their agency in order to explore opportunities and to cope with constraints. It was opposed to earlier structural perspectives concerned with the poverty of dependence and neo-Marxist approaches that depicted the poor as victims of societal constraints. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that the livelihood approach can be set aside as another adherent of the Washington Consensus, with its neo-liberal focus on the regulation of market forces, free choice and individual responsibility. This paper acknowledges that originally the livelihood approach tended to downplay structural constraints; especially issues of power, but more recently these issues have been better addressed. However, what remains prominent is the focus of the livelihood approach on agency, i.e. the recognition that Africans create their own history and take an avid interest in their own world of lived experience.

The origin of modern livelihood policy studies can be traced to Chambers and Conway (1992: 9-12), who saw livelihood as the means of gaining a living, including livelihood capabilities, tangible assets, such as stores and resources, and intangible assets, such as claims and access. The first section of this article shows that the approach's popularity is partly due to its enactment by policy circles but also to its roots in various scientific disciplines. Subsequent sections discuss two issues, namely issues of power and multi-local dynamics, which merit particular attention if the approach is deemed to contribute to the understanding of contemporary African livelihoods. In so doing, this article also sets the agenda for future research.

The livelihood approach: modern articulations and disciplinary roots

An actor-oriented perspective challenged the structural perspective on African development of neo-Marxist studies in the 1970s and 1980s for various reasons. First of all, it could not come to terms with the diverging responses of African peasants to the dominant capitalist mode of production. Moreover, studies in peripheral capitalism got caught in a functionalist impasse because they suffered from a continuous obligation to prove the dominance of the capitalist mode of production over non-capitalist modes by the extraction of surplus value through labour and commodities. Also, and despite their wealth of empirical studies, French economic anthropology found difficulties when attempting to make the Marxist concept of mode of production operational in the context of local African communities organized upon the basis of kinship. Thus, the structuralist idea of dominance and surplus extraction proved too schematic when confronted with the deviating behaviour of those thought to be exploited.

In actor-oriented studies a micro-orientation became predominant with a focus upon local households, which was also considered as a convenient unit for the collection of empirical data. As a consequence, various types of household studies appeared in the 1980s. 'New household economics', as opposed to earlier 'peasant economics' – which regarded peasants as passive victims of capitalist exploitation and state dominance – focussed instead upon labour, land allocation and income strategies, using micro-economic modelling as an explanatory tool. 'Survival studies', more sociologically inspired, were mainly interested in

the micro-social behaviour of poor people in coping with and surviving different types of crises, such as falls in prices, droughts and famines. In those days, both droughts and Structural Adjustment Programmes afflicted Africa. Therefore many of these studies came to rather pessimistic findings, indicating the increased impoverishment of African households, despite their appreciation of people's initiative and actions.

At the beginning of the 1990s more optimistic 'livelihood studies' were undertaken which focused on how people organize their lives rather than on impoverishment itself. One may simply say that, in their optimism, these livelihood studies are an expression of the *Zeitgeist*, but from an inside perspective one could argue that the swing towards optimism was also inspired by the search for more effective poverty alleviating policies which would put, contrary to top-down interventionist methods, people's daily lives and needs at the centre. The latter point of view is pursued by Solesbury (2003a) in his account of the development of the sustainable livelihoods approach. He argues that the 1987 Brundtland Report, the Greening of Aid Conference at the International Institute for Environment and Development in the same year and the first Human Development Report in 1990, which all called for drastic changes in development policies, must be regarded as the direct predecessors of the "livelihood founding paper" by Chambers & Conway (1992), in which they established the foundations of a people centred conceptualisation of poverty. Subsequently, UNDP (Hoon et al. 1997), Oxfam and CARE adopted this approach

A major stimulus to the popularity of 'sustainable livelihoods' and its further development came with the taking up of office of the New Labour government in 1997. According to Solesbury (2003b: 2) the pro-active, self-help image of the sustainable livelihoods approach in improving the lives of the poor fitted very well with the image the new administration wished to project. Sustainable livelihoods became an important theme in the United Kingdom's development policy, while the Department of International Development (DFID) initiated a multitude of new research projects and policy debates on the subject. For that reason the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) was able to put a great effort into its popularisation among policy makers and practitioners (Carney 1998, Farrington et al. 1999). Also, significant scientific contributions came from the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) in Sussex – especially from the environmental entitlements group, bringing several illustrative cases from Africa on access and institutions to the discussion (Leach et al. 1999) – and from the Overseas Development Group of the University of East Anglia - highlighting the diversification of livelihood activities on the basis of extensive research in East-Africa (Ellis 1998), while also drawing upon earlier work on de-agrarisation in Africa of Bryceson (1997) at ASC Leiden.

Finally, the World Bank joined the livelihood mode with its controversial, as well as extremely long, volume Voices of the Poor (Narayan et al. 2000), in which again Chambers played a major role.

Generally, these researchers defined livelihood in a similar fashion to Chambers and Conway (1992). However, gradually sustainability was understood more as long-term flexibility and less specifically as ecological soundness, as demonstrated in the second sentence of the following definition.

> A livelihood system comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base (Carney 1998: 2).

Typically, the sustainable livelihood concept was visualized in so-called frameworks, i.e. schematic figures that tried to imagine livelihoods as a flow of activities going through various boxes representing key elements of the perspective. However, such a framework was

> not intended to depict reality in any specific setting ... (but) rather as an analytical structure for coming to grips with the complexity of livelihoods, understanding influences on poverty and identifying where interventions can best be made. The assumption is that people pursue a range of livelihood outcomes (health, income, reduced vulnerability, etc.) by drawing on a range of assets to pursue a variety of activities. The activities they adopt and the way they reinvest in asset-building are driven in part by their own preferences and priorities. However, they are also influenced by the types of vulnerability, including shocks (such as drought), overall trends (in, for instance, resource stocks) and seasonal variations. Options are also determined by the structures (such as the roles of government or of the private sector) and processes (such as institutional, policy and cultural factors), which people face. Their conditions determine their access to assets and livelihood opportunities and the way in which these can be converted into outcomes. In this way, poverty, and the opportunities to escape from it, depends on all of the above (Farrington et al. 1999:1).

The supportive political environment in the United Kingdom, as well as the ample resources made available to research groups and practitioners to develop this method, led to the identification of the livelihood approach as a DFID instigated phenomenon. However, there is more to note with regard to its popularity, especially the fact that the concept also reverts to well-known and often older approaches from various academic disciplines and, consequently, also became quickly embraced by academic discussions.

(1) Firstly, there is the notion of the 'genre de vie' approach adopted in French geography in the early 20th century to explain ways of life as highly localised, with rooted, stable and socially bounded connections between people and land (Kaag et al. 2004: 51). This notion is still easily recognizable in contemporary human ecology studies of African livelihoods. Striking examples are: environmental studies of soil erosion, desertification, land management and resource competition such as Scoones (1994) on the new directions in African pastoralism; Leach and Mearns' (1996) review of the debate on the African environment; and Tiffin et al. and their (1994) neo-boserupian study of sustainable agricultural development in the globalisation of Machakos, Kenya. A francophone line of descent is clear in studies on man-land dynamics in Sahelian agrarian societies (ref. Raynaut 1997), and pastoral societies (de Bruijn and van Dijk 1995) and the resource competition between both ways of life throughout West Africa (Blanc-Pamard and Boutrais 1994, de Haan 1997).

(2) In addition, Kaag et al. (2004: 51) made clear that lines of descent are also simple to trace to anthropologists like Evans-Pritchard (1940), who used the term livelihood as a descriptive concept for the strategies of the Nuer for making a living, and subsequently the volume from Kimble (1960) on African lands and livelihoods and the article from Freeman (1975) on the livelihoods of subsistence populations and commercial investments in Kenya.

(3) Moreover, and by contrast to these older geographical and anthropological studies in which 'livelihood' was a simple descriptive term and mainly pointed towards economic activities, the economist Polanyi (1977) came up with a much more sophisticated conceptualisation. Drawing upon his earlier work, which also included an account of Dahomey and the slave trade, he not only gave the concept of livelihood more theoretical weight, but also considered the economy as socially, culturally and historically embedded. According to him people need a material base to satisfy their needs and wants but to

understand their livelihoods one has to go beyond the material and thus beyond formalist economics: 'the means not the wants are material' (quoted in Kaag et al. 2004: 51).

(4) Another, contemporary academic contribution to the livelihood approach, to some extent also related to previous work in human and political ecology, stems from the first studies on the impact of AIDS in Africa, such as of Barnett and Blaikie (1992) in the Rakai district, Uganda. Within the multidisciplinary field of disaster analysis, Blaikie et al. (1994) further elaborate this livelihood perspective into an access-to-resources model, which proves extremely useful in explaining the livelihoods of poor people and their coping mechanisms in periods of crisis.

(5) Finally, Sen's (1981, 1985) work on entitlements and capabilities must be mentioned. Though he cannot be considered as an early root of livelihood nor, even, as a adherent, Sen is a major fifth source of inspiration to livelihood researchers due to his interest in understanding poverty. For example, Blaikie et al. (1994) partly build upon the entitlements of Sen (1981) as they find that more appropriate for the understanding of effects of disasters than simply 'roperty'. The views of Sen on wellbeing in terms of capabilities and on entitlements as a process of accessing resources and opportunities stimulated the livelihood approach to better specify livelihood outcomes and access.

Livelihood research in Africa has produced a large number of studies, bringing to the fore the particularities and diversity of African livelihood situations and practices. The communality of the approach is situated in an actor-oriented perspective, predominantly focusing on (poor) individuals and households, aiming at a dynamic and holistic understanding of their actions, i.e. a strive towards an integrated complexity of both material and non-material objectives, in the context of both local and global opportunities and constraints. What is still lacking, however, first of all, is the revaluation of a political perspective on livelihoods to compensate for the almost imperceptible de-politicizing brought about by neo-Liberal thought. In that respect the conclusion of Guyer and Peters (1987), in their summary issue on the African household, remains remarkably topical. They not only point towards the fluidity of the household and occurrence of intra-household disparities but, also, made specific reference to a holistic understanding of livelihood and to power relations, which do not feature as prominently in more recent livelihood studies.

> The major shortcoming of structural-functional and economic approaches to the household is the neglect of the role of ideology. The socially specific units that approximate 'households' are best typified not merely as clusters of task-oriented activities that are organized in variable ways, not merely as places to live/eat/work/reproduce, but as sources of identity and social markers. They are located in structures of cultural meaning and differential power (Guyer and Peters 1987: 209).

Secondly, there is a lack of a significant effort to aggregate and generalise findings relating to substantive trends in African livelihoods, such as the phenomenon that, increasingly, Africans tend to perform their livelihood activities in different localities, often quite remote from one another, i.e. a trend towards the multi-locality of African livelihoods. Both deficiencies will be examined in the remainder of this article.

Politicizing the livelihood approach: issues of power

Access to resources and opportunities are considered a key issue in the conceptualization of the livelihoods of the poor. Nevertheless, for some time now the livelihood approach has shunned power relations in its analysis of access. Some may argue that this has to do with the

focus on agency, but on closer inspection, this would appear to be a quite inconsistent reason. After all, agency is embodied in individuals but embedded in social relations, which are governed by institutions in their broadest sense. Therefore, through these social relations, the agency of actors becomes effective and may impact upon structure (de Haan 2000: 349). Power is an indisputable part of social relations and institutions, so the attention upon agency is not wholly to blame. The neglect of power relations, and the related over-emphasis on agency – largely that of the poor –, has a lot to do with the somewhat non-ideological stand of the approach. However, now that it has outpaced the constricted structural perspective of the 1970s and 1980s by emphasizing the agency, the livelihood approach must also struggle out of the grasp of New Labour and neo-liberal flavoured policy makers, who have, in their turn, stressed personal responsibilities - even for the poor - in contrast to the prohibitive collective responsibility of the welfare state, while, at the same time, downplaying structural constraints. Therefore, the livelihood approach should now ready itself to integrate power relations more prominently into its conceptualization.

Although the livelihood approach may have adorned itself for some time with the aura of win-win prospects for livelihoods of people, the following is not meant to argue that livelihood is instead a zero-sum game. However, what one should remember is that restricted access to resources and opportunities is the result of mechanisms by which people are purposefully excluded from access so as to maximize the returns of others. Property relations or certain social or physical characteristics, such as race, gender, language ethnicity, origin or religion, are used to legitimize this fencing in and exclusion from opportunities. As a consequence, paying attention to power relations starts with the exploration of the mechanisms and working of institutions, as power relations are legitimized by institutions and continuously reproduced by them – though, at the same time, they may be challenged during their reproduction. In this field valuable work has been undertaken in Africa by the environmental entitlements group in IDS Sussex. Drawing upon Sen's entitlement approach, which showed that hunger was not a matter of food shortage but, rather, an effect of failed access to available food, they focus upon people's access to natural resources. They start from 'endowments', which refer to the rights and resources people possess. 'Environmental entitlements' refer to the alternative sets of utilities derived from environmental goods and services over which social actors have legitimate effective command and which are instrumental in achieving wellbeing (Leach et al. 1999: 233). Thus, entitlement refers to what people can have, rather than what they should have; the latter being a right. Entitlement comes close in meaning but differs slightly to access in the livelihood approach. This is best demonstrated by looking at the concept of 'mapping'. 'Mapping' refers to how people gain endowments and entitlements; it is the process by which endowments and entitlements are shaped. Thus, in their conception, endowment is the right in principle, entitlement is what one actually obtains and mapping specifies how one obtains it, thus, making power relations apparent.

> There is nothing inherent in a particular … good or service that makes it a priori either an endowment or an entitlement. Instead, the distinction between them depends on the empirical context and on time, within a cyclical process. What are entitlements at one time may, in turn, represent endowments at another time, from which a new set of entitlements may be derived (Leach et al. 1999: 233).

This is illustrated by the example of the gathering of remunerative *Marantaceae* leaves in Ghanaian forests. Before the leaves become endowments, people have to gain rights over them through 'mapping'. This depends on their entitlements: village membership gives collection rights to leaves in commonly owned forests; household membership to leaves on one household's farmland – or through negotiations with other appropriate land-holding

families; in forest reserves leaves can be gathered only with an official permit. Usually, women first set up a trade in order to finance these permits. Leaf gathering is again a mapping process, because of competition among gathering groups of women, and between women within a group, with regard to leaves and sites. Moreover, the mapping also extends to competition with husbands over time spent and other household duties. Once the leaves have become endowments, the entitlements derived from the leaves include direct use, or cash income from their sale. But, before the cash contributes to women's capabilities or wellbeing, a new cycle of endowment and entitlement mapping commences and concentrates upon how it is to be spent. The way the cash is spent is the result intra-household bargaining arrangements of the women with their husbands and co-wives (Leach et al. 1999: 235-236). What the authors fail to recognize is that, in the mapping process, both individual and collective power processes are at play. Both will be explored further below.

Firstly, gender studies recognized years ago that a neglect of power relations in society would not bring any closer the understanding of – and solution to – the deprivation of women. Gender studies, therefore, began the analysis of power as the critical mass upon which livelihoods depend and empowerment as the key to the development or well-being. Various notions of power entered the debate, mostly relating to the question as to how individuals, as subject to power mechanisms, can also induce change. This is also the focus of a recent study by Lakwo (2006) assessing the latest wave in empowerment-directed policies in Africa i.e. micro-finance programmes for women, in a quantitative and qualitative analysis of such a case in North Uganda. Following earlier work in gender studies (Villareal 1994: 8-14, but also Kabeer 1994 and Rolands 1997), he maintains that, in the interaction between individuals, power never completely belongs to one of them. The outcome of the interaction is always the result of negotiation and, herein, power relations are re-created and, thus, constitute a dynamic process of wielding and yielding. The wants of the power wielder are influenced and shaped by the other in the subordinate position. From this point of view, women are not sheer victims. They also have an active role in their subordination and may improve their position. Though Lakwo's (2006) quantitative analyses does not show significant increases in the material well-being of the women participating in micro-finance groups, qualitative analysis does indicate, however, significant changes in the power relations between husbands and wives and, thus, has pointed towards empowerment on the individual level.

Secondly, with respect to the collective level of power relations, the work of Bierschenk and Olivier de Sardan (1997, 2003) is extremely useful. In their village studies in various African countries, some of them in the context of political decentralisation, they use the concepts of strategic groups and political arenas, which enable us to consider livelihoods as being organized in arenas of conflicting or co-operating actors. Elsewhere, it was summarized as follows: strategic groups are

> 'groups of differing composition, which present themselves depending on the problem. Sometimes it is an occupational group, sometimes it is a status group like women or youths, sometimes it is a kinship group, sometimes a network of mutual assistance or clients of a patron and sometimes a group of individuals with a common historical trajectory of livelihood strategies. Conflicting interests exist between these groups, which are fought out in the local political arena……. Depending on their role and activity, individuals belong to different strategic groups and, therefore, the dividing lines between individuals and between groups are never rigid, but variable and fuzzy. General categories such as 'the poor' do not exist; in the arena of livelihood, inclusion and exclusion may differ in each dimension (de Haan 2000: 352).

Deleted: and extra-local

Deleted: s.

Deleted: In fact, g

In fact attention for the aggregated effects of livelihood strategies or collective behaviour is still underexposed in the livelihood approach. Justifiably Brons et al. (2005) also arrives at the conclusion that, besides the individual and the household, more attention needs to be directed towards collective behaviour, but in the institutional analysis, power relations are again disregarded

In summary, the livelihood approach would enhance its sense of reality if power relations, as wielding and yielding processes on the micro level and carried out through political arenas at the meso and macro levels, became a standard part of the analysis.

African multi-local livelihood dynamics

The second deficiency in the livelihood approach to be discussed is the relative indifference towards another substantive trend in African livelihoods, namely its increased multi-locality. Of course, many livelihood studies point to the importance of migration, but what is meant here is rather the combined effect of individualisation, multi-tasking and mobility giving way to livelihood networks. Basically, the concept of migration refers only to the spatial movement of actors. Rather than the movement itself, the resulting interlinking of livelihoods, which actors organize in various places, i.e. the multi-local livelihood network, deserves our attention.

Usually households, defined as co-resident groups of persons who share most aspects of consumption drawing on and allocating a common pool of resources, including labour, to ensure their livelihood, are units of analysis of livelihood studies. But, rather than being harmonious entities pursuing an optimal balance as a harmonious domestic unit, African households are groups of individuals also pursuing individual ways to improve their situation. Consequently, there is a trend towards individualised livelihoods, or, at least, towards individual decision-making concerning livelihood opportunities.

Livelihood studies have ascertained that, during the last decade, increasing numbers of people have opted for a pathway characterised by multi-tasking and income diversification. There exists a tendency towards livelihood diversification, ‘a process by which ... households construct an increasingly diverse portfolio of activities and assets in order to survive and to improve their standard of living’ (Ellis 2000: 15). Today, few of the African poor derive all their income from just one source, e.g. as wage labour, or hold all their wealth in the form of just one single asset, as the same author also demonstrated in a number of publications on rural poverty in Uganda, Tanzania and Malawi (Ellis and Bahiigwa 2003, Ellis and Mdoe 2003, Ellis et al. 2003). In livelihood studies, diversification in Africa is described as a pervasive and enduring phenomenon, which exists both in both the urban and the rural context. Multi-tasking is mentioned as a way to escape poverty, to cope with insecurity or to reduce risk. Note that there is also a parallel to the individualisation trend discussed above. Partly households diversify because individual members are able to decide in relative autonomy about the allocation of resources they have access to. Nonetheless, decision making on the household level still is a reality and individual decision-making is understood better within the context of the background of the characteristics of the household people belong to.

Individualisation and multi-tasking are joined by a third trend, i.e. the rapid expansion of people’s mobility enabled by the improvement of communications and transport technology. Increasing numbers now live on the edge of urban and rural life, commuting from the countryside to the urban centres. Also poor people supplement their income by travelling large distances to earn additional money as temporary migrants. Finally, there is a

considerable group of transnational migrants and, in countries such as Morocco, Ghana, Lesotho and Senegal, large groups temporarily or permanently live abroad. No longer is international migration from Africa discussed only in terms of the brain drain and labour extraction. The developmental impact on national, as well as local, levels of both remittances and flows of information generated by migration are increasingly recognized, as is underpinned, for example, in an overview publication on West African migration (Manuh 2005).

However, the relevant issue here is not these impacts as such, but what they mean to the future of African livelihoods. Large numbers of Africans are no longer rooted in one place. Although they maintain relations with their home community, they are also attached to other places. As a consequence, individuals are no longer organised as co-resident groups, i.e. concentrated in space, but resemble individual nodes, connected to each other by livelihood networks, along which flow remittances, information and goods. These multi-local networks of African livelihoods spread like wildfire around the globe. To study the Senegalese brotherhood of the Murids or the Pentecostalists from Ghana as emerging Diasporas, trading networks or transnational communities, are all legitimate perspectives. However, these perspectives neglect their most distinct and salient feature: they constitute networks of African livelihood which could constitute an important undercurrent for the strengthening of African development and, therefore, deserves closer scrutiny by a new generation of livelihood studies

Conclusion

This article argues that a new generation of livelihood studies is needed. This new generation should politicize issues of livelihood by consistently including power relations on individual and meso-macro levels of scale in the analysis. In addition, it should explore the anticipated emergence of a multi-local network of livelihoods, which has gradually begun to replace mono-local African livelihoods. African livelihoods deliver their contribution to the creation of multi-local or even transnational social spaces, i.e. social structures and livelihood practices as configurations of social practices that span places in various countries. The way they use social space reflects their near and remote social relations and their identity. In that sense a new generation of livelihood studies should also find inspiration in the recent ‘spatial turn’ in the social sciences in general.

Bibliography

Barnett, T. and P. Blaikie 1992. AIDS in Africa: its present and future impact. London: Belhaven Press.

Bierschenk, T and J. Olivier de Sardan 1997. Local powers and a distant State. In rural Central African Republic, Journal of Modern African Studies 35 (3) 441-468.

Bierschenk, T and J. Olivier de Sardan 2003. Power in the village. Rural Benin between democratisation and decentralisation, Africa 73 (2) 145-173.

Blaikie, P. et al. 1994. At Risk. Natural hazards, people’s vulnerability and disasters. London: Routledge.

Blanc-Pamard, C. and J. Boutrais 1994. A la Croisée des Parcours. Pasteurs, éleveurs, cultivateurs. Paris: ORSTOM Editions.

Brons, J. T. Dietz, A. Niehof and K. Witsenburg 2005. Collective behaviour as a missing element in the analysis of livelihood vulnerability in less favoured areas. Unpublished paper. Wageningen.

Bryceson, D. and V. Jamal (eds.) 1997. Farewell to farms: de-agrarianisation and employment in Africa. ASC Research Series. Avebury: Ashgate.

Carney, D. (ed.) 1998. Sustainable rural livelihoods. What contribution can we make? Department of International Development. Nottingham: Russell Press Ltd.

Chambers, R. and G. Conway 1992. Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century. Discussion Paper 296. Brighton: IDS.

De Bruijn, M. and H. Van Dijk 1995. Arid Ways. Cultural Understandings of Insecurity in Fulbe Society, Central Mali. Amsterdam: Thela Publishers.

De Haan, L. 1997. Agiculteurs et Eleveurs au Nord-Bénin. Ecologie et genres de vie. Paris: Karthala.

De Haan, L. 2000. Globalization, localization and sustainable livelihood, Sociologia Ruralis 40 (3) 339-365.

Ellis, F and N. Mdoe 2003. Livelihoods and Rural Poverty Reduction in Tanzania, World Development 31 (8) 1367-1384

Ellis, F. 2000. Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, F. and G. Bahiigwa 2003. Livelihoods and Rural Poverty Reduction in Uganda, World Development 31 (6) 997-1013.

Ellis, F., M. Kutengule and A. Nyasulu 2003. Livelihoods and Rural Poverty Reduction in Malawi, World Development 31 (9) 1495-1510

Evans-Pritchard, E. 1940. The Nuer: a description of the modes of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Farrington, J. et al. 1999. Sustainable Livelihoods in Practice. Early Applications of Concepts in Rural Areas. London: ODI Natural Resources Perspectives 42.

Freeman, D. 1975. Development Strategies in Dual Economies: a Kenyan example, African Studies Review 18 (2) 2, 17-33.

Guyer, J. and P. Peters 1987. Introduction. Conceptualizing the household: issues of theory and policy in Africa, Development and Change Special Issue 18 (2) 197-214.

Hoon, P., N. Singh and S. Wanmali 1997. Sustainable livelihoods: concepts, principles and approaches to indicator development. Paper presented at the workshop Sustainable Livelihood Indicators, Social Development and Poverty Eradication Division. New York: UNDP.

Kaag, M. et al. 2004. Ways forward in livelihood research. In D. Kalb, W. Pansters and H. Siebers (eds.) Globalization and Development. Themes and Concepts in Current Research. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 49-74.

Kabeer, N. 1994. Reversed Realities. Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought. London: Verso.

Kimble, T. 1960. Tropical Africa. I. Land and Livelihood. II. Society and Polity. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

Lakwo A. 2006. Micro-finance, rural livelihoods and women's empowerment in Uganda. Leiden: ASC Research Reports.

Leach, M. and R. Mearns (eds.) 1996. The Lie of the Land. Challenging received wisdom on the African environment. London: James Currey.

Leach, M., R. Mearns and I. Scoones 1999. Environmental Entitlements: Dynamics and Institutions in Community-based Natural Resource Management, World Development 27 (2) 225-247.

Manuh, T. (ed.) 2005. At Home in the World? International Migration and Development in Contemporary Ghana and West Africa. Accra: Sub-Saharan Publishers.

Narayan, D. et al. 2000. Crying out for Changes. Voices of the Poor. Washington DC: World Bank.

Polanyi, K. (ed. by H.W. Pearson) 1977. The Livelihood of Man. New York: Academic Press.

Raynaut, C. 1997. Sahels. Diversité et dynamiques des relations sociétiés-nature. Paris: Karthala.

Rowlands, J. 1997. Questioning Empowerment. Working with Women in Honduras. Oxford: Oxfam Publications.

Scoones, I. 1998. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis. Working Paper Institute of Development Studies. Brighton: IDS.

Sen, A. 1981. Poverty and Famines. An essay on entitlement and deprivation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. 1985. Commodities and Capabilities. Amsterdam: Elsevier

Solesbury, W. 2003a. Sustainable Livelihoods: A Case Study of the Evolution of DFID Policy. London: ODI.

Solesbury, W. 2003b. The Sustainable Livelihoods Case Study. Bridging Research and Policy Seminar. Transcript of presentation 9th October 2003. London: ODI.

Tiffin, M., M. Mortimore and F. Gichuki 1994. More People, Less Erosion. Environmental Recovery in Kenya. Chichester, Wiley.

Villareal, M. 1994. Wielding and Yielding. Power, Subordination and Gender Identity in the Context of a Mexican Development Project. Wageningen: Wageningen University.