International Journal of Education and Development Studies
Open access · Double-blind peer reviewed · ISSN: In Progress
Volume 1, Issue 1 · 2026

Original Research

Beyond Recovery: How Rural Households Navigate Climate-Related Livelihood Insecurity in Coastal Bangladesh

Ngozi Ukamaka Ejiofor[1], Sabrina Nusrat Islam[2]

[1] Alex Ekwueme Federal University Ikwo, Ebonyi state Nigeria
[2] TMSS Medical College, Bangladesh
* Corresponding author: sabrina.konka@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

How to cite

Ejiofor, N. U., & Islam, S. N. (2026). Beyond recovery: How rural households navigate climate-related livelihood insecurity in coastal Bangladesh. *International Journal of Development Studies, 1*(1), 1–4.

DOI
Pending

Received
15 Oct 2026

Accepted
25 Oct 2026

Published
30 Oct 2026

Licence
CC BY 4.0 (open access)

ABSTRACT

Climate-related hazards are often discussed in terms of immediate damage and post-disaster recovery. Yet for rural households in coastal Bangladesh, repeated exposure to salinity, tidal flooding, cyclones, and irregular rainfall can gradually reshape livelihood choices, household responsibilities, and perceptions of the future. This qualitative teaching demonstration explores how rural households make livelihood decisions under recurring climate-related insecurity. It uses a constructed multiple-perspective dataset representing 25 adult participants from three fictional coastal communities. The illustrative analysis identifies four themes: (1) livelihood adjustment as a sequence of constrained choices; (2) diversification as both protection and additional risk; (3) unequal capacity to adapt; and (4) the importance of institutions that remain present between disasters. The analysis suggests that adaptation is not simply a technical response to environmental change. It is also a socially differentiated process shaped by assets, labour, credit, local institutions, and access to reliable information. The paper contributes a teaching example of how qualitative evidence can connect household experience with broader development concerns. Because all data are constructed, the findings are illustrative and cannot be treated as evidence about actual coastal communities.

Keywords
[climate change daptation; livelihood insecurity; coastal Bangladesh; rural development; vulnerability; qualitative research]

1. Introduction

Climate change is a development challenge because its effects are experienced through existing inequalities in income, land access, employment, infrastructure, and public services. In coastal Bangladesh, environmental pressures such as salinity intrusion, cyclones, tidal flooding, and waterlogging can affect agriculture, fisheries, drinking water, mobility, and household expenditure. These pressures do not operate separately from social and economic conditions. A hazard may produce very different consequences for a household with secure land, savings, and access to public support than for a household dependent on daily wages or informal borrowing.

Development policy frequently emphasizes resilience, adaptation technologies, and recovery programmes. These are important, but they can overlook how households make decisions over time when shocks recur. A family may shift from crop cultivation to wage labour, lease land, migrate temporarily, borrow money, reduce food expenditure, or rely on relatives. Such decisions may reduce immediate exposure while creating new forms of insecurity. For example, borrowing can finance a livelihood transition but also increase debt obligations; migration can diversify income but may increase care burdens for those who remain.

This paper uses a qualitative teaching demonstration to examine how rural households navigate climate-related livelihood insecurity. It focuses not on measuring the prevalence of particular strategies, but on illustrating how people interpret changing conditions, evaluate available options, and negotiate constraints. The central argument developed in the demonstration is that household adaptation is a process of constrained negotiation rather than a simple movement from vulnerability to resilience.

1.1 Research questions

1. How do rural households describe the ways climate-related pressures affect their livelihood decisions?
2. What strategies do households use to manage repeated environmental and economic uncertainty?
3. How do differences in assets, social relations, and institutional support shape households' capacity to adapt?

2. Conceptual Background

2.1 Sustainable livelihoods and vulnerability

The sustainable livelihoods approach draws attention to the assets and institutional processes through which people pursue livelihood strategies. Livelihoods depend not only on financial resources but also on human, social, natural, and physical capital. The approach is useful for understanding why

households exposed to similar environmental pressures may have different options. Access to land, skills, social networks, transport, savings, and public services can shape both the choices available and the costs of making them (Chambers & Conway, 1992; Scoones, 1998).

Vulnerability is also shaped by the interaction of exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity. It is therefore not reducible to the physical intensity of a hazard. Social differentiation matters: poverty, insecure tenure, gendered responsibilities, and unequal access to institutions influence how risks are experienced and managed (Adger, 2006; Ribot, 2014).

2.2 Adaptation as a social and political process

Adaptation is commonly understood as adjustment to actual or expected climate conditions. However, adaptation choices are conditioned by power, resources, and institutions. Some households can invest in improved production methods or move to alternative employment, while others may be limited to short-term coping. The distinction between adaptation and coping is not always clear in practice: a strategy that helps a household survive this season may undermine its future assets or increase debt.

This paper brings these perspectives together by examining livelihood decisions as situated choices. It treats household strategies as responses shaped by both environmental pressures and the wider development context, including markets, local government, NGOs, credit providers, and community networks.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

The demonstration is framed as an interpretive qualitative study using a multiple-community design. An interpretive approach is appropriate for exploring how people understand their circumstances and explain the meanings attached to livelihood decisions. The purpose is analytical rather than statistically representative: to develop an account of processes and differences that can inform further research.

3.2 Demonstration setting and constructed participants

The fictional study setting comprises three anonymized coastal communities in southern Bangladesh, labelled Community A, Community B, and Community C. The communities are described for teaching purposes as having mixed dependence on smallholder agriculture, fisheries, wage labour, petty trade, and migration. The participant pool contains 25 constructed adult profiles. It includes 10 women and 15 men, aged between 23 and 67 years. Participants are represented as small farmers, fishers, agricultural labourers, small traders, household caregivers, and temporary migrants or members of migrant households.

The participant composition is summarized below. These numbers describe the constructed teaching dataset only; they are not a sample recruited from real locations.

Illustrative participant category	Number	Purpose in the demonstration
Smallholder farmers / tenant cultivators	7	Land, crop choice, salinity and production costs
Fishers / aquaculture workers	5	Water conditions, seasonal work and market uncertainty
Agricultural / casual wage workers	4	Employment insecurity and labour mobility
Small traders / service workers	3	Non-farm income and local markets
Women with primary household-care roles	4	Care work, water access and household budgeting
Temporary migrants / migrant-household members	2	Mobility, remittances and family responsibilities

The categories are analytical and may overlap in real households. For this constructed dataset, each participant is assigned one primary category to make the demonstration transparent.

3.3 Data generation: illustrative interview material

In a real study, data might be generated through semi-structured interviews, supplemented by observation and relevant local documents. For this teaching example, however, no interviews took place. Instead, 25 fictional participant accounts were drafted to represent a range of livelihood positions and perspectives. The accounts were treated as if they were interview excerpts solely to demonstrate the stages of qualitative analysis. The quotations in the findings are invented and must not be mistaken for verbatim statements from actual people.

A real interview guide for this topic could include questions about livelihood changes over the past five to ten years, experiences of flooding or salinity, household decisions after a shock, sources of support, debt and savings, migration, gendered responsibilities, and expectations for the future.

3.4 Analytical procedure

The constructed accounts were examined through an illustrative thematic analysis informed by Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach: familiarization, initial coding, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the account. Initial codes included 'changing crop choice', 'borrowing for inputs', 'seasonal work', 'care responsibilities', 'informal support', 'delayed assistance', and 'uncertain programme access'. Related codes were grouped into broader patterns and compared across participant categories.

The analysis also considered divergent cases. For example, diversification was not assumed to be universally beneficial: some accounts described new income sources as protective, while others described them as low-paid and unreliable. This comparison helped avoid presenting adaptation as a uniformly positive process.

3.5 Ethical considerations and quality

Because this is a demonstration built from fictional material, there were no human participants, interviews, consent procedures, or institutional ethics approval. A real study would require voluntary informed consent, confidentiality safeguards, secure data management, and review by an appropriate ethics committee. Researchers should also explain their positionality, recruitment decisions, language and translation procedures, and

the steps used to support credibility and reflexivity. The constructed dataset cannot establish empirical trustworthiness; it can only illustrate transparent reporting.

4. Findings

The illustrative analysis generated four themes. Together, they show how livelihood decisions are shaped by repeated environmental pressures, limited resources, social relations, and the quality of institutional support.

4.1 Livelihood adjustment as a sequence of constrained choices

The first theme concerns the gradual and often reactive character of livelihood change. In the constructed accounts, households rarely described a single decision that transformed their livelihood. Instead, they adjusted in stages: reducing cultivated area, changing crops, taking temporary work, selling an asset, or borrowing to cover immediate costs. The order of these decisions mattered because early adjustments could influence later options.

One fictional smallholder account stated: “First we tried a different crop. When the return was not enough, I started taking work outside the village. The land is still there, but it cannot carry the whole family now.” This invented quotation illustrates a movement between livelihood activities rather than a clean transition from farming to another occupation.

The theme also highlights the difference between choice and necessity. Diversification may be described as an adaptation strategy, but the constructed accounts suggest that some households diversify because their previous livelihood no longer provides a dependable minimum income. For these households, flexibility is not necessarily a sign of improved opportunity; it may reflect the absence of a secure alternative.

4.2 Diversification offers protection but can reproduce insecurity

The second theme captures the mixed effects of livelihood diversification. Non-farm work, small trading, seasonal migration, and fisheries-related activities were represented as ways to reduce dependence on a single income source. Yet these options also carried risks: irregular earnings, transport costs, unstable demand, debt, and separation from family members.

A fictional participant engaged in casual labour explained: “If one kind of work stops, I look for another. But the other work is not waiting for me every day.” The quotation is constructed to show that multiple income sources do not automatically create stable income.

The accounts also suggest that the costs of diversification are unevenly distributed. Households with savings or access to trusted networks can experiment with new activities more easily. Those without such resources may enter low-return work or borrow at unfavourable terms. Diversification should therefore be assessed not only by the number of income sources but also by the quality, predictability, and control associated with those sources.

4.3 Adaptive capacity is unequal within and between households

The third theme concerns the distribution of adaptive capacity. Differences in land access, education, skills, savings, health, social networks, and mobility shape the strategies that households can realistically pursue. The constructed accounts portray better-resourced households as more able to invest in alternative production or temporary relocation. Households with fewer assets were more likely to rely on daily labour, informal borrowing, or support from relatives.

Gender also appeared as a cross-cutting dimension. In the fictional accounts, women’s responsibilities for food preparation, water collection, childcare, and household budgeting influenced the time available for paid work and training. A constructed woman participant described the pressure this way: “When water is difficult to find, the day becomes shorter for everything else.” This invented line illustrates how environmental stress can increase unpaid work and indirectly constrain livelihood choices.

The theme cautions against treating the household as a unified actor. Members may experience risks differently and may not have equal influence over decisions. A household-level description can therefore conceal differences in control over income, mobility, assets, and time.

4.4 Institutions matter between disasters, not only during response

The fourth theme concerns the timing and continuity of institutional support. The constructed accounts distinguished between short-term relief after a major event and support that helps households prepare for recurring pressures. Relief was represented as useful for immediate needs, while longer-term assistance was associated with access to reliable information, affordable finance, livelihood training, water infrastructure, market connections, and predictable public services.

A fictional community member stated: “People come when the water rises. We also need someone to help when the water goes down and we have to start again.” The invented quotation captures a concern about the gap between emergency response and sustained livelihood support.

The accounts also reflected uncertainty about programme eligibility, information channels, and the reliability of assistance. This suggests that institutional presence should not be measured only by whether a programme exists. Accessibility, continuity, transparency, and responsiveness shape whether households can use support when decisions are being made.

5. Discussion

The four themes support a process-oriented interpretation of household adaptation. First, livelihood adjustment is incremental and path-dependent: decisions made under pressure can change the resources available for later decisions. Second, diversification has conditional benefits. It may spread risk, but its value depends on the stability and returns of the activities households can access. Third, adaptive capacity is socially differentiated, including within households. Finally, institutions influence adaptation not only through emergency assistance but also through the everyday conditions that enable or restrict livelihood choices.

5.1 Moving beyond the language of household resilience

The concept of resilience can be useful, but it may imply that households can absorb repeated shocks through their own effort. The constructed accounts instead foreground the limits of individual and household action. A family cannot independently solve insecure land access, inadequate water infrastructure, weak market connections, or the absence of affordable financial services. A development perspective

should therefore connect household strategies to the institutions and political-economic conditions that shape them.

5.2 Implications for livelihood-focused adaptation policy

The demonstration points to four policy considerations. First, livelihood support should be designed around local economic realities rather than assuming that a single technical intervention will suit all households. Second, programmes should assess the quality and security of alternative work, not simply count the number of income sources. Third, adaptation planning should recognize unpaid care work and gendered constraints on time and mobility. Fourth, local institutions should provide continuity between emergencies through accessible information, transparent eligibility, and support that can be used before a household is forced to sell productive assets or take costly loans.

These implications should be treated as propositions for further investigation, not as policy conclusions established by this fictional dataset. A real study would need to examine differences across locations, livelihood groups, and institutional arrangements.

6. Conclusion

This qualitative teaching demonstration has examined how rural households may navigate climate-related livelihood insecurity in coastal Bangladesh. Its constructed analysis presents adaptation as a sequence of constrained decisions shaped by livelihood assets, unequal responsibilities, social relations, and institutional support. The central lesson is that diversification and coping should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of resilience. Their consequences depend on the security, returns, and distribution of available options.

For development research, the paper illustrates the value of moving from a hazard-centred description towards an account of how environmental pressures interact with everyday livelihood decisions and wider institutional conditions. The next step for an actual research project would be to collect and analyse genuine accounts from diverse household members, compare communities with different livelihood and institutional settings, and test whether the themes developed here are supported, challenged, or substantially revised by field evidence.

6.1 Limitations

The most important limitation is that the dataset is entirely constructed. It cannot establish what coastal households actually experience, how common particular strategies are, or whether the themes accurately represent any community. The fictional setting also compresses substantial differences across coastal Bangladesh. The manuscript should therefore be used only as a structural and analytical teaching aid.

References

Adger, W. N. (2006). Vulnerability. Global Environmental Change, 16(3), 268–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.02.006

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Chambers, R., & Conway, G. R. (1992). Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century (IDS Discussion Paper 296). Institute of Development Studies.

IPCC. (2022). Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844

Ribot, J. (2014). Cause and response: Vulnerability and climate in the Anthropocene. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 41(5), 667–705. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.894911

Scoones, I. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis (IDS Working Paper 72). Institute of Development Studies