

Issues and Perspective on Rural Development

By

Anthony Ikhide Osawe

Department of Geography and Environmental Management
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria.

toniosawe5@gmail.com; osaweanthony434@gmail.com.

Abstract

The issues and perspectives in rural development bothers on the provision of basic infrastructures, welfare services, co-operatives with the presence of a facilitator. It is pretty difficult to predict the future and also not convinced of the utility of prognostic which inform much futurology. So, the only meaningful approach to the future is to try to design and to evolve a preferred model for the future and strategies for moving from the expected future if human agencies do not intervene in the historical process to the preferred future if they do- as indeed they should, for the alternative is nothing short of disaster. It is necessary to reconsider the whole model of development that we have adopted which has produced and will continue to produce mass poverty and inequality co-existing with high affluence and waste. Key to moving away from negative to positive scenario are major aspects of development strategy and the optimal interrelationship between them. These include life style, change organization of space, production system and technology. All these will be achieved not only through development that is environmentally, socially and economically sustainable, but one that will depend largely on developing modes of local governance that are inclusive, accountable, and effective.

Key Words: Community Development, Rural Development, Agriculture, Livelihood, Rural Industries and trade.

Introduction

Much has been said in most third World countries about rural development. Many of the formulations of the problem and the phrases and clichés used are reminiscent of the fifties and early sixties when discussions on planning and the concept of community development (CD) was in vogue and laid emphasis on the development of the rural area. The economic development plan of most countries was then tilted towards the thinking of economic development. In the era of community development, the focus was mainly on establishing an administrative network that flows down to the remote villages providing extension services through paid personnel. This was without due consideration of the social structural aspects and the level of relationship prevailing in the rural areas, the current accent is on problem of massive poverty on the “rural poor” which urgently require attention.

Looking back to the era of community development (CD), despite all the defects that were identified with community development as an approach and its largely bureaucratic characteristics, the CD recorded considerable level of development in rural areas. This was so

because it created awareness and laid out a vast infrastructure of welfare services, cooperative and voluntary organizations. This period witnessed the transfer of resources from urban to rural areas, which in no small measure contributed to a steady relationship with the two sectors (Kothari, 1981). Kothari noted that ‘this was the period political power shifted to the rural areas’ and through the CD there was a permeation of electoral process and competitive politics which gave rise to substantial articulation of rural needs and interest, though it still left out a very poor segment of underprivileged.

Rural development is at once a concept and a program. As a concept it is ‘elusive’ but it is amenable to systematic analysis both in terms of ongoing programs and futuristic scenarios. As a program it is multidimensional, with some wide operational strategies, institutional structures and procedural approaches.

Today, while there is much talk about rural development and the problem of rural poor, the fact remains that the condition of rural areas is deteriorating and within the rural social structure, the position of the very poor is worsening. Especially in Nigeria, the rural poor, in the last few years has witnessed erosion in their political power shifting to urban elites. Government poverty programs have not improved the lots of the poor and consequently expectations from the lofty ideas of rural development turned out to be more of a rhetoric than reality.

The Rural Economy

As it remains, the rural economy is known to have been characterized by low productivity, widespread unemployment and under-employment, social inequality, lack of infrastructural facilities and absence of basic minimum of social amenities necessary for civilized living. It was from this scenario that the World Bank (1975) in her sector policy paper on Rural Development defined rural development as “a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people –the rural poor. It involves extending the benefit of development to the poorest among those who seek livelihood in the rural areas. The group includes small-scale farmers, tenants and the landless (World Bank, 1975).

Looking at the multi-dimensional aspect of the problems in rural scenario, the World Bank went further to identify what some national rural development activities should be comprised of: “a mix of activities, which should include projects to raise agriculture out-put, create new employment, improve health and education, expand communications and improve housing. Such a program might be made up of single-sector or multi-sector projects, with a component implemented concurrently or in sequence. The components and phasing must be formulated both to remove constraints and to support those forces prevailing in the target area which are favorable to development.

This was in parts the departure from agricultural development as a key area of rural development to a rural development concept that snow-balled with multi labored splendor, bringing a range of modulation to modernization, efficiency of production to spread and redistribution, all these were aimed at bringing about what were weak about the initial approaches prioritized attention of rural scene and the betterment of their economy and living

conditions. In consonance, the tertiary and service sector were expected to receive attention to provide employment opportunities and in the provision of goods and services (Rau, 1981).

The Difference between Agricultural Growth and Rural Development

For agriculture, it is believed that it has the potential to help improve the lives of rural society. But rural development is a holistic growth of the rural society. This is why rural development is not just about agricultural growth. World Bank (2007) observed that most nations' development policy and practice equate agricultural growth with rural development. Since the majority of the world's poor live in rural areas, this may have made it seem logical that growth in that sector could reduce poverty. However, in an earlier report, Agriculture and Rural Development Department of the World Bank (2005) observed that a rich literature, both theoretical and empirical which examines the structural transformation of economies, extending from the least developed economies, in which economic activity is based largely on agriculture, to high income-economies, in which agriculture typically account for less than 5 percent GDP. The dominant paradigm of structural transformation since 1970 has seen agriculture as "an engine of growth" in countries in the early stages of development because of agriculture's high share of economic activity and strong growth linkage with the rest of the economy. This is without prejudice to the significance of non-farm incomes and mobility for what is undeniable with the majority of the World's rural population.

For Obinozie (1999), rural development is "a multi-dimensional process aimed at uplifting the life of the rural dwellers in the society. This involves the creation of employment, access roads, health facilities, better housing, good water supply and equitable distribution of income among the rural people. In spite of numerous and diverse definitions of the subject by scholars, one thing is imperative about the scope and boundaries of rural development as a field of inquiry. This analytical importance borders on the fact that rural development is directed principally and completely towards the total transformation of rural communities. The essence is to transform these communities to modern cities. The ultimate goal is to eradicate poverty and further reduce the persistent migration of people from rural to urban areas in search of better means of livelihood in the contemporary world.

The diversification of income sources, often include remittances from migrant family, this is not only significant for the well-being of rural households but also has substantial implications for agricultural production itself. For instance, Botswana, low-income urban households maintain livestock and farms in their own areas. In Gaborone alone, about half of all low income urban households do so; perhaps, more surprisingly, about a third had moved to the city more than 20 years earlier (Kruger, 1998). While investment in rural assets are essentially a safety net for urban poor, these assets are shared with and looked after by family member and contribute to local economy. Tiffen (2003) noted that in Africa, small investment in technologies and products of 'dry lands', farmers are very often funded by non-farm incomes and remittance. Similarly, Hoang, Dang and Tacoli (2005) observed that in Vietnam's Red River Delta, farmers' seasonal migration to work in Hanoi's construction sector finances agricultural intensification and diversification into higher-value products. The most commonly held view is that

technological innovation is just a matter of public investment and farmers training from extension agents or multilateral agencies.

Urban, Agriculture, non-farm and rural development are thus closely linked. On the one hand, incomes from non-farm activities, often earned in cities and towns, both local and farther away, provide vital capital to small-scale farming and a safety net that encourages innovation. On the other hand, domestic urban markets are more stable than export ones, and stimulate production by small-scale farmers who respond rapidly to changes in consumer's preferences, unlike largest commercial farming. Access to domestic markets is effectively managed by extensive networks of local traders who, unlike exporter, do not rely on centralized processing and packaging but prefer to concentrate these operations as close as possible to the production areas to minimize losses. This, in turn, creates local non-farm employment which is especially valuable for poor group who cannot afford to migrate to urban centers (UN, 2011). Hence, while agriculture remains the main component of rural economic base, its diversification at the settlement and household levels relies on strong links with urban food and labor markets. Rural development policies that build on and support these linkages are more likely to be successful than those that focus narrowly on agricultural production.

Rural Industrialization

In 2007, the World Bank acknowledges that the neoliberal policies of the last decades have failed to give a new impetus to agriculture and reduce rural poverty. Its important message that 'agriculture continues to be a fundamental instrument for sustainable development and poverty reduction' in the twenty-first century (World Bank, 2007) is an exaggeration because only one of its three proposed pathways out of rural poverty is based on farming, while two rely on rural non-agricultural activities and on outmigration. Rural industrialization means encouraging location of large and small units away from urban areas (Ujjimishra, 2013). Scoones in his (2009) 'Rural Livelihood Approach' observed that rural small holders increasingly combine three activities (farming, non-agricultural activities and out-migration) for their livelihood strategies. It is significant to note that the mutually reinforcing multiple pathways may not alleviate the poor out of poverty. The work on the rural livelihoods approach developed by scholars in the UK during the 1990s stresses the agency of actors on things, such as the ability of peasants and rural workers to construct their own livelihood strategies by drawing on a variety of resources at their disposal, including 'social capital' (Chambers and Conway 1992; Bebbington 1999 and Ellis 2000).

Promoting rural industries to absorb surplus labor while reducing migratory pressures on cities has long been an aim of many national governments. In China, industrial development was fueled by township and village enterprises (TVEs) which grew enormously between 1978 and 1994. During the same period, their share of the gross national industrial output went from 9 per cent to 42 per cent, and their contribution to the total state revenue increased from 4 per cent to

22 per cent (Kirkby, Bradbury and Shen, 2000). By 1997, the rural TVE sector in China employed nearly 30 per cent of the rural labor force.

Similarly, Thailand has experienced processes of rural industrialization since the 1980s and has involved both the growth of local enterprises and the rural relocation of export-manufacturing factories (Rigg, 2003). Similarly, Vietnam rural and peri-urban craft and industrial villages (CVIs) are estimated to account for 41 per cent of total GDP and employ 64 per cent of the industrial workforce (Douglass and others, 2002). The majority are household enterprises (83 per cent of the sector's contribution to GDP and 58 per cent of the workers), the rest are domestically owned small and medium-sized enterprises. These categories are linked to domestic urban markets as well as to international market and are located primarily in high-density rural and peri-urban areas such as the Red River Delta (Douglass, et al., 2002; Hoang, Dang and Tacoli, 2005).

A large proportion of rural enterprises in Eastern Asia are located in sizeable settlements with strong non-agricultural economic bases and which could be classified as urban centers. In many cases, these enterprises are not linked to the local agricultural base and may be in competition with farmers for access to land and water. Trade liberalization has affected small rural enterprises everywhere. In India especially, household enterprises lost to competition from imports, and the share of the rural nonfarm sector in total non-farm net domestic product decreased from about 35 per cent in 1981 to under 32 per cent in 2001 (Mukherjee and Zhang, 2007). In China, those that have survived increasingly concentrate in the high-growth eastern provinces of the country, which absorb 90 per cent of foreign direct investment and, in so doing, contribute to the growing regional inequalities that are at the root of China's internal migration. In summary, most rural industries are in many cases small-scale enterprises, often operating at the household level. Notwithstanding, they are linked to domestic and sometimes export markets, as a result of the quality of their output and are crucial in providing non-farm employment to the rural and peri-urban poor. Though they are however, vulnerable to international competition. In addition, they are in most instances located in 'rural' settlements, where local administrations lack the capacity and revenue to address environmental pollution, which can affect residential and agricultural areas. This is of particular concern since, especially in Southeast Asia, rural industrial activities tend to concentrate in densely populated peri-urban areas and larger settlements.

Emerging Scenario on Population Growth

At the beginning of the 20th century, the world's population was 1.6 billion; projected to reach 7 billion in 2012, 8 billion by 2030, and top 9 billion in 2050 (Zlotnick, 2009). According to CIA (2006), the world's population currently increases by 203,800 people every day. It is equally noted that the forty-nine least developed countries in the World is the fastest, growing at the rate of 2.3 percent per year. With this, Africa could double in population to 1.9 billion by 2050. These growth rates hold despite the World's highest rates of AID infection, and civil war, famines and other factors. Despite strife in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), its population could triple to 181 million by 2050, while Nigeria's population could double to 307

million. Triple-digit growth rates are also forecasted for Iraq and Nepal. China's population is expected to grow by 170 million over the next quarter of the century, however it will as well age significantly because of the national edict of one child per family which is under strict enforcement. Consequently, the choice of many families to satisfy that limitation of a male child as against a female is another demographic factor that may impact on Chinese behavior in the years ahead. Ten years from now, (2030) the resulting imbalance between young males and females will play out in China's external and internal politics and though it is very difficult to predict because not much of such existed before now.

Cultivable lands are reducing every day due to land population-ratio, that is being affected, especially by private property in land, current inheritance regimes that has resulted in a very high fragmentation of holdings that is constantly subjected to fragmentation. This has made agricultural holding uneconomical (especially with standard of small farm technology); and productivity from land will continue to experience decline. The implication is that food production cannot match the growing population. Consequently, most countries will have to resort to importation with the available scarce foreign exchange with its adverse implication on export earnings. This could lead to a short-fall in the required nutritional standards that will reflect on the per capita intake of food of the citizenry.

The above scenario is linked to perspectives with several components: such as maximization of productive agriculture and allied activities in the rural areas including the generation of employment opportunities; development of rural industries to absorb the weaker section of rural community; the provision of basic amenities, such as drinking water, health and education facilities, link roads, village markets centres and recreational facilities. These efforts are linked with provision of and full utilization of the productive capacities of the rural poor; the endowments in the rural areas, keeping in view the need for egalitarian society. The concept is based on the theme that as the income of the poor rises, through production of labor-intensive goods, in and outside the farm, it will accelerate both local and national development in the achievement of social justice (Kothari, 1982). When economic and commercial activities in rural areas gets strengthened, it leads to the growth of trans-village transaction and link semi-urban centres and peri-urban areas will develop, thereby providing the needed rural urban continuum.

Quality of Health Facilities in Rural Areas

So far, in the era of medical tourism by senior government functionaries, it is evident that the normal health situation has decline as the needed expansion in health services are beyond the reach of the general poor, and especially for the large majority of village settlements and areas where the poor are huddled together in the cities will definitely be inaccessible to public health services and subject to a breakdown of sanitation and a spread of the diseases that normally goes with overcrowded pockets of poverty.

Similarly, disparity in the standard of education will grow, and the absolute number of illiterates will increase and by extension, the skills and capabilities needed for gainful employment will be restricted to the upper strata of the population.

The convergence of poverty, unemployment, disease and illiteracy that denies life chances to vast majority at the periphery of the underprivileged, and the fact that the same growing incidence of convergence will occur in urban and metropolitan settings can only produce a climate of extreme tension, a growing incidence of crime and not a little public violence that can be held down only by growing repression by police and by the paramilitary arms of the government. According to Kothari (1982) ‘this is a scenario of not only extreme misery and iniquity and injustice but also one of breakdown of authority and indeed of the social fabric itself’. This type of scenario may seem inconceivable at the moment but it is very likely with the present indicators. What need to be done are as follows:

Wealth Creation and Employment Generation

Policymakers and rural development practitioners increasingly recognize that a short-term focus on creating jobs or increasing income is insufficient to generate sustainable rural development or achieve a long-term reduction in rural poverty. Therefore, a focus on creating and maintaining wealth offers the potential to achieve more lasting rural prosperity sustainably.

Scholars have studied wealth creation at least since the time of Adam Smith’s *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), and several Nobel prizes have been awarded to economists for their work on wealth. Ecologists, sociologists, and political scientists have examined broader wealth concepts such as natural, social, and political capital. Many rural development researchers, foundations, think tanks, and advocacy groups argue that investing in a broad range of assets is critical for long-term economic growth and prosperity in rural communities (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993; Castle, 1998; Green and Haines, 2002; Flora and Flora, 2004; Ratner, 2010). Despite the importance of this topic to policymakers and practitioners, and the broad and deep foundation of knowledge about it, efforts to conceptualize and measure rural wealth creation have been quite limited (Pender, Marré, and Reeder, 2012). Similar conceptual frameworks were proposed, that were independent of the North American literature, in the international agricultural and rural development literature. Scoones (1998) and Carney (1998) developed the ‘Sustainable Livelihoods Framework’ (SLF), which has been used by the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom and other international development organizations.

The SLF, relied on earlier works by Chambers and Conway (1992); (Osawe, 2017) and others, considered rural people’s livelihood strategy decisions to be influenced by five types of assets (human, natural, financial, physical, and social capital); by the vulnerability context within which they make decisions, including shocks, trends, and seasonal variations; and by transforming structures and processes, such as the structure of different levels of government and the private sector, and laws, policies, culture, and institutions. DFID (1999) defined livelihood strategies as “the range and combination of activities and choices that people make/undertake in order to achieve their livelihood goals (including productive activities, investment strategies, reproductive choices, etc.)”. Examples of livelihood strategies pursued by rural households in developing countries include agricultural intensification or extensification, livelihood diversification (e.g., nonfarm activities), and migration (Scoones, 1998). These strategies have

proved resorting to various economic, social, and environmental outcomes, which over time has resulted in changes in assets.

Farrington, Carney, Ashley and Turton, (1999) recognized one criticism of the SLF, which they said, 'did not pay sufficient attention to power and politics'. This particular observation informed some authors to propose adding political capital to the SLF as one of the types of local assets affecting livelihood strategy options and decisions (Baumann and Sinha, 2001). Others have argued that this is insufficient and that broader structures of inequality and political economy must also be considered (Scoones 2009). Such considerations were meant to be included as part of the analysis of development context and the transforming structures and processes (Scoones, 1998; DFID, 1999). However, these were often not combined with the investigations that were conducted using the SLF (Scoones, 2009).

Bebbington (1999) proposed a "capitals and capabilities framework" this was similar in many respects to the SLF. Similar to the SLF, Bebbington's framework emphasized the importance of local actors (individuals, households, and organizations) able to access multiple types of assets, even though the set of assets that he focused on was slightly different: natural, human, cultural, social, and produced capital. His argument was that these capital assets are important to people not only to achieve material well-being, but also to make their livelihoods meaningful and to provide them with capability. He argued that cultural capital is particularly important to provide meaning, such as the value attached to living in a particular rural place. Cultural and other forms of capital can also be a source of power, which according to Bebbington, it enables them to alter the political, economic, and institutional context affecting their livelihoods, such as by organizing to obtain better terms of trade on their products.

De Janvry (2003) developed a framework for "integral rural development" which seemingly was based on the SLF. The framework, has the elements of the SLF (household assets, context, livelihood strategies, outcomes) and are considered as the well-being determination process. The key innovation in the framework is specification of entry points for rural development programs to influence different components of the well-being determination process (filtered through the program implementation process) and/ or the policymaking and program design process. For instance, he stated that land reform programs can be used to address households' limitations in access to natural capital; market or governance reforms or investments in local public goods can address limitations in the context; social protection programs can seek to improve well-being outcomes directly; and programs for social incorporation and empowerment can help to improve the policy process and program design and implementation to better serve the poor. This framework helps to address another criticism of the SLF – the need to more explicitly specify the linkages between the internal community factors in the SLF and the more macro-level political factors, policies, and programs influencing them (Scoones, 2009).

Pender, Ehui and Place (2006) developed a conceptual framework that explains the factors affecting East African rural households' livelihood strategies and land management decisions and the outcomes of those decisions. Again, similar to the SLF and De Janvry's (2003) framework, these frameworks incorporated five types of household assets (physical, human,

natural, financial, and social capital) and local contextual factors (agricultural potential, population density, access to markets, programs and services, and local institutions and culture). Both De Janvry (2003), Pender et al. (2006) considered how government policies, programs, and institutions could affect the development process at different levels through various entry points, such as by affecting household endowments, local market or institutional development, livelihood strategy, and land management decisions, or directly affecting outcomes. They used this framework to generate hypotheses and synthesize findings of a set of research studies investigating the determinants and impacts of rural livelihoods and land management decisions in the East African highlands. Like Reimer (2006), their findings demonstrate how the influence of different types of capital on livelihood decisions and outcomes depends upon the local context.

Providing Modern Energy Service to the World's Rural Population.

It is hard not to be daunted by the scale of the problem of providing modern energy service to the world's rural population. There are nearly two billion people without access to modern forms of energy, such as electricity and oil (World Bank, 1996). Liberalizing energy markets, however important, may not be the complete answer. There has been much progress made in encouraging private investment in the electricity industry since the privatization, however, private companies have shown little or no interest in extending electricity supplies to rural areas. This has further supported the views of Micet (2019) on urban rural spaces: development issues. They have instead preferred to concentrate on more lucrative contracts to generate electricity and to supply industrial and urban customers that are constantly under their exploitation through the use of “mad bill”. World Bank (1996) noted that ‘there is evidence, that creating urban-based energy market by itself will fail to provide rural electricity. There is a particular hurdle that discourages companies from providing supplies to rural areas: high start-up costs. Extending an electricity grid to a remote village can be very expensive, especially if only a few households are to be connected. Until more households take advantage of the network, the cost of electricity can be as high as US¢70 per kWh. This is seven times the cost in an urban area. Even setting up a solar electricity system for a single home can cost between USD500 and USD1,000, a large sum to spend in one lump. The problem here is not necessarily that people are unwilling to pay. Evidence suggests that people will spend a significant proportion of their incomes on better energy, which improves their quality of life or enables them to become more productive. Evidence from Bangladesh has shown that even the poorest among the poor are connecting to the grid when the service is available. On the other hand, many people in rural China without easy access to cooking fuels are investing in efficient stoves and planting trees.

While investors feared the difficulties to pay the high startup costs of improving their energy supplies because rural customers often cannot get affordable credit. They have resorted to finding solution by forming themselves into a local member-supported bank to make small loans (such as the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, Lift Above Poverty Organization- LAPO in Nigeria which lend mainly to women and poor people assist them. Another is to promote companies that lease basic equipment relevant to rural development that requires technologies such as solar,

wind, and small-scale hydropower as the most appropriate and ideal in rural areas and require far more systematic attention by policymakers than they have previously received. Renewable technologies have substantial environmental advantages comparative to fossil fuels. Sunlight is also in ample supply in many developing countries. Policy makers need to provide the leadership needed to create a safe environment to investors including guarantee of agreement reached with local communities in this direction. Especially, as the costs of many renewable technologies have come down significantly over the last decade. A combination of improved technology and economies of scale has pushed down the costs of wind power, solar thermal power (sunlight is used to heat air or water), and photovoltaic power (electricity is generated directly from sunlight).

Conclusion and Future Challenges

The central argument of this paper is the need to reconsider the development models that have produced and will continue to produce mass poverty and inequality co-existing with high affluence and waste. The need to search alternative path of development that can produce minimum condition for rural masses to stop (or at least keep within limits) the influx into urban areas and give rise to an integral approach to both rural and urban development, each sector supporting each other (instead of the present parasitic relationship) and both becoming part of a common continuum of human settlement with productive relationship that have the well-being and dignity of all individuals irrespective of location or status as a central focus. From the above issues and perspectives, it is evident that rural circumstance and thinking are changing without corresponding paradigm shift to match the changes in the following areas:

Employment generation to absorb the new or additional adult and youth population, existing unemployment and underemployment for a just social order. This will arrest the major source of injustice that is found in not so much in a condition of general scarcity as in the fact of diminishing marginal utility of man as such, to the fact that millions of people find themselves idle and useless, often in their very prime of youth.

Agricultural transformation has always been conceived as motivation for employment that comes through transformation in the agricultural sector. This will require the transformation of the dwindling fortune and state of stagnation to acquire a multifaceted growth. This can be achieved through agricultural technology and innovations on a wide scale to realize the objective of self-sufficiency through technological breakthrough and making agriculture a priority in national discuss.

Rural Industrialization is alternative for those who were not absorbed through expected reforms in agricultural sector. With the prevailing fragmentation of holding, as agriculture begin to absorb a diminishing proportion of rising population, rural industry or city job for modern industries as alternative to absorb the unemployed. The fact remains that modern industries are great employers while agriculture and small-scale industries as machines dominate in the work process.

The non-farm employment is situated between agriculture and rural industries as a stop-gap trend in resource use, congestion, breakdown of city life and growth of crime and violence. To restrain large-scale migration to cities, herein lies the need to create and provide non-farm employment in rural and semi-rural areas through massive public work program through construction of durable community assets, infrastructure facilities for rural development.

Social Continuum requires putting agriculture and rural development at the core of public policy that is aimed at creating employment and alleviating poverty. Another way to achieve this is through urban development and industrial policy. These ideas are to ensure their capacity to create employments, that are able to produce goods and services that benefit the larger strata of the population rather than a small segment of the middleclass. Socially, it requires a shift in the present duality of city and countryside to shift and make a continuum in which agricultural innovations, including livestock, horticultural development can regenerate in the village, small scale and medium scale are located in towns, while large scale industries requiring heavy investment, technical efficiency should be located in urban areas.

The above approach will produce a fusion between industry and agriculture and further this will usher in an intermediate link in the continuum producing –rural social structure in towns, urban amenities in the village will develop, the approach will bring the best tradition of both rural and urban life capable of producing a composite and integrated culture.

There is also the issue of educational policy. Altering the economic basis of rural urban relationship cannot usher in a just social order. We strongly need to alter the cultural underpinning of the present dominance and disparity as currently embedded in certain regions. Another significant aspect of this duality of life style and living standards which are common in most poor developing countries is the nature of the educational system whose aim is to produce some colonial type gentlemen, who are disoriented from the larger society and constituting a class apart. Many decades after independence, the elite syndrome still persist in our society; so, education, far more than property or income, is the basis of privilege in any society. Meanwhile, majority of the population continue to remain illiterate and unskilled as the rank of highly educated people in the urban areas keep increasing. Emphasis on basic education must be strengthened because expansion of literacy and primary education produces very rich and rapid dividends.

Participation and Involvement: The idea of participation is linked with a model for social and economic justice. This is why the norms of minima and maxima are not mere economic formulation but part of certain conception of a good and desirable life. This goes to say that not only for a person to be entitled to a minimum level of living but he should be able to participate actively in the entire cycle. The suggested model of participation here goes beyond simple political reforms. Moderately, it should reflect a number of sectors- as relate economic organization and its governance, the nature of education, location, work and enterprise, choice of technology etc. Rural development participation is conceived to consist in evolving institutional structures from which diverse individuals get a sense of dignity and self-respect, such that they can determine their own destinies. This conception flows from the fact that poverty and

inequality are themselves reflections not just prevailing relations of production but rather of structures and values that deny dignity to the human person.

With regard to occupational diversification, the main challenge is to protect natural resources, especially land and water, from industrial pollutants while also ensuring that non-farm employment is available locally to those groups that need it most, especially the poor and vulnerable. Small-scale and household enterprises who employ the poor, find it most difficult to comply with environmental regulations that are not tailored to the size of their operations and capital (Hoang, et al., 2005).

The challenges outlined above can have long-term consequences in Africa and Asia, and their management is likely to become more urgent in the foreseeable future. Whether they will be addressed in ways that support development that is environmentally, socially and economically sustainable will depend largely on developing modes of local governance that are inclusive, accountable, effective and supported by national governments.

References

- Bah, M., S. Cisse, D., Bitrina, D., Dialo, G., Lerise, F., Okali, D., Okpara, E., Olawoye, J., and Tacoli, C., (2003). Changing Rural-Urban Linkages in Mali, Nigeria and Tanzania. *Environment and Urbanization* vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 13-24.
- Baumann, P., and Sinha, S. (2001). "Linking Development with Democratic Process in India: Political Capital and Sustainable Livelihoods Analysis". London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Bebington, A., (1999). "Capital and capabilities: A Framework for Analyzing Peasant Viability, Rural Livelihoods and Poverty," *World Development*, 27(12): 2021 – 2044.
- Byerlee, D., Diao, X., and Jackson, C. (2005). Agriculture, Rural Development, and Pro-Poor Growth, Countries Experiences in the Post-Reform Era. Washington D.C: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- Carney, D. (1998). "Implementing the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach," Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What Contribution Can We Make? Carney, D. (ed.), Department for International Development, London.
- Castle, E. N. (1998). "A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Rural Places" *American Journal of Agriculture Economics*, 80, 621 -631.
- Chambers, R. & Conway, G.R. (1992). "Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century." IDS Discussion Paper 296. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, United Kingdom.
- CIA, (2006). *The World Factbook*. Washington DC: Central Intelligence Agency,
- De Janvry, A. (2003). "Achieving Success in Rural Development: Tools and Approaches for Implementation of an Integral Approach." Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

- Department for International Development (DFID). (1999). "Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets." <http://www.enonline.net/pool/files/ife/section2.pdf>. Accessed on 4th July, 2020.
- Douglass, M. (2002). *The Urban Transition in Vietnam*. UNHCS, Fukuoka, Japan; Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Hawaii: Manoa, Honolulu, 119.
- Ellis, F. (2000). *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farrington, J., D. Carney, C. Ashley, and C. Turton. (1999). "Sustainable Livelihoods In Practice: Early Applications of Concepts in Rural Areas," 52 *Rural Wealth Creation: Concepts, Strategies and Measures / ERR-131 Economic Research Service/USDA Natural Resource Perspectives 42*. Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Flora, C.B., & Flora, J.L.(2004). *Rural Communities: Legacy and Change*. Second edition. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Green, G., & A. Haines, A.(2002). *Asset Building and Community Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoang, X., N. Dang and C. Tacoli (2005). *Livelihood Diversification and Rural-Urban Linkages In Vietnam's Red River Delta*. Rural-Urban Working Paper No. 11, IIED: London
- Hoang, X. T., Dinh, T.T.P & Nguyen, T.H. (2008). *Urbanization, Fruit Production and Rural Livelihood Transformations in the Mekong Delta*. Rural-Urban Interactions Working Paper No.14, IIED: London.
- Kirkby, R., Bradbury, I. & Shen, G (2000). *Small Town China: Governance, Economy, Environment and Lifestyle in Three Zhen*. Dartmouth: Aldershot.
- Kothari, R. (1982). *Rural Development: Issues and Perspective*. In Mehta, D. R.& Batra, S.K. (Eds). *Administration for Rural Development*. Jaipur, India: Centre for Administrative Change.
- Kretzmann, J., & McKnight, J.(1993). *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing Community Assets*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.
- Krüger, F. (1998). Taking Advantage of Rural Assets as a Coping Strategy for the Urban Poor: The Case of Rural-Urban Interrelations in Botswana, *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 119-134.
- Micet, M. (2019). *Rural Urban Public Space: Development Issues*. www.fao.org. Accessed on 23rd July, 2020.
- Mielink, O. and Goldemberg, J. (2001). *Foreign Direct Investment and Decoupling Between Energy and Gross Domestic Product in Developing Countries*. International Energy Initiative/ Instituto de Eletrotécnica e Energia, University of Sao Paulo.
- Mukherjee, A. & Zhang, X. (2007). *Rural Industrialization in China and India: Role of Policies and Institutions*. *World Development*, Vol. 35, No. 10, pp. 1621-1634.

- Okali, D., Okpara, E. & Olawoye, J. (2001). The Case of Aba and its Region, Southeastern Nigeria. Rural Urban Working Paper, No. 4, IIED: London.
- Obinozie, S. A. (1999) The Rural Development Problems Revisited: Some lessons from China. Paper Presented at the National Seminar on Innovative Approach to Development Theory. Ibadan NISER.
- Osawe, Anthony Ikhide (2017). Land Tenure and Sustainable Rural Livelihood. *Journal of Environmental Studies*, Vol. 2, No2, December, pp. 77 – 90.
- Pedersen, P. O. (2000). Busy work or real business: Revaluing the role of non-agricultural activities in African rural development. ASC Working Paper, No. 46, Africa Studies Centre: Leiden.
- Pender, J., Ehui, S. & Place, F. eds. (2006). “Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses,” Strategies for Sustainable Land Management in the East African Highlands. Washington D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Pender, J., Marré, A. & Reeder, R. (2012). Rural Wealth Creation Concepts, Strategies, and Measures. Economic Research Service, Economic Research Report Number 131, March.
- Ratner, S. 2010. “Formulating a Sustainable Economic Development Process for Rural America: Second Interim Report.” Yellow Wood Associates, St. Albans, VT. <http://www.yellowwood.org/wealthcreation.aspx>. Accessed on 6th August, 2019.
- Rau, S. K. (1981). Strategies of Rural Development. Rural Development in India some Facets. Revised Edition; National Institute of Rural Development Rajendranagar, Hyderabad-500 030.
- Reimer, B. (2006). “The Rural Context of Community Development in Canada,” *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 1(2): 155-175.
- Rigg, J. (2003). Evolving Rural-Urban Relations and Livelihoods. In Chia, L.S. ed. *Southeast Asia Transformed: A Geography of Change*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, pp. 231-256.
- Scoones, I. (2009). Livelihoods Perspectives and Rural Development. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(1), 171–96.
- Scoones, I. (1998). “Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis.” IDS Working Paper 72, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, United Kingdom.
- Sen, A. (1981). Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Serageldin, M. (2005). Migratory Flows, Poverty and Social Inclusion in Latin America. In Nabeel H. ed. *Urban Futures: Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction*. Rugby: ITDG Publishing, pp. 89-108.

- Tacoli, C., McGranahan, G. & Satterthwaite, D. (2007). Urbanization, Poverty and Inequity: Is Rural-Urban Migration a Poverty Problem, or Part of the Solution? Background paper for the UNFPA's State of the World Population 2007. International Institute for Environment and Development: London.
- Tacoli, C. (2011). Links Between Rural and Urban Development in Africa and Asia. International Institute for Environment and Development, United Kingdom. In United Nations Population Distribution, Urbanization, Internal Migration and Development: An International Perspective. Economic and Social Division
- Tiffen, M. (2003). Transitions in Sub-Saharan Africa: Agriculture, Urbanization and Income. *World Development*, Vol. 31, No. 8, pp. 1343-1366.
- Webster, D. & Muller, L. (2002). *Challenges of Peri-urbanization in the Lower Yangtze Region: The Case of the Hangzhou-Ningbo Corridor*. Asia/Pacific Research Center, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Wilkins, G. (2002). Technological Transfer for Renewable Energy; Overcoming Barriers in Developing Countries. Royal Institute of International Affairs, Sustainable Development Program. London: Earthscan Publications Limited.
- World Bank (1975). Rural Development-Sector Policy Paper. Washington D.C. IBED.
- World Bank (2007). *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (1996). *Rural Energy and Development: Improving Energy Supplies for Two Billion People*. Vice Presidency for Finance and Private Sector Development, Industry & Energy Department. Washington D.C. The World Bank.

Osawe, Anthony Ikhide has a background in international development activities as a participatory training and institutional development expert, having worked with IRED-Anglophone West Africa, DFID/CBDD, Africare and EU-MPP6 and 9 in the Niger Delta States. He is currently a lecturer in Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma teaching and researching in the following areas: Management of Strategic Resources, Comparative Development Studies, Internal Defense and Security management, Strategic planning, Land Resources Evaluation, Political Geography and Geopolitics as well as Environmental Resource Management.