

Farming Systems and Household Food Security in Tanzania: the case of Mvomero and Kishapu Districts

Goodluck Dastan Massawe

Student Number 12259359

The thesis is submitted to University College Dublin in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Health and Agricultural Sciences

AUGUST, 2016

School of Agriculture and Food Science

Prof. Alexander Evans, Head of School

Prof James Kinsella (University College Dublin), Supervisor

Prof Amon Mattee (Sokoine University of Agriculture), Supervisor

ProQuest Number: 10271703

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10271703

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | i |
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| LIST OF FIGURES | viii |
| LIST OF APPENDICES | x |
| ABBREVIATIONS | xi |
| ABSTRACT | xiii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | xiv |
| STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP | xv |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Overview | 1 |
| 1.2 Poverty and Food Security Status in Developing Countries | 1 |
| 1.3 Food Security in Tanzania | 2 |
| 1.4 The Significance of Farming in Tanzania | 4 |
| 1.5 Significance and Rationale of the Study | 5 |
| 1.6 Objectives | 8 |
| 1.6.1 General Objective | 8 |
| 1.6.2 Specific Objectives | 9 |
| 1.7 Research Questions | 9 |
| 1.8 Methodology | 9 |
| 1.9 Utility of the Study | 10 |
| 1.10 Organisation of the Thesis | 10 |
| CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK | 11 |
| 2.1 Overview | 11 |
| 2.2 The Concept of Poverty | 11 |
| 2.2.1 The Entitlement Approach | 12 |
| 2.2.2 Clusters of Disadvantage and Deprivation/Poverty Trap | 14 |
| 2.2.3 Sustainable Livelihoods Approach | 16 |
| 2.2.4 Intra-household Power Dynamics and Power Relations | 18 |
| 2.3 The Concept of Food Security | 21 |
| 2.3.1 Framework for Food Security Analysis | 26 |
| 2.3.2 Measuring Food Security Status | 28 |
| 2.3.2.1 Undernourishment Measures of Food Security | 28 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.3.2.2 Dietary Diversity and Food Frequency Measures of Food Security | 32 |
| 2.3.2.3 Consumption Behavioural Measures of Food Security | 33 |
| 2.3.2.4 Experiential Measures of Food Security | 33 |
| 2.3.2.5 Self-assessment Measures of Food Security | 34 |
| 2.4 Farming Systems | 34 |
| 2.4.1 Global Farming Systems | 35 |
| 2.4.2 Farming Systems in Sub Saharan Africa | 36 |
| 2.4.3 Farming Systems in Tanzania | 40 |
| 2.5 Population Pressure and Farming Systems..... | 43 |
| 2.6. Natural Environment, Climate and Farming Systems | 45 |
| 2.7 Farming Systems and Food Security | 46 |
| 2.8 Household Decision-making Processes around the Choice of Farming Systems | 48 |
| 2.8.1 The Expected Utility theory | 49 |
| 2.8.1.1 Application of the Expected Utility Theory | 50 |
| 2.8.1.2 Limitation of the Expected Utility Theory | 52 |
| 2.8.2 The Theory of Planned Behaviour | 53 |
| 2.8.2.1 Application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour | 54 |
| 2.8.2.2 Limitations of the Theory of Planned Behaviour..... | 57 |
| 2.8.3 Combining the Expected Utility Theory and the Theory of Planned Behaviour.... | 57 |
| 2.9 The Study Analytical Model | 58 |
| 2.9.1 Institutional/Farming Context Factors | 58 |
| 2.9.2 Farmer/Household Factors | 60 |
| 2.9.3 Natural Environment Factors | 61 |
| 2.9.4 Factors Influencing Household Food Security Status..... | 62 |
| CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY | 65 |
| 3.1 Overview | 65 |
| 3.2 Methodological Approach and Study Design..... | 65 |
| 3.3 Study Area | 68 |
| 3.4 Study Population and Sampling Procedure | 69 |
| 3.5 Types of Data and Data Collection Procedures..... | 72 |
| 3.5.1 Pretesting of Questionnaire..... | 73 |
| 3.5.2 Pre-harvest Household Survey..... | 73 |
| 3.5.3 Post-harvest Household Survey | 75 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3.5.4 Focus Group Discussions..... | 76 |
| 3.5.5 Key Informant Interviews | 77 |
| 3.5.6 Monthly Market Price Survey..... | 78 |
| 3.5.7 The Use of Secondary Data | 78 |
| 3.6 Data Management Procedure (Data Analysis) | 79 |
| 3.6.1 Describing the Main Characteristics of the Study Area and Sample..... | 79 |
| 3.6.2 Determination of Farm Household Income | 79 |
| 3.6.3 Determination of Adult Equivalent Units | 80 |
| 3.6.4 Identification of Farming Systems..... | 82 |
| 3.6.5 Determination of Factors Associated with Household Choice of Farming Systems. | 83 |
| 3.6.6 Determination of Household Food Security Status | 87 |
| 3.6.6.1 Determination of Food Security Based on Household Food Insecurity Access Scale..... | 87 |
| 3.6.6.2 Determination of Farm Household Food Security Status Based on Household Dietary Diversity Score | 90 |
| 3.7 Ethical Issues | 91 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA AND FARM HOUSEHOLDS | 92 |
| 4.1. Overview | 92 |
| 4.2 Farming in Kishapu District | 92 |
| 4.3 Farming in Mvomero District..... | 94 |
| 4.4 Characteristics of Farm Households in Kishapu and Mvomero..... | 97 |
| Source: Agridiet Study Household Survey: Pre-Harvest (2014). | 98 |
| 4.4.1 Sex of the Household Head..... | 98 |
| 4.4.2 Marital Status of the Household Heads | 99 |
| 4.4.3 Household Size | 99 |
| 4.4.4 Age and Experience of the Household Head | 100 |
| 4.4.5 Education of the Household Head | 100 |
| 4.4.6 Cultivated Land Area..... | 100 |
| 4.4.7 Land Access | 102 |
| 4.4.8 Crop Production | 102 |
| 4.4.9 Livestock Production | 106 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 4.4.10 Household Income | 107 |
| 4.4.11 Summary | 108 |
| 4.5 Household Food Security | 109 |
| 4.5.1 Food Security Status Based on Household Food Insecurity Access Scale | 109 |
| Source: Agridiet Study Household Survey: Pre- and Post-Harvest (2014). | 116 |
| 4.5.2 Food Security Status Based on Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)..... | 116 |
| 4.6 Summary..... | 120 |
| CHAPTER FIVE: FARMING SYSTEMS AND HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY ... | 122 |
| 5.1 Overview | 122 |
| 5.2 Main Farming Systems in the Study Areas | 122 |
| 5.3 Household Characteristics by Farming Systems | 123 |
| 5.4 Agricultural Activities by Farming Systems | 125 |
| 5.5 Household Income by Farming Systems | 127 |
| 5.6 Household Food Security Status | 129 |
| 5.6.1 Prevalence of Food Insecurity | 129 |
| 5.6.1.1 Households by Food Security Status by Farming Systems..... | 129 |
| 5.6.1.2 Households Characteristics by Food Insecurity Prevalence Categories | 132 |
| 5.6.2 Household Dietary Diversity Score | 136 |
| 5.7. Summary..... | 141 |
| CHAPTER SIX: FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH FARM HOUSEHOLD CHOICE OF FARMING SYSTEMS..... | 142 |
| 6.1 Overview | 142 |
| 6.2 Farm Households by Study Areas | 142 |
| 6.3 Factors Associated with Household Farming Choices | 144 |
| 6.3.1 Factors Associated with Household Farming Choice in Kishapu | 145 |
| 6.3.2 Factors Associated with Household Farming Choices in Mvomero | 151 |
| 6.4 Summary..... | 157 |
| CHAPTER 7: INTEGRATED DISCUSSION | 159 |
| 7.1 Overview | 159 |
| 7.2 Characteristics of the Main Farming Systems in the Study Area..... | 159 |
| 7.2.1 Single Food Crop (SFC) Farming System | 160 |
| 7.2.2 Mixed Crop-Livestock (MCL) Farming System | 160 |
| 7.2.3 Cash Crop (CC) Farming System | 161 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 7.2.4 Mixed Food Crops (MFC) Farming System..... | 162 |
| 7.3 Household Food Security Status | 162 |
| 7.4 Farming Systems and Farm Household Food Security | 163 |
| 7.5 Farm Household Decision-Making Processes about the Choice of Farming System.. | 167 |
| 7.5.1 Household Size | 167 |
| 7.5.2 Age of the Household Head..... | 168 |
| 7.4.3 Education of the Household Head | 168 |
| 7.5.4 Farm Size | 169 |
| 7.5.5 Access to Off-farm Income..... | 170 |
| 7.5.6 Sex of the Household Head..... | 171 |
| 7.5.7 Access to Credit and Input Services | 172 |
| 7.5.8 Extension Services | 172 |
| 7.4.9 Membership to Organisations | 173 |
| 7.5.10 Land Tenure System | 173 |
| 7.5.11 Psychological Factors (farmer’s attitudes, subjective norms and perceptions).. | 174 |
| 7.6 Farm Household Decision-making, Farming Systems and Food Security..... | 174 |
| CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 176 |
| 8.1 Overview | 176 |
| 8.2 Theoretical Implications..... | 176 |
| 8.3 Practical Implications | 177 |
| 8.4 Methodological Aspects | 178 |
| 8.5 Conclusions | 179 |
| 8.5.1 Characteristics of the Main Farming Systems in the Study Area | 179 |
| 8.5.2 Food Security Status of the Study area in Pre- and Post-harvest Seasons..... | 180 |
| 8.5.3 Farming Systems and Food Security Status..... | 181 |
| 8.5.4 Factors Influencing Choices of Farming Systems | 182 |
| 8.6 Recommendations | 184 |
| 8.6.1 Policy Level Recommendations | 184 |
| 8.6.2 District (Study Area) Level Recommendations | 185 |
| 8.6.3 Household Level Recommendations | 185 |
| 8.6.4 Recommendation for Future Research..... | 186 |
| REFERENCES | 187 |
| APPENDICES | 210 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 1: The Evolution of the Food Security Concept (1974-2001)..... | 22 |
| Table 2: Indicators of Food Security Status | 25 |
| Table 3: Major Farming Systems of sub-Saharan Africa..... | 39 |
| Table 4: Farming Systems in Tanzania | 42 |
| Table 5: Basic Characteristics of the Study Area..... | 69 |
| Table 6: Selection of Households for Household Survey in Kishapu and Mvomero Districts..... | 72 |
| Table 7: Distribution of Focus Group Discussion Participants by District in Pre- and Post-harvest season..... | 77 |
| Table 8: Distribution of Key Informants by Study Area | 77 |
| Table 9: Adult Equivalent Scales Constants for East Africa..... | 81 |
| Table 10: Household Economies of Scale Constants | 81 |
| Table 11: Conversion Factor of Livestock Type into TLU (1 TLU = 1 mature cow of 250kg)..... | 82 |
| Table 12: Predictor Variables for Household Decision-making about Choice of Farming System Used in the MNL Model..... | 86 |
| Table 13: Responses in Each Food Security Category..... | 89 |
| Table 14: Key Household Characteristics by Study Areas | 98 |
| Table 15: Distribution of Households by Food Insecurity Prevalence (categories) by Districts..... | 116 |
| Table 16: Household Characteristics by Farming Systems..... | 124 |
| Table 17: Distribution of Households by Major Crops Grown by Farming System (2013) | 126 |
| Table 18: Average Yield of Major Crops by Farming Systems in 2013 and 2014 (kgs/acre) | 126 |
| Table 19: Distribution of Households by Food Security Status by Farming Systems in 2014 | 130 |
| Table 20: Household Characteristics by Household Food Insecurity Access Prevalence Status (Pre-Harvest Season) | 133 |
| Table 21: Distribution of Farm Households by Food Groups Consumed by Farming System in Pre- and Post-harvest seasons..... | 139 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 22: Descriptive Statistics for Variables Included in the MNL Model..... | 143 |
| Table 23: Likelihood Ratio Statistics Showing the Overall Contribution of Each Predictor Variable to the Model | 145 |
| Table 24: MNL Estimates for Factors Associated with Household Farming Choices in Kishapu District..... | 149 |
| Table 25: Selection of Statements/Quotes from FGDs Indicating Farmers’ Beliefs Regarding Household Choices of Farming System in Kishapu | 150 |
| Table 26: MNL Estimates for Factors Associated with Farming Choices in Mvomero District | 155 |
| Table 27: Selection of Statements from FGDs Indicating Farmers’ Beliefs Regarding Household Choices of Farming System in Mvomero | 156 |

PREVIEW

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 1: Deprivation Trap | 15 |
| Figure 2: Components and Flows in a Livelihood | 16 |
| Figure 3: Sustainable Livelihood Framework | 17 |
| Figure 4: Food Security Conceptual Framework | 27 |
| Figure 5: Major Farming Systems of Sub-Saharan Africa | 37 |
| Figure 6: Theory of Planned Behaviour | 54 |
| Figure 7: Schematic Relationship among Individual Differences in Personality Traits, Attitudes, Objectives and Behaviour | 55 |
| Figure 8: Study Analytical Model of the Factors that Impact on Household Food Security | 64 |
| Figure 9: Distribution of Households by Cultivated Land Area by Districts | 101 |
| Figure 10: Distribution of Households by Main Crops Cultivated by District in 2013 Farming Season | 103 |
| Figure 11: Annual Yield of Major Crops in 2013 and 2014 Farming Seasons in Both Areas | 104 |
| Figure 12: Annual Yield of Major Crops in 2013 and 2014 Farming Seasons in Kishapu District | 105 |
| Figure 13: Annual Yield of Major Crops in 2013 and 2014 Farming Seasons in Mvomero | 105 |
| Figure 14: Distribution of Households by Livestock type Owned by District in 2013..... | 107 |
| Figure 15: Percentage of Annual Household Income from Farm and Off-farm | 108 |
| Figure 16: Distribution of Households by their Experienced Food Insecurity in Pre- and Post-harvest Seasons in Both Study Areas | 110 |
| Figure 17: Distribution of Households by their Experienced Food Insecurity in Pre-Harvest Season by Districts | 111 |
| Figure 18: Distribution of Households by their Experienced Food Insecurity in Post-harvest Season by Districts | 112 |
| Figure 19: Distribution of Households by their Experienced Food Insecurity Access-related Domains by Districts | 113 |
| Figure 20: HFIAS Mean Score by Districts and Farming Seasons | 115 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 21: Farm Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) by Study Areas..... | 117 |
| Figure 22: Distribution of Households Consuming Each Food Group in Pre- and Post-harvest Seasons..... | 118 |
| Figure 23: Distribution of Households in Kishapu Consuming Each Food Group in Pre- and Post-harvest Seasons..... | 119 |
| Figure 24: Distribution of Households in Mvomero Consuming Each Food Group in Pre- and Post-harvest Seasons | 120 |
| Figure 25: Distribution of Households Keeping Livestock by Farming Systems (2013) . | 127 |
| Figure 26: Household Dietary Diversity Scores by Farming Systems in Pre-harvest and Post-harvest seasons | 138 |

PREVIEW

LIST OF APPENDICES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Appendix 1: Map of Kishapu District Showing the Locations of Study Villages ... | 210 |
| Appendix 2: Map of Mvomero District Showing the Locations of Study Villages | 211 |
| Appendix 3: Pre-harvest Household Survey Questionnaire..... | 212 |
| Appendix 4: Post-Harvest Household Survey Questionnaire..... | 240 |
| Appendix 5: Checklist for Focus Group Discussion in the Pre-Harvest Season..... | 264 |
| Appendix 6: Checklist for Focus Group Discussion in the Pos- harvest..... | 267 |
| Appendix 7: Checklist for Key Informant Interviews..... | 270 |
| Appendix 8: Market Price Survey Questionnaire..... | 274 |
| Appendix 9: Local Market Prices in Mhunze, Makuyu and Dakawa Markets..... | 275 |
| Appendix 10: Households use Farm Equipment/Implement/Asset by districts..... | 276 |
| Appendix 11: Number of Water resources by Districts..... | 276 |
| Appendix 12: Road Infrastructure by District..... | 276 |
| Appendix 13a: Rainfall Patterns in Kishapu District..... | 277 |
| Appendix 13b: Rainfall Patterns in Mvomero District..... | 277 |
| Appendix 14: Annual Yield of Major Crops by District in 2013 farming season (kg/acre)..... | 278 |
| Appendix 15: Annual Yield of Major Crops by District in 2014 Farming Season (kg/acre)..... | 279 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------|--|
| CSI | Copping Strategy Index |
| CRRA | Constant Relative Risk Aversion |
| CUTS | Consumer Unity and Trust Society |
| DES | Dietary Energy Supply |
| DFID | United Kingdom Department for International Development |
| DFID-SLF | Department for International Development- Sustainable Livelihood Framework |
| ECOSOC | United Nations Economic and Social Council |
| ESRF | Economic and Social Research Foundation |
| EUT | Expected Utility Theory |
| FANTA | Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project |
| FAD | Food Availability Decline |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations |
| FCS | Food Consumption Score |
| FCND | Food Consumption and Nutrition Division |
| FIVIMS | Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping System |
| HDDS | Household Dietary Diversity Score |
| HEA | Higher Education Authority in Ireland |
| HFIAS | Household Food Insecurity Access Scale |
| HH | Household |
| HHS | Household Hunger Scale |
| IA | Irish Aid |
| IAC | Inter Academy Council |
| IAWG | Inter-Agency Working Group |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| IFPRI | International Food Policy Research Institute |
| IIA | The Independent Irrelevant Alternative |
| ILRI | International Livestock Research Institute |
| IPC | Integrated Phase Classification |
| ISS | Institute of Social Studies |
| IUCN | International Union for Conservation of Nature |

| | |
|----------|---|
| MAFS & C | Tanzanian Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives |
| MCL | Mixed Crop-Livestock |
| MDGs | Millennium Development Goals |
| MFC | Mixed Food Crops |
| MNL | Multinomial Logit |
| MNP | Multinomial Probit |
| NBS | National Bureau of Statistics |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PELUM | Participatory Ecological Land Use Management |
| PMO | Prime Minister's Office |
| REPOA | Research on Poverty Alleviation |
| SAUT | Saint Augustine University of Tanzania |
| SDGs | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SFC | Single Food Crop |
| SUA | Sokoine University of Agriculture |
| TFNC | Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre |
| TLUs | Tropical Livestock Units |
| TPB | Theory of Planned Behaviour |
| TZS | Tanzanian Shilling |
| UCD | University College Dublin |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNCEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| WB | World Bank |
| WFS | World Food Summit |
| WFP | World Food Programme |
| WHO | World Health Organisation |

ABSTRACT

About three out of every four income-earners in Tanzania are small-scale farmers and food insecurity remains a chronic problem for many of them. Around 48% of households in rural areas were either moderately or severely food energy deficient in 2011 and 39% of rural children under 5 years were stunted in 2013. To improve food security in Tanzania, it is important to understand the existing farming systems and their relationship with household food security. This study was conducted in two distinctly different agro-ecological zones of Tanzania, namely Kishapu and Mvomero Districts, to determine the main factors which influence farm households' choice of farming systems and how these associate with food security. Data were collected during both pre- and post-harvest seasons in 2014 from 506 farm households, and augmented with market surveys, key informant interviews and focus group discussions. Four main farming systems were identified based on: crops cultivated; degree of market orientation for particular crops; and the number of livestock units owned. Household food security status was measured and a combination of Expected Utility Theory and Theory of Planned Behaviour used to analyse the factors associated with household choice of farming system. The study found that households which diversified their income sources through off-farm activities were more likely to have better food access in the lean (pre-harvest) periods. The factors influencing decisions on farming systems were related to the household size, farming context and farm characteristics. In the semi-arid and remote areas of Kishapu, larger households were more likely to choose a Mixed Crop and Livestock farming system, indicating that larger family size ensured the supply of needed labour for both livestock keeping and cropping activities. In the higher rainfall and more accessible district of Mvomero, households were more likely to practice a Single Food Crop farming system and were compelled to seek out off-farm work. The study recommends that strategies to improve food security in rural areas should attempt to: enhance income from farming, promote off-farm income generating activities, and promote behavioural change communication on what is culturally regarded as food in the study area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Irish Aid and the Higher Education Authority (HEA) in Ireland for supporting this study through the AGRIDIET Research Project.

Many thanks are extended to my supervisors, Prof Jim Kinsella from UCD and Prof Amon Mattee of SUA whose time and effort made this thesis possible. Their valuable encouragement, comments, guidance and support were very productive in every stage of preparing this thesis.

Many thanks also to the Project Team Members: Dr Deirdre O'Connor (UCD), Dr Aifric O'Sullivan (UCD), Prof Joyce Kinabo (SUA) and Dr Thadeus Mkamwa (SAUT) for their useful advice during the study period. I would also like to thank my fellow PhD students at UCD: Ms Achilana Mtingele and Ms Happiness Muhimbula, who also worked under the AGRIDIET Research Project. With support of Achilana and Happiness, I was able to successfully plan the fieldwork, collect and process all the data.

I also thank leaders from Lubaga and Mwakipoya Villages in Kishapu District and from Makuyu and Milama Villages in Mvomero District who organised participants to take part in focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and household surveys. Further, I thank all focus group discussion participants, the key informants and all respondent households whose members spared their precious time responding to questions of this research.

Finally, regards and blessings go to my beloved wife, Regina and our three children: Gracious, Gian and Giana. They were always there to encourage me during good and bad times.

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

I hereby certify that the submitted work is my own work, was completed while registered as a candidate for the degree stated on the title page, and I have not obtained a degree elsewhere on the basis of research presented in this submitted work.



Goodluck Dastan Massawe
(PhD Candidate)

Date

PREVIEW

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

This chapter starts with a general overview of poverty and food security in developing countries and Tanzania. It is followed by discussion on the significance of farming in Tanzania, rationale for undertaking this study as well as its significance. Finally, the general and specific objectives, guiding research questions, overview of the study methodology and utility, and the structure of the thesis are explained.

1.2 Poverty and Food Security Status in Developing Countries

More than one-third of all people in developing countries are poor and live on less than US\$ 2 a day while every one person out of six is extremely poor, living on less than US\$1.25 a day (Townsend, 2015). Although the contemporary world has seen a shift towards urbanization of populations with an estimated 54% living in urban areas (UN-Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2014), poverty remains largely a rural phenomenon (FAO, 2015). A World Bank Report estimates that, by 2010, almost three quarters of the extreme poor were living in rural areas (Townsend, 2015). The relative deprivation in rural areas is reflected in a wide range of welfare indicators. For instance, child malnutrition, as measured by wasting in children under five years of age, is worse in rural areas as compared to urban areas in nearly every country for which data were available (FAO, 2015).

Notwithstanding the multiple causes and forms of poverty, strategies to alleviate it predominantly address the problem of malnutrition with emphasis on child and maternal under-nutrition (Bundara et al., 2013; Ruel and Alderman, 2013). This is because poverty is considered as both the cause and consequence of under-nutrition (Bradshaw, 2007; UNICEF, 2013). For instance, insufficient income limits access to social and health services resulting in unhealthy individuals (Black et al., 2008). Good nutrition during the first 1,000 days between the start of a woman's pregnancy and her child's second birthday is considered critical to the future health, wellbeing and success of her child (Save the Children, 2012a). The unhealthy condition, in particular at this

early time of life, entraps the individual to a life cycle of poverty. It is argued that under-nutrition (e.g. stunting) has an impact on the child's cognitive and intellectual development thereby affecting the child's academic performance and ultimately escalating the cycle of poverty (Bradshaw, 2007; UNICEF, 2013).

Global statistics indicate that under-nutrition is one of the key factors contributing to more than a third of all global child deaths amounting to 2.6 million deaths per year (Save the Children, 2012b). Indeed, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) Report on Goal Four, which aimed to reduce child mortality indicates that one third of all child deaths in sub-Saharan Africa was caused by hunger (United Nations, 2010). It is with this understanding the United Nations MDGs considered malnutrition as an important dimension of poverty among others that were to be halved by 2015 (Alderman et al., 2006). The global renewed commitment to address malnutrition in all its forms is reflected by the newly enacted 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The first goal aims to end poverty in all dimensions by 2030 while the second goals aim to end all forms of hunger and malnutrition by 2030 by making sure that all people, especially children and the more vulnerable, have access to sufficient and nutritious food all year round (UNDP, 2016). The second goal of the SDGs promotes sustainable agricultural practices: improving the livelihoods and capacities of small scale farmers, allowing equal access to land, technology and markets (UNDP, 2016).

According to OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2013-2022, global agricultural production is projected to grow by 1.5% annually, compared to 2.1% in the previous decade (OECD and FAO, 2013). It is anticipated that this low growth will be manifested in both crop and livestock sectors. The projected trend of reduced productivity globally is likely to put more pressure on the nutrition status, in particular for people living in the developing world.

1.3 Food Security in Tanzania

The Tanzania Food and Nutrition Policy of 1992 defines nutrition as “the end-result of various processes in society in which food is eaten, followed by subsequent absorption

and utilization of the food nutrients¹ by the body to provide health” (Tanzanian Ministry of Health, 1992). The policy maintains that good nutrition is partly a result of staying free from infectious diseases and eating a well-balanced diet with all necessary nutrients required by the body. The policy goal is, therefore, geared towards ensuring that food, which provides all nutrients, is available and its utilization is in accordance with nutritional requirement of the body to maintain good health. On the other hand, the policy attaches the concept of food security to availability and accessibility of adequate food at all time and to all people, especially special groups such as children, pregnant and lactating women, elderly and sick. The definition of food security focuses much on quantitative aspects by ensuring that food is adequately available and accessible and it makes no mention of the quality of food.

Malnutrition, in particular under-nutrition, is one of the big challenges facing Tanzania and the problem is more severe among women and children. For example, a study conducted by the Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre (TFNC) in 2014 indicated that 38% of children aged 0-59 months were stunted (TFNC, 2015). The Government of Tanzania places strong emphasis on issues related to food security and nutrition. In order to coordinate national efforts against malnutrition in Tanzania, the government has established a High Level Steering Committee on Nutrition with representatives from different sectors including: private sector, NGOs, academics, UN agencies and donors (TFNC, 2015). This committee is chaired by the Permanent Secretary in the Prime Minister’s Office and the secretariat is managed by the Tanzania Food and Nutrition Centre. Although district steering committees for nutrition have been established, and District Nutrition Officers appointed, their capacities are still limited and offer considerable scope for improvement (TFNC, 2015). Likewise, a Tanzania National Nutrition Strategy (2011-2015) with a US\$520 million budget was developed, but a recent public expenditure review on nutrition has indicated that only 0.22% of total government expenditure was allocated to nutrition in the financial year 2012/13 and, therefore, few nutrition activities are implemented (INNOVEX, 2014).

¹ These nutrients include carbohydrate, minerals, proteins and vitamins (FAO, 1990)

1.4 The Significance of Farming in Tanzania

In Tanzania, the agriculture sector employs about two thirds of the total employed persons, and almost 90% of those employed in the sector are smallholder farmers living in rural areas (Tanzanian NBS, 2014a). Crop production is the dominant farming activity that engages 60% of households; followed by mixed crop-livestock production (39% of farm households) and livestock/pastoralism (1%). On average, farm households cultivate 5 acres of land (Tanzanian NBS, 2012). Farm productivity is generally low; it is estimated that production is 10% less than a decade ago (Irish AID, 2011). The main types of crops grown in Tanzania are cereals (for example: maize, rice and sorghum) which occupy 67% of the land under annual crops, followed by pulses (11%), oil seeds and oil nuts (11%), root and tubers (3%), cash crops (tobacco, cotton, pyrethrum, jute and seaweed) (7%) and vegetables and fruits (1%) (Tanzanian NBS, 2012). However, it should be noted that the land area proportions for every crop as presented here do not reflect intercropping practices. Smallholder farmers in rural areas produce most of Tanzania's food; yet they are poorer and more food insecure than their counterparts in urban areas (Tanzanian NBS, 2012).

It is accepted that the extent to which agriculture can contribute to poverty reduction (e.g. reducing insecurity) depends on the total amount of national resources allocated to the sector (DFID, 2005). The African Union (AU) Heads of State and Government in their meeting in Maputo, Mozambique in July 2003 emphasised the need for each AU member state to place agriculture at the heart of development funding. In what later came to be known as 'Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa', they asserted that each AU member state should ensure a

‘...commitment to the allocation of at least 10 percent of national budgetary resources to agriculture and rural development policy implementation within five years’ (African Union, 2003).

It is assumed that sustaining such 10% allocations of national budgets to the agriculture sector would translate into 6% percent annual sector growth (African Union, 2003). A review of the agricultural sector budget trends in Tanzania at both national and local

government levels shows that the agricultural budget increased from 3% of the national budget in 2000/01 to 7.8% in 2010/11, but declined to 6.9% in the 2011/12 budget year (Gabagambi, 2013). Although this budget trend was generally positive, the funds allocated to the sector were still below the proposed 10% indicated by the Maputo Declaration. The proportion of funds allocated for agriculture from the national budget was inadequate to run the broad range of activities covered under the sector in order to fight poverty and under-nutrition.

1.5 Significance and Rationale of the Study

One way to achieve greater outcome in poverty reduction strategies in developing countries is to promote growth in the sectors that support the livelihoods of most people (OECD, 2006). It is generally acknowledged that broad-based development of the agricultural sector is an effective approach to reducing poverty and to facilitate the country's economic growth (Amani, 2005; Dixon et al., 2001; Mnenwa and Maliti, 2010; OECD, 2006). Growth in the agricultural sector reduces poverty by harnessing the productive capacity of the poor people's key assets such as land and labour, by providing labour-intensive employment for the poor, by stimulating growth in the rural economy, and by lowering and stabilising food prices (Byerlee et al., 2005; OECD, 2006).

Poverty remains an overwhelmingly rural and, by implication, an agricultural phenomenon in Tanzania, and particularly among households whose major source of income is farming (Amani, 2013). As noted earlier, almost two thirds of the total employed persons in Tanzania, and almost 90% of all agricultural employed persons are smallholder farmers living in rural areas (Tanzanian NBS, 2014a). However, agriculture is the least remunerative sector (i.e. has low return to labour remuneration) in the economy (Amani, 2013). In 2012, the basic needs poverty rate in rural areas was 33%, compared with 22% in other urban areas and 4% in Dar es Salaam (Tanzanian NBS, 2014b). Likewise, in 2011, an estimated 48% of households in rural areas compared to 39% in urban areas of Tanzania were either 'moderately' or 'highly' food energy deficient (United Nations World Food Programme, 2013). Moreover, in 2013, about 39% of children under five in rural Tanzania were stunted, in contrast to 30% in urban

areas (Tanzanian NBS, 2014b). The large proportion of the population engaged in agriculture in rural areas implies that agriculture has potential to do more in poverty alleviation. Therefore, addressing poverty and hunger for most people in Tanzania implies confronting problems experienced by smallholder farmers in their daily lives in making decisions about farming.

The agricultural sector in Tanzania has a number of strengths, which offer significant potential for future growth and poverty reduction. Firstly, Tanzania still has a relative abundance of natural resources (including arable land and rangeland), which can be used for productive purposes. For instance, there is about 7.1 million ha of high and medium potential land (2.3 and 4.8 million ha, respectively) suitable for irrigation (URT, 2016). Of the 2.3 million ha classified as high potential, only 461,326 ha had improved irrigation infrastructure in 2015, accounting for only 1.6% of the total land with irrigation potential. Likewise, an estimated 55% of the land may be used for agriculture and more than 51% for pasture (URT, 2016). However, only about 6% of the agricultural land is cultivated. Secondly, Tanzania has an expanding domestic and regional food market opportunities, especially for livestock products and crops with high-income elasticity of demand (URT, 2016, 2001). Similarly, Tanzania's membership in regional communities (Southern African Development Community and East African Community) and as a signatory to international trade protocols is improving market opportunities for agricultural food and non-food commodities at both regional and global level. Thirdly, Tanzania has a comparative advantage in the production of traditional food crops (maize, rice, cassava, sorghum, sweet potatoes, legumes), horticultural crops, wheat and almost all traditional industrial export crops (cotton, cashew, tea, coffee, and tobacco) (Tanzanian NBS, 2012). This advantage can be improved through enhanced productivity and market efficiency.

Tanzania's diverse farming environment (Kavishe and Mushi 1993; Mnenwa and Maliti, 2010; Thornton et al., 2010) means that household farming decisions are influenced by a numerous production challenges. The key challenges which hamper the agricultural growth and overall poverty reduction among smallholder farm households include: firstly, significant exposure to variability in weather patterns with periodic droughts (Tanzanian MAFS & C, 2013; URT, 2016). The impact of variability in

weather patterns is amplified by the dependency on rain-fed agriculture and the smallholder farmers' limited capacity to manage land and water resources. Secondly, the use of productivity enhancing agricultural inputs among smallholder farmers in Tanzania is one of the lowest in the region. For example, Tanzanian farmers use about 8–10 kg of fertilizer per hectare compared with an average of 16 kg/ha for Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries and 279 kg/ha for China (URT, 2016); Other factors include: underdeveloped markets, market infrastructure and farm-level value addition; high transaction costs due to the poor state or lack of rural infrastructures such as rural roads, communications and electricity; inadequate agricultural finance, including public expenditure; and inadequate agricultural extension services (Tanzanian MAFS & C, 2013; URT, 2016). The challenges outlined here influence farm households' production and resource allocation decisions (Dixon et al., 2001; Garrity et al., 2012). Part of the decisions considered by farm households include the choice of farming system², normally in terms of the enterprise pattern such as livestock, crops, non-farm businesses, foodstuffs consumed and the way farm households interact with markets. The farm household decision-making process about their farming system is usually complicated, and many factors such as institutional or farming context characteristics, farmer or household characteristics and natural or farm characteristics (see discussion in Section 2.9) are considered simultaneously (Borges et al., 2015a; Dixon et al., 2001; Edwards-Jones, 2006).

The Government of Tanzania recognises that agricultural extension services have great potential to facilitate informed decision-making about the choice of farming system and are crucial for reducing household food insecurity and poverty in rural areas (United Republic of Tanzania, 2015). This is because the extension services facilitate the flow of advice, information, technical know-how and transfer of technology as well as inputs to farmers which are needed to increase and sustain agricultural production (CUTS International, 2011). In Tanzania, the agricultural extension services have been vested in local government authorities for them to foster effective participation of all stakeholders including beneficiaries, and motivate private sector participation in service delivery

² Since decision-making processes about the choice of farming systems is usually undertaken at the farm household level, this study defines a farming system as the totality of all decisions made by a particular farm household in relation to what, how and when to produce and how to consume what is produced (Dixon et al., 2001; Köbrich et al., 2003).