



## What do urban dwellers and people with dual residence do in rural areas of Tanzania?

Mwabless Malila<sup>1</sup>  
Nsajigwa Mwalupani<sup>2</sup>  
Fredrick Mfinanga<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>3\*</sup>fredrickmfinanga@gmail.com

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Institute of Rural Development Planning (IRDP), Tanzania

<https://doi.org/10.51867/scimundi.5.2.15>

### ABSTRACT

This study intended to examine the activities of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence when they return to rural villages. The theories underpinning this study are Everett Lee's Theory of Migration, Duncan's Theory on Population Mobility and the Push and Pull Theory of Migration. A cross-sectional research design was employed targeting smallholder farmers. Purposive sampling techniques were used to select the study area and key informants. The study involved 394 smallholder farmers systematically selected after establishing their sampling frame. Primary data were gathered from smallholder farmers and key informants through interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs), while secondary data were collected from library documents and websites. For the formal survey, primary data collection relied on structured interviews and FGDs. The collected primary data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics v.25. Descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions and percentages, were used to summarise the data. Qualitative data from FGDs were analysed thematically. The study found that urban dwellers and people with dual residence acquire large tracts of land for commercial farming when visiting rural areas. The emergence of tea estates, avocado orchards, and timber plantations in the Njombe and Iringa regions reflects significant investments by these groups. The study concludes that urban dwellers and people with dual residences primarily invest in commercial agriculture when returning to rural villages. Their presence brings both benefits and challenges to local smallholder farmers. The study recommends that stakeholders design and implement integrated rural development projects, recognising the interdependence of factors affecting rural communities, as urban dwellers and people with dual residence significantly drive agricultural transformation. This phenomenon should be encouraged, with appropriate regulations, to enhance employment opportunities and facilitate the transfer of new technologies. Given the positive contributions of these groups, policymakers should develop initiatives that leverage their expertise and experience to benefit rural areas.

**Keywords:** Dual Residence, Rural Areas, Urban Dwellers, Tanzania

### I. INTRODUCTION

According to Cambridge English dictionary farmland is a land that is used for or suitable for farming purposes. Land grabbing refers to the large-scale acquisition of land through buying or leasing of large pieces of land by domestic, companies, governments, and individuals such that it affects land that had previously been used communally by smallholder farmers (Gilbert, 2017). In the Oxford learners dictionary land grabbing is defined as the act of buying or taking land illegally or in a way that it is considered morally wrong and affecting the small-scale farming communities. In Tanzania and Kenya land grabs often occur against the will of existing inhabitants, that corruption is rife, and local socioeconomic divisions increase after land grab takes place (Greco, 2015).

Urban dwellers back to the villages refers to the movement of people from urban areas to their hometowns or neighbouring small villages. It occurs due to urban inhabitants' desire to get back in touch with nature since they frequently experience higher levels of noise and air pollution, frequent crimes, as well as emerging need to increase an income. It is something like urban-to-rural "migration" due to the yearning circumstances among urban dwellers. People with dual residence are the people who maintain residences in two separate areas (Urban and rural) often for reasons tied to employment, family obligations, or lifestyle preferences, residents split their time between urban and rural areas depending on the season, job opportunities, or personal preferences (Rapsomanikis, 2015). According to Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) (2023b) smallholders are the pastoralists, forest guardians, fishermen, and small-scale farmers who oversee lands ranging from less than one hectare to ten hectares. Having family-centred goals, including supporting the farm home system's stability, utilising family labour primarily for production, and reserving a portion of the products for family consumption.

People's movement termed as migration is coded in our genes; people have always been moving around from rural areas to urban areas from mountains to low land areas and from low land areas to mountains, from unpeaceful areas to peaceful areas. The out of Africa theory postulates that Homo sapiens migrated to the rest of the world around



70,000 years ago in search of food and a better life (Adult Education University, 2017). Major reasons for migration being search for employment opportunities, adequate on-farm, and off-farm incomes, quality education, and better health care facilities. According to Martins (2018) contrary to the prevailing trend of people leaving rural areas for the city, some places in Portugal experienced something different: in-migration of skilled workers who bring new types of social interaction and organization, new forms of Social-Ecological Systems (SES) relationships, and new opportunities to create value thanks to the inflow of new ideas, knowledge, and skills. The same rural-urban movement of people is experienced in many parts of Africa; however, we are questioning what they bring in whether is beneficial to the rural smallholder farmers or not. Contemporary research on in-migration to rural areas – simply put people moving from the city to the country - suggests that the demand is increasing and largely motivated by opportunities created by ecosystem services. This is particularly relevant since it represents an important shift from previous patterns of out-migration of rural communities, with consequent abandonment of natural and cultural values (Martins, 2018).

Rural areas that witness the arrival of skilled in-migration movements have experienced the emergence of new types and forms of social interaction and organization, new forms of socio-ecological systems (SES) relationships, and potential opportunities to create value thanks to the inflow of new ideas, knowledge, and skills (Martins, 2018; Urso, 2021). Regions like Iringa, Morogoro, and Njombe experience the arrival of urban dwellers and people with dual residence whose main business is timber and avocado production, beekeeping, animal rearing, and poultry production (Mwalupani et al. 2025). However, it is not clear that the phenomenon results in the creation of new forms of social interaction, bringing to the rural areas new ideas and innovations, knowledge, and skills of sustainably tapping available resources to improve the living.

Research developed at the University of Lisbon has been looking into the consequences of SES with the arrival of skilled in-migrants to Portuguese rural areas. The empirical data collected by interviewing skilled in-migrants and analysing their projects has informed the role and importance of ecosystem services, and their contribution to the establishment and consolidation of socio-ecological systems (Martins, 2018). Results show that skilled in-migrants change their lifestyle and the relationship they establish with the ecological system. They have been promoting new products, interaction among the members of the community through cultural events, and new services, such as new schools and local associations. They are also responsible for an increasing diversity of activities and products in rural areas that contribute to new dynamics in local businesses, and its marketing in external local networks. These networks contribute to the reinforcement of synergies in urban-rural spaces establishing new relationships and dynamics, like an increase of urban visitors to rural communities, through new demands on rural initiatives, or through new services, like the direct delivery of fresh agricultural products to urban dwellers (Martins, 2018). Do we experience the same in Tanzania or our rural smallholders are increasingly suffering from a shortage of arable and grazing land? In-migrants in their destination points in rural areas tend to emphasize obstacles created by local mindsets and feelings of distrust within existing local communities, who are suspicious of the skilled in-migrants. This fact may create difficulties in establishing new learning processes, which are essential to enable sustainable transitions in SES (Martins, 2018).

Rural-urban, urban dwellers and people with dual residence back to villages with varying magnitude have been common phenomena in Africa including Tanzania and the reasons for the situation are obvious. People especially youth from many villages have been migrating to urban areas, the adults and old people have been migrating to rural areas for different reasons as well (The United Republic of Tanzania (URT), 2015). The move to the villages is mainly for settlement at retirement age or for investment in agriculture to earn an income Both rural-urban and urban-rural movements of people for different reasons have effects on the destination points and places of origin.

In recent years there has been a wave of urban dwellers and people with dual residence going back to villages (home villages and non-home villages) to acquire land for agricultural activities. It is quite evident that today some urban dwellers are having dual residences, one hand working in formal employment or non-farm business operation in urban areas and the hand working in agriculture in rural areas (Mwalupani et al. 2025). Rural areas of Njombe and Iringa do experience inflow of individuals and companies from urban areas investing in agriculture. In Iringa region heavy investments and its related repercussions are experienced in Mufindi district especially in Mapanda and Kibengu wards, while in Njombe region the issue is more pronounced in Njombe Town Council especially in Ihanga ward. The question of interest is how back-to-villages of the urban dwellers and people with dual residences affect smallholder farmers' access to the farmland. How does the phenomenon affect the farming of smallholders in rural areas? What kind of farming do urban dwellers and people with dual residence get engaged with? Does the phenomenon have anything to do with land resource base conflicts?

Regarding rural-urban migration, if the truth is told, cities are polluted, towns and municipalities are experiencing not enough drinking water, life is very mechanical, trust and feelings are absent and there is a lack of social cohesion (International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 2014). What about urban dwellers and people with dual residence going back to villages? Does this have any repercussions on smallholder farmers' access to land? What do the urban dwellers or people with dual residence do in the rural areas? Africa's rural areas are transforming deeply and quickly, due to several factors including increasing rural-urban linkages through improved communication, periodic

rural open markets, and urban dwellers back to villages. The conducted study therefore, intended to assess how urban dwellers and people with dual residence back to villages affect smallholder farmers’ formal and informal access to land for farming and grazing.

If the study would have not conducted to generate evidence-based recommendations on the effect of urban dwellers and people with dual residence back to villages on rural smallholder farmers’ access to land, land use planners and decision-making practitioners would have remained uninformed and victims of the phenomenon continue suffering for the same. Since the study used rigorous approaches in data collection and analysis to come up with useful policy informing recommendations for land resource management, the study highlights some benefits and challenges created by the urban dwellers back to the villages.

The study generally intended to assess the effect of urban dwellers and people with dual residence back to the villages on smallholder farmers’ access to land for farming and grazing. Specifically, the study intended to identify what do the urban dwellers and people with dual residence going back to the villages do in the rural areas, determine what urban dwellers and people with dual residence going back to the villages bring to the rural areas, and examine the link between what urban dwellers and people with dual residence do in rural areas and smallholder farmers’ access to farmland. The generated finding on the benefits and challenges of linkages between urban dwellers and people with dual residence back to villages and the smallholder farmers access to farmland are useful to policy and decision makers, development planners, land officers, village councils, advocates, and smallholder farmers. The study was done in Njombe TC and Mufindi DC generating important information what do the urban dwellers and people with dual residence do in the rural areas? What urban dwellers and people with dual residence bring to rural areas and the link between what urban dwellers and people with dual residence do to villages and the smallholder farmers’ access to farmland.

**1.1 Research Objective(s)**

The study intended to examine the activities of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence when they return to rural villages. The study therefore, focused examining what do the urban dwellers and people with dual residence do in the rural areas, and what such people bring to rural areas.

**II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.1 Theoretical Review**

This subsection presents the reviewed theories related to movement of people from one area to another and the associated effects as follows:

**2.1.1 Everett Lee’s Theory of Migration**

Everett Lee in his Theory of Migration divides the factors that determine the decision to migrate and the process of migration into four categories: Factors associated with the area of origin; these are the push factors that motivate people to leave their place of origin for the outside area. The pull factors are the attractive forces around destination to which the proportion of “selectivity” migrants is high. Intervening obstacles like distance and transportation which increase migrant selectivity of the area of destination. These obstacles have been lessened in modern times with technological advancement. Lee also refers to the cost of movements, ethnic barriers, and personal factors as intervening obstacles to migration. Lastly, are personal factors which the decision to migrate from the place of origin to the place of destination depends. In fact, it is an individual’s perception of the ‘pull and push forces’ which influence actual migration. Lee categorizes these forces into “pluses” and “minuses” respectively. In other words, pluses are the pull factors and minuses are the push factors. In between them are “zeros” which balance the competing forces. The factors that determine the decision to migrate and the process of migration are explained in Fig. 1, where the first circle represents the area of origin and the second circle the area of destination. The sign pluses represent the forces that attract people to a place (pull factors) and the minuses represent the forces that push people from the area. Zeros represent the indifference of the people towards migration. In between these forces are the intervening obstacles (Divisha, 2021a; Blazhevskva, 2017).



**Figure 1**  
*Origin and Destination Factors for Migration*



According to Lee, personal factors such as age, sex, income, race, and education along with the pull-push factors and intervening obstacles determine migration of any type. Furthermore, there are sequential migrants such as children and wives of migrants who have little role in the decision to migrate.

### 2.1.2 Duncan's Theory on Population Mobility

This theory is the combination of microscopic and macroscopic active forces in the process of migration. According to Duncan, whatever effects are created by changes in the structural factors of the country, the same effects are caused by migration. Thus, for achieving many structural aims, migration is the functional alternative to social change (Divisha, 2021a). Major factors responsible for migration of any form include; Economic and Technical causes which relate to the changes occurring in the technique of production, methods and structure of agricultural operations, market structure, price situation, specialisation, production, and in relative changes in the wage level, etc. Social Causes which refer to the development of institutional structure, policies regarding public land and production, development of transport and communication systems, population growth, increase in knowledge and its expansion, class conflicts and competition, disarrangement coming in social degradation and structure of administration, changing needs of maintenance of the family, etc. Personal Causes include unsatisfied needs, an increase in the intelligence of persons and expanding horizon of knowledge, health, emotions of alienation, views regarding neighbours, imagination power, nature, emotions, etc. Natural Causes which pertain to the environment and atmosphere, frequent existence of diseases, floods, earthquakes, droughts, malaria, hookworm, seasonal changes, land erosion, etc. Other Causes may include some miscellaneous causes that affect migration, these are aspects like labour problems, strikes, riots, increase in real wealth, search for new means or ending up of the supply of old resources, etc.

### 2.1.3 The Push and Pull Theory of Migration

Push factors encourage people to leave their points of origin and settle elsewhere, while pull factors attract migrants to new areas. For example, high unemployment is a common push factor, while an abundance of jobs is an effective pull factor. The theory is real and works in Tanzania as in the study area as well, people do move in and out for some reasons.

## 2.2 Empirical Review

### 2.2.1 Description of Key Concepts

People with dual residence are the people who maintain residences in two separate areas (Urban and rural) often for reasons tied to employment, family obligations, or lifestyle preferences, residents split their time between urban and rural areas depending on the season, job opportunities, or personal preferences (Rapsomanikis, 2015). According to FAO (2023c) Smallholders farmers are the pastoralists, forest guardians, fishermen, and small-scale farmers who oversee lands ranging from less than one hectare to ten hectares. Having family-centred goals, including supporting the farm home system's stability, utilising family labour primarily for production, and reserving a portion of the products for family consumption. Urban dwellers back to the villages refers to the movement of people from urban areas back to their hometowns or neighbouring small villages. It occurs due to urban inhabitants' desire to get back in touch with nature since they frequently experience higher levels of noise and air pollution, frequent crimes, as well as emerging need to increase an income. It is something like urban-to-rural "migration" due to the yearning circumstances among urban dwellers.

### 2.2.2 Effects of Migration

Internal migration affects the place from where people migrate and the place to which they migrate. When the migrants move from rural to urban areas, they have both positive and negative effects on the society and economy. Effects of rural-urban migration on rural areas (places of origin).

*Economic Effects:* When the population migrates from rural areas, it reduces the pressure of population on land, the per-worker output and productivity on land increases and so does per capita income. Thus, family income rises which encourages farmers to adopt better means of production thereby increasing farm produce. Those who migrate to urban areas are mostly in the age group of 18-40 years. They live alone, work and earn and remit their savings to their homes in villages. Such remittances further increase rural incomes which are utilised to make improvements on farms that further raise their incomes. This particularly happens in the case of emigrants to foreign countries who remit large sums at home.

Moreover, when these migrants return to their villages occasionally, they try to raise the consumption and living standards by bringing new ideas and goods to their homes. Modern household gadgets and other products like mobile phones, TV sets, refrigerators, solar power devices, electricity generators, water pumps, new food storage technologies, computer and motorcycles have entered most rural areas in which larger remittances flow from urban areas. Further, with the migration of working-age persons to urban areas, the number of farmworkers is reduced. This leads to the



employment of underemployed family members on the farm such as women, older persons and even juveniles. Further, out-migration widens inequalities of income and wealth in rural area families which receive large remittances and their incomes rise. They make improvements on their farms which raise productivity and production. These further increase their incomes. Some even buy other farmlands. Thus, such families become richer as compared to others, thereby widening inequalities.

*Demographic Effects:* Migration reduces population growth in rural areas. Separation from wives for long periods and the use of contraceptives help control population growth. When very young males migrate to urban areas, they are so influenced by urban life that they do not like to marry at an early age. Their aim being to earn more, settle in any vocation or job and then marry. Living in urban areas makes the migrants' health conscious. Consequently, they emphasise the importance of health care and cleanliness which reduces fertility and mortality rates.

*Social Effects:* Migration also affects the social setup of rural communities. It weakens the joint family system if the migrants settle permanently in urban areas. With the intermingling of the migrants with people of different castes and regions in cities, they bring new values and attitudes which gradually change old values and customs of rurality. Women play a greater role in the social setup of the rural life with men having migrated to towns. Effects of rural-urban migration on Urban Areas (Destination places)

*Demographic Effects:* Migration increases the population of the working class in urban areas. But most migrants are young men between the ages of 15 to 24 years who are unwedded. Others above this age group come alone leaving their families at home. This tendency keeps fertility at a lower level than in rural areas. Even those who settle permanently with their spouses favour a small number of children due to the high costs of rearing them. The other factor responsible for the low fertility rate is the availability of better medical and family planning facilities in urban areas.

*Economic Effects:* The effects of migration on income and employment in urban areas are varied depending on the type of migrants. Usually, the migrants are unskilled and find jobs as street hawkers, shoeshine boys, carpenters, masons, tailors, rickshaw pullers, cooks, and other tradesmen. These are "informal sector" activities which are low paying. But, according to the ILO, the evidence suggests that the bulk of employment in the informal sector is economically efficient and profit-making. Thus, such migrants earn enough to spend and remit to their homes. Other migrants who are educated up to the secondary education level find jobs as shop helpers, assistants, taxi drivers, repairing machines and consumer durables, marketing goods and in other informal activities that are small in scale, labour intensive and unregulated. Their earnings are sufficient to bring them into the category of a common urbanite with an income level higher than the unskilled workers. Another class of migrants that is very small is those who come for higher education in colleges and institutes in towns. They find a good job in the "formal sector", get good salaries, and follow a good standard of living. These are the persons who remit large sums to their homes and help in modernising the rural scenario.

### 2.2.3 Economic Importance of Migration

Bruin et al. (2021) discusses and reports on the economic importance of migration which include: Returning migrants may spread health-related knowledge and good practices through the high-quality training they received overseas. Brain gain can be achieved through the return of individuals who gained skills abroad through temporary migration. Migrants may introduce new practices, procedures, and medical training. Migrants may also establish health facilities, such as clinics and hospitals, with the proceeds of their stay overseas. Indeed, for instance in Nigeria, many medical doctors who departed from Nigeria in the 1970s and 1980s have come back to set up their own facilities upon their return to the country. Migration helps to reduce the pressure on social amenities within one geographical region. Migration helps to promote cultural integrity. It creates a wide range of the market and aids in the supply of labour. It helps to reduce pressure on the limited agricultural lands, and migration also tend to ensure the flow of capital.

### 2.2.4 Reasons for Migration

Push factors are the main reasons why people leave an area. These may include; lack of services, lack of safety, high crime, crop failure, drought, flooding, poverty, and war. Pull factors are the reasons why people move to a particular area, these include; higher employment, more wealth, better services, good climate, safer life, less crime, political stability, more fertile land, and lower risk from natural hazards. Migration usually happens because of a combination of push and pull factors (Bruin et al., 2021). People migrate from point of origin to point of destination especially from rural to urban to improve their standard of living, natural disaster or civil disturbance, this type of migrant is described as a refugee, however, refugees do not carry many possessions with them and do not have a clear idea of where they may finally settle. Environmental factors result in large population movements in situations of famine or some other major environmental disasters, rural populations may be forced to move to urban areas in search of food and employment or other means of livelihood. To escape from the religious, political, or social situation in a country, in this case, the migrant seeking refuge from political, religious, or other forms of persecution is usually described as an asylum seeker. People also migrate to the city for an educational reason and to also acquire new skills. Favourable climates are another



factor that triggers people to migrate. For the sake of differences in social amenities, and for the sake of change and adventure.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Study Area

The study was funded by the Institute of Rural Development Planning, and it was conducted in Njombe and Iringa regions, Njombe TC and Mufindi DC respectively that have the potential for timber and avocado production (tree planting) and economic avenues attracting several urban dwellers to get engaged while maintaining their living in urban areas.

#### 3.2 Research Design

The study mainly adopted a non-experimental research design (cross-sectional or correlational research design). This design was adopted because it allows the collection of data from different participants at one point in time (Bryman, 2016). Because the study is descriptive in nature, therefore, a proper research design is cross-sectional. The cross-sectional research design has a greater degree of accuracy and precision in social science studies like this one than other designs like participatory observation or case studies. Compared to other research designs the cross-sectional approach provides findings a-gently, thus, helping researchers to get quick results for the studied issues.

#### 3.3 Study Population and Sampling Procedures

The target study population was smallholder farmers in rural areas; therefore, the sampling frame consisted of village smallholder farmers. There are two major groups of sampling methods namely probability and non-probability sampling methods. Purposive sampling techniques was used to obtain study regions, Districts, wards, Villages, and key informants. Smallholder farmers were selected systematically after establishing their sampling frame.

**Table 1**

*Number and Sampled Households of Smallholder Farmers*

SN	Village	Number of households	Number of sampled households
1	Ihanga	580	85
2	Itipula	392	79
3	Mgala	145	58
4	Mapanda	611	86
5	Kibengu	658	87
6	Igeleke	389	80
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2775</b>	<b>494</b>

#### 3.4. Unit of Analysis and Sample Size

The unit of analysis was individual rural smallholder farmers who provided data on incidences of urban dwellers and people with dual residence going back to the villages, what they do, what they bring to the villages and the experienced effect of such a phenomenon on smallholder farmers' access to farmland. The sample size of the study participants was determined during the pilot study after establishing the sampling frame. In the process of doing that Yamane (1967) formula was used to estimate the sample size. The formula states that  $n = N / [1 + N (e)^2]$  where:  $n$  = Sample size estimate,  $N$  = Size of study population or sampling frame (2775 households) and  $e$  = error of the sample size estimate (0.1). The results for sample size estimation using the provided number of households for each of the sampled villages are presented in Table 1.

#### 3.5 Data Types, Sources and Collection Methods

Data about the effect of urban dwellers and people with dual residence going back-to-villages on smallholder farmers' access to farmland were of paramount importance in this study. Current challenges faced by smallholder farmers because of urban dwellers and people with dual residence going back to villages to acquire land for agricultural activities. Both primary and secondary data were used in this study. Primary data were collected from rural smallholder farmers, VEOs, and WEOs. Secondary data were abstracted from accessed documents from IRDP library and Websites.

#### 3.6 Data Collection Methods

Principal researchers were assisted by nine trained graduates to collect primary data using various participatory and non-participatory tools as well as an abstraction for secondary data. A reconnaissance survey (pilot study) was done to get a general picture of the study area and the reaction of respondents to the study. The main activities during the reconnaissance survey included introducing the team, testing the tools, making appointments, and meeting with WEOs,



VEOs and other village leaders. A formal survey was conducted to pursue major issues in relation to data collection. Two questionnaires containing both open-ended and closed-ended questions were used in the survey. The first one was administered to key informants and the second one to rural smallholder farmers. Primary data were also collected through Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with wards' land and housing Committee members. Thus, the methods used were appropriate for collecting facts about the current prevailing practices or behaviours hence, preferred by most social science researchers. Secondary data were collected by abstraction from various accessed documents from IRDP library and websites.

### 3.7 Data Processing and Analysis

Collected primary data were processed and verified prior to analysis using IBM-SPSS Statistics v.25 computer software. The data processing exercise included checking up the filled-in data in the questionnaires, preparing the codebook and template for data entry, entering the data from the checked and edited questionnaires, cleaning, and verification of the entered data prior to analysis at different levels. The processed and cleaned data were analysed using IBM-SPSS Statistics v.25 computer software. For univariate analysis, descriptive statistics were been used to capture distributions (Frequencies and %) as well as sample means, mode, median, range, and standard deviation for the studied categorical and numeric variables. For bivariate analysis, cross-tabulation was applied to capture association between study variables of interest depending on the need of the specific objectives and the nature of the processed data being categorical. The analysis of qualitative data from FGD mainly were thematic and content-functional. Analysed data at different levels have been presented in Tables and Figures of different forms.

## IV. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Respondents' Characteristics

The demographic behaviours and socioeconomic characteristics of respondents were a key focus of this study. This section presents the profiles of the demographic and socioeconomic attributes of respondents from six villages who participated in the study. Data on these variables were collected through in-person questionnaires administered to eligible smallholder farmers (household heads) aged 18 years and older, encompassing both men and women. The characteristics examined included location, sex, age, marital status, education level, household size, and primary sources of income.

**Table 2**

*Distribution of respondents by Districts, Wards, and Villages*

<b>Districts</b>			
	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
Njombe TC	117 (23.7)	124 (25.1)	241(48.8) *
Mufindi	152 (30.8)	101 (20.4)	253 (51.2)
<b>Total</b>	<b>269 (54.5)</b>	<b>225 (45.5)</b>	<b>494(100.0)</b>
<b>Wards</b>			
Ihanga	117 (23.7)	124 (25.1)	241 (48.8)
Mapanda	43 (8.7)	34 (6.9)	77 (15.6)
Kibengu	109 (22.1)	67 (13.6)	176 (35.6)
<b>Total</b>	<b>109 (54.9)</b>	<b>67 (45.5)</b>	<b>176 (100)</b>
<b>Villages</b>			
Ihanga	51(10.3)	37 (7.5)	88 (17.8)
Itipula	31(6.3)	53 (10.7)	84 (17.0)
Mgala	35 (7.1)	34 (6.9)	69 (14.0)
Mapanda	50 (10.1)	36 (7.3)	86 (17.4)
Kibengu	56 (11.3)	31(6.3)	87 (17.6)
Igeleke	46 (9.3)	34 (6.9)	80 (16.2)
<b>Total</b>	<b>269 (54.5)</b>	<b>225 (45.5)</b>	<b>494(100.0)</b>

The analysed demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of respondents such as age, marital status, education level, and economic status provide the foundation for understanding their responses regarding the movements of urban dwellers, the activities of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence in rural areas, and the resulting impact on land accessibility for smallholder farmers. Table 2 presents the distribution of respondents by location (district, ward, and village) and sex. Location-wise, 48.8% of the respondents were from Njombe Town Council (TC), predominantly from Ihanga Ward, while 51.2% were from Mufindi District Council (DC), mostly from Kibegu Ward. Of the 494 respondents, 54.5% were male and 45.5% were female. This gender distribution underscores the importance



of addressing gender dynamics in smallholder farming and highlights the need for gender responsive policies and interventions. However, the distribution by sex and location showed no significant variation.

Further analysis of respondents' marital status and education levels (Table 3) revealed that a significant proportion 78.7% were married, while 73.1% had completed formal primary education. This suggests that family dynamics and responsibilities play a key role in shaping smallholder farming and resource management. It also indicates that the participants were sufficiently mature to provide reliable and realistic information. Conversely, only 17% of respondents were single, highlighting marital status as a critical factor influencing farming practices and land access strategies among smallholder farmers.

**Table 3**

*Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status and Education Levels*

<b>Marital status</b>		
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Single	88	17.8
Married	389	78.7
Separated	2	0.4
Divorced	5	1.0
Widowed	10	2.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Education levels</b>		
None formal education	25	5.1
Primary education	361	73.1
Secondary education Ordinary Level	82	16.6
Secondary education Advanced Level	4	0.8
College Certificate	6	1.2
College Diploma	5	1.0
Bachelor Degree	11	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Data in Table 4 indicate an average household size of 4.6 people among smallholder farmers, ranging from one to twenty-eight individuals. This finding highlights the importance of understanding household composition and size dynamics in the context of smallholder farming. It emphasizes the need for policies and interventions tailored to the challenges faced by larger households, such as limited access to resources, land fragmentation, and intra-household decision-making processes. The descriptive characteristics of the respondents offer valuable insights into the diverse demographic and socioeconomic profiles of smallholder farmers. Such understanding is critical for designing targeted interventions and policies that foster sustainable and inclusive agricultural development.

**Table 4**

*Respondents' Age, Household Size and Number Years in Formal Schooling and the Average Income Per Month*

	<b>n</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Variance</b>
Respondent's age in years	494	83.0	18.0	101.0	38.814	13.7112	187.998
Household's size	494	27	1	28	4.61	2.375	5.642
Years in formal schooling	494	16.0	0.0	16.0	7.543	2.7656	7.648
Average income per month from different sources in Tsh.	494	5432000.00	2000.00	5434000.00	256550.35	391208.51	15304410 0956.88

The survey included continuous variables such as age, with respondents ranging from 18 to 101 years. The average age was 38.5 years, with a standard deviation of 13 years. Data in Table 4 further detail that the youngest respondents were 18 years old, the oldest were 101, with a mean age of 38 years and a range of 83 years. Household sizes varied from one to 28 members, with an average of 4.6 people and a range of 27. This distribution underscores the intergenerational nature of smallholder farming in these villages, where individuals across age groups actively participate in agricultural activities. These findings highlight the need for targeted policies and support systems addressing the distinct needs and challenges faced by different age groups within rural smallholder farming communities.

The number of years of formal schooling ranged from zero for those with no education to 16 for those with the highest education level, with a mean of seven years. This suggests that most respondents had completed primary education. These findings highlight the need for targeted educational programs and initiatives to enhance the knowledge and skills of smallholder farmers, thereby improving their productivity and sustainability. Descriptive data on respondents' income from various sources show that smallholder farmers' monthly earnings ranged from a low of 2,000 TZS to a high of 5,434,000 TZS, with a mean of 256,550 TZS and a range of 5,432,000 TZS. These findings indicate significant income variation among smallholder farmers, with differences exceeding five million TZS. Respondents were asked to identify the primary sources of household income, and data in Table 5 indicate that smallholder farmers relied on multiple sources, predominantly food crop production (54.5%), timber tree planting (17.6%), non-farming activities (e.g., shops, kiosks, pombe clubs, bars, food vending, butcheries, and *boda-boda* services) (10.7%), and poultry production (10.1%). This suggests that smallholder farmers in the study area engaged in diverse income-generating activities, including casual labour in tea, pine, eucalyptus, and avocado plantations.

The results in Table 5 provide insights into the primary income sources of smallholder farmers and their implications for interactions with urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence returning to villages. Respondents were asked to rate their agreement on various income sources, and data in Table 6 show that smallholder farmers agreed (weighted mean = 4) that food crop production was their main income source. They were neutral about poultry production, fruit production, and timber tree planting, but disagreed on livestock keeping, business activities, and timber sales. Additionally, they strongly disagreed that fishing, garage work, artisanal activities, masonry, carpentry, charcoal production, and tea production were significant income sources. A study by Bhatti et al. (2021) in Malawi, titled "Diversity of Sources of Income for Smallholder Farming Communities in Malawi," offers further insights into the economic well-being of smallholder farmers, emphasizing the role of income diversification. It notes that smallholder farmers often depend on a mix of income sources, such as crop production, livestock farming, and casual labour. Similarly, Rapsomanikis (2015) highlights that income diversification helps smallholder farmers mitigate risks and enhance their economic stability.

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 2015 reported that smallholder farmers face significant barriers to diversifying their income sources, including limited access to markets, credit, and technology. Overall, the findings indicate that crop production remains the primary income source for smallholder farmers, underscoring the importance of income diversification for their economic well-being. Policymakers and stakeholders must address these challenges to enhance income diversification, support farmers' livelihoods, and improve their economic stability. Key note: SD=Strongly Disagree D=Disagree U=Undecided A=Agree SA=Strongly Agree

**Table 5**  
*Main Sources of Income*

Source of income	Responses					Weighted mean
	SD (%)	D (%)	U (%)	A (%)	SA (%)	
Food crops production (maize, beans, <i>njegere</i> , figure millet, potatoes)	18 (3.6)	19 (3.8)	6 (1.2)	182 (36.8)	269 (54.5)	4
Livestock keeping	209 (42.3)	122 (24.7)	25 (5.1)	123 (24.9)	15 (3.0)	2
Poultry production	107 (21.7)	114 (23.1)	22 (4.5)	197 (39.9)	54 (10.1)	3
Fruits production	147 (29.8)	139 (28.1)	36 (7.3)	144 (29.1)	28 (5.7)	3
Tree plantings for timber	80(16.2)	95(19.2)	20(4.0)	212(42.9)	87(17.6)	3
Fishing	295(59.7)	164(33.2)	27(5.5)	8(1.6)	-	1
Casual labour	180(36.4)	144(29.1)	22(4.5)	120(24.3)	28(5.7)	1
Shop/kiosk/pombe club/bar/food vending/butcher/ <i>Bodaboda</i>	220(44.5)	123(24.9)	17(3.4)	81(16.4)	53(10.7)	2
Timber production/selling timber/ <i>miche ya miti</i>	271(54.9)	177(35.8)	15(3.0)	22(4.5)	9(1.8)	2
Garage	314(63.6)	168(34.0)	5(1.0)	2(0.4)	5(1.0)	1
Artisanal activities	323(65.4)	160(32.4)	6(1.2)	4(0.8)	1(0.2)	1
Masonry	316(64.0)	167(33.8)	7(1.4)	2(0.4)	2(0.4)	1
Carpentry	307(62.1)	168(34.0)	7(1.4)	7(1.4)	5(1.0)	1
Salary from the government	330(66.8)	159(32.2)	5(1.0)	-	-	1
Salary from private company	330(66.8)	157(31.8)	5(1.0)	2(0.4)	-	1
Wood charcoal making	365(73.9)	121(24.5)	3(0.6)	3(0.6)	2(0.4)	1
Tea production	354(71.7)	122(24.7)	4(0.8)	2(0.4)	12(2.4)	1
Tailoring	299(60.5)	190(38.5)	3(0.6)	-	2(0.4)	1
Bee keeping	293(59.3)	196(39.7)	3(0.6)	-	2(0.4)	1

According to FAO (2023c), income is a key determinant of smallholder farmers' economic well-being and livelihoods. It not only reflects their financial status but also influences their capacity to invest in improved farming practices. The report emphasizes the importance of income diversification in enhancing resilience and improving livelihoods among smallholder farmers. Findings in Table 6 demonstrate that these farmers rely on multiple income sources. On average, their income is derived from diverse streams, highlighting their ability to leverage various economic activities. This diversification can mitigate the impact of economic shocks and strengthen overall financial stability.

Food crop production stands out as a primary income source for smallholder farmers. Beyond generating income, it enables them to enhance food security and agricultural productivity. Additionally, smallholder farmers participate in diverse business activities, such as operating shops, kiosks, pombe clubs, bars, food vending services, *Duka la Dawa Muhimu* (essential medicine shops), and *boda-boda* (motorcycle taxi) services. These entrepreneurial ventures offer supplementary income streams and bolster the local economy.

Tree planting for timber, casual labour, and beekeeping is identified as additional income sources for smallholder farmers. Although these activities may not generate substantial earnings compared to other sources, they contribute to the income diversification strategies of smallholder farmers. Notably, beekeeping, despite yielding the lowest mean income, plays a critical role in supporting pollination and ecological balance. Findings from FAO (2023a) and FAO (2023c) underscore the importance of income diversification for smallholder farmers. By diversifying their income sources, farmers can reduce vulnerability to economic shocks and improve their livelihoods. This can be achieved through non-farm activities, such as off-farm employment, small businesses, and other income-generating ventures.

To support smallholder farmers in diversifying their income sources, policymakers and stakeholders should prioritize initiatives that promote entrepreneurship, improve market access, and provide financial support. Additionally, capacity-building programs and training opportunities can equip farmers with the skills and knowledge needed to pursue alternative income-generating activities (USDA ERS, 2023). In conclusion, income diversification is a vital strategy for smallholder farmers to enhance their economic well-being and livelihoods. By leveraging diverse income sources, they can build resilience, adapt to evolving economic conditions, and ensure a sustainable future for themselves and their communities.

Since agriculture is a primary income source for smallholder farmers, the study found that 76% own land through customary rights (Table 6), typically inherited from their ancestors, with most lacking formal documentation. Only a small proportion reported owning land through statutory rights, indicating a need for land officers in the study villages to implement land survey programs and encourage smallholder farmers to register their farms for statutory ownership. Smallholder farmers in rural areas predominantly rely on traditional land ownership methods, suggesting limited awareness of land rights literacy. These findings shed light on land ownership and leasing challenges faced by landowners and tenants. Land acquisition should be understood in terms of control, encompassing both ownership and leasing. Many farmers benefit from combining these approaches, particularly when capital is scarce. For new farmers, especially in regions where land is costly, leasing is often the most viable option. Ownership offers advantages such as control, equity building, and potential value appreciation, whereas leasing provides flexibility to adjust farm size as conditions change (The Pennsylvania State University, 2014). Overall, these results highlight the complexity of land ownership and leasing, urging policymakers and stakeholders to raise awareness of land rights and ensure smallholder farmers have access to land and essential resources for their livelihoods.

**Table 6***Means of Owning Land*

Means	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Customary right (Traditional allocation)	399	76.0
Statutory right (Formalized land titling and registration)	30	5.7
Both Customary and Statutory	12	2.3
Renting every year/for several years	76	14.5
Documents from the village office	8	1.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>525*</b>	<b>100.0</b>

#### 4.2 What do Urban Dwellers and Individuals with Dual Residence do in Rural Areas?

This study examined the activities of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence in rural areas. Data were collected through observations and interviews with respondents. Results presented in Table 7 offer insights into the potential activities of these groups in rural settings. Smallholder farmers were asked to rate their agreement on a five-point Likert scale regarding activities such as settlement, timber production (tree planting), avocado production, livestock production, poultry production, beekeeping, and fish farming. The findings indicate weighted means of 4 for

settlement due to retirement, timber production, and avocado production; 3 for livestock production, poultry production, and beekeeping; and 2 for fish farming. This suggests that, on average, smallholder farmers agreed that urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence engage in agricultural activities upon returning to villages

Data in Table 7 also indicate that a significant proportion of respondents (63.4%) reported that some urban dwellers return to villages for settlement, primarily due to retirement, as well as other factors such as job loss and urban hardships. Additionally, Table 7 shows that most respondents noted urban dwellers acquire large tracts of land for timber production (tree planting) (97.2%), avocado production (88.9%), and livestock production (59.1%) upon returning to villages. These agricultural activities were confirmed through observations of tea, avocado, and timber tree plantations.

**Table 7**

*What Urban Dwellers and People with dual Residence do in Rural Areas*

Activity	Responses (n=494)	
	Yes	No
Settlement due to retirement or other reasons	417 (84.4) *	77 (15.6)
Timber production (Tree planting)	488 (98.8)	6 (1.2)
Avocado production	465 (94.2)	29 (5.8)
Livestock production	350 (70.8)	104 (29.1)
Poultry production	334 (67.6)	160 (32.4)
Beekeeping	340 (68.9)	154 (31.1)
Fish farming	161 (32.6)	333 (67.4)

The United Nations (UN) (2021) and Tacoli and Agergaard (2017) highlight the potential benefits of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence returning to villages for rural development. Their return can boost the incomes of the rural poor, many of whom rely on smallholder and family farming for their livelihoods. Rikolto (2022) suggest that urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence facilitate knowledge and skill transfers, stimulate economic activity, and improve access to new markets upon returning to villages. However, Bruin et al. (2021) note that their presence can also present challenges, such as land use changes, environmental degradation, and reduced access to resources and services. Policymakers and stakeholders must carefully balance these factors to maximize the benefits of this migration while mitigating its negative impacts. Regarding the activities of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence in rural areas, key informants and focus group discussion participants emphasized their primary engagement in agriculture, particularly in activities such as timber production, avocado farming, livestock rearing, beekeeping, tree planting (*mbao na nguzo*), avocado production, tea production, and Pineapple production in some villages as shown in Plate 1.



*One of the pine trees in Igeleke village in Mufindi DC as evidence of what urban dwellers and people with dual residence do in rural areas*



*One of the avocado plantations in Mgala Village in Njombe TC as evidence of what urban dwellers and people with dual residence do in rural areas*



*One of the tea farms in Itipula Village in Njombe TC as evidence of what urban dwellers and people with dual residence do in rural areas*



*Pines farm in Mapanda Village in Mufindi DC as evidence of what urban dwellers and people with dual residence do in rural areas*

### Plate1

*Some Investments in Commercial Farming by Urban Dweller and People with Dual Residence*

### 4.3 What Do Urban Dwellers and Individuals with Dual Residence Bring to Rural Areas?

This study sought to investigate the contributions of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence to rural areas. To assess their activities, smallholder farmers were asked to rate a series of statements on a five-point Likert scale. These statements addressed aspects such as the introduction of new technologies, establishment of new relationships, acquisition of large agricultural landholdings, introduction of new ideas, innovative methods and approaches, income generation, employment opportunities, rising land prices, investment in commercial farming, and the displacement of undercapitalized smallholder farmers.

To examine the benefits and perceived negative effects of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence, smallholder farmers identified several contributions these groups bring to villages. These included rising land prices (95.4%), establishing new relationships (92.5%), acquiring large agricultural landholdings (93.3%), increasing employment opportunities (90.3%), generating income from investments (89.5%), introducing innovative approaches to crop and livestock production (89.3%), investing in commercial farming (88.9%), adopting new technologies (77.3%), and displacing undercapitalized smallholder farmers (75.5%). These findings suggest that the return of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence to villages yields both significant benefits and challenges for smallholder farmers. As shown in Table 8, smallholder farmers rated all statements with a weighted mean of 4, indicating general agreement with these impacts. This implies that the return of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence has substantial repercussions for rural smallholder farmers.

The findings suggest that urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence bring positive changes and benefits to rural areas, as perceived by smallholder farmers. These results align with Bhatti et al. (2021) and Mekonnen and Gerber (2017), who argue that urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence introduce valuable knowledge and skills to rural settings, significantly benefiting smallholder farmers. They contribute advanced farming techniques, innovative technologies, and new business practices, fostering the overall development and progress of rural areas. Additionally, the findings are consistent with FAO (2023d) and UN (2017), which note that the return of urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence to villages can generate employment opportunities in rural areas, particularly in agribusiness, food processing, and related sectors. This, in turn, enhances the livelihoods of smallholder farmers and supports the economic growth of rural communities.

**Table 8**

*What Urban Dwellers and People with Dual Residence Bring to Villages*

What they bring in	Responses (n=494)	
	Yes	No
New technologies	435 (88.0) *	59 (12)
New relationships	483 (97.8)	11 (2.2)
Acquire huge land for agriculture	484 (98.0)	10 (2)
New ideas, ways and means of doing things	480 (97.2)	14 (2.8)
Income in Tsh	478 (96.8)	16 (3.2)
Employment in the investments	457 (92.5)	37 (7.5)
Increase of price of land	486 (98.4)	8 (1.6)
Invest in commercial farming	459 (92.9)	35 (7.1)
Displace undercapitalised smallholder farmers	403 (81.5)	91 (18.5)



According to Borrás et al. (2017), Hall et al. (2024) and Worford et al. (2025), land grabbing refers to the practice of seizing land by external interests such as individuals or companies to establish medium or large-scale commercial farms, plantations, or livestock operations on land that has traditionally been communal or governed by customary tenure systems. It is the control of land through lease, concession or contracts of larger than locally typical size of land by any persons or company public or private, foreign or domestic legally or illegally for any purpose at the expense of indigenous smallholder farmers. In recent years, land grabbing has become an increasingly widespread phenomenon in many parts of the world, including Central and South America, Africa, and Asia (McLeman, 2017). However, in many rural areas, the exact size of the seized land is often unknown, as most transactions occur without public oversight or even the knowledge of local village authorities. In the surveyed villages, most of the land grabbers were identified as coming from urban areas of Tanzania. As a result of land grabbing, a considerable number of rural residents have been displaced, with their ancestral lands converted into intensive monocultures such as timber plantations, avocado farms, and commercial livestock operations by outside investors (McLeman, 2017).

In addition to creating jobs, urban dwellers and individuals with dual residence can also support smallholder farmers in rural areas through their investments. They may hire local farmers as labourers or engage them in contractual agreements to supply goods and services. This symbiotic relationship fosters a mutually beneficial dynamic in which both parties thrive, ultimately contributing to the sustainable development of rural areas. Overall, the study's findings supported by existing literature highlight that urban dwellers and those with dual residence make several positive contributions to rural communities. Their presence often leads to the introduction of new knowledge, skills, technologies, and employment opportunities. These benefits not only enhance the livelihoods of smallholder farmers but also promote broader economic growth and prosperity in rural regions. On what urban dwellers and people with dual residence bring to rural areas, participants in the focus group discussions reported what urban dwellers and people with dual residence bring to rural areas including;

*"Employment opportunities for youth, participation in village development activities such as classroom construction, the introduction of new technologies and skills, and the establishment of stronger relationships with locals have all contributed to increased land value. This phenomenon also stimulates the circulation of money in villages by fostering the growth of small businesses. Similarly, key informants in face-to-face interviews highlighted the contributions urban dwellers and people with dual residence make to rural areas, including employment opportunities for youth, education on new methods, village development projects, and the introduction of new technologies."*

## V. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Conclusions

Many urban dwellers are returning to rural villages for settlement, driven by reasons such as retirement, job loss, and life hardships in cities. At the same time, people with dual residence are moving to rural areas to acquire large tracts of land for investment, particularly in timber, avocado, and livestock production. The emergence of tea estates, avocado plantations, and timber tree farms in villages across Njombe and Iringa regions is a clear indication of significant investments made by these urban residents. While this return has its benefits, such as the establishment of medium and large-scale commercial farms and livestock operations, it also brings challenges to smallholder farmers in the villages. Historically communal or customary lands are being converted into commercial farming areas, often leading to land grabs. Some rural residents are displaced due to these land acquisitions, particularly for plantations in tea, avocado, livestock, and timber. In addition to large-scale farming, the return of urbanites and people with dual residence have led to increased land prices, the development of new connections, and the creation of job opportunities. Villagers are also learning new agricultural techniques for crop and livestock production. Overall, the phenomenon of urban dwellers returning to villages has brought significant benefits, such as expanded agricultural production, new employment opportunities (in both farms and factories), and the transfer of knowledge about farming practices. However, it has also contributed to land scarcity and conflicts over resources, posing challenges to the rural community.

### 5.2 Recommendations

The significant agricultural changes in rural areas are primarily driven by the influx of urban residents participating in commercial farming, particularly in tea, timber, avocados, and livestock production. To address this, stakeholders must design and implement integrated rural development projects that consider the interdependence of various factors affecting village smallholder farmers. These initiatives should include gender-responsive education programs that equip farmers with the skills and knowledge needed to increase their yields. The study proposes encouraging urban dwellers and people with dual residence to return to rural areas. Given the positive impacts these groups have had on rural communities, policymakers should create initiatives that leverage their expertise and



experience for the benefit of rural areas. This could involve supporting collaboration between smallholder farmers and migrants, fostering entrepreneurial opportunities, and facilitating the transfer of knowledge.

## REFERENCES

- Adult Education University. (2017, October 17). Back to the village. *The Kathmandu Post*. <https://kathmandupost.com/opinion/2017/10/17/back-to-the-village-20171017072634>
- Bhatti, M. A., Godfrey, S. S., Ip, R. H. L., Kachiwala, C., Hovdhaugen, H., Banda, L. J., Limuwa, M., Wynn, P. C., Ådnøy, T., & Eik, L. O. (2021). Diversity of sources of income for smallholder farming communities in Malawi: Importance for improved livelihood. *Sustainability*, 13(17), 9599. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13179599>
- Blazhevskaja, K. V. (2017). Factors that influence the process of migration of youth: A case study of Kosovo. *Security and Defence Quarterly*, 17(4), 48–73.
- Borras Jr, S. M., Scoones, I., White, B., & Wolford, W. (2017). Global land grabbing and political reactions 'from below'. In M. Edelman & R. Hall (Eds.), *Global Land Grabbing and Political Reactions 'from Below'* (pp. xx–xx). Taylor & Francis.
- Bruin, S., Dengerink, J., & van Vliet, J. (2021). Urbanisation as driver of food system transformation and opportunities for rural livelihoods. *Food Security*, 13(4), 781–798. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-021-011828>
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Divisha, S. (2021a). Migration: Meaning, types, and effects—Sociological discussion. *Sociology Discussion*. <https://www.sociologydiscussion.com/communication>
- Divisha, S. (2021b). Top 3 theories of migration—Sociological discussion. *Sociology Discussion*. <https://www.sociologydiscussion.com/demography/top-theories-of-migration>
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2023a). Rural employment guidance material: Toolkit for sustainable reintegration of return migrants in rural areas. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc5212en>
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2023b). The future of food and agriculture: Trends and challenges. <https://www.fao.org/3/i6583e/i6583e.pdf>
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2023c). The economic lives of smallholder farmers. <https://www.fao.org/3/i5251e/i5251e.pdf>
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2023d). Urbanization can be a catalyst for rural development? <https://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/854016/icode/>
- Gilbert, J. (2017). Land grabbing, investments and indigenous peoples' rights to land and natural resources: Case studies and legal analysis. International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA).
- Greco, E. (2015). Landlords in the making: Class dynamics of the land grab in Mbarali, Tanzania. *Review of African Political Economy*, 42(144), 225–244.
- Hall, R., Wolford, W. W., White, B., & Scoones, I. (2024). *Global land deals: What has been done, what has changed, and what's next?* Princeton University Press.
- IOM. (2014). *World migration report 2015: Urbanization, rural-urban migration, and urban poverty*. International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Kassie, M., Teklewold, H., & Shiferaw, B. (2014). Adoption of interrelated sustainable agricultural practices in smallholder systems: Evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 86, 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.08.019>
- Martins, R. (2018). Moving out: Urban-to-rural migration. <https://rural-urban.eu/news-moving-out-urban-rural>
- McLeman, R. (2017). Migration and land degradation: Recent experience and future trends. Wilfrid Laurier University and UN-Convention to Combat Desertification. [https://knowledge.unccd.int/sites/default/files/2018-06/8.%20Migration+and+Land+Degradation\\_R\\_McLeman.pdf](https://knowledge.unccd.int/sites/default/files/2018-06/8.%20Migration+and+Land+Degradation_R_McLeman.pdf)
- Mekonnen, D. A., & Gerber, N. (2017). Rural-urban migration and agricultural productivity: Evidence from Ethiopia. *Food Policy*, 67, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2016.12.002>
- Mwalupani, N., Zakayo, E., & Paul, S. (2025). Implications of urban-to-rural migration and dual residency on farmland access: Insights from Njombe Town and Mufindi District Councils, Tanzania. *Rural Planning Journal*, 5(1), 118–132.
- Rapsomanikis, G. (2015). The economic lives of smallholder farmers: An analysis based on household data from nine countries. FAO/IFAD/WFP.
- Rikolto, F. A. O. (2022). *RUAF. Urban and peri-urban agriculture sourcebook—From production to food systems*. FAO.
- Tacoli, C., & Agergaard, J. (2017). *Urbanisation, rural transformations and food systems: The role of small towns*. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED).
- The Pennsylvania State University. (2014). *Agricultural alternatives: Owning and leasing agricultural real estate*. <https://extension.psu.edu/owning-and-leasing-agricultural-real-estate>



U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service (USDA ERS). (2023). Income, wealth, and the economic well-being of farm households. [https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/41451/31370\\_aer812.pdf?v=41271](https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/41451/31370_aer812.pdf?v=41271)

United Nations (UN). (2017). Ways urbanization can be a catalyst for rural development. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2017/03/un-report-explores-ways-urbanization-can-be-a-catalyst-for-rural-development/>

United Nations (UN). (2021). *World social report 2021: Reconsidering rural development*.

URT. (2015). Migration and urbanization report. Ministry of Finance and National Bureau of Statistics. United Republic of Tanzania.

Urso, K. (2021). Understanding international migrations in rural areas: New processes of social innovation and rural regeneration in Southern Italy. *Italian Review of Agricultural Economics (REA)*, 76(1), 59–75.

Wolford, W. W., White, B., Scoones, I., Hall, R., Edelman, M., & Borras, S. M. (2025). Global land deals: What has been done, what has changed, and what's next? *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 1–38.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics, an introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.