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Both development and post-structuralist anthropologists have critiqued development. Development anthropologists are concerned that development does not take adequate account of the social and cultural factors of developing nations, while post structuralists question the ontology of development and assert that domination over developing nations is inherent in the concept of development. To examine the social effects of development projects I conducted ethnographic research for a nine-week period on social relations at Sagana Fish Farm, located two kilometers from Sagana Township in the Kirinyaga District of the Central Province of Kenya. (The population of Sagana Township is approximately 5,885 people.) I obtained thirty-one semi-structured interviews, also relying on participant observation and
informal interviews with civil servants (permanent employees) and casual laborers (temporary employees). I analyzed information obtained during interviews and participant observation within the context of power and resistance theory.

Civil servants tended to value the presence of development projects because projects made structural enhancements and renovations to the fish farm. Development projects presented civil servants the possibility for skills development and additional income to fish farm employees and created temporary employment for individuals from neighboring communities. Civil servants stated that an inexpensive source of protein was available in the form of fish, chicken, and milk as a result of the work of development organizations. However, they also expressed concerns regarding the sustainability of development projects due to tension between expatriate development project workers and fish farm employees, inadequate information sharing and technology transfer, and financial and human resource mismanagement in the Kenya civil service.

Casual laborers discussed the possibility of skills development through their work with development projects at the fish farm and expressed concern about their employment conditions. They were
concerned about low wages in contrast with the intensity of their labor; insecure terms of employment; an absence of protective equipment at their work site; health and medical issues; and the availability of treated drinking water. Other concerns were associated with dignity, tribalism, and a fear of power of expatriate development workers and Kenyan civil service officers. Based on the above findings I made the following recommendations were made: implement cultural sensitivity training for expatriate development workers; develop project plans that foster a sense of investment in project operations; provide discounted fish to casual laborers; improve the work conditions of casual laborers; establish a health clinic; and provide informal loans to facilitate technology transfer.
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AN ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AT A DEVELOPMENT SITE IN KENYA

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

INTEREST IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

My interest in development arose after my first extended experience overseas, a nine month tour with the US Peace Corps in the Republic of the Marshall Islands in 1991/1992. I spent three months in Majuro, the capital of the country, in language and ESL instructor training and six months teaching English, science, and health at Mae Elementary School, located on the remote outer island, Mae, of Namu Atoll. I returned to the Republic of the Marshall Islands a second time in 1996 as a technical assistant with the Micronesia South Pacific Program. I lived in Majuro for four months where I taught an expository writing class at the College of the Marshall Islands (CMI) and designed the college's course catalog.

While living on Mae, Namu, and teaching at the elementary school, I often questioned my role as development worker with the Peace Corps and the conception of development. The intention of the
Peace Corps program was that I would teach in collaboration with the teachers on the island; however, I soon realized that the teachers’ priorities were different than my aims or the aims of the Peace Corps. The teachers’ priorities were directed toward taking care of their families, their land, and maintaining their predominantly subsistence lifestyle. If there was time left after these priorities were taken care of, then they dedicated it to teaching. Usually I was on my own at the elementary school, teaching from US textbooks that had pictures of kites caught in power lines, an unlikely sight for a student on Mae. While the people of Mae recognized that education was important, their everyday lives took precedent, and the agenda that I attempted to carry out as a Peace Corps Volunteer was not meaningful to their everyday lives.\(^1\) I also questioned why Marshallese needed “development.” There were health issues that needed to be addressed, but the quality of life on the islands was good. I spoke with other Peace Corps Volunteers who encountered similar situations with their work as teachers; however, I was concerned to hear from some of them that they felt Marshallese people were “lazy” and uninterested in education. It seemed that Marshallese people had been labeled “lazy” by some because they hadn’t conformed to Western conceptions of education. I met very

\(^1\) This scenario was not the case for all Peace Corps Volunteers. There were islands where, due to political, economic, and social factors, education had become a higher
few teachers questioning the relevance of a western education for
students who had spent their entire lives in a very different reality and
whose choices were very different from those of a student from the
West.

During the time that I taught at CMI, I found that expatriates had
determined how education should proceed for Marshallese people
without considering their thoughts and ideas for education. The
President of CMI, an expatriate, at the time had decided that the use of
Marshallese language should be banned on campus so that the students
would learn to speak English. I again encountered negative attitudes
among some of the expatriate teachers toward Marshallese students. For
example, because students were very quiet or shy in class, they were
considered lazy or uninterested in education. I also learned that
students were writing essays on topics such as “Three Things I Like to
Do on a Hot Day.” This experience reinforced my perception that the
education being offered to Marshallese students was neither meaningful
to their experience nor were the values and ideas of Marshallese people
being incorporated into the education process

As a result of these experiences I surmised that development
activities, while born from good intention, did not necessarily have

priority. On these islands there tended to be more collaboration between Marshallese
and Peace Corps teachers.
positive outcomes. It also became apparent that development organizations and expatriate development workers tended to overlook the needs of the communities they served, and that different value systems were in operation. As a result community members and development workers had different definitions of development and expectations surrounding the development process. Based on my experiences in the Marshall Islands it appeared that the results of development work ranged from having a positive effect, to little effect in a positive or negative manner, to creating strained relations between development workers and the people they served with a negative outcome of development activities. Additionally, it appeared to me that the imposition of Western value systems seemed to perpetuate social relations reminiscent of colonialism rather than foster self-determination and independence.

After my experiences in the Marshall Islands I decided that I was interested in continuing to work overseas and also exploring some of the observations I made about development in an academic setting. This led me to pursue a graduate degree in anthropology that focused on the relations of power existing between developed and developing nations and how these relations affect the development process.
BACKGROUND

At the beginning of my graduate studies I obtained a research assistantship as a technical editor with the Information Management and Networking Component of the Pond Dynamics/Aquaculture Collaborative Research Support Program (PD/A CRSP) located at Oregon State University. Through collaboration with developing countries and the use of resources of both developing countries and US institutions, the PD/A CRSP conducts applied and strategic aquacultural research in three areas: production optimization, environmental effects, and socioeconomic aspects. The program’s overall objectives are the following: 1) improve the efficiency of aquaculture systems in both the US and developing countries, 2) minimize the negative environmental effects of fish culture, 3) examine the socioeconomic aspects of fish culture, 4) develop economical and culturally appropriate aquaculture strategies, and 5) disseminate relevant scientific and technical information (PD/A CRSP, 1996).

In March of 1997 a formal relationship was established between the PD/A CRSP and the Government of Kenya Department of Fisheries. The PD/A CRSP then initiated a long-term research project at Sagana Fish Farm, located in Kenya. The PD/A CRSP will remain at Sagana Fish Farm for a period of at least five years from the signing of the
Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Kenya Government provided there aren't changes in the available funding for the program.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION

The PD/A CRSP component of the program that addresses the socioeconomic aspects of aquaculture covers a broad range of areas associated with aquaculture development—marketing strategies, technology transfer, food security issues, the socioeconomic environment of the countries in which the program operates, the development of computer applications, and product development (PD/A CRSP, 1996)—however, the program does not conduct social impact assessments nor does it monitor its own social effects throughout the duration of its presence at a research site. Given the absence of social impact assessments and continued monitoring of the program's social effects, I decided to conduct a study that focuses on the experiences of individuals employed by Sagana Fish Farm and their social relations with development organizations. The qualitative aspect of this research, descriptions of experiences of individuals involved with the operations of the fish farm and with development organizations, is intended to illustrate the social relations associated with the presence of
development organizations at Sagana Fish Farm. Results of this study will 1) provide the PD/A CRSP and other development organizations operating at Sagana Fish Farm with information regarding the possible social effects of their presence and 2) offer insight regarding the value systems of individuals closely affiliated with the operation of Sagana Fish Farm and their perceptions of the development process. A deepened understanding of the social effects of the presence of development organizations, i.e., people's perceptions of development and the value systems associated with development, will allow for development planners to alleviate or avoid neocolonial social relations, which have the potential of alienating participants in the development process, and create more meaningful development plans that are characterized by collaboration and cooperation, thus increasing the likelihood of the success of a development project.
CHAPTER 2: THEORY

DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT AND ITS CRITIQUES

Development is, according to Arturo Escobar’s (1997) post World War II definition, a process designed to elevate developing nations in terms of economy and infrastructure. Through “high degrees of urbanization and education, technification of agriculture, and the adoption of values and principles of modernity” development has attempted to influence developing nations to more closely emulate the more “economically advanced nations of the world.” Wealthier “developed” countries through development assistance (e.g., injections of capital inputs and technical assistance) assumed poverty would be alleviated and the economies of “less developed nations” would eventually be able to sustain themselves; however, development has not done what it originally intended to do (Mosse, 1993). Developing nations are not more closely emulating developed nations as a result of development; rather, in a number of instances development has enhanced already existing inequalities or created inequality, which has led to extensive discussion regarding the approach of development.
organizations. The ontology of development, however, and its implications have not been critically analyzed.

Whether in political science or sociology, economics or political economy, development has been debated without questioning its ontological status. From modernization theory to dependency or world systems; from ‘market friendly development’ to self directed, sustainable, or eco-development the qualifiers of the term have multiplied without the term itself having been rendered radically problematic (Escobar, 1997).

Additionally, development has been criticized for its acknowledgment of difference and concomitant aim to eliminate difference. Escobar (1997) asserts that inherent in the definition of development is an acknowledgment of difference and at the same time a negation of difference, and he states that development is the “mechanism through which that difference is to be obliterated.” The operations of development organizations serve to homogenize developing nations, which he views as a failure of development. Escobar asserts that the “recognition and disavowal of difference” continually enacted by development organizations is a failure of the enterprise.

There is discussion within the discipline of anthropology regarding development. Development anthropologists have criticized development for the failure of “top down, economically-oriented
approaches" and have asserted the importance of accounting for social and cultural factors in the development process. Post-structuralist anthropological critiques have questioned the ontology of development and asserted that development is not a neutral concept. Escobar (1997) summarizes post-structuralist anthropological critiques: "Since its inception, 'development' has been considered to exist in reality, 'out there,' solid and material. Development has been taken to be a true descriptor of reality, a neutral language that can be utilized harmlessly and put to different ends according to the political and epistemological orientation of those waging it." According to Escobar (1997), however, the concept of development implies domination, i.e., developed nations have assumed that groups of people from developing nations require help and/or assistance in becoming more like the people of developed nations.

Critiques of Aquaculture in Development

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) defines aquaculture as "the farming of aquatic organisms, including fish, crustaceans, molluscs, and aquatic plants...Farming implies some form of intervention in the rearing process to enhance
production, such as regular stocking, feeding, and protection from predators, etc. Farming also implies individual or corporate ownership of the stock being cultivated" (Bailey et al., 1996). Aquaculture has received attention as a development activity that can facilitate foreign exchange, generate income, and provide an inexpensive source of protein to poor rural communities. Though optimism has surrounded the prospect of aquaculture as a development activity, problems associated with the natural environment and within economic, political and social realms have surfaced regarding its promotion. Within the social realm which is the focus of this research Bailey et al. (1996) assert that "aquaculture is not simply a technical process, but one that involves social relationships."

Critiques of Development in Kenya

Norman Miller (1984) discusses the problems that exist in relation to foreign aid and development in Kenya. Projects tend to become politicized and bureaucracy can hinder the progress of development organizations. Often grass-roots communities aren't consulted regarding how donor organization funds are spent and donor organizations will assume that the benefits of their work will "trickle
down" to the poorest classes. Miller (1984:143) also stated that there were three basic problems hindering the success of development and foreign aid in Kenya: 1) "Kenya's ability to absorb the aid that is given;" 2) duplication of activities of development organizations; and 3) "problems of cultural conflict between expatriots [sic] and Kenyans."

Miller (1984:144) also discusses the likelihood of the development of social and economic misunderstanding when the "outsider" (development workers) goes to Kenya to help the "insiders."

The situation creates a social impasse. To do an operational job, technical expertise is required, and the easy way is to bring in operational "experts," essentially to do the job for Kenya. Yet many of these people are broadly ignorant of Kenyan society and language. If their technical competency or their ability to relate professionally is not extremely high they may in fact contribute negatively rather than positively. The cost can be enormous. One UN estimate in 1981 was that a senior technical person would cost $120,000 per year—half in salary and half in support of per diem costs, overseas education for children, maintaining the Land Rover, and so on. The salary figure alone is six times as high as that of a senior Kenyan official.

Critiques of Aquacultural Development in Kenya

Regarding aquaculture development in Kenya the following critique was presented. Support for aquaculture development exists in
Kenya; however, development plans are not well documented: "Far too many projects revolve around scientists undertaking work that they enjoy, are interested in, without giving due consideration to other project aspects" (Satia et al., 1985 as cited by Harrison, 1993).

POSTMODERNISM AND FEMINIST ANTHROPOLOGY

The theory that influenced the direction of my research is rooted within the related paradigms of feminist anthropology and postmodernism. Some valuable questions were brought forth with the rise of postmodern anthropology in the 1980s—what is the political, historical, economic, cultural, and social context of research and how do these different contexts influence power relations and the consultant/researcher relationship? Postmodernism also challenged the authoritative voice used in ethnography and encouraged the discipline to exercise reflexivity. Anthropologists were expected to be self-critical, to question generalizations, and to avoid dichotomized categorizations in their research and writing.

According to postmodern anthropology objectivity is not achievable because reality is subjectively experienced. Reality is composed of many different voices and of discordant points of view.
Many factors influence an individual’s subjective experience: gender, class, age, ethnicity, language, family, education, and political economy. This assertion, implicit within the discipline of cultural anthropology, is addressed by postmodernism in the realm of ethnographic representation. Postmodernism, to address the subjective experiences of individuals involved in the research process (including the researcher), advocates the concept of multivocality, i.e., the inclusion of multiple points of view, in ethnographic writing.

Feminist anthropology diverges from postmodern anthropology in two areas: methodology and the concept of cultural relativity. Postmodern anthropology advocates that anthropologists discontinue field research and direct their efforts toward textual analysis and deconstruction. Feminist anthropology, however, asserts that researcher involvement and advocacy on behalf of communities are necessary components of field research. Feminist anthropology is also critical of postmodernism’s adherence to the concept of absolute cultural relativity. Feminist anthropologists are concerned that cultural relativity could be construed as moral relativity, which could result in an inadequate addressing of the existence of structures of inequality—a reality that feminist anthropologists assert is not relative. Inequality, according to feminist anthropologic theory is a concrete, observable, phenomenon.
Methods in feminist anthropology are action-oriented and collaborative. The emphasis of the research is on the needs, emotions, and desires of the informants, who are continually involved with the construction of text. This methodology aims to decentralize the researcher's power; the research process is open and shared with consultants. Additionally, analysis in feminist anthropology utilizes emically rather than etically constructed categories in the research process.

**Power and Resistance Theory**

While exploring postmodern and feminist anthropologic theory, I also realized it would be important for me to consider the experiences of individuals within the context of development in terms of power and resistance. In addition to a discussion of hegemony, I have included theory that addresses issues of power and resistance within the context of work, the structuring of the physical environment as a form of control, and theory that deals with concepts such as the anthropologist’s relationship to the community she studies, historical and political connections that affect local experience, and ethnographic writing that
moves away from creating difference, rather than further solidifying the people of the community studied as the "the other."

**Definition of Hegemony**

I found elements of the discussions of Raymond Williams and James Scott regarding hegemony useful for my research. Williams (1977) defines hegemony based on Antonio Gramsci's definition of hegemony. Gramsci distinguishes between "rule" and "hegemony," stating that rule is achieved through directly political forms and in periods of crisis through direct effective coercion. Hegemony, in contrast, is a much more subtle assertion of dominant forms. Everyday situations involve "a complex interlocking" of the political, social, and cultural realms. Both culture and ideology are included in the concept of hegemony. Culture is defined as a "whole social process" in which humans are solely capable of defining their existence, and ideology is the system of meanings and values that individuals use to express class interest. Hegemony, however, extends beyond the concept of culture and encompasses the distribution of power and influence. According to Williams (1977), Gramsci asserted that there were obstacles or inequalities existing in society that impeded all humans from defining
their whole lives and asserted the necessity of recognizing subordination and domination as an aspect of the whole process. Further, Gramsci thought that beyond ideology—a conscious system of ideas and beliefs—that the whole lived social process—structured around dominant meanings and values—was an essential component of hegemony. In considering hegemonic processes a distinction between consciousness and the “articulate formal system” (ideology) exists. Consciousness incorporates ideology, but it is not solely reduced to ideology. Individuals are completely immersed in the whole process of living, which includes relations of domination and subordination, and their lived, subjective experience of these relations is termed practical consciousness. Humans are embedded in continually transforming power relations. Political, social, and economic activity and lived identities and relationships constitute practical consciousness—a state of being in which power relations are not obvious. The following describes practical consciousness: “It is a whole body of practices and expectations, over the whole of living: our senses and assignments of energy, our shaping perceptions of ourselves and our world. It is a lived system of meaning and values—which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming” (Williams, 1977).

In the chapter “Hegemony and Consciousness,” James Scott (1987) contests Gramsci’s definition of hegemony, asserting that not only does
the dominant class control the means of production, but as well it controls mental production. Control of production in the physical realm is replicated in the symbolic realm—through culture, religion, education, and the media—thereby allowing the values of the dominant ideology to be reinforced. Scott (1987) is concerned that this definition implies that the subordinate classes accept the "legitimacy and superiority" of the ruling group. Through his analysis of class relations in Sedaka, a village in Malaysia that was in the process of agriculturally industrializing, Scott (1987) attempts to show that concepts such as false consciousness, mystification, and ideological state apparati are inadequate for understanding class relations. Subordinated groups have not unquestioningly adopted the values and beliefs of the dominant classes. "The rich" and "the poor" relate radically differently to one another than they do within their own classes. Scott (1987) states that relations between "the rich" and "the poor" only reveal a "partial transcript" which has lead to the illusion of mystification. He also asserts that "mystification and impression management are as much a pose of the powerless as ideological domination by the rich" and questions Gramsci's assertion that "that the radicalism of subordinate classes is to be found more in their acts than in their beliefs." Scott (1987) feels that dominated classes are more controlled within the realm of action; however, within the realm of belief there is more safety and
freedom. He maintains that resistance within this realm is often overlooked.

Scott (1987) also questions the idea that a "a system of social domination often appears to be inevitable" and is considered almost natural or legitimate by those who are oppressed by it. He suggests that what may appear to be compliance is actually an awareness of the realities of the system and what is pragmatic or feasible given those realities. An alternative definition of hegemony is suggested by Scott (1987): "...It might be said that the main function of a system of domination is to accomplish precisely this: to define what is realistic and what is not realistic and to drive certain goals and aspirations into the realm of the impossible, the realm of idle dreams, of wishful thinking."

Scott (1987) asserts that there is a realm for subordinated groups in which they are able to remove the "mask of obsequiousness, deference, and symbolic compliance" directed toward the ruling class. According to Scott (1987):

This realm of relatively safe discourse, however narrow, is a necessary condition for the development of symbolic resistance—a social space in which the definitions and performances imposed by domination do not prevail. This social space is, moreover, defined not only by the absence of vertical power relations but by the presence of sanctions and influence exercised by others who find themselves in the same boat.
Invisibility, Ressentiment, and Consciousness of the Other

Judy Rollins (1997) discusses three qualities that she observed in her field research on domestics’ relationships to their employers—specifically the relationship between black women domestics and their white employers—invisibility, consciousness of the other, and ressentiment. Rollins (1997) uses the term invisibility to describe experiences where domestics are treated as if they do not exist. She felt that the absence of acknowledgment of her existence was not “intended as insults...they were expressions of the employer’s ability to annihilate the humanness and even, at times, the very existence of me, a servant and a black woman” (Rollins, 1997). She states that rendering an individual invisible serves as a tool for dehumanization.

Rollins (1997) also discusses other race-related dynamics involving invisibility such as the interracial relations of colonies, in particular the Arabs who were colonized by the French. She discusses how the process of rendering humans invisible, i.e., dehumanizing them, serves to justify acts or decisions that would be otherwise unacceptable if acknowledged by the individuals implementing them.

Albert Memmi explained how this mechanism [dehumanization] facilitated the control of the colonized Arabs by the French: “What is left of the colonized at the end of this stubborn effort to dehumanize him?...He is hardly a human
being...[and] one does not have a serious obligation toward an animal or an object." But Frantz Fanon, writing of the same colonial dynamic, added the important point that the conceptualizations of those of the more powerful group create reality only for themselves and not for the people they choose to define as other than human (Rollins, 1997).

She concludes her discussion by stating that individuals have been socialized to perceive black people as inferior to white people and states that her field experience validates this assertion. In addition to the white employers that she encountered in her field work she stated that "whites (particularly those in societies with large Third World populations) do, to varying degrees, devalue the personhood of such people [referring to black people]" (Rollins, 1997).

Consciousness of the other refers to the ability of an oppressed individual to intimately understand the mental processes of his/her oppressor in an effort to cope with being treated as invisible. Rollins (1997) suggests that this knowledge is one of the "most powerful protections" against the individual with power.

It seemed to me that their most powerful protections against such treatments were their intimate knowledge of the realities of employer's lives, their understanding of the meaning of class and race in this country, and their value system, which measures an individual's worth less by material success than by "the kind of person you are," by the quality of one's interpersonal relationships and by one's standing in the community (Rollins, 1997).
Rollins (1997) asserts that developing a consciousness of the other allows individuals functioning in an oppressive situation to maintain their self respect and sense of self worth.

Rollins (1997) also discusses how individuals in subordinate positions realize the necessity and importance of having knowledge of the powerful and asserts that this is a "significant element of domination." She critiques Nietzsche's assertion about slave ethics:

Slave ethics...begins by saying no to an "outside", [sic] and "other", [sic] a non-self, and that no is its creative act. This reversal of direction of the evaluating look, this invariable looking outward instead of inward, is a fundamental feature of rancor. Slave ethics requires for its inception a sphere different from and hostile to its own. Physiologically speaking, it requires an outside stimulus in order to act at all; all its reaction is reaction (Rollins, 1997).

While Rollins agrees that domestics had to look outward and continually be aware of the dynamics of their situation, she asserts that they also were "inner directed and creative," not solely responsive or reactive to the actions of their employers (Rollins, 1997).

Rollins (1997) also discusses ressentiment, "an attitude which arises from a cumulative repression of feelings of hatred, revenge, envy
and the like."² If an individual is unable to release these feelings, he/she develops a sense of powerlessness. The continued experience of these emotions results in ressentiment. Additionally, Rollins (1997) writes that "a critical element of ressentiment is the sense of injustice based on the belief that one does not deserve to be in the subordinate position."

Another aspect of ressentiment that Rollins discusses is the psychological exploitation inherent in the relationship between an employer and employee in work relationships involving servitude (i.e., domestics). Rollins (1997) states that the psychological exploitation is caused by the domestics' awareness that the employer has used his/her "power to also exploit them materially." Rollins asserts that "If employers paid better, the quality of their [domestics'] lives would be better. Even egalitarian interpersonal relationships (which are non-existent, in any case) could not fully compensate for the hardships caused by not making enough money to provide adequately for oneself and one's family" (Rollins, 1997).

² Ressentiment is a French term adopted by Nietzsche into the German language and later explored by Max Scheler (Rollins, 1997).
Panopticon

In the chapter "The Eye of Power" from Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977, Michel Foucault (1981) discusses the Panopticon, which is:

A perimeter building in the form of a ring. At the centre of this, a tower, pierced by large windows opening on to the inner face of the ring. The outer building is divided into cells each of which traverses the whole thickness of the building. These cells have two windows, one opening on to the inside, facing the windows of the central tower, the other, outer one allowing daylight to pass through the whole cell. All that is then needed is to put an overseer in the tower and place in each of the cells a lunatic, a patient, a convict, a worker or a schoolboy. The back lighting enables one to pick out from the central tower the little captive silhouettes in the ring of cells. In short, the principle of the dungeon is reversed; daylight and the overseer's gaze capture the inmate more effectively than darkness, which afforded after all a sort of protection (Foucault, 1981).

Foucault (1981) describes the Panopticon as "system of isolating visibility" and a "technology of power," but also points out that visibility is not the only principle to govern technologies of power and that the Panopticon is only one of a variety of forms of power used in modern societies.

3 Jeremy Bentham first wrote of Panopticon at the end of the eighteenth century. Jean-Pierre Barou and Michel Foucault discuss the concept of Panopticon in an interview. Foucault describes Panopticon as an "event in the history of the human mind" and "a sort of Columbus's egg in the order of politics."
In “The Eye of Power,” Foucault further discusses the “techniques of power that are used within the Panopticon,” specifically “the gaze” (Foucault, 1981), and notes regarding its power and utility, that:

...you have a system of surveillance, which on the contrary involves very little expense. There is no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself. A superb formula: power exercised continually and for what turns out to be a minimal cost.

Foucault (1981) argues that power is nebulous and cannot be traced to one particular individual: “Power is no longer substantially identified with an individual who possesses or exercises it by right of birth; it becomes a machinery that no one owns.” He describes power as a “machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised” and adds that individuals all occupy different positions in society, which leads to the creation of differences in power and the “effect of supremacy,” so that “class domination can be exercised just to the extent that power is dissociated from individual might” (Foucault, 1981).
The Language of Exploitation

In the chapter "Stretching the Truth: Ideology at Work" from Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance, James C. Scott (1987) discusses exploitation, its relationship to language, and how exploitation is rationalized. Two types of discourse are observable—elite and folk categories—in situations where exploitation exists. According to Scott (1987) the concepts of "stinginess and arrogance" are significant aspects of "the vocabulary of exploitation" that are almost always used privately if a laborer feels exploited by members of the elite class. "Backstage accusations" of "stinginess and arrogance" are what Scott (1987) feels constitute "folk concepts of exploitation."

Scott (1987) maintains that the entirety of "the vocabulary of exploitation," shared by both "the poor" and "the rich," constitutes an "ideology of class relations." For example, when a laborer accuses his/her landlord of being stingy, the statement contains a latent ideology or a belief system regarding the relations that should exist between "the rich and the poor." In the context of Malaysian laborer/landlord relations (Malay peasant society), landlords, or "the rich," are expected to be "considerate (timbangrasa), helpful (tolong), and unselfish (senang kira);...[they should provide] employment, tenancies, loans, charity, and suitable feasts" (Scott, 1987).
The use of the terms of stinginess and arrogance are "one of the few remaining social weapons that Malaysian peasants are able to employ to persuade "the rich" to act in a humane fashion; however, "the rich" are also to provide assistance in such a way that does not humiliate or shame the recipient of the charity (Scott, 1987). The term "arrogance" is also used by the wealthy to control the behavior of the peasant labor force. "Arrogance," for the wealthy class refers to the more aggressive, less deferential poor who violate their view of what constitutes seemly behavior" (Scott, 1987). Arrogant poor are not as easily controlled, expect higher wages than they are entitled to and overall do not conform to the wealthy class' notion of how the poor should behave.

A Discussion of Resistance

In the chapter "Beyond the War of Words: Cautious Resistance and Calculated Conformity," from Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance, Scott (1987) discusses forms of "routine resistance" that do not fall under the definition of real resistance—a resistance that is "collective," "cooperative," "organized," "principled or selfless," with "revolutionary consequence," and intended to directly
oppose the dominant system. He discusses how this definition negates the significance of other forms of resistance, such as the resistance that he observed in Sedaka, and sets up a dichotomy in which forms of resistance that do not fall under this traditional, academic, view are deemed *token* resistance. *Token* resistance is "incidental or epiphenomenal" activity that is "unorganized," "unsystematic," "individual," has "no revolutionary consequence," and accommodates the dominant system" (Scott, 1987). Deference and conformity are presented publicly by the oppressed; however, according to Scott the oppressed are always testing the limits of their situation (Scott, 1987).

The forms of routine resistance that Scott (1987) identifies are 1) trade unionism without trade unions, 2) imposed mutuality, and 3) self help and/or enforcement. Scott observed trade unionism without trade unions among threshers, who are hired individually and paid on a per piece basis. The piece work nature of the work of threshers creates a conflict of interest between the farmer and the thresher. The thresher wants to fill as many sacks with rice as he can, and the farmer wants all of the rice from his field; however, the thresher can fill more bags if he only harvests 80 to 90% of the grains on a paddy in two or three strokes, rather than harvesting 100% of the paddy with six or seven strokes and then moving on. If the thresher is thorough he makes less money. Additionally, if a thresher leaves rice behind on the paddy, it is possible
that a woman from the thresher’s household can glean the rice left behind. Farmers constantly supervise threshers and often will not hire threshers who have many gleaners in their household. The farmers will sometimes check the sheaves of threshers to make sure they are harvesting enough rice and on the occasion that they are not satisfied with the work, they will not invite the thresher to return the next day to work. Informal wage negotiations also take place between the workers and farmers, and the workers will also use the threat of a strike to attempt to increase their wage (Scott, 1987).

Imposed mutuality refers to a requirement of class solidarity. The members of the working class are expected not to "undercut" one another so as to "magnify the considerable economic power of their employers and landlords" (Scott, 1987). To maintain class solidarity, sanctions are in place to keep everyone from straying out of line. Sanctions may include negative gossip, public shunning, and even violence.

Self help and/or enforcement refers to the theft and murder of livestock. Thefts are always carried out anonymously, after dark, and done by individuals or pairs. The targets of theft are also almost always the wealthier individuals of Sedaka, and people caught stealing tend to be the poorer inhabitants of Sedaka. Scott (1987) points out, however, that the latter two points do not necessarily indicate that "the poor"
perceive theft as a form of resistance. Scott feels that what is significant about theft is that the "class character of theft is built into the very property relations prevailing in Sedaka. The rich, by and large, possess what is worth taking, while the poor have the greatest incentive to take it" (Scott, 1987).

Scott (1987) also discusses how he views the "dull compulsion of economic relations" operating within the given general atmosphere of state intimidation that Malaysian peasants experience. Poor families depend on the "benevolence" of wealthy farmers and are extremely reluctant to offend a wealthy farmer who has the power to withhold wage work, make recommendations for settlement schemes, aid school children, and provide loans and short-term credit. This "benevolence," Scott (1987) asserts, has a malevolent component to it: a wealthy farmer has the power to withdraw assistance. Given that power, Malaysian peasants are highly unlikely to behave in a way that will alienate the farmer. This creates a "protection racket" for the wealthy farmers. The larger context of state control excludes any direct resistance by "the poor" and maintains a sense of powerlessness in the workers, which allows "the dull compulsion of economic relations [to] extract its daily toll" (Scott, 1987).

Scott also discusses the role of voluntary deference and compliance as tools for survival of Malaysian peasants. Those who
conform to the notion of the "respectable poor" do not question wages and do not refuse work. If a worker is discontent with his work situation, he does not reveal it. "A due regard for his livelihood requires a public comportment that is not in keeping with his private views." Scott also emphasizes that voluntary deference and compliance do not indicate false consciousness. A worker may be very angry about his/her situation and realize that he/she is being exploited or poorly treated, but at the same time realizes that in order to survive, he/she must behave in a way that is acceptable to the dominant group.

Scott's (1987) discussion of the "art of dissimulation" also speaks to issues of power and resistance within ethnographic research. Subordinate classes feign a position of acceptance of the reality of their situation in relation to their oppressor as a survival technique or a way of working within the system. As a result, Scott (1987) contends that, historically, many of the ethnographies and historiographies of the peasantry have been conservative. Typically, ethnographies and historiographies are written by classes other than the peasantry itself, so what is purported to be by the peasantry is potentially only a "partial truth" (Scott, 1987).

As the sources are almost invariably created by classes above the peasantry, they are likely, quite apart from ideological intent, to see only the cautious and deferential aspect the peasantry adopts in the presence of poser. What they may
describe on this basis is not false, but it is at best a partial and misleading truth that takes a necessary pose for the whole reality. When that happens, we get a picture of rural society that is distorted (Scott, 1987).

Scott (1987) feels that it is likely that there is a “massive middle ground, in which conformity is often a self-conscious strategy and resistance is a carefully hedged affair that avoids all-or-nothing confrontations,” that has been left out of ethnographies. According to Scott (1987),

...power-laden situations are nearly always inauthentic; the exercise of power nearly always drives a portion of the full transcript underground...What is safe and appropriate is of course defined rather unilaterally by the powerful. The greater the disparity in power between the two parties, the greater the proportion of the full transcript that is likely to be concealed.

He asserts that the effect of the observer on the observed may explain why much of the ethnographic data collected supports the concepts of “mystification” and “ideological hegemony.”

It is also important to note that “the art of dissimulation” is practiced not only by those who are oppressed (Scott, 1987). The powerful also engage in dissimulation, so that “mutual dissimulation” characterizes class relations. The “unedited transcripts” of each class are well-hidden from the other class, so that “unedited transcripts are never in direct contact.” Scott (1987) emphasizes, however, that the
subordinate class is generally more aware of the "unedited transcript" of the elite than the reverse, because the elite are more free to reveal their opinions of the subordinate class without fear. Because the elite are in power, the necessity of knowing what goes on backstage with the subordinate class is of only slight importance. Additionally, Scott notes, the subordinate class is required to try to anticipate the mood of the elite in order to operate safely within a system defined by the elite.

The Concept of Culture

Lila Abu-Lughod (1991) considers the concept of culture that has served as the foundation of anthropology. She asserts that the concept of culture serves to further entrench differences that create hierarchy and reaffirms the hegemony out of which anthropology was born. According to Abu-Lughod (1991), anthropology "is a discipline built on the historically constructed divide between the West and the non-West...and the relationship between the West and the non-West, at least since the birth of anthropology, has been constituted by Western domination." Abu-Lughod (1991) additionally discusses several concepts that might begin to address issues of positionality, connections, and ethnographies of the particular.
She presents the concept of positionality by discussing the dilemma for “halfie” anthropologists—individuals who are a part of the community they are studying. Critiques of the work of “halfie” anthropologists have expressed concern that halfies cannot maintain their objectivity since they are intimately connected with the community. Abu-Lughod (1991) asserts that these critiques would indicate that anthropologists still are attempting to define themselves as standing apart from the participants in their research, “the other.” She states, however, that this separation is illusionary and that an anthropologist, “the outsider,” stands in relation with, rather than detached from the community she studies regardless of whether she is a “halfie” anthropologist or not. “What we call the outside is a position within a larger political-historical complex...the [anthropologist] is in a specific position vis-á-vis the community being studied” (Abu-Lughod, 1991).

The use of the terms “practice and discourse” in theoretical discussions in anthropology indicates that the concept of culture is dynamic and evolving according to Abu-Lughod (1991). Practice deals with “problems of contradiction, misunderstanding, and misrecognition,” while discourse “relates to notions of discursive formations, apparatuses, and technologies” and in the “sociolinguistic sense [explores] the social uses of verbal resources by individuals” (Abu-
Lughod, 1991). The adoption of terms such as "practice and discourse" were intended to move descriptions of culture away from generalization and "to enable us to analyze social life without presuming the degree of coherence that the culture concept has come to carry" (Abu-Lughod, 1991).

Lila Abu-Lughod (1991) also advocates seeking connections and interconnection, both historic and contemporary, that exist between the anthropologist and the community and the connections that the anthropologist has "in the world to which he or she belongs and which enables him or her to be in that particular place studying that group" (Abu-Lughod, 1991). In addition to historical connections, there are "national and transnational connections of people, cultural forms, media, techniques, and commodities" that provide insight about the "articulation of capitalism and international politics." Abu-Lughod (1991) acknowledges the risk of overlooking local interactions if the larger historical and political context is considered; however, she believes that this context can be linked with the everyday experience of individuals.

Abu-Lughod (1991) advocates writing "ethnographies of the particular" to move away from casting communities studied as "the other." By uniting "the language of everyday life" and ethnographic text, it is possible to emphasize similarity, rather than create distance and
difference. She advocates writing ethnography that emphasizes the everyday particulars of an individual’s life while at the same time addresses the forces operating outside the community that may influence that everyday experience. Through emphasis on the everyday experiences of an individual in ethnography, his/her changing relationships, emotions, thoughts, and conflicts would address the "connotations of culture: homogeneity, coherence, and timelessness" that Abu-Lughod (1991) finds problematic.

Regarding the relationship between the individual and events that occur extralocally, Abu-Lughod writes, "...the effects of extralocal and long-term processes are only manifested locally and specifically, produced in the actions of individuals living their particular lives, inscribed in their bodies and their words" (Abu-Lughod, 1991).

To move away from creating "the other" in ethnographic text, Abu-Lughod (1991) feels that it is necessary to try to ascertain the relationships between individuals and their extralocal environments and convey that relationship via the written word.

In addition, Abu-Lughod (1991) emphasizes the richness associated with writing ethnographies of the particular:

And the particulars suggest that others live as we perceive ourselves living, not as robots programmed with "cultural" rules, but as people going through life agonizing over decisions, making mistakes, trying to make themselves look
good, enduring tragedies and personal losses, enjoying others, and finding moments of happiness.

Representations of the Poor

In the chapter "Seeing and Making Culture: Representing the Poor" in Outlaw culture: Resisting representation, Bell Hooks (1994) discusses poverty and the values associated with poverty by those who are poor and those who are a part of the ruling class. She describes growing up in a poor family, in which "poverty was no disgrace" and relays how she was socialized to believe that an individual's worth is not connected to material wealth. This value system was challenged at the time she began college. She described feeling "shocked by representations of the poor learned in classrooms." Poor people were generally portrayed as "shiftless, mindless, lazy, dishonest, and unworthy...the poor were without values" (Hooks, 1994). Hooks (1994) also argues that contemporary culture in the United States does not represent the poor as people with dignity.

The poor are portrayed through negative stereotypes...When they are lazy and dishonest, they are consumed with longing to be rich, a longing so intense that it renders them dysfunctional. Willing to commit all manner of dehumanizing and brutal acts in the name of material gain, the poor are portrayed as seeing themselves as always and only
worthless. Worth is gained only by means of material success (Hooks, 1994).

Hooks (1994) also discusses how people from poorer classes in the United States are socialized via films and television to identify with attitudes and values of the privileged class in this society and "internalize fear and contempt for those who are poor"; she asserts that the fear of "shame-based humiliation is a primary factor leading no one to want to identify themselves as poor" (Hooks, 1994). She also discusses how language used to describe the poor in the mass media equates poverty with "being nothing" and that this use of language has served to create a nihilistic outlook in poor people. She criticizes those who produce knowledge (intellectuals, journalists, and politicians) who do not make a connection between the despair felt in the underclass and the representations of poverty in mass media. She also states that "rarely do intellectuals suggest by their rhetoric that one can lead a meaningful, contented, and fulfilled life if one is poor. No one talks about our individual collective accountability to the poor, a responsibility that begins with the politics of representation" (Hooks, 1994). Typically the value system that has been perpetuated by the mass media is an "ethic of liberal individualism," affirming that it is "morally acceptable not to share." According to Hooks (1994), an ethic of liberal individualism best suits the "privileged classes" and also makes the
situation of the poorer class, which depends on an “ethic of communalism,” more difficult.

Hooks (1994) feels there are two necessary routes for changing the effects of poverty. She believes that first change must be made in the way that resources and wealth are distributed. Secondly, she asserts that modes of representation of the poor also need to be altered. “Since many folks will be poor for a long time before those changes are put in place that address their economic needs, it is crucial to construct habits of seeing and being that restore an oppositional value system affirming that one can live a life of dignity and integrity in the midst of poverty” (Hooks, 1994).

Hooks (1994) also discusses the different values systems of the privileged classes that perpetuate a negative representation of the poor. Hooks states that “progressive intellectuals from privileged classes” hinder the process of changing the way the poor are represented because they are fearful that if poverty is represented as something that is “acceptable” then the conservative upper classes will feel no responsibility, concern, or accountability for the lower classes. The conservative upper class, which Hooks (1994) feels “did much to put in place a system of representation that dehumanized the poor,” fears that if the poor do not relate economic status to self-worth then, they “will not passively assume their role as exploited workers.” Hooks (1994) feels
that this base fear of the conservative privileged class is “masked” by the argument that if the poor learn that poverty is acceptable, then the poor will not seek work and will become a social burden. Hooks (1994) feels that the increasing numbers of individuals from poorer classes who are “refusing menial labor in low-paid jobs” are not doing so because they are “lazy”; she asserts that they do so because “it is not worth it to work a job where one is systematically dehumanized or exploited only to remain poor.”

Hooks (1994) suggests several ways to begin to shift or “intervene” against the damaging effects of representations of the poor. For example, she feels that political movements that strive for individuals to “live more simply” are a potential place of “connection and constructive interaction” between the poor and privileged class. The poor are well-practiced at living simply and offer skills, creativity, and resources that could be shared with members of privileged classes who are interested in the redistribution of wealth. Hooks (1994) feels that literacy programs in connection with “education for critical consciousness” are another method for reversing disabling regimes of representation. She also asserts that changing representations of poverty may “challenge everyone to look at the face of poverty and not turn away” (Hooks, 1994).

In sum, the theories informing this research deal with power relations. This chapter covered the concept of development itself and
the problems associated with the development enterprise, specifically with aquaculture development in Kenya. Both postmodernism and feminist anthropologic theory provided frameworks for approaching research that address power relations and inequality. Additionally, the chapter discusses hegemony, the subtle assertion of domination, how individuals experience and cope with oppressive situations, and the ways that systems of domination are perpetuated.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

STUDY LOCATION

This research was conducted for a nine-week period extending from March to the June 1998 at Sagana Fish Farm. Sagana Fish Farm is located 2 km from Sagana Township in Kirinyaga District of the Central Province of Kenya (Figure 1). Kirinyaga District, based on a 1979 census, was estimated to have a total population of 452,988 in 1993. The population of Sagana Township, considered an urban center in Kirinyaga District was 2,098 in 1979 and was expected to increase at a rate of 9.5% per annum. Given this growth rate the population of Sagana Township is currently approximately 5,885 (http://www.kenyaweb.com/ourland/central/kirinyaga/kn_dempt.htm, November 10, 1998).

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND THEIR APPROACHES

Two non-profit aquaculture development organizations have operated at Sagana Fish Farm. The first project, jointly funded through the Belgian and Kenyan governments, operated at the fish farm in the early to mid 1990s. The goal of the project was to renovate and rehabilitate the fish farm and demonstrate the sustainability of the fish
Figure 1. Kenya is located in East Africa. Sagana township is located in Kirinyaga District of the Central Province of Kenya.
farm after renovation. The project integrated all fish farm activities and incorporated all employees into the project's operations.

The Pond Dynamics/Aquaculture Collaborative Research Support Program (PD/A CRSP) initiated operations at the fish farm in March 1997 and continues to operate. The project does strategic and applied research that focuses on the optimization of aquaculture systems. The operations of the PD/A CRSP are separate from overall activities of the fish farm in terms of physical location and also agenda, and the project incorporates approximately one-fourth of the civil staff in its operations (Table 1; Figure 2).

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF CONSULTANTS

At Sagana Fish Farm there were two primary groups of employees that I interviewed—casual laborers and civil servants. Casual laborers are temporary employees, who theoretically work no longer than three months, and the civil servants are permanent employees. There are two different groups of casual laborers—the “casuals” who are hired by development organizations, called “donor projects” by consultants, at the farm and the “casuals” who are hired by the Kenyan government. Civil servants at Sagana Fish Farm are categorized into three areas—senior, junior, and subordinate staff (Table 1).
Table 1. List of civil service employment positions at Sagana Fish Farm and their rank. Positions are ranked B through M with position B having the lowest rank and M having the highest rank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Position</th>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
<th>Rank of Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Fisheries Officer*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Officer I, Deputy Head of Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Officer I, Head of Fish Production Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Officer II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Development Officer*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Research Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Clerical Officer, Government Accounts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Officer, Registry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Assistant I, Fishing Team Supervisor*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Assistant III, Fishing Team Supervisor*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Assistant III, Computer Operator and Storekeeper*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver I*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan I, Maintenance Crew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan II, Maintenance Crew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan III, Maintenance Crew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Technician*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Fish Scout, Bird Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Scout I (poultry, water control, security, catfish propagation, farm kiosk operator)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Scout II, Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Subordinate Staff, Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Subordinate Staff, Assistant Laboratory Technician*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Staff II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy Typist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Civil Service Employees: 42

* Civil service employees who have a daily connection with the operation of the donor project.
Figure 2. The research activities of the PD/A CRSP primarily involve ponds one through twelve, the computer room, and the laboratory. (This map is not to scale and is not an exact representation of the fish farm.)
SAMPLING AND INTERVIEWS

A purposive sampling strategy was used to select consultants for interviewing. With a stratified sampling strategy consultants would have been randomly chosen from each classification of civil service employee. Because civil servants were apprehensive regarding the interview process I decided to use a purposive sampling strategy. I still attempted to obtain a cross section of interviews that represented the employment ranking described in Table 1; however, I interviewed people as they came to trust what I was doing and felt comfortable speaking with me. I wanted people to speak with me on their own volition, rather than feeling obligated or pressured because they were aware that I represented the current project that is in operation at the farm. Pressuring people for interviews seemed counter productive to building trust.

To obtain interviews, I or my research assistant explained the intention of my research, relayed the questions that I would ask, and emphasized that they could discontinue the interview at any time or refuse to answer any questions, and then invited individuals to discuss their experiences. At the end of the nine-week period for this study there were still many people who were apprehensive about the research.
While at the farm I conducted thirty-one semi-structured interviews, one focus group, and informal interviews in addition to participant observation (see Appendix for interview questions). Ten of the semi-structured interviews were with civil servants; fourteen semi-structured interviews were with casual laborers; three of the semi-structured interviews were with individuals who were affiliated with Sagana Fish Farm but not employed by the farm; and three semi-structured interviews were with elders who had worked at Sagana Fish Farm in the 1950s and 60s. The focus group consisted of four women who were civil servants at Sagana Fish Farm. Also, twelve fish farm employees were informally interviewed—four civil servants and eight casual laborers. (The following civil service ranking was represented in semi-structured and informal interviews—B, D, F, G, J, H, K, M.)

**SAGANA FISH FARM EMPLOYEE RECEPTIVITY TO INTERVIEWS**

Upon my arrival many people appeared uneasy about being interviewed because there had been tension between the previous development organization and members of the civil staff, which led to a mass transfer of the civil staff. Additionally, the second phase of the project was not implemented by the donor organization. I do not know
why the second phase of the project was not implemented; however, it became apparent that there were civil staff members who felt that the discontinuation of the second phase was attributed to tension between the civil staff and donor organization.

I was informed by one senior officer about the Government of Kenya protocol regarding interviews with civil service employees. Civil service staff may not reveal information because "only the government department in charge of manpower disposition and development are the ones who undertake such surveys [referring to the questions posed in this study to civil servants; see the Appendix for a list of questions for civil servants]" and Sagana Fish Farm's "mode of operations gives little room for personal opinions to be entertained hence transfers, job descriptions, upgrading and promotions, etc. are really determined in Nairobi for all civil servants."

Additionally, donor staff informed me after the research was complete that the station had been "plagued by criminal elements" who are difficult to remove from the station. Donor staff felt that "giving them [the criminal elements] another method to create trouble was not [their] intention" when they permitted me to come and do interviews. Donor staff explained that in addition to trying to prevent further trouble that "other civil servants who refused an interview did not do so out of fear so much as they resented the 'leading questions' and knew
that all surveys must be first passed by the government (Office of the President, I think) before being conducted."

DATA COLLECTION

Translation

Translation affected participant observation and interviewing. Because I did not speak the tribal language (which tended to be Kikuyu) of the farm employees or Swahili, the Kenyan national language, I missed interactions that would have provided me with a better understanding of the context of people’s daily lives. When interviews were not conducted in English, my research assistant translated. Translation, however, introduces many layers of interpretation—what the translator thinks I’ve asked or stated, how the individual being interviewed interprets the question, the translator’s interpretation of the consultant’s response, and then again my own interpretation of what the translator has relayed to me.
Positionality

Lila Abu-Lughod (1991) argues the importance of acknowledging positionality in the research process and in ethnographic text. It is relevant to discuss how positionality affected my fieldwork. The power differential that existed between myself and the casual laborers became evident during participant observation and interviewing. Everyday I arrived at the ponds carrying my field bag with notebooks and pens, wearing my clean khaki skirt, t-shirt, and tevas. I was a graduate student from the United States who had enough money to fly to Kenya to stand on the edge of the ponds and watch the casuals work. Chris, a consultant who was affiliated with but not employed by Sagana Fish Farm asked me if I realized that most everyone (referring to the casuals, the civil staff, and most Kenyans with the exception of the very wealthy) I encountered “would never have the opportunity to travel to the United States in their lifetime.” In addition to the economic challenge of traveling to the United States, he also described how difficult it is for Kenyans to go to the United States due to US immigration policies. Chris asked me how much it would cost to go the United States. After I told him he joked, “I’d have to sell ten pigs to get to the United States.”

I related from a particular position regardless of whether or not I acknowledged that position. I became aware that I was relating to people from a more economically privileged position. On another day Chris asked the value of my camera. I replied that it was approximately $150. Chris laughed and asked me if I realized that what I was carrying around
the equivalent of 10 female cows that give milk. He then asked, "Why do mzungu always have to have a camera? Is it something innate? Did they just come out of the womb with a camera attached to them?" (Mzungu is a generalized term for anyone who is from anywhere other than the African continent; during interviews, Americans, Russians, Belgians, and Canadians were referred to as mzungu.)

I also became aware that I was perceived as coming from a technologically advanced, developed nation, which implied superiority. In another instance I was sitting outside the canteen at the fish farm with several casuals and civil servants. There was a discussion about evolution versus creationism. Everyone in the discussion was skeptical about the theory of evolution and believed that Creation was how humans came into existence. During the conversation someone brought up the Massai creation myth, that humans came from the sky. Everyone present felt this was merely myth and reaffirmed that the Christian creation myth was the legitimate explanation of how humans came to be here. Then one of the casuals asked me if it was true that human beings were still evolving. I answered that it was true, but that it was on a time scale so large that the change would be impossible to see. He then asked, "will Africans evolve to be clever like wazungu?". I responded that "Africans" already were clever like "wazungu," but he disagreed with my assertion. (Wazungu is the plural mzungu.)

While in another conversation with two civil servants, I was reminded that I came from the "world superpower," a "technologically advanced nation," a nation that behaved as "robocop." Additionally,
mzungu like to take the best land. In a conversation with two civil servants, Gerald and Bob, I was asked where my “blood comes from.” After I told them that it was from England, France, Italy, and Ireland, they asked, “so there are no indigenous Americans?” Gerald commented that “there are Native Americans, but wazungu took over their land.” Gerald and Bob then laughed and commented on how “wazungu like to take the best land.” They then provided Eldoret as an example in Kenya. They explained that Eldoret is called the “White Highlands.”

Additionally, I felt that as I stood on the edge of the ponds that I was perceived more as an evaluator and was aware of the discomfort that my “gaze” caused. At a later point one of the civil servants informed me that the casualties “were fearing” me because they thought I was an evaluator or a supervisor.

Time also was a factor constraining this research. Nine weeks is a short period of time. With additional time I think it would have been valuable to interview a broader cross section of the farm employees and to have included interviews with senior officers and donor staff. Additionally, more time as a participant observer would have helped me to develop a better sense of relationships, interactions, and routines.
Participant Observation

According to Bernard (1988), extended periods of contact characteristic of participant observation allow the researcher to observe the subtleties of individuals' roles in a community and the dynamics of a community that may not be accessible through interviews or focus groups. Participant observation may lead to insights regarding data that have already been collected or to the refinement of techniques for future data collection. While I feel that this assertion is valid I would like to discuss some of the positive and negative aspects of participant observation that I encountered during my research.

Despite the constraints of translation, participant observation resulted in the most honest, spontaneous responses. Because there were no questions that bound my interactions with people I developed a better sense of what was meaningful to people (at least within the context of our discussions); nonetheless, my presence still influenced what people felt comfortable with discussing. For example, at the end of a work day at the donor project ponds I conversed with an individual about wazungu. He described to me his perceptions of wazungu and wanted to discuss his observations with me. Additionally there were evenings after work when I conversed with one of the casuals who was very interested in the United States, Kenya politics, and cultural differences between wazungu and wafrika. The fact that I was a mzungu who was open to having discussions about Kenyan people's perceptions of wazungu facilitated these discussions. The position that I was in as a
graduate student researcher funded by the development organization and all the factors (age, class, education, family, friends, values, and gender) influenced the relations that I had with the employees and the content of our interactions, discussion, and exchanges.

Participant observation at the ponds where the casuals mostly worked and at the fish farm offices was difficult. The casuals were engaged in manual labor most of the day and so opportunities for interaction were scarce. Although, as the casuals became more comfortable with my presence, I was able to meet with them during lunch or in the canteen after work. Initially while at the ponds as a participant observer, I asked the fisheries assistant who was supervising to translate for me; however, I thought that I was violating the privacy of the casuals by doing this and putting the fisheries assistants that I was with in a difficult or compromised position. My interactions with the casual laborers were at first awkward and strained. I didn’t speak Kikuyu, spoke only remedial Swahili, and the casuals communicated with each other and the fisheries assistants in Kikuyu. My research assistant spoke Kikuyu and Swahili and could translate for me; however, it seemed that the relay that comes with translation decreased the spontaneity of interaction, especially in groups of more than two or three people. In those situations my research assistant would try and summarize the overall context of the situation.

Once the casuals were more comfortable with my presence as a participant observer and understood that I was interested in their experiences alone rather than the needs of donor organizations, they
shared with me at various points in the day or after work their experiences working at the farm. These discussions seemed to yield richer descriptions than when I interviewed individuals or attempted focus groups. The slightest structure created by an interview situation seemed to cause people to feel ill at ease.

Participant observation was difficult at the ponds. To truly be a participant observer I should have been in the ponds working with the casuals. Rather, I either sat or stood on the edge of the ponds and talked with the fisheries assistant who was supervising the casuals while the casuals were in the ponds seining. In terms of physicality I was standing on the ponds edge literally looking down into the ponds at the casuals while they worked. During the first few weeks that I visited the ponds I thought that I was more an outsider than a participant observer. This perception was validated a few weeks later when I was told by one of the fisheries assistants that the casual laborers thought that I was there to supervise and evaluate them for the project coordinator, which means that I was perceived as an "evaluator" rather than a participant. Toward the end of my research one of the fisheries assistants would voluntarily translate for me and the casuals more freely described their experiences and discussed their thoughts and feelings about working at the farm. It was at this point that I felt more as if I were a participant observer, though still very much an outsider.
Semi-structured Interviews

Throughout the nine weeks that I was at Sagana Fish Farm, people tended to feel apprehensive and/or fearful about being interviewed. For example, regarding an interview one person joked with my research assistant, "Why should I fear an interview? I was interviewed during the Mau Mau [referring to interrogation by British officers during the Mau Mau rebellion; the Mau Mau rebellion is covered in the history section of this thesis (chapter 4)]."

My research assistant put people at ease about the interviews we were doing. People at the farm felt very comfortable with him and would ask him what I wanted to know and why I was doing the research. I also feel that during the interviews of some people, the presence of my research assistant helped them to feel more relaxed and conversant. People at the farm would then "make appointments" through him as they gained trust. During these interview situations I found that people had items that were important to them that they would relay to me first, then they would ask for my questions.

Interview situations created tension that I did not find during participant observation. Conversations and discussions sitting outside the canteen or on walks into town tended to be much more relaxed and gave me a clearer understanding of people's everyday experiences at the farm and their work with development projects.
Focus Groups

The focus group was intended to be supplemental to ethnographic research methods and was used as a tool to triangulate data collected during interviews and participant observation.

Agar and MacDonald (1995) commented that "a focus group works to the extent that group members discuss the topic among themselves. But there is an outsider, the moderator, and probably an observer as well, who are responsible for the group and the topics to be discussed. Too much moderator control prevents the group interaction that is the goal; too little control, and the topics might never be discussed." I organized one focus group with four single women, Michelle, Grace, Regina, and Irene, who worked as civil servants. The focus group ran seemingly as a relaxed conversation and did validate data that had been previously collected. All the women came to my house for tea. They had been informed prior to the interview that I was interested in their experiences working at the farm and how the presence and/or absence of development projects affected their experiences. When they arrived we had tea, ate, took pictures and then once this was finished they talked to me about their experiences. I didn't have a sense that I really had much control over how the course of the meeting went, which in one sense was positive because the meeting felt natural and relaxed. In the other sense there wasn't as much time to focus on questions related to their experiences. The discussion,
however, did give me more of a sense of the women's everyday lives—their relationships, children, and families.

Agar and MacDonald (1995) also discussed how the "structure of a focus group sets constraints on interaction. Turns are usually short, moderator control is inevitable, a few group members dominate, and group formation sets up constraints on what can be said." I found in my focus group that Michelle seemed to be most at ease discussing her experiences. The other three women appeared to be in agreement with what was said, but their verbal participation wasn't to the same degree as Michelle's. The women's descriptions of everyday experiences at the farm (not in relation to the presence of donor organizations) flowed easily, whereas description of experiences in relation to development organizations didn't get too involved. This may have been because the topics put forth for discussion were not meaningful, the women were uncomfortable discussing donor organizations, or an inadequate level of trust in the group and me.

Semi-structured Interviews with Elders

For comparative and contextualization purposes I conducted three semi-structured interviews with three elders who had worked at Sagana Fish Farm during British rule. One of the elders worked at the farm during the 1950s doing "nation building," which was required, communal, unpaid labor; another elder described his experiences
working at the farm during the Mau Mau rebellion (early to mid 1950s); and another elder described working at the farm during 1962 and 1963.

**APPROACH TO RESEARCH AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS**

I attempted to write this ethnography in a collaborative manner with the intention of decentralizing my power as a researcher. I tried to convey that the employees of the farm were the authorities and experts about their experiences. I also sought to include marginalized voices in the research process and in the writing and reading of ethnographic text. In including those marginalized voices; however, the goal to decentralize power in the research process was undermined and the power relationship that existed between myself and the casuals was revealed. Although, it seemed there were different levels to our relationship in terms of power. The casuals were informed by the contractor supervising them that one by one they should interview with me. Sometimes the casuals would decide among themselves who would interview and other times the contractor would choose who would be interviewed. They were not obligated or required to answer any questions asked of them, nonetheless they were required to meet with me. It seemed, however, that there were different ways to view power and resistance in terms of the interviews. Some of the casuals
viewed the interviews as an opportunity to take a break from strenuous labor. Others viewed the interviews as an avenue to make known their frustrations regarding their work. It was easier for the government casuals and the civil servants to avoid being interviewed; they were not fearful about losing their jobs if they chose not to speak with me about their experiences, whereas casual laborers were very concerned about being laid off. Civil servants were able to observe what I was doing and determine on their own whether or not they wanted to be interviewed.

PERCEPTIONS OF RESEARCH AND RESULTS AS DISCUSSED BY CONSULTANTS

During a conversation with Douglas, a civil servant, he asked if I had gotten all my information from the casuals. Douglas reminded me that he had already told me “his piece,” i.e., how hard working donor staff were; how mismanagement had been a problem with a donor; how donors were positive because they provided jobs for casuals. Douglas then relayed to me that he had spoken with some of the casuals and that they had wanted him to ask me to ask the donor organization if they could pay the casuals a little bit more money. He said even half of what they make per day would be good. He said that this would benefit the project and benefit the casuals. He said that with more pay the casuals would increase their efforts, which would benefit the project. He also
informed me that if I talked to donor staff and/or wrote in my report that the casuals wanted more money and then they received more money that I would have helped the casuals too. Douglas then added that the casuals asked him to ask me to ask the donor project for more money, because "they are afraid to" do so on their own. He explained that they are "fearful that they will be sacked."

During a semi-structured interview with another civil service employee, Anthony, I was informed that an anthropological study was a positive aspect of the current donor project. He felt the donor project's administrative offices would have a better sense of what was going on and that an anthropological study would open communication. With a previous donor project, Anthony said that the administrative offices only heard from the donor staff in charge; he felt that this made it difficult for the administrative office to know if the project was having a positive effect or not.

During semi-structured interviews with four casual laborers I was asked if the research I was doing was going to alleviate or "fix" their circumstances. Additionally, casual laborers asked about how they would benefit from my research. At the end of one semi-structured interview, Glenn asked if this research "would fill their expectations?" Prior to beginning an interview with Frederick he asked what the benefits were for me and the casuals from my research? Another casual
laborer who works for the donor project, George, also asked “Whose benefit is this for [referring to this research]?” At the end of our interview Eric wanted to know if what I wrote in my report would affect any change. Edward and Tom, both casual laborers working for the Kenya Government, asked me if the research I was doing would “benefit the casuals” and “fix our problems.” They then asked if I would be able to “speak freely” with the donor staff because the casuals “were fearing” saying what they think because they “fear being sacked.”

For the last week of my research at the farm I invited the civil servants and casuals to read what I had written about our interviews. I was set up in the conference room at the farm and invited people to come by at any point in the day to read what I was working on. Three civil servants came to read what I had written, who didn’t have any comments regarding the results. One evening I met with four of the government casuals at the canteen and we went through my results. I asked that they comment about what had been written, whether their comments were positive, negative, or additional information. The only comment that was offered was that the results seemed to be “transparent.”

After I returned to the United States I sent hard copies of a draft results section of this thesis to the social development officer, my research assistant, and a civil servant who worked closely with the
casuals. I asked that they distribute the text to as many civil servants and casuals as possible and requested that they send me their responses. Later, I received a letter from the civil servant I mentioned above who I sent a copy of my results and who worked closely with the casuals. He indicated that the results section I sent to Sagana Fish Farm had been "confiscated," marked "confidential," and "impounded" in the safe at the fish farm.

**CONTENT OF INFORMATION SHARED DURING INTERVIEWS**

Scott's (1987) discussion of "partial transcripts" may be relevant when considering consultants' interview responses.

It is probably just this necessary "art of dissimulation" that has been largely responsible for much of the conservative historiography of the peasantry. As the sources are almost invariably created by classes above the peasantry, they are likely, quite apart from ideological intent, to see only that cautious and deferential aspect the peasantry adopts in the presence of power. What they may describe on this basis is not false, but it is at best a partial and misleading truth that takes a necessary pose for the whole reality (Scott, 1987).

What was revealed by civil service employees and casual laborers when I was present, I believe, was only a slight portion of consultants'
transcript—their thoughts, feelings, and experiences. Likewise, what I revealed about myself, i.e., my thoughts and feelings about the research, was also only a portion of my transcript.

I suspect that I was provided with a “partial transcript” the first full day that I spent at the farm when one of the civil servants, Douglas, made a point of introducing himself to me. According to Douglas, the civil staff had been informed that I would be coming to Sagana to study the impacts/benefits of the donor organization. It was apparent that continued funding was important to at least Douglas. He reminded me that he was the person that I had seen at the farm on my first in Sagana. He continued and said the following:

I understand that you are here to find out how the [current donor project] benefits the farm...Yes...yes...there were problems between the junior staff and the donor staff of the [previous donor project]...There was mismanagement. Staff members wrote a letter to the Embassy [of the donor organization and circumvented the donor staff].

More importantly, however, he wanted to inform me that the relationship with the current donor staff was quite different—

[The current donor organization staff] are good people and they are not proud...The [donor staff] is very hardworking...If we receive another five years of funding then I can see that the current donor project will have done good things for the farm...I imagine that you will probably go back and write a
report about how the [donor project] benefits Sagana and I would like you to write that [the current donor staff] is doing good things for the farm...The [donor project] provides jobs for the people in the neighboring villages and provides an inexpensive source of protein by producing chicken, fish, and milk.

I then explained that I was a graduate student from the US, that I was doing my thesis research, and that I would be writing a thesis for my Master's degree rather than writing a report about the impacts of the donor project. I explained that I was interested in people's experiences both positive and negative at the farm. He acknowledged what I had said, referred to me as the "expert," stated that I'm better qualified to make assessments, and then reiterated that I should be sure to include in my report that the donor project has had a very positive affect on Sagana Fish Farm in only a short time. "If the donor project stays for a full ten years then I can see that it will do very good things for this place." I do not doubt the honesty of this exchange; however, on both of our parts there was information withheld from the other party.

COMMENTS REGARDING INTERVIEW RESPONSES

This thesis is a compilation of information that I'd been given by the civil servants and casual laborers in unstructured and semi-
structured interviews and group discussions in addition to participant observation. There were questions often asked of me by consultants, mostly casual laborers, that I think are important to address. Many of the consultants with whom I spoke asked the same significant question: “How will the work that you are doing benefit you and also the civil servants and casual laborers? Will this research fix our problems?”

The surface-level benefit for me is that the research I am currently doing will hopefully lead to my attaining my Master’s Degree. There are benefits on a deeper level, however, regardless of completion of a Master’s Degree. I am interested in anthropology because being connected to and understanding the experiences of people is very important to me. Not only do I learn about the people that I am with, I learn about myself—who I am and where I am from. The education on being human that I receive from the people I speak with has a richness, depth, and value that cannot be attained through academia and/or university training.

What are the benefits of this research for consultants? My hope for this research was to provide a place for consultants to share their points of view about their experiences at the farm. I wanted to create a space where they would have an avenue of expression or a place to discuss aspects of their work that were significant to them. For the casuals I hope that their experiences will be read by people involved
with work at Sagana Fish Farm, i.e., the junior and senior staff at the fish farm and as well the people who are involved with donor projects. I think it is important for the experiences of the casuals to be written, so that perhaps their experiences will be slightly more tangible and visceral to those (people such as myself) who are removed from what they casual laborers do and experience. I hope that by writing what I have learned about their thoughts and concerns that their experiences will be heard or formalized. A written compilation of their experiences I hope gives their voice strength, so that their concerns do not sift through the consciousness of the fish farm.

I also need to comment about my own awareness. While in the United States I work as a graduate research assistant for the PD/A CRSP, the development organization currently working at the fish farm. In the publications we produce there are pictures of men and women seining fish ponds, maybe there's a person holding a basket of fish that has just been harvested, or maybe there is a picture of 20 or 30 people manually constructing fish ponds. I have seen photographs from other countries in which the development organization has operated in Africa in addition to photographs from Sagana Fish Farm. At some point one of the pictures that I have taken or another project person has taken of casuals seining ponds or slashing grass or making fish feed may end up in one of the donor organizations reports. I think that when people
outside of the development process read the program's annual reports and brochures they are provided with only one perspective on development. I realize that it is important for the donor organization to develop a positive image regarding its work and I do not deny that the development organization can have positive effects. However, overlooking the perspectives of the people affected by development organization that might introduce critical points of view does a disservice to the people who are outside the development organization's work. I think this creates a false consciousness in people regarding the concept of development, because they are provided with a single point of view. For example, much of the literature that the donor organization currently working at the fish farm produces informs people on the outside that aquaculture is providing the rural poor with an inexpensive and sustainable source of protein. While there were individuals, typically civil servants, who did discuss the inexpensive sources of protein at the fish farm that they could obtain, the casual laborers did not mention this. It is unlikely that a casual laborer, the individual who performs the highest intensity manual laborer for the fish farm and the development organization, can afford to buy the fish that Sagana Fish Farm produces.\footnote{One kilogram of tilapia costs 80 Kenya shillings. At the time of this research, the government casual laborer earned between 70 and 80 Kenya shillings per day and the...}
that people outside the development process receive multiple points of view about development organization and their effects.

casual laborers working for the development organization earned 100 Kenya shillings per day.
CHAPTER 4: HISTORY

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF KENYA FROM 1945 TO 1960

Prior to 1963, the year Kenya gained independence, Sagana Fish Farm had been administered by the British colonial government. According to Miller (1984) Kenya had become by 1945 (three years prior to the establishment of Sagana Fish Farm) a "very different political society." The European community had become more diverse, consisting of "a small liberal wing of the settler society," missionaries, businessmen, colonial administrators and discharged officers, and African soldiers who had returned from fighting in World War II.

In 1946 Jomo Kenyatta had returned from Britain and had become leader of the nationalist movement. The Kenya African Union, a movement of almost 150,000 concerned with land and social inequities, was formed and Kenyatta was elected the Union's president (Miller, 1984).

By 1950 a large population of Kikuyus were landless and unemployed in the Central Province, thus fueling more militant action. Additionally, there were strong demands for self-government from African leaders of trade unions and the vernacular press. Violence
emerged in 1951 in areas of the Central Province and continued through 1957 when hostilities gradually decreased. The British attributed the violence of this period to what they described as a secret society called the Mau Mau; however, historians have stated that the Mau Mau was more than a secret society—it was a land rebellion. As a result of the land rebellion a number of social changes were facilitated regarding African land rights. In 1955, the Swynerton Plan led to a transformation of traditional African land tenure to an individual

5 The British Government responded to the Mau-Mau Rebellion by declaring a State-of-Emergency, arresting Jomo Kenyatta, and requesting more British troops in 1952, which lead to an escalation in violence from the Mau-Mau. The violence continued for approximately a period of four years. At the height of the Mau Mau Rebellion, approximately 100,000 Africans were placed in detention camps by the British Authorities. In 1954, "Operation Anvil" forced 27,000 Kikuyu, Embu, and Meru people living in Nairobi back to rural areas, and "nearly a million Kikuyu were forced to move from their homesteads to stockaded villages. Thousands of homesteads were destroyed to deny them to the Mau-Mau, and hundreds of villages were bulldozed." During 1956 and 1957 the violence began to diminish. Although Europeans were thought to be the primary targets of the Mau-Mau, the death count indicated that only 32 Europeans and 1,819 African "loyalists" had been killed. In terms of military death toll, approximately 11,503 Mau-Mau combatants had been killed in contrast with the British forces that lost 101 Kenyan African soldiers, 53 European soldiers, and three Asian soldiers. The Mau-Mau Rebellion lead to the death of the legislation entitling Europeans to the "European Highlands," 16,700 square miles of land and a subsequent exodus of Europeans to South Africa. Additionally, the Mau-Mau Rebellion lead to a social change surrounding African land rights and representation in the government. The other important outcome of the Mau-Mau Rebellion was that the Kikuyus imprisoned in stockaded villages inadvertently caused rapid land consolidation. "With [Kikuyus temporarily clustered off the land, the mechanics of land reform could take place. By 1959 freehold titles in large numbers had been issued to Africans, new farm supports were in place, and a campaign was underway to employ landless people. The growth of an agrarian middle class had discernibly picked up speed (Miller, 1984)."

6 The Swynerton Plan emerged from this social change and "called for a change in customary African land tenure practices to an individual freehold system based on land demarcation and registration...for consolidating small parcels of property, giving Africans access to credit, to farmer training, to research findings, to technical assistance,
freehold system based on land demarcation and registration (Miller, 1984).

Entrepeneurship for Africans through the mid 1950s included the trade of food and livestock between the Massai and Kikuyu tribes and informal artisan activities (e.g., carving, carpentry, thatching, tinsmithing, rope making, and other unlicensed activities that were outside the formal economy). There was also a growing African indigenous capitalism composed of a "middle peasantry of traders-farmers-businessmen;" however, European and Asian competition, a lack of capital and technical expertise, and a scarcity of commercial trust created difficulties for African entrepeneurs.

The transition to independence moved at an accelerated pace according to Miller (1984). Colonial officials and European farmers attempted to preserve some control of the government apparatus through negotiations involving long-term economic concessions. One of the profound results of these negotiations was that Kenyan nationalists maintained a system of private land title and land registration. Miller (1984) asserts that this greatly affected the social structure of the country and "how the production and exchange of goods and services would occur in Kenya. The nationalists, in short, accepted a

and to improved water supplies. The objective [of the Swynerton Plan] was to bring more profitable cash-crop farming to small farmers (Miller, 1984).
capitalistic, free-enterprise, private property system (Miller, 1984).”
Kenyan nationalists ensured that European farmers received fair prices for their farms, close economic alliances were continued with the West, multinational corporations continued to be hosted, citizens were encouraged to “buy British,” and the country was amenable to continued Western foreign aid (Miller, 1984).

The transition to independence also created in Kenya “a small African elite” that would be in a position to garner economic reward at the expense of poorer citizens (Miller, 1984). Miller states that the “African elite” was established when the British government and European settlers willingly transferred “the apparatus of government: the civil service, police, judiciary, prisons, army, and the buildings, equipment, employees, and symbols and legitimacy of government” over to the Kenyan nationalists.

A CASUAL LABORER’S DESCRIPTION OF THE CHANGING ECONOMIC SITUATION IN KENYA

One of the casual laborers I interviewed spoke to me about how land policy had affected the people of Kenya. Timothy has three children—two boys and a girl. He said he would like to have more children but his life is too hard. He then compared his life to the past
when his father and grandfather were having children. Timothy said his father and grandfather could have at least twelve children, but now that was not possible because life is too demanding. Also, he said at that time people could cultivate *itema*, the Kikuyu word for newly opened land or virgin land; he added that people could cultivate anywhere because it was not illegal to move around and plant. “Now,” he said, “because of land demarcation the soil is not productive because it is tilled and tilled and worn.” He remembered how as a child he had been given fermented *uji* (sorghum, millet, and maize) from a gourd when he went to the *shamba* with his mother. He would help his mother by

---

7 Land demarcation began in 1957 to consolidate fragmented plots of land. Previously, land demarcation was done according to clan, but law made it so that children inherited land. According to one consultant, people are feeling pressure to demarcate their land to protect themselves from "land scramblers," i.e., senior people in the town council. "Land scramblers" will exchange an individual's land for infertile land if the land is not demarcated. If a person's land is involved with town plans then that person has to either sell or exchange their land. When a person sells their land to the town council and it's not demarcated then the town council can buy a quarter acre of land for 20,000 Kenyan shillings and then turn around and sell the same quarter acre of land for 200,000 Kenyan shillings. Additionally, according to the same consultant, if land is not demarcated then "land scramblers," for example, will exchange eight acres of unproductive land for four acres of a person's productive land without warning. Now with the way land inheritance is arranged, the grandfather divides a given amount of land between his sons and then the sons divide the land among their children, so the plots of land become smaller and smaller. Over the generations, a family will eventually end up landless. According to another consultant, Chris, the birth rate in Kenya is affecting land use very much. Chris said, for example, that in his family in which he is the sixth of twelve children, he has to hire land and pays 600 to 800 Kenyan shillings per acre and will hire two or three acres. Chris added that if I ask people if they have a *shamba* that they will say yes but that doesn't mean that they own the land. Chris also said that education frustrates people in Kenya and that, for example, a man with ten children and then acreage might have to sell his land to pay for school fees. According to Chris, one acre of land is equivalent to one year of secondary school fees. The man ends up selling all of his land, but then realizes once he's educated all his children that there's no employment. Even if the educated children do find employment they can't buy back the land because it is so expensive.
scaring away the weaver birds. Now, he said that trying to persuade his children to eat sorghum, millet, or cassava was like trying to play guitar to a goat. He recalled when grazing the cows that he was given one cow of his own to milk. Also, at that time a person could go to extended family or a member of the clan to receive a free piece of land to cultivate.

\[\text{HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF SAGANA FISH FARM}\]

In 1924, research at the national fish culture station in Sagana on *Oreochromis* spp. was the first indication of the Kenyan government's interest in culturing indigenous species, and by 1948 "fish farming proper had started nationwide (Achieng, 1993)." According to the World Bank (1980 a and b cited by Achieng, 1993) Sagana Fish Farm was one of two of the first fish culture stations established in Kenya in 1948. Through the 1950s the Government of Kenya lead a campaign to increase fish consumption and fuel aquaculture development. Fish farming expanded throughout Kenya and included non-fish eating communities in the Central Province; however, within the last decade FAO estimated that aquaculture provided less than 1% of Kenya’s per capita fish consumption (Harrison, 1993).
Elders' Histories of the Fish Farm

The following are accounts of three elders' experiences in relation to the fish farm: Julius, Mutia, and Ithangu.

Julius

The first man I spoke with, Julius (also known as Mwalim), was born in 1929 and described himself as a small-scale farmer. He lives in the village behind the fish farm, Kirimu, and was born and raised in Sagana. In 1949 his parents gave him the land that he is currently living on.

There were six elders, Julius' father was one of the elders, who were responsible for and made decisions regarding the clan land that now is Sagana Fish Farm.

David Waruhui, the first African District Officer at the time, came to the elders to convince them to give their land to the colonial government. He tried to persuade the elders that giving the land to the colonial government was good because the British government was going to teach people how to grow and eat fish. At first the elders refused and stated that they didn't know anything about fish; however,
the District Officer explained that although presently people of the village were not interested in fish the sons and grandsons would eat the fish. Eventually, there was a village meeting, a *baraza*, attended by the District Officer that included the chief of the village and members. At this time the elders and the District Officer formalized a decision that the elders would not sell the land and that the colonial government would lease the land for 20 shillings per acre per year. Thus, in September of 1949 the formal agreement was that the land was leased not sold. Once the agreement between the District Officer and the elders was made, a land surveyor was called in and the names of the elders were recorded so that they could receive their payment for the leasing of their land each month.

Julius said that the first casual laborers to work at Sagana Fish Farm were from Nyanza. The people from Nyanza assimilated well into the village because they were so hardworking. When the casuals from Nyanza were not constructing ponds they helped the people of the village with cultivation in exchange for food.

Julius worked at the fish farm through the 1950s; however, his labor was not paid because the people of the village were doing “nation building.” During this time he said that the chief of the village would mandate communal work days, “nation building.” If you refused the work, you were sent forward as a criminal to the District
Commissioners, who then would give the "criminals" hard labor. He said the people who refused to work were lashed with sugar cane and were sent to construct roads. The punishment lasted for one month and then people were sent back to their villages for reconciliation. Reconciliation meant that they would participate in "nation building." Prior to working at the fish farm Julius, had helped his family with cultivation and grazing.

Julius said that in 1952, the Mau Mau Rebellion "freedom fighters" or leaders of the Mau Mau sent letters to the elders of the village telling them not to take money from the white man. The Mau Mau said that anyone who received money from the whites would be killed and that they would let the elders know when it would be okay to take money again. The elders relayed this to the village chief who then told this to the District Commissioner, so from 1952 through 1960 the elders did not receive any money for the fish farm land. According to Julius, throughout this period construction at the farm continued and the whites were not harassed by the Mau Mau.

There was only one white officer at the farm at this time, John Peterson, and the remainder of the officers were Africans. Julius said that John Peterson lived on the hill that overlooked the farm and the African officers lived near the input canal of the fish farm. The first black senior officer was Michael Ojo who was from Homa Bay in
Nyanza. Prior to his posting as senior officer, a white man named Wilson acted as senior officer. Initially Michael Ojo was a bookkeeper at the fish farm, but then he was sent to Italy to learn about fish farming. When he returned from Italy he succeeded Wilson as senior officer.

When the Mau Mau Emergency was over and Jomo Kenyatta had come out of detention, the elders of the village were told by the District Officer, who spoke on behalf of the government at a baraza, that their land was going to be taken for the fish farm. The District Officer then advised at the baraza that the elders should take 300 shillings per acre, which the elders accepted because they felt they had no other choice. The District Officer then dismissed all the members of the village from the meeting and then immediately paid the elders. They were given 300 shillings per acre and 81 acres of land were sold.

Mutia

Mutia was born in and had lived in Sagana his entire life. He began working at the farm in 1964 and spent four years working there. Mutia’s father was a fish scout at the farm and Mutia decided to come see his father and work at the farm as a casual laborer. Prior to working at the farm as a casual, he had been working for Indians in Mombassa as
a houseboy. His work at the fish farm involved slashing grass, harvesting ponds, and maintaining the canals. He said his work was very hard (he had to work eight straight hours of manual labor), he earned only 60 shillings per month, and he was strictly supervised. He said his immediate supervisor (the foreman) was not strict with supervision; however, John Brown, the white man present at the farm at the time was harsh with his supervision. John Brown would concentrate on the casual laborers' work from the hill with binoculars. If he saw that someone wasn’t working then he came down from the hill and threatened to lay off whomever wasn’t performing the way he expected. According to Mutia, if John Brown had a “case” with one of the casuals he would call the casual into the office, close and lock the door, and beat him. Mutia said that John Brown had pulled a gun on some of the casuals when they had entered his office. John Brown’s “supervising” created fear in the casuals and the casuals were in a difficult position. After a casual had a confrontation with John Brown he could not leave the compound because on the outside the Mau Mau were fighting and he feared to join the war.

If you lived outside the fisheries compound, you were either harassed by the Home Guard or you were in the hands of the Mau Mau. While Mutia worked at the fish farm he said the British imposed a curfew, so people working at the farm had to return to their compound.
or village by 3:00 in the afternoon where they would stay until the next morning. The fisheries compound didn't have trenches surrounding it as did the villages on the outside, however, there were rolled wire mesh fences that surrounded the staff quarters. Mutia said that once the Mau Mau Emergency was over his life was better at the compound because he was free to move again—he said his time in the compound was like prison during the Emergency and that he felt as if he'd been released from prison when the Emergency was over.

Ithangu

Ithangu began working at the fish farm somewhere between 1962 and 1963 and said that he remembers when the farm's C line ponds were constructed. The casuals from this time were nicknamed *nyamnyam*, which essentially means "chop chop", i.e., hurry up or move faster. Most of the casual laborers working at that time were from the Luo tribe. They did the work very quickly because they were hired by Indians who had contracted work at other places in addition to the work at the fish farm.

Regarding his work as a casual, he said there was no rest with his work with John Brown. There was a lot of work without any
breaks—he worked from seven in the morning until three in the afternoon straight. Then at three everyone had to return to the compound. Through 1961, 62, and 63 he didn’t see much change in the farm and, as well, there was not a very big change before and after independence from the colony, mperu.

Michael Ojo then took over as senior officer. His style of “supervision” was different than John Brown’s. He explained that rather than calling the casual laborers into the office and intimidating them as did John Brown, he’d call the casuals to the window to speak with them. Michael Ojo, however, only seemed to be “free” with the clerks and accountants that worked at the farm. Mr. Muthee was the foreman who directly supervised the casuals. He allowed the casuals to rest and would explain to them that if they rested too much he’d lose his job; the casuals liked his supervision.

He remembered that land mines were used to construct the canal that separates the fish farm from the neighboring village. At that time the farm was not selling big fish, it was giving the people in the village fish as part of the “eat more fish” campaign; however, the farm did sell fingerlings. He said the people of the village were very happy to be receiving free food and that there were so many fish at the time that Luos would come from Kwavi with sacks to carry the fish back to their homes. He said that the farm continued to give fish away throughout
the 1960s, 70s, and 80s and during that time only enough fish were provided for home consumption. When a donor project arrived in the early 90s there was no longer free fish; the fish were then sold at the canteen. He felt that the arrival of the donor project present at the time of this research was good for the farm because the sale of fish started generating income and work for the people at the fish farm.

Prior to the arrival of the donor project in the mid 80s he said the staff at the farm wasn't very busy. They came to work in the morning and then left in the afternoon to cultivate their shamba. People from the village were also grazing their cows on the land of the fish farm. He said the cows didn't harm the dykes and because people had been grazing their cows on the fish farm land, the farm looked very clean because the cows kept the grass short. He contrasted the past when cows grazed with the present situation of the farm. He said now the whole place is "bushy," especially by the river where the nepia grass is growing. There is so much nepia grass by the river now that pythons live there. Recently, he had killed a python living in the nepia grass.

A fence surrounding the farm came in the early 1990s with the arrival of the donor project and people of the village were forced to stop grazing their cows on the fish farm land. Some of the people were forced to sell their cows because they did not have enough land in the village for the cows to graze on. People had to begin tethering their
cows. The fence also created problems with trespassing, so the donor project constructed a new road that runs along the backside of the farm. He said that people didn't view this as a major problem.

CIVIL STAFF DESCRIPTIONS OF SAGANA FISH FARM PRIOR TO THE PRESENCE OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

According to descriptions of the civil staff, just prior to the arrival of the donor project that was present from the early to the mid 1990s the farm was not sustaining itself nor producing well. Gregory described the farm prior to the presence of donors as "collapsing." He recalled that there was a mixture of species cultured such as common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) and *Tilapia zilli*. However, based on descriptions of the civil staff, it appears that the farm had functioned well in the early 1980s. Employees were receiving free fish; fish farmers were coming to the farm for advise; the fish produced were big; and there were periods of time when staff recalled being able to see the fish feeding on the surface of the ponds. In one interview, however, a consultant mentioned that production was fluctuating.

Michelle, who began working at Sagana Fish Farm in March of 1982, said that when she arrived the farm had been producing big fish. According to Michelle, the senior officer at that time gave everyone a
fish with the intention that if employees were given fish they wouldn’t steal fish. She said that she remembers at that time that “visitors would come to the farm to watch the fish feeding on the surface.” Also, she said a book was produced entitled “Fish Farming in East Africa.”

Michelle felt that around 1989 the fish farm “started to go down” and that is when a professor visited representing a donor project, who said, “I’ve come to uplift your life.”

Grace described Sagana Fish Farm at the beginning of her employment. She said “there were so many staff members, even more than now...A number of casuals were employed at that time to cut back the bush and the staff also helped them.” The farm was growing babas, common carp, *Tilapia nilotica*, and *Tilapia zilli*. She said the farm didn’t have the physical structures that it currently has such as the administrative offices. Also she said the lab was not as equipped as it is now.

At the beginning of her work at the fish farm, Grace said that she heard “from others that farmers were coming to the fish farm to learn about fingerlings and fish farming” and she said that “this still occurs today.” Also, she recalled that fish production fluctuated and was not fixed.

Ivan, a civil servant at Sagana Fish Farm, told me the history that he knew of the fish farm. He said that the British operated the farm
prior to independence and then at independence the fish farm was operated by the Government of Kenya. Ivan said that in the 1970s a Japanese donor operated at the farm, then in the early 1990s a Belgian donor came to the farm, and now currently there is an American donor at the farm. The Japanese donor grew common carp and were involved in the "eat more fish campaign," according to Ivan. He said the Japanese donor gave free fish to the staff and to neighboring villages. Additionally, he said that the donor prepared fish at the farm and also invited people to the house on the hill to eat fish. He recalled that people enjoyed the fish, which was steamed and served with rice. Ivan said that the common carp were fed pellets and that the fish knew what time they'd be fed. He said that a person could walk out to the edge of the docks that extended to the center of ponds and tap a net on the edge of the dock and the fish would swim to the surface. He said there were so many fish in the ponds that you could put the net in the pond and just scoop out fish.

Ivan said that prior to 1975 the civil staff at the farm was given fish to eat and contrasted this with the current situation. He said that the civil staff must buy their fish and that it only costs 5 Kenya shillings less than the market price. He added that sometimes casual laborers stole fish, but that if they were caught they were immediately fired. He said he remembered one casual laborer who tried to fit two fish into his
pockets as he was leaving the farm. The casual was caught by a security
guard and then told not to come back.

**Unanticipated Effects of Sagana Fish Farm**

One day my research assistant and I walked through Kamuthanga,
a village located on government land allocated to families without land
approximately 2 km away from Sagana Fish Farm. There is a canal that
was built by the British that runs from Sagana Fish Farm through the
village. The canal has deteriorated in many places and as a result has
created swampy or marshy areas near the village. There are catfish that
have escaped from Sagana Fish Farm via the canal that live in the
marshy areas surrounding the canal, and people from Kamuthanga fish
in these marshy areas. Several weeks prior to visiting Kamuthanga I
met several boys who were on their way to the Tana River to go fishing.
They had with them several catfish that they had caught in the marsh at
Kamuthanga.

According to Ivan, when the Belgian donor came to the fish farm,
young they drained all the fish into the Tana River. There's a hydroelectric
dam on the way to Nairobi, known as Seven Falls, where people go to
get catfish brooders, which according to Ivan are a result of the fish that
the donor drained into the Tana river. He said that on the Nyeri/Nairobi Road there are fishermen on the roadside selling common carp and catfish brooders.

DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS AT SAGANA FISH FARM

Two non-profit development organizations from Belgium and the United States have operated at Sagana Fish Farm in the realm of aquaculture development.

The first of the two aquaculture development projects was designed in two phases. The first phase was intended to rehabilitate and renovate the Sagana Fish Farm facility and demonstrate the sustainability of the fish farm's operation. A second phase of this donor project was to focus on developing researcher-extension-farmer linkages; however, this phase of the project was discontinued. The second of the two donor projects focuses on conducting applied aquacultural research to increase the production of aquaculture systems while improving their economic efficiency and accounting for local resource availability and the sociocultural environment.
Prior to these two organizations a Japanese Volunteer organization operated at the farm for an unknown period of time during the 1980s.

FOCUS OF AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT AT SAGANA FISH FARM

According to the Kenya Department of Fisheries aquaculture development is intended to do the following:

The intention of the Fisheries Department is to increase fish production to the extent that it is available to a larger proportion of the population in [Kenya]. This can be achieved through the adoption of appropriate cost-effective methods for fish culture...Aquaculture is expected to play a greater role in the fish protein production in the future. Aquaculture when developed in rural areas will not only increase fish protein supply but will also generate income and create employment opportunities in the rural areas (Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, Fisheries Department, 1996).
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

This chapter summarizes the results obtained from interviews with civil servants, casual laborers, and individuals affiliated with Sagana Fish Farm but not employed by the farm. To protect the identity of consultants, actual names of consultants are not used in the presentation of results.

This chapter is divided into two major sections: Sagana Fish Farm Prior to the Presence of the PD/A CRSP and The Presence of the PD/A CRSP and other Aquaculture Development Organizations at Sagana Fish Farm. The first section sets the context of Sagana Fish Farm without the presence and effects of development organizations. This section covers the distinctions between the work of casual laborers and civil servants and presents the working realities of civil servants and casual laborers. The second section presents the changes that occur at Sagana Fish Farm with the presence of development organizations. This section begins by introducing the casual laborers that are hired by development organizations and their reasons for seeking employment with development organizations. After the casual laborers are introduced, the following aspects associated with development organizations are presented: the sustainability, benefit, focus, and productive relations introduced by development organizations at
Sagana Fish Farm. Additionally, perspectives are presented on the
direction of development in Kenya and the possibility of the adoption of
fish culture in Kenya.

**SAGANA FISH FARM PRIOR TO THE PRESENCE OF THE PD/A CRSP**

There are two groups of employees at Sagana Fish Farm—civil
servant and casual laborers. Civil servants are permanent employees
whereas casual laborers are temporary employees. The term of
employment for civil servants is fairly secure, i.e., once a civil servant is
hired into the civil service it is difficult for him/her to be laid off. In
contrast, the term of employment for a casual laborer is insecure, i.e., a
casual laborer may be laid off without notice and theoretically work for
no more than three months.

**Distinction between the Work of Casual Laborers and Civil Servants**

Casual laborers are paid less than civil servants and are employed
on a temporary basis. Because of the insecure nature of their work
situations, casual laborers are more fearful of losing their jobs and are,
therefore, more easily managed by supervisors. Civil servants, in contrast, have permanent employment and are more secure in their work situation. If they choose not to work they are not fearful of losing their employment.

Civil Servants' Perceptions

Two semi-structured and three informal interviews provided me with civil servants' perceptions of the work situations of casual laborers in contrast with the work situations of civil servants. According to Anthony, casual laborers are "easier to manage" because they fear losing their jobs. Civil servants are permanently hired and do not fear losing their job. A civil servant can choose to work or not work and the pay still comes. For casuals if they don't work they are laid off."

Richard also explained that casuals do not have the opportunity to stop working for fear of being fired, whereas "permanent staff members will work, but they will look for the slightest excuse to sit down...or they prefer to work on their shamba or other business."

During an informal interview with Bob, he offered his perception of the work situation of casual laborers. Bob stated that "casuals never protest if they think their work is too hard;" however, civil servants "have no fear [about losing employment]." Bob thought that the worst
fear for a civil servant is a “transfer to an area that is not desirable for work [e.g., the northeast part of Kenya].”

Diana, during an informal interview, asked about how my interviews were going with the casual laborers. I answered that many of the casuals had stated that they were underpaid. Diana then emphasized that the work of the casuals is very difficult and they are not paid according to the intensity of their work. She said, “They spend their days digging, digging, digging and need to keep themselves healthy, but with the money they [the casuals] make they can hardly feed themselves or keep themselves healthy...At lunch time they only eat bread if they go to the canteen because they can’t afford stew...” Diana then relayed a story of a casual who had gotten sick. “After he’d given the money he’d earned from his work to his family, he didn’t even have enough money to get an injection for himself...He said the work wasn’t worth it considering the pay.” Diana commented that “even though our [the civil service] salaries are low at least we can afford to buy medicine...The casuals aren’t able to take care of themselves [i.e., buy needed medicine when they are sick].” Diana then stated the following: “If the casuals are truly going to benefit from the work they do at the farm [either with the donor projects or the government], they should at least be provided with medicine, lunch, and transport...In this way their jobs would be beneficial—they could at least save their wages from a day’s work...It’s almost as if they [the casuals] are being oppressed.”
Oliver shared with me his impression of the work situation of casual laborers and said that the work of the casual laborers was "almost like slavery."

**Casual Laborers' Perceptions**

During an interview, Andrew, a casual laborer who had worked for the government of Kenya and donor projects, explained his perceptions of the difference between the work situation of civil servants and casual laborers. He said civil servants receive fixed pay. "If you work with the civil service you are either hard working or not." Casual laborers, Andrew said, usually work for a period of three months and are paid biweekly. In contrast, he said that civil servants are permanent employees and receive a salary at the end of the month. Andrew thought "civil servants [in comparison with casual laborers] aren't as hard working."

**The Work Situation of Civil Servants at Sagana Fish Farm**

Civil servants at Sagana Fish Farm overall seemed to feel frustration about their employment situations. Civil servant morale
was waning due to factors such as low salary, management issues at the farm and in the higher levels of the Kenya Government, and financial stress associated with school fees and medical expenses. To address the discrepancy that existed between their salary and maintaining their livelihood, civil servants utilized the land of the fish farm for farming.

Employee Morale

During two semi-structured interviews and two informal interviews, civil servants spoke of feeling frustrated with their employment in the civil service for reasons such as low salaries, a lack of resources for employees to accomplish their work, corruption throughout the civil service hierarchy, difficulty in obtaining promotions, and financial and human resource mismanagement at a number of levels in the hierarchy of the civil service.

During an informal interview, Anthony described what he termed the “civil servant mentality.” He began by explaining that the “Kenyan Government pays its staff very poorly.” As a result of the low salaries he said the staff feels “demotivated” and “demoralized,” which subsequently “affects production, for which there is low output.” Additionally, there is “no proper management” at the fish farm and
"remuneration to the staff is not tied to production." Anthony described the civil service as having entered a "dubious contract with the Government, whereby civil service employees are barely sustaining themselves." According to Anthony, to "bridge the gap," referring to the disparity that exists between civil staff salaries and their financial needs, civil service staff members engage in peripheral activities such as farming or they might attempt to start a small business.

In a semi-structured interview with Richard he described how civil servants may address the disparity existing between salary and living expenses. Richard explained: "A member of the junior staff may say that [s/he] will not slash grass beyond ten o' clock. Their supervisor understands this because [s/he] knows how slight the salary is, but the supervisor is also getting pressure from [his/her] senior officer." From ten o' clock in the morning, Richard said that a junior staff member might go cultivate the shamba because work on the shamba is a place where [s/he] will see benefits from their labor. (Shamba is the Swahili word for farm; shambani is the plural of shamba.) Regarding his own work, Richard said, "I hate to be idle because then I will start thinking of things I can never do or projects I can't afford."

Richard also discussed promotions of civil staff members at Sagana Fish Farm. Richard explained that "the whole idea with most people is promotion, promotion, promotion." The problem for fisheries
assistants and fish scouts in Kenya, Richard commented, is that the institutions for the acquisition of certificates do not exist in Kenya. Richard said that for a time the World Bank funded a project at the Naivasha Fisheries and Wildlife Institute, but the project ended and was left to the Government of Kenya. Now the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) runs the project, but training is only available to KWS employees. Richard commented that “even if you produce a lot of fish while working at the farm, you cannot get a promotion because you do not have a certificate.”

In a semi-structured interview with Gregory he discussed promotions, the demoralized civil staff at the fish farm, and their response to feeling demoralized. Gregory felt that it was important that the civil staff be promoted or given an allowance (whether from the government or a donor project) for higher levels of production. He said, “the staff needs to be motivated to continue with high output, but there’s no incentive to work hard.” Gregory said he feels a great deal of pride about the work he does despite the lack of pay. Regarding how he responds to his frustration with his employment situation, Gregory stated the following:

---

8 Certificates in Kenya are the only path to promotion for civil servants. Certificate was used as a generalized term to describe either a two-year or four-year degree obtained from institutions such as a vocational or junior college or university.
As you know you can't live idle...I work so much and I don't see any benefit to me...Yes I know the work, but I'm not happy because the government's not recognizing me...[supervisors] can rely on me...I have to work harder because I don't want my place to go down...If [a supervisor] asks me any questions I'm able to answer them.

Gregory said that prior to the donor projects there was a lack of facilities and finance so the farm was operating at a low level of production. When a civil staff member came to work s/he was given a specific area of grass to slash. The work would only take a couple of hours, so when s/he finished there was nothing left to do. Gregory said that the civil staff dealt with their work situation differently—everyone had "their own ways of killing time"—some people prepared their shambani; others had businesses in town; some remained idle and drank; and others operated PSVs (personal service vehicles or matatus).

Anthony also felt that financial mismanagement was an issue that impeded the progress of Sagana Fish Farm. Anthony offered the following hypothetical situation to convey what he meant: "The farm might receive 100,000 Ksh meant for the repair of a vehicle. When everything has transpired only 20,000 of the 100,00 shillings have been spent on the vehicle and the remaining 80,000 shillings have disappeared." Anthony also discussed how votes at Sagana Fish Farm
are not being allocated properly."9 "Somehow," he said, "the money from votes does not percolate to the area [production unit] it's supposed to." He said, for example, allocations at the farm intended for the fish production unit are diverted to other units. Additionally, he thought that communication among senior officers and officers who work in the fish production unit was inadequate. Consequently, the civil servants who work in the fish production unit feel "demoralized."

Joel also provided an example of mismanagement. He described how the farm had sold a cow a day prior to our interview. "The cow," Joel explained, "was sold for 2,000 Kenya shillings rather 200,000 Kenya shillings." "This," he commented, "is a very big loss to the farm." He said the cow should have been sold when she was healthy and fat rather than underweight. Joel felt this was an example of how the higher

---

9 Anthony explained the financial situation of the fish farm. Even though Sagana Fish Farm is a government-run farm, it has a certain "degree of autonomy." Typically, everything that occurs at a "government run farm is done on the behalf of the government and all revenues are turned over to the government." The government measures production through the amount of money it collects and then makes decisions about how to reallocate the money to each government station. (The money that is reallocated may not necessarily be proportional to the amount of money that was remitted to the government.) The government has special receipts (MR-miscellaneous receipts) that are to be used for all produce sold. The MRs are surrendered weekly to the District Treasury. At the end of the year if a station surpasses the amount of revenue allocated then the government will increase the following year's allocation. According to Anthony, one of the donor projects at the fish farm found this system cumbersome and facilitated policy change which now allows the fish farm a certain degree of autonomy. He said the farm still receives its revenues from the government; however, the farm's revenues are managed autonomously from its own bank account. Now all farm revenues stay at the farm and the farm still receives its government allocation. Anthony also explained votes, which are the allocations provided to the different areas of operation at the farm such as fish production, pond maintenance, and transport operations.
levels of management were not "listening to the people on the ground" who had felt the cows should have been sold much sooner.

According to Anthony, "[the] principles of people seem to go once people are in positions of power...The same thing would happen to you, Deborah, if you were in a position of power."¹⁰ He said "all people want to make money for themselves." Anthony then described a situation involving one of his friends (who does not work at the farm now) who moved from third in the chain of command to the senior fisheries officer position. Prior to this person’s promotion, Anthony described how they discussed how they’d run things differently at the fish farm if they were in power. However, when his friend actually moved into a more powerful position, management at the fish farm was worse than the previous officer’s management.

Additionally, Anthony commented that mismanagement could be observed in the "dilapidated nature of the farm" and that things such as unutilized ponds, overgrown canals, a run down zero grazing unit, an absence of growth or profit in the sheep unit and poultry units, and no serviceable vehicle evidenced mismanagement. He asserted, "the

¹⁰ Anthony said after observing the operations of donor projects he thought this was true for everyone whether the person be Kenyan, Belgian, or American. To support this statement he said that he’d been told by another civil servant that donor staff had had a discussion about how to earn money from the project to buy a new vehicle. I cannot verify the truth of this assertion; however, I think the assertion is important in that it reflects Anthony’s perceptions or expectations of individuals in power whether they be Kenyan or expatriates.
staff are demoralized” and added that there are periods at the farm when
the mismanagement is so high that work virtually ceases. For example,
he said that “work virtually came to a standstill between 1990 and 1993,
but things picked up when the project came [referring to a donor
project].” He said, however, that when the donor project left he could
see “things starting to go down again.” Decisions are made
“excruciatingly slow,” according to Anthony, and this also contributes to
mismanagement.

Anthony also felt that “human resource mismanagement [is]
born from financial mismanagement.” If there was financial
mismanagement then senior officers did not want to meet with the staff
because the staff would ask questions, “so [senior officers] avoid the staff
as much as possible.” The subsequent lack of appropriate input from the
staff, Anthony suggested, contributes to the “going down of the farm.”

Bob also explained how civil service employees feel
“demotivated.” He described how the government of Kenya’s
“retirement scheme” was attempting to “trim the civil service.”11
According to Bob, the intention of the reduction in civil servants was to
pay more to the people retained in the civil service; however, he felt
that this had not occurred. (At the time of this interview, the Kenya

---

11 The Kenya Government is paying individuals who are willing to retire early 60,000
Kenya shillings.
Government was discussing cutting civil servant salaries by twenty percent; ultimately, the government decided not to follow through on the salary cuts.) Bob said, “people feel like they are being taken for a ride.” Despite his frustration, Bob said he does not like “to remain idle” and that he enjoys his work, although, he commented, “I’d enjoy my work more if I were paid better.”

Stresses of Women Who Work as Civil Servants at Sagana Fish Farm

During a focus group with four women—Michelle, Grace, Irene, and Regina—who are employed as civil servants at Sagana Fish, I was informed that financial stress was difficult for them. Michelle has two daughters—the youngest daughter was in primary school and the eldest daughter was in secondary school. Grace has one daughter in secondary school; Irene has twins, a boy and girl, who were in nursery school and a daughter in secondary school; and Regina has two sons, both in primary school. All of the women are the heads of their households and do not have husbands to assist them. The women cited school fees and medical expenses as their greatest financial stressors. They lamented that not

12 Civil servants dealt with feeling demoralized differently. One consultant I spoke with felt demotivated about his work with the civil service and spent most of his day
only did they have tuition to pay but also they had to pay for additional school expenses such as books, uniforms, shoes, and school supplies.

Regina described her previous week as being very stressful because she spent most of it at the hospital in Karatina with one of her sons because he had malaria and typhoid. He had to go to the hospital because he was vomiting his medicine and needed to receive the medicine intravenously. To pay for the hospital stay and treatment, Regina was able to borrow money from the senior officer and the executive assistant of the fish farm.

All the women agreed that they were in a never-ending cycle with debt. Irene commented, “At the end of the month, all of our money has been spent paying debts...At the end of the month we are back to zero again and then we start the journey over again.”

The women also discussed social stresses in addition to financial stresses. All the women in the focus group commented that they had to “forget about men” because they didn’t want “to be cheated again” as they had in the past. The women explained that “being cheated” meant that a man gets a woman pregnant, promises to marry her, and then walks away from the whole responsibility. Grace added and the other women agreed that “it is very difficult to find someone who will want to reading the newspaper, whereas other consultants did not want to remain idle and worked at varying levels of intensity.
marry a woman with a child in Kenya. The women also agreed that they weren’t interested in men because they “fear disease, especially HIV.” The women said that if they died there would be no one there to care for their children. The women then added, “men can be financially draining,” i.e., “they drink the money that is intended to take care of school fees.”

The women also said that they weren’t interested in “going into town to meet men because it creates too much trouble,” so they “just go straight to [their shambani] and plant and cultivate, so that [their] children have educations. All the women agreed that people would laugh at them if their children aren’t in school because they are educated women who have employment. People will ask, “Why do these women have educations and yet their children aren’t in school?” All four women also agreed that the financial stresses of school fees are severe.

The Use of Sagana Fish Farm Resources by Civil Service Staff

Several civil staff members commented that they cultivated on the fish farm land not being used by the Kenya Government or development projects. According to staff members the food produced
on this land greatly assisted their livelihoods because of the food produced for consumption and because of the additional money from the sale of food. Gregory said he has an approximately half acre *shamba* located on the farm where he raises maize and beans. He has been cultivating his *shamba*, which he said, is “very important” to his livelihood, for the last two years. According to Gregory, to use Sagana Fish Farm’s land, an employee must ask permission from the fish farm office, and the office can request the land to be returned if it is needed. In addition to maize and beans, Gregory said there were also people growing papayas, bananas, and sweet potatoes on their *shambani*. To complete the work involved with cultivation on his farm, Gregory hires casual laborers to work on his farm and pays them “by the piece”\(^{13}\) or by “barter trading.”\(^{14}\)

Another civil servant Grace discussed civil staff cultivating fish farm land not in use. During the time near the beginning of her employment, Grace said “more staff were cultivating for home consumption, rather than for selling.” The land that the staff used was the land that the “fish farm left fallow.” When the first donor project arrived Grace said she had to return the land to the farm that she had 

\(^{13}\) To pay “by the piece” means that an individual is paid for completion of a particular area. Gregory pays 35 Kenya shillings for weeding and 120 Kenya shillings for digging a 10 x 10 meter area.
been cultivating. Even now though, Grace commented, the staff cultivates for home consumption. Grace said, "cultivation is very important to us because we are earning very little salary" and explained that it is difficult to save any money unless an individual cultivates for home consumption.

The importance of cultivation to civil staff members was also discussed in the focus group with Michelle, Grace, Irene, and Regina. The women discussed the importance of cultivating their *shambani* and stated they "wouldn't make it" otherwise. The crops of their *shambani* were for home consumption mostly.

Prior to the arrival of a donor project all the women had *shambani* along the hillside leading up to the housing of donor project staff, which, at the time of this study, they described as mostly bush. They were required to turn their land over for project use. Grace commented that "everyone was mad when they were without land because we were having to buy our food which was very expensive for us."

The women said that they cannot be "idle" because they need to work for their children's futures and their education. They said that their free time was usually spent cultivating their *shambani*, and that

---

14 Barter trading in this situation entails paying casual laborers with the food grown on the *shamba*. 
free time typically meant after work in the evenings, during the week when they were on leave, and Saturdays and Sundays. Regina commented that she was behind with cultivation because her son had been sick and in the hospital. Irene said that because she has two small children that she must care for, her shamba is directly in front of her home; additionally, she said that she couldn't afford to hire someone to work on her shamba if it were further away from her home.

Government Casual Laborers

The following section contains descriptions from government casual laborers working at Sagana Fish Farm. Government casual laborers are paid by the Kenya Government\textsuperscript{15} and work for the government-run farm (as opposed to the donor project); however, government casual laborers sometimes do work for donor projects at Sagana Fish Farm. Government casual laborers are supervised by civil servant staff. Government casual laborers discussed their views of wages, the status associated with their work, concerns regarding their work environment, the absence of opportunity for employment in the civil service, and their reasons for working at Sagana Fish Farm are presented.

\textsuperscript{15} Government casual laborers receive 70 Kenya shillings per day; $1 US equals approximately 60 Kenya shillings.
*Wages, Intensity of Labor, and Terms of Employment*

Eric, a casual laborer employed by the Kenya Government said that he worked on the fishing team for the government ponds, but seined the donor project ponds as well. Regarding his work he said the following: "kazi nyingi mshahara kidogo," which means much work and small salary. Eric felt that in comparison with other places he’d worked, the wage he received working at the fish farm was low.

Government casuals sometimes experience a several week delay in receiving their paychecks. Edward explained this to me one day after finding out he would not be going to the District Office in Kerugoya to pick up his paycheck. Edward said that each week the casuals’ hopes for being paid are raised because they are told they’ll be going to the District Office to get their check, but then when the day arrives they are told there are “technical problems” and that the money is not there.

“Technical problems,” Edward said, means “the government has no money.” On this particular day Edward said the casuals were “feeling sick” because “they [government offices] make us wait a long time for our money and we are very hungry.” Edward provided an analogy to describe how he felt when each week he learned that he wouldn’t be paid. In jest, he compared it to coming home and telling the family that
they’re going to eat ugali. (Ugali is made from white corn flour and water; it is served with stews.)

So you tell them to put water on to boil, but then you go to the cupboard only to find that there is no unga (maize flour) to make ugali...Maybe your wife will chase you from the house with a mwiko [wooden spatula]...To be completely sincere I don’t want to work today...How can I concentrate with this disappointment? I might accidentally cut my foot while slashing because I won’t be able to concentrate on my work [joking tone].”

Edward, Tom, and David who all worked as casuals for the Government of Kenya were explaining that they earned 70 Kenya shillings per day. On this particular day they were slashing grass, and they said that the area they slashed was determined by their supervisor. Edward then commented about the insecurity of his employment as a government casual: “it’s best to do the work on the day it is given.” I then asked why, and Edward explained that casuals “fear being sacked“ if the designated area is not done.

[Note: That day the supervisors allowed casuals to go home if they were "feeling sick" because they recognized the unfairness of the casuals situations.] For this particular situation Sagana Fish Farm fronted the casuals 100 Kenya shillings per person until their money came through. When the casuals were paid they returned the 100 Kenya shillings they had been loaned.
Edward also discussed how his life was very different now compared with previously when he’d been working as a casual laborer in a brewery where he made 320 Kenya shillings per day rather than 70 Kenya shillings per day. (Including *kitu kidogo* Edward made 500 Kenya shillings per day.) The work he did at the brewery was temporary and eventually his employment ended; however, he said, “it was very hard for me to come to Sagana...I had a very difficult time coping because of the change in dignity.” He discussed how he felt he had been treated differently depending on the work he did and the amount of money he made. He explained that “Africans when they get money will not treat everyone the same way.” At the fish farm’s canteen he said he observed this phenomenon. The people who earn more money, he felt, typically are served first, whereas a casual laborer might “sit and wait for a long time for a chai.” Edward thought that perhaps “*wazungu* know how to balance things.” He said that because of his experiences with work, at first making a lot of money and then making a little money, that “I have learned how to balance things and understand more about how people are.”

I spoke with two casual laborers, Tom and Edward, who talked to me about a rumor that the government casuals were going to be laid off

---

17 *Kitu kidogo*, or a bribe, refers to extra money that customers paid Edward to make their requests a priority.
by the donor project staff. Edward expressed the following: "We're having a cold feeling right now. I don't know how to explain the Swahili word in English to you. The guys have heard they are going to be sacked and now they are scrambling to find work with small businesses..." Then, Tom said, "There is racial discrimination against us [the casuals]...The [donor staff] walks passed us and doesn't even look at us..." Edward continued,

We are exchanged as if we're used clothing. We're very frustrated. You come to work and it seems like a sunny day, but then the next moment it's a downpour. You budget and plan for an income and then the income disappears. Maybe you have a family. Maybe you have to tell your wife [that there is no longer and income coming in] and she bursts [meaning she cries].

Concerns Regarding Work Situations

Casual laborers expressed concern regarding health and medical expenses and protective equipment. Because their wages are low it is difficult for casual laborers to afford the necessary medicines to maintain their health or take care of their health when they are sick. Casual laborers also thought that the provision of boots would be useful for when they slashed grass or worked in the canals at the farm.

18 There was a rumor circulating around the farm that development project staff wanted to fire the government casual laborers.
Health and Medical Expenses

One day Edward, who is employed by the Kenya Government told me that he wasn’t feeling well and that he could “feel malaria coming from a distance.” He said he’d been slashing grass that day rather than getting in the ponds, because he thought getting in the ponds would make him sick. He asked his supervisor if he could slash grass rather than work in the ponds and was permitted to do so. Edward said, “At this place they won’t give someone a loan to buy medicine,” so he’s waiting until the end of the week to buy some “doses for malaria.” Edward commented that malaria medicine is very expensive and that if he had to go in the ponds that he would have decided to go home.

Tom, a government casual said that it was difficult for the casuals to take care of themselves, because they didn’t earn enough money to take care of themselves if they become sick.

As Ned, also a government casual, was walking back to work after our conversation, one of the civil servants passed and joked (looking at Ned) that “if the work that casual laborers are doing is supposed to be helping to feed them, then why do they look so unhealthy?”
Protective Equipment

David said that he felt protective equipment would be good for the work they do. He said that none of the casuals have gum boots to wear when they work in the ponds. He also said that the boots would be good for when they are slashing grass because there are snakes.

Edgar said he receives 70 Kenya shillings per day for clearing the canal. He said that when he used to do the job in the 70s and 80s that he was given gumboots or rubbers to wear, but now he gets in the canal without any shoes. Edgar said that after an hour of clearing the canal the water is very cold. He also worries about microorganisms in the water that affect his skin; he said he knows there are leeches in the canal, but that he doesn’t know what else lives in the canal.

Gaining Civil Service Employment

During an informal group discussion and an informal interview with casual labors at the fish farm, I learned that at one time casual laborers could gain employment at Sagana Fish Farm; however, at the time of this study, it had become increasingly difficult for casual laborers to get hired on at the farm. Several government casuals discussed their frustration by stating their concern as a question. Martin asked, “Is it
possible after three months working as a casual that you are hired as permanent staff [Martin asked the question knowing that the current economic situation does not allow for casuals to be hired on the permanent staff]?” Then Edward explained that at one time casuals had opportunities to be hired as permanent staff with the government, but the government is not hiring casuals now even though the casuals "know the job very well and have been working for a long time with low pay."

During an informal interview, Andrew said that he was interested in working with the civil service because of his field interests in fisheries, but the civil service is not hiring. He said his chances of being employed with the civil service weren’t good because of the retirement scheme that is reducing the civil service.

Reasons Casual Laborers Sought Employment at Sagana Fish Farm

Government casual laborers came to work at Sagana Fish Farm for reasons such as extra money to take care of necessities. Additionally, they came to work at the fish farm if they had been laid off from other employment.
Ned is from Muratina and has worked as a government casual for one year. He said that prior to working at the fish farm he had been in school. He came to work as a casual laborer because he had been “having problems with money.” Ned said that he lives on his family’s land in his own hut and that his family said that the money he makes at the farm can be used for his own necessities. In town Ned had seen clothing that he had wanted to buy. He also said that his roof is leaking on his thatch hut, so he’s trying to save money to buy some iron sheets to put on his roof. He said he works as a casual because he didn’t want to be a thief and steal to earn money and be subject to “mob justice.” He said that it’s important to him that he earn his money “in an honest way.”

Eric lives in Sagana with his family but was born in Western Province. Prior to working as a government casual at Sagana Fish Farm he had worked in Nairobi for five years doing casual labor as a security guard in a secondary school. He was laid off because the head mistress of the school who had employed him was transferred. He returned to his parent’s shamba for two years in Vihiga District of Western Province to work and then moved to Sagana in 1984, where he first worked in the tannery. While at the tannery he did machine maintenance, cleaned machines, and transported leather to bus stations for customers. Eric said he was laid off from the tannery when leather sales declined. He
came to work at Sagana Fish Farm after the tannery and has been a casual at the farm for the last three years.

Edward came to work at Sagana Fish Farm after he was laid off from the brewery that he worked for in Nairobi.

Relations Among Senior Officers, Supervisors, and Casual Laborers

During a semi-structured and informal interview I learned about the relationship the civil servants and casual laborers maintain at Sagana Fish Farm. During a semi-structured interview, Richard discussed the cutbacks in the civil service and the effects of the retirement scheme, "The Golden Handshake." He explained that the number of junior civil service employees expected to do the manual work at fish farm has decreased. As a result more casual laborers have been hired because the junior civil staff could not handle the work alone. Richard stated the following regarding casual laborers at the fish

19 Richard discussed how the International Monetary Fund (IMF) had been pressuring the Government of Kenya and how the IMF was concerned that there were a number of "employees [in the civil service] who aren't working properly." In response to IMF pressure the Government came up with a retirement scheme, "The Golden Handshake," which reduced the number of junior civil service employees, but not the number of senior civil service employees. As a result, according to Richard, the intended "pyramid-shape" managerial structure of the civil service, which should have fewer senior officers at the top of the pyramid and a larger number of junior officers at the base, had been turned upside down so that "there may be five senior officers to manage very few junior staff when all that is needed is one senior officer." Richard commented that the Government of Kenya's retirement scheme hadn't reduced the costs of the civil service because it still hired senior officers whose salaries were probably the equivalent of three laid off junior staff.
farm: "The casuals then are a supplemental labor force...casuals are hired to work hand-in-hand [with the junior staff]."

Supervision of the casuals challenges junior officers because they are expected to meet levels of production assigned by the senior officer, however, the actual production of the casual laborers does not always achieve the expected production. One of the junior officers that I spoke with was sympathetic to the fact that casuals receive low wages and are expected to work at a high intensity. During an informal interview with Bob, he commented that he viewed himself as a "mediator" between the senior staff at the fish farm and the casuals. He said that he has to try to get the casuals to work and at the same time tries to get them more money. Bob said he didn't "view the casuals as lazy...they work hard," and described how there were periods at the farm when ponds were being harvested that the casuals would work through an entire day without a break. He added during some of the days "it rained quite a bit and the casuals were in the ponds without rain gear or the yellow covers."

Regarding his role as a supervisor, Bob said that his position was sometimes difficult because he came "across casuals with big heads," who didn't want to work. He said he also knew that sometimes when he wasn't present the casuals wouldn't work. Bob provided one example of how he got the casuals to work more. I had taken some pictures of the casual laborers that Bob said weren't given to the casuals immediately (the pictures were delayed one day) because their production wasn't high enough. He explained to them that if they
accomplished a demarcated area of work that they’d receive their pictures. According to Bob, the next day the casual laborers were working very hard cutting lilies that had grown in one of the ponds because they wanted their pictures. He said the following regarding his position as supervisor: "Sometimes it is hard because if someone isn’t working I have to lay them off...Hiring is also difficult because there are more casuals who want work than there are jobs...Sometimes I have to choose who I’ll hire, which is difficult when a friend shows up and I have to be fair." In an effort to treat people fairly, Bob would flip a coin to decide who would be hired when there were two or more people trying for the same job. Bob thought that if the casuals were paid maybe a 120 or 130 Kenya shillings that it would be possible to “get them to work more.”

THE PRESENCE OF DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS AT SAGANA FISH FARM

Casual Laborers Hired to Work for the Donor Project

Previous and present development organizations at Sagana Fish Farm hire contractors to do the manual construction of ponds. In turn contractors hire casual laborers to do the work. The casual laborers
solely work for the donor project and are paid by donor project funds.\textsuperscript{20} They are supervised separately from the casual laborers who work for the government-run farm. The following section is intended to provide a sense of the work casual laborers were doing before working for the current donor, how they came to work for the donor, and their experiences while working with the donors.

\textit{Casual Laborers' Descriptions of Their Livelihoods: Past and Present}

Glenn, a casual for the donor project, compared his work at a quarry with his work at the fish farm. He said that with his quarry job he made a lot of money in a short time, whereas with his job at the farm there was a lot of work for a long time in which he could earn a little money. Additionally, Glenn worked at the fish farm in the early 1990s clearing canals. He said the work at that time was easier than the work he is doing now with the donor project constructing ponds.

Frederick had worked at Sagana Tannery on a threshing machine and a spraying machine prior to working at the fish farm. In comparing his work at the tannery with his work with the donor project, he said

\textsuperscript{20} At the time of this research casual laborers paid by the donor project earned 100 Kenya shillings per day.
that his work at the tannery was better because he made more money. (At the tannery casuals were paid overtime.) Although, Frederick added, the working conditions were better at the fish farm because casuals aren’t working with chemicals that are harmful to human health. Regarding the work he does at the fish farm, Frederick said that constructing ponds was more difficult than seining, but that was acceptable because with pond construction he doesn’t have to get in the ponds during the cold season.

Oscar had been working on his family’s shamba and fishing prior to working at Sagana Fish Farm for the donor project. He said he would typically cultivate in the morning hours and then fish during the evening hours. He fished in Lake Victoria, and said that the fishing at Sagana Fish Farm was different than the fishing in Lake Victoria where he netted fish from a boat. Oscar learned of the donor project work through one of his brothers who is a civil servant at the fish farm. Oscar said that in terms of his length of employment, he will continue to work with the donor project as long as there is work; however, if his brother is transferred from the station it “will cut off his work.” Oscar is able to stay with his brother and save money. He said the mobility associated with looking for casual labor didn’t bother him too badly as long as he was making money for his family.
Another casual laborer, Glenn, prior to his work at the fish farm with the donor project, had worked at a quarry for two years doing stonedressing. He said he carved stones into 4” x 6” rectangular shapes and was paid according to how many stones he dressed. He said he was able to dress 200 stones per day and received 1 Kenya shilling per stone; he said his pay was raised to 1.50 Kenya shilling per stone, so he made 300 Kenya shillings per day. Glenn said he no longer had the job at the quarry because of El Niño—the quarry where he worked was flooded and there was a wash of silt.

Robert is from Busia and including himself comes from a family with 15 siblings. Robert graduated from secondary school in 1993 and for the last six years has been searching for work or “tarmacking.” Prior to coming and working for the donor project, Robert had been helping one of his brothers in Nairobi. Robert had been working at the donor project ponds for two weeks and said that he came to work at Sagana Fish Farm because there weren’t any industries in the Western Province that had work for him. He said that the work he’d prefer is “of course the white collar job or any suitable job.”

Paul has been living in Sagana, but he was born in Kianjeje, which is a town approximately 25 km from Sagana. Prior to working at

21 Tarmacking refers to traveling throughout Kenya (on the tarmac roads) looking for employment.
Sagana Fish Farm with the donor project he'd been living in Nakuru. His entire family had been living in Nakuru as well. He and his family left Nakuru because of clashes between Kikuyus and Kalejin, and his family now lives in Karema. He attempted to return to Nakuru, but was only able to stay for 12 days. He fled after 12 days because the clashes were not over. The day he left he was ambushed in his home. He said he'd been at home and had looked out the window to see three men with spears who'd surrounded his house. He escaped through his front door; however, while escaping he was shot in the foot by an arrow.

After he fled his home it was burnt down. Paul said that he managed to flee with his personal documents and some cash, but everything else was burned. He said he lost his TV, solar system panel, and furniture. Paul hopes to return to Nakuru to work. Prior to working for the donor project he had been working in Naivasha as a driver. He said he'd also worked in Nakuru collecting rent and had a private business that involved buying and selling charcoal. Paul said that he also did architectural drawing and construction, and he described himself as self-taught regarding architectural drawing. After primary school Paul spent two years in masonry school and two months in driving school. He said that although he doesn't have any capital at the moment, he'd like to start a business in Maralana with a music studio.
Keith, prior to working with the donor, cultivated sukuma wiki (cale) and other crops on his shamba. He also scooped sand from the river to sell to construction companies.

Matthew had worked at Sagana Fish Farm previously with a donor project, discontinued work, and then returned to work with the donor project currently operating at the farm. Matthew had been working with this donor project for two months. His work with the previous donor project involved scooping silt out of ponds. He relayed that in his entire life he had never had a "white collar job" and that he has only worked as a casual. When he first started working as a casual he worked in masonry in Mombassa and Nairobi. He felt that through his experiences he'd learned to do the "hard work" and that's why he fits well with the work of the donor project.

Reasons Casual Laborers Sought Employment with the Donor Project at Sagana Fish Farm

Casual laborers listed a number of different reasons for seeking employment at Sagana Fish Farm. Most of the casuals came to work at the fish farm out of financial necessity. Glenn was born in Sagana and his family is from Sagana. He started working at the fish farm in April of 1997 for the donor project. He came to work as a casual because "there
was an outbreak of famine and drought;” his food supply, which was
"paramount”, had not been good. He said he came to work at the fish
farm because there had been nowhere else for him to work.

Isaac had been working at the farm with the donor project for one
month. He decided to come to work as a casual because he had problems
after the downpours of El Niño. His crops were washed away by floods.
After the floods he said he planted more crops, but it continued to rain
and his crops started to rot.

Timothy said that he worked at the fish farm because he was
trying to educate his children and the government was demanding
school fees. Also he had to pay for medical expenses. Timothy said that
he had to pay 1,000 Kenya shillings in building fees for his children’s
school and 100 to 800 Kenya shillings for his children’s medical
expenses. During majira umbu, the short rains, he said there are a lot of
mosquitoes and that people get sick but they can’t afford medical
expenses. He added that once he has paid all of his medical expenses he
realizes “things aren’t going anywhere” or “money isn’t being saved.”

Nathan had been working at Sagana Fish Farm for four months
with the donor project. He said he came to work as a casual because he
was “searching for something to keep [him] going on.” He needed to be
able to purchase the basics, which were primarily food and personal
items for his wife and child. Prior to working with the donor project,
Nathan worked plowing and planting with oxen for 80 Kenya shillings per day. He said his day began at six o’clock in the morning when he was plowing and ended at noon because the oxen needed to graze. Additionally, Nathan said he assisted masons mixing ballast and cement. He said the work he did prior to work at the fish farm and the work he currently does at the fish farm are comparable—it is manual labor. The difference for Nathan now is that he works more hours.

Howard was born in Sagana and his family lives in Sagana. His family consists of his mother, himself, and two sisters aged twenty-two and twenty-four. Howard said that he is the only son and is responsible for his family, but he doesn’t feel that he’s giving his best because he doesn’t have enough finances. He had been working with the donor project as a casual for approximately four months. Prior to working as a casual at the farm he had been cultivating for six months, but the production had been low and he’d been unable to earn any money. He said he had kept half of his produce for consumption and sold the remaining half. The half for consumption was finished before the next harvest and he had run out of money, so he decided to come to work. He also said that he had his own business, in which he bought and sold maize and beans. His business fell apart when the money he saved was spent on medicine when he became sick. For his business Howard
bought maize and beans in Karima and then sold them in Sagana at a higher price to a shop owner.

Andrew is from Sagana. His family also lives in Sagana. He was born in Mombassa, but then his family decided to come to the "fatherland" where they have "a small piece of shamba." Andrew said he had heard about a donor project at the fish farm in 1991 and that he was interested in fish propagation. Andrew attended school in Nyeri and went to seminary school in 1992. Andrew said at that point his "objective was to become a priest." Normally, Andrew explained, the eldest son is given responsibility for the whole family; however, in Andrew's situation he was given responsibility even though he is the second born. His grandfather died in 1991 and wrote in his will that Andrew should be responsible for his family. During 1991 and 1992 when there were tribal clashes, Andrew worked for a volunteer service through one of the churches. He was rehabilitating "street boys". He also taught in a private primary school in Nakuru. In 1994 Andrew was in Mombassa at the Mkumani Research Station. Three years ago Andrew began working at Sagana Fish Farm for the donor project and the Government of Kenya. He stopped working at the farm four months prior to our interview. He said he stopped working at the farm because fingerling sales weren't good and he was told that there was no money to pay him. He said he then got himself involved with politics.
He involved himself with the last election (January 1998) counting votes in Sagana at the local precinct. About working at the fish farm, he said that he was more interested in the study than the salary and that "knowledge is paramount." While working at Sagana Fish Farm Andrew said he hoped to get a recommendation for work and practical knowledge in the dairy, fish propagation, agroforestry, sheep and poultry units. He worked with all the units at Sagana but he said he mostly worked with the hatchery in fish propagation. Andrew said he viewed the job at Sagana as a way to earn a living and as well study.

George lives just outside of the sublocation of Sagana and had been working with the donor project for four months. He said he came to work at the fish farm with the donor project because of financial problems at home. George said his financial problems stemmed from school fees, food, clothing (he gestured to the shirt he was wearing) and taking care of his dwelling. He said he lives on his father's shamba. There are three brothers who live on and cultivate his father's four acres of land. He said that he and his brothers live on different parts of the shamba so that environment doesn't become "corrupted."

Keith was born in Sagana sublocation and now lives approximately four km outside of Sagana. Keith began working with the donor project a year ago. He said that in 1997 "famine was a major problem in Kenya," which brought him to try to get a job as a casual. He
said that "people were very hungry" and that he came to work with the donor project to help his family.

The primary reason Matthew came to work with the donor project at Sagana Fish Farm was to earn money for school fees and medical expenses. Matthew said his first born finished form four (form four is equivalent to completing highschool in the US), went to CPA school, and then tried to find work in Nairobi. He couldn't find work as a CPA, so he now works as a casual. Matthew's second born finished secondary school; his third son is attending university; his fourth and fifth children are in secondary school—a daughter in boarding school and a son in day school and his sixth and seventh children are in primary school. The cost of school fees demanded that he get a second job. His primary work is subsistence farming; he plants maize, beans, and tobacco. Matthew expressed concern because despite his hard work he was still feeling the pressure of school fees. He said he was trying to make an effort to earn the school fees, but he's having a difficult time. One of the problems he's dealing with concerns his son who is at Daystar University. His son is in his second year of study and has been given "two free years of study" but Matthew has still had to pay 20,000 Kenya shillings for additional expenses.
Casual Laborers' Discussion of Wages in Comparison with Intensity of Labor

Almost all of the casual laborers I spoke with felt that their wage was low and not in accordance with the intensity of their labor. Two casual laborers, however, discussed how they received a better wage working for the donor project that was present at the time this study as opposed to a previous donor project in the early- to mid-nineties. Two casual laborers also commented that the close proximity of the fish farm to their homes was beneficial in terms of their wage because they did not spend a lot of the money they earned on transport and other expenses. Additionally, two casual laborers felt that longer term employment with the donor project and a low wage was preferable to shorter term employment and a higher wage.

During a semi-structured interview with Oscar, he informed me that he thought that an increase in wage would assist him. He commented that "life would be bearable if he made a little money...earning money is the most important thing" and described his work as being very hard and the pay unsatisfactory.

Isaac said that the casuals didn’t have enough time on their breaks to get tea at the canteen. He also said that the "work is very hard and the pay is low."
Glenn felt that the work expected of the casuals was more than what the casuals could do in eight hours. He felt the work was worth at least 200 Kenya shillings. With the 100 Kenya shillings he earned he said that it was difficult to save money.

Frederick discussed his wages in terms of what he'd received previously from donor projects. Frederick commented that the wages he received with the current donor project were better than the wages he received previously with a donor project at Sagana Fish Farm in the mid 1990s. Additionally, Frederick thought that because many of the casuals who worked at the farm lived nearby that the wages might be better, because people are coming from town and don’t have to pay a lot of money for transport and have fewer expenses. Nonetheless, Frederick said his expenses are still higher than the salary he receives from working as a casual with the donor project. He added that “mwafrika and mzungu paid the same;” however, “mwafrika paid more for hard labor than mzungu,” which surprised him because he thought that mzungu might have more money. (Mwafrika is a Swahili word referring to black Africans.)

Matthew also compared the wages of two donor projects to comment on the salary he received. He said with the previous donor project the casuals weren’t paid very much. (Initially the casuals were paid 70 Kenya shillings per day, but their wage was increased to 80 Kenya
shillings per day.) He felt this pay wasn’t much in comparison with the pay he received with the current donor project.

Andrew, who previously worked as a casual with the donor projects, also commented that the salary at Sagana Fish Farm was better than other places because the fish farm is near to the homes of the casual laborers. The casuals prefer to work at the fish farm because they earn money there and are less likely to spend it because their homes are nearby. He said most of the casuals are from nearby and work at Sagana Fish Farm because they don’t have other alternatives. Andrew also felt that the work was not congruent with the pay that the casuals earned.

In a semi-structured interview with Howard he began by asking me if there were people who do “such hard work in America?” He said that he’s frustrated because he makes so little money. For example, he said, “I can hardly buy chai on my break.” Regarding his salary he said the following: “With the money I make, if I try to buy new clothes, then I can’t buy soap to wash them...If I buy tea then I can’t afford to buy the sugar to put in the tea.” Howard thought salary was his main problem and that if he could get a good salary then he could support his family and clothe himself. He said that sometimes he looks forward into his future and knows that “there will be a time when [he’s] not so energetic, so now [he wants] to create a good foundation and be able to educate his children.”
According to Paul, the work is *kua haraka*, which means killing him quick. "I come to work at the job to make money, but the money is not enough," stated Paul. He summarized his work with the donor project in the following statement: "The work is hard labor, the wage is low, and there is heavy supervision."

George described some of the problems he found working as a casual with the donor project. He said that "the labor was very difficult—the work is very hard."

Keith commented that one of the problems he observed with the work with the donor projects was that people will only come for one or two weeks and then go because "the work is so hard and the payment is so low."

Timothy described his work at the fish farm with the donor project as "demanding" and said that the *mwana nchi*, the common man, is doing most of the work at the fish farm and getting low pay.

*Casual Laborers' Concerns Regarding their Work Environment*

Like the casual laborers who work for the government-run farm, casual laborers who work for the donor project raised concern regarding protective equipment and medical and health expenses. They also,
however, expressed concern regarding the insecurity of their employment, the quality of their drinking water, and tribalism.

Terms of Employment

Robert, commented that there were "no specific working terms...everything is just suspended of faulting."

For the casuals who work at the ponds their future is not known...You are supposed to be informed or given notice of when your work is going to terminate, but that doesn't happen here...Some companies let you know that you will be working three months and then you either renew your contract or with some jobs after three months you become permanent.

Then Robert commented that work breaks and provisions such as equipment would be important. Robert also explained that "things in Kenya are not the way they are in the States [referring to the USA]. People aren't paid well and due to their circumstance they have to work and accept their work conditions."
Protective Equipment

Robert felt the work on the donor project ponds was "not a place you can work barefoot because a person can prick their foot and be exposed to tetanus." Robert also suggested that gloves would be important, especially for people handling manure because the manure burns the skin. Additionally, he said that "if a person is sick he/she should be given the time to rest without a deduction in pay."

George, a casual with the donor project said that people injure themselves with tools and that when they work during the cold season and have to go in the ponds they end up getting sick with malaria. He said that the malaria attacks the casuals because their bodies are tired from the hard work. He told me that it would be better if the casuals could be let off work at 4:00 rather than 5:00.

Keith said that injuries are a problem; people have injured themselves with the tools. He also said that "from beating the hard rocks," dust gets into the casual laborers' lungs, which causes problems with coughing.
Health/First Aid/Medical Expenses

Regarding his work with the donor project, Glenn said "there are problems." If someone falls sick in the middle of the day the person is not paid for the full day; the person is only paid for the hours worked.

Nathan stated that he'd like a first aid box because the casuals sometimes cut themselves.

Frederick explained that when working as a casual with the donor project it is "easy to become sick with malaria or pneumonia." He said, "when you are sick you are at home so you don't get the pay...then you end up spending the money [for medicine] and when you go back you have nothing."

Robert said that the work that the casuals do "fatigues people...people need to stay healthy to do the work. He said he'd been told that if there's an accident at work then employees aren't treated.

Drinking Water

Isaac began the interview by discussing what his concerns were with his work. He said the water that the casuals drink throughout the day is not treated because it comes straight from the river. Isaac said one
of the casuals got typhoid and he thought that possibly the typhoid was associated with the water the casuals were drinking from the river. He suggested a water conservation tank to collect pure water would be better so that the casuals didn’t drink water from the canals.

Timothy expressed concern because he said he was “forced to take untreated water.” Timothy thought that if the water was treated that maybe fewer casuals would get typhoid, which would benefit the donor project that had hired them.

Nathan also commented that he’d like treated drinking water. Howard said that he was concerned about drinking the water at the work site because it isn’t purified, but he said that “mainly mshahara [salary] is the biggest problem.”

**Tribalism**

The Monday morning following the lay off of a number of donor project casuals, Robert came to visit me and tell me that he was leaving Sagana.

Robert felt his being laid off might have been due to tribalism. He offered an example as to why he felt this way. Robert said the foreman (a casual laborer), who is from the Kikuyu tribe, had told the other
casuals (also Kikuyu) that the two casuals who weren't Kikuyu (Robert and Oscar who are from the Luo tribe) shouldn't be working at the donor project ponds because the project money was supposed to be for people in the area. Robert said that the foreman had told he and Oscar that they should go back to their homelands. Robert said he was also humiliated by the foreman because the foreman had told the other casuals that Robert didn't have enough money for transport back to his homeland. Robert described another instance in which he and Oscar were speaking in their "mother tongue" and were told that they shouldn't speak their mother tongue. Robert said that he and Oscar were the only two casuals who weren't Kikuyus and that the other casuals, rather than speaking Swahili, the national language, only spoke Kikuyu. Robert felt this was tribalistic and he also thought that the firing of the casuals might have been tribalistic. Robert thought that the foreman may have had all the casuals fired and then on Monday hired back the casuals he didn't have problems with. Robert said he felt "Kikuyus were very tribalistic," and he thought it was better to leave without making problems because he was afraid of being harmed. Robert said that Kikuyus were causing all the problems in other areas. He added that Jomo Kenyatta was a Kikuyu and during his presidency made sure that Kikuyus and the Central Province did well to the detriment of other tribes.
Another Point of View on Wages of Casual Laborers

One consultant I interviewed, Chris, first joked about the difference in wage for workers in the US and Kenya, but then stated that the wage of casual laborers was fair, especially in contrast with the wage paid to the casual laborers by a previous donor project in the early- to mid-nineties. During a conversation with Chris, an individual who works closely with the casual laborers and who worked for the donor project, we discussed the type of work I would be doing when I finished my Master's degree. I said that I was interested in working for organizations that monitored what US manufacturing firms and other US organizations were doing overseas. I told him about a program that I was interested in that educates people in the US about exploitative labor practices by US firms overseas and pressures these firms to treat their laborers better. After I explained the work of this organization, Chris jokingly asked, "Would that organization go after donor projects here?" He then in a serious tone followed his question by stating that the current project was fair with its wages. He supported this assertion by stating that the donor project had even raised the wages of casuals 20 Kenya shillings. He compared the current donor project with other donor projects and said other donor projects had worked at the farm for years and the wage (80 Kenya shillings) stayed the same the entire time, even though the project demanded work from the casuals throughout
its duration. He felt the current project was fairer with wages because the donor staff would increase the wage "little by little" as production improve. He felt that if the salary of the casuals reached 120 shillings per day that would be a "very fair wage."

**Benefits Associated with Donor Projects**

**Civil Servants' Perceptions**

The benefits that civil servants attributed to the presence of donor projects varied. Civil servants viewed positively the structural enhancements made to the farm, the inexpensive source of protein available to farm employees, the opportunity for training or work experience with the project, loans and overtime allowances, and employment for individuals from neighboring communities.
Structural Enhancements

During an interview with Anthony, he described the advantages associated with the donor project. He said that a donor project present at the farm in the mid 1990s gave the farm a “facelift”—including a canteen, laboratory, modern hatchery, and new equipment. He also said that ponds were rehabilitated and that technology transfer also took place at the farm.

In an interview with Kevin, he commented that the farm was well fenced as a result of the presence of a donor.

Also, Grace said that prior to the presence of donor projects the farm was not fenced, which made it difficult for “outsiders” to determine where the boundaries of the farm were.

During an interview with Ted he discussed how he had arrived at the fish farm three years ago during the presence of the donor project in the mid 1990s. “There was the zero grazing unit, the poultry unit, and fish production and all these departments had been promoted...Even the work was not so bad.”

Another individual Kenneth felt that “the presence of the farm was improved,” because prior to donor projects there had not been the following production units: hatchery, zero grazing, sheep grazing, and poultry.
Gary discussed how the physical appearance of the fish farm had changed a great deal since the time that he first arrived at Sagana Fish Farm. When he first arrived at the fish farm there had not been a zero grazing unit so he was surprised to see the zero grazing unit. Additionally the fish had not been producing well so he was pleased to see that, in addition to fish, there were functioning fish ponds that looked "very clean."

Richard felt that with the donor projects at the farm, "because of the resources they bring," the farm is able to supply fingerlings to farmers and to follow through with extension.

During a conversation with Gerald, he provided his opinion regarding development organizations coming to Kenya. He said, "Donors are a good thing because they give people resources to develop that they don't have." For example, Gerald said, "I feel very proud when I sit here [in the canteen] and look around at the resources [donors] have brought to the farm."

**Future Outlook**

During an interview with Kevin he said that he had observed that the donor project work could be very "profitable and
promising...pond productivity is high...I would like to see things continue to improve.” Kevin thought that eventually the increased pond productivity would affect the entire farm in addition to village neighbors. He said that village neighbors would be taught how to make their own ponds and would buy their own fingerlings from Sagana Fish Farm to stock their ponds.

Regarding donor projects Gregory felt that the research was going well and he foresees the research results leading to increases in production at the fish farm. He also felt that the donors created work for the civil servants who work in the laboratory of the fish farm.

Skills Development

During an interview with Kenneth he discussed how with the operations of donor projects “employees working at the farm could build their skills...For example, they could learn to sex fish.” Additionally, he said that people who worked in the poultry unit “learn about poultry rearing and bring this practice home, so that they can rear chickens at home.”

22 Village neighbor refers to the village that borders the backside of the farm, Kirimu.
Richard said, as a result of donor projects, that the staff has learned methods of producing fish or techniques for culturing fish that improved production in compared with previous techniques used at the farm. Additionally, Richard commented that he enjoys learning and doesn’t feel overworked by the presence of donor projects. He views his work as training and sees it as beneficial to him. “The skills I acquire here [with donor projects] will allow me to go to other places.” He said that he would be able to show that he has experience after working with donor projects. Though Richard enjoyed the “on-the-job-training” that he had received with donor projects he was concerned because he “only knows one field.” He thought that attending college would be a good way for him to “broaden his knowledge base.” “One of the benefits of college,” Richard said, “is that you receive a certificate,” which he felt might open up “greener pastures” for him.

The Provision of an Inexpensive Source of Protein

Several civil service employees discussed the availability of an inexpensive source of protein in the form of fish, chicken, and milk. Gregory stated that Sagana Fish Farm supported the surrounding community through “selling milk, chicken, and fish at a nice price.”
Michelle said, "Donor projects had changed the farm...[Since the presence of donor projects] people have had fish...The cows help us because instead of going outside the farm to buy milk, we can buy it at the farm...The donor projects have made a difference at the farm...The projects are giving fish which the staff consumes."

Kenneth stated that he felt people in the area benefited from donor projects: "Villages are benefiting with protein from fish, milk, and chicken."

In an interview with Grace she commented that Sagana Fish Farm had benefited from donor projects because the land had been cleared, buildings were constructed, and cows were bought. "Now," Grace said, "the staff can buy milk cheaply."

Employment for Individuals in Neighboring Communities

Two civil servants discussed the possibility of employment of casual laborers with donor projects. In an interview with Ted he commented that donor projects were good because they employed "outsiders."
Richard also said that donor projects create temporary employment for casual laborers; by "employing one casual...he [referring to the casual] can help his entire family."

Joel felt that the hiring of casual laborers by the donor project was a very positive idea. He reiterated and said that he wasn't against the hiring of casual laborers.

**Loans**

During an interview Grace said that when "people hear a donor project is coming they think that there will be more work and more pay on top of the government salary." She learned through her experiences that this was not necessarily always the case; however, she said she had been able to go to the donor staff for loans that she would pay back at the end of the month.

**Overtime Allowance**

Grace mentioned overtime allowance as a benefit of the donor projects. "Now," she said, "the staff is sometimes given work on
Saturdays." According to Grace the work typically involved slashing grass, cultivating, or washing the store.

In an interview with Gary he relayed his experience with a donor project that operated during the mid 1990s. During the presence of this project people received *kitu kidogo*\textsuperscript{23} and were “very happy.” Gary said that because of *kitu kidogo* people were “motivated and worked very hard.” The staff, Gary said was “working day and night during the time of *kitu kidogo* ,” and he thought that during this time the donor project was “very good.” The “big bosses,”\textsuperscript{24} according to Gary, “were given money to visit other parts of the country to raise their knowledge, but the junior staff was not sent anywhere to raise their knowledge.” Gary said the benefit to him from the donor project was the *kitu kidogo* because he was “able to put something in [his] stomach.”

*Casual Laborers’ Perceptions*

Few casual laborers volunteered information about the benefits of donor projects. Three consultants, however, did discuss the benefits of donor projects. Donor projects create employment over extended

\textsuperscript{23} *Kitu kidogo* in this instance refers to the allowance that the donor project paid the civil servants for participating in the project’s operations.
periods of time for casual laborers and knowledge and information that casual laborers can take and apply to their own livelihoods.

Robert, a casual laborer for the donor project, thought that the donor project was "creating employment and knowledge," and that the casuals could possibly learn to construct fish ponds through their work with the ponds, although he thought constructing ponds "was a little expensive." Though, he thought "small-scale fish farming might be something that people could start at home."

Additionally, Robert said that "the research laboratory [at the farm] was good because people could learn what species do well in such a place...the study of fish diseases...pond soils...research needs to take place in laboratories."

Matthew, who works for the donor project, felt that one of the advantages of working with the current donor project was that "the work was taking a little longer" and that there was opportunity for work for three or four months rather than finishing the work in one week.

Graham, a casual laborer who works for Sagana Fish Farm rather than the donor project, explained that he is also a farmer in addition to his work at the farm and described how he used his money when he first started working as a casual. He said he used his first two weeks of pay to buy a sheep, which reproduced. He sold some of the lambs and

24 "Big bosses" refers to senior officers at Sagana Fish Farm.
said that the sheep reproduced again and so he sold some more of the lambs. After he made money with the sheep, he decided to buy some chickens from Sagana fish farm. He said he did the same thing with the chickens several times. Graham said that with the money he earned from the chickens he bought a pig. He said at this point he’d like to buy a cow, but he said that they are very expensive. Graham said that he had watched how the sheep and chickens were raised at the farm, and then he did the same thing at home to make money.

During an informal conversation with Edward and Graham who were boiling soya, Graham explained why they boiled soya to me. Graham discussed the toxins and fats that needed to be broken down before the soya could be mixed into the fish feed; boiling soya he said was necessary to maximize the effectiveness of the protein in the soya, i.e., improve digestibility. Graham said that he learned about why the farm boiled soya when a “doctor [representing a donor project] came and explained this to us.” Graham said prior to the doctor’s explanation of why soya is boiled he and another casual “were fools” who didn’t know the reason for boiling soya
Perceptions of Individuals Affiliated with Sagana Fish Farm but not Employed by the Farm

Consultants discussed how casual laborers were able to save their money to buy livestock. Additionally, consultants discussed the inexpensive protein source in the form of milk, fish, or chicken that civil staff could purchase, overtime allowances paid to the civil staff, an available vehicle for extension purposes, and the availability of the necessary resources for farm functioning as a result of donor projects.

Chris felt that the employment of casual laborers was a benefit of donor projects. Regarding the employment of casuals by the donor projects, Chris said that after one month of work a casual might buy a goat, and then after another month buy another goat, and then sell the goats to buy a cow. Chris said that he knew of one casual who had invested and saved his money so that he earned three times what he had saved (10,000 Kenya shillings increased to 30,000 Kenya shillings.)

Regarding donor projects Neill stated the following:

[Donor projects have] benefited people across the board from the lowest staff member to the highest staff member...Because of donors people are able to buy milk, fish, and chicken...There is a mobile vehicle available for extension purposes...Staff have been able to come work on the weekends...The casuals wish that the projects will continue for a long time because it has enabled them to feed their families.
He added that Sagana Fish Farm has the best facilities in Kenya and that many people visit the farm and learn from the farm. “Even if you don’t gain directly from the resources at the farm you can learn from the computers or maybe you’ll just be assisted by one of the vehicles.”

Lawrence discussed how the fish farm had the necessary equipment and resources, such as ponds, equipment, computers, books, and mentorship, to carry out aquaculture research as a result of donor projects. “Donor assistance offers the resources that are unavailable due to a lack of finances...If the donor was not at the farm, then the land would not be used and the farm would be stagnant...The donor projects have made the farm operational and have provided employment for the people in the area.”

Lawrence felt that at the time of the interview the farm was able to sustain itself. “It’s not making a profit, but it’s sustaining and it is able to provide fingerlings and do some extension.”

**Sustainability of Donor Project Activities**

Consultants discussed the importance of donor staff sharing information with civil servants and including civil servants in the operations of the donor project, the equipment of donor projects and the difficulty associated with repairing equipment, the sustainability of Sagana Fish Farm without the presence of donor projects, and financial
issues within the Government of Kenya that make Sagana Fish Farm operations difficult. Consultants also discussed how individuals sometimes tended to be more interested in their own well-being rather than the good of the community affected by a donor project. Corruption was also an issue that consultants felt hindered the sustainability of donor project work.

Civil Servants' Perceptions

In an interview with Gary he explained that if donor projects didn't provide access to instructions or information regarding new technology then the sustainability of donor project work was questionable. Based on his experiences with donor projects he stated that "if the donor projects ended today that the farm would not sustain itself." He provided an example of a computerized typewriter that was left in the fisheries office by a previous donor project. He said, "nobody knows how to work the machine and nobody benefits...The only manual on how to operate the typewriter is written in a language that nobody understands...The [donor staff] worked alone in the office and never showed anyone how to use the typewriter...Now the machine is useless...We might as well throw it in the bushes because nobody knows how to use it."
Gary felt that if the staff doesn’t know how something is designed or how it operates then they won’t be able to maintain the farm and repair the equipment. For example, he said, “If donor projects ended today at Sagana Fish Farm, nobody on the permanent staff would know what was going on with the D line ponds [that donor projects have worked on]...This makes the ponds very difficult to maintain at a later point...I don’t feel that I can speak about the D line ponds.” Gary expressed concern that he will have to work on the ponds at a later point after the donor projects are gone and there won’t be any knowledge available. He said, “the casuals working for the project are the people with all the knowledge about D line, but when the projects are over the casuals go home.” Additionally, he said he could see that the canal construction was different; the donor project was using pipes rather than cement, which for him was very new technology. Of the ponds that Gary had constructed, he felt confident in his understanding of the construction and had no problems explaining the operation of those ponds.

Gary continued and stated that “all the work that a donor accomplishes at the fish farm will die if nobody on the permanent staff is left with any knowledge of the project’s work.” He provided two recent examples illustrating the importance of knowledge being transferred from the donor to the civil staff. “Just the other day I was asked about a waterline that was built by a contractor [hired by a donor project]. I couldn’t answer any of the questions because I was not a part of the construction of the waterline.” In another situation a casual was
doing some digging behind the laboratory. Because Gary was familiar with the electrical work that had been done in the area, he was able to point out that there were electric lines. He was concerned that if he hadn’t had information about the electrical work that had been done in that area that the person who was digging could have injured himself. Gary stated the following regarding donor projects: “If you come here with new technology, you have to teach me...then I am very happy.”

In an interview with Richard he discussed equipment repair, the sustainability of the fish farm without the presence of donor projects, and government technicalities as deterrents to the sustainability of the work of the donor project. Regarding what will happen “once the project[s] go,” Richard said the following: “All the equipment that the [donor] projects have brought over, while it is very nice equipment, will eventually break down and not be of any use because it can’t be repaired locally...Secondly, the [donor] projects have put a lot of money into the farm, but unless the farm is able to sustain itself, or reach a stage of sustainability, the money will have been spent and the benefits lost...Thirdly, government technicalities are causing difficulties.” Richard clarified what “government technicalities” are. He said all the money collected from the kiosk at the fish farm is remitted to the Treasury and then the Treasury allocates money to the various fisheries stations and departments. According to Richard, the Treasury returns a disproportionate amount of money to the fish farm in contrast with the money the farm remits. As a result, Richard thought that the allocation the farm receives is not enough for fish food, fertilizers, and petrol, i.e.,
the resources necessary to keep the farm productive—"allocations are subject to the availability of funds." Richard explained that the Director of Fisheries can request that more funds be given to the fish farm but the ultimate decision lies with the Treasury. For example, Richard said that "what the farm produces doesn't come back to it...money is requested and the amount received is five or six times less than what was requested." Richard didn't feel that self sustainability could ever apply to a government station—"there's no light at the end of the tunnel" and "people on the ground aren't making the decisions" about resource allocations, "people in Nairobi, who don't know what's going on are making the decisions."

Anthony questioned the sustainability of donors based on his observations of the farm with and without the presence of a donor. He had observed the farm come to almost a standstill without the presence of a donor, then he observed improvements at the fish farm in the presence of the donor, but then he could see "things starting to go down again" after the donor left.

Gregory discussed in an interview how corruption at higher levels in the Kenya Government challenges the sustainability of the work of donor projects. On the "government side" Gregory felt that the "big people are killing the donors...grabbers are taking all the money and keeping it for themselves." Gregory said that the farm is "like an engineer;" it has "all the resources and knowledge but no way to get it out to the people...the technology is just lying here...there is no means of communication." Gregory felt that "authority from the top, the big
bosses" can undermine the work that the senior officers are trying to accomplish at the farm. He said, for example, that one of the donor projects had left the vehicle they had brought to the fish farm. According to Gregory, within several months of the donor projects departure the vehicle was co-opted to be used in Nairobi, and the fish farm hasn’t seen the vehicle since.\(^{25}\)

Gregory also commented about what he supposed would happen once the current donor project left the farm. “Now,” he said, “people have adjusted to being kept busy [with the work created by donor projects]...[nonetheless] if the donor project goes the [the farm] will go back to zero...For the first few months after the donor project goes, management will be good, but then there will be a decrease in the work...There aren’t any officers seriously taking part in the donor’s work so there will be no one to continue the work of the project.”

Perceptions of Individuals Affiliated with Sagana Fish Farm but not Employed by the Farm

Regarding the exit of donor projects, Lawrence said that “if the donor project[s] pulls out everything will go down.” He felt that “people who work for the government tend to play it low.” He didn’t know why this occurred; however, he suggested that it was due to a lack of money available to accomplish tasks. “People,” he said, “tend to work for their

\(^{25}\) Note: I was informed that since the time of the writing of this paper that the vehicle
own rather than for the good of everyone." Lawrence felt this was what hampered development. When donor projects leave, Lawrence said that "people will admire the equipment" and tend to want to "possess [the equipment that donor projects bring]." Regarding possessing objects, Lawrence felt that people were "just fitting into the hierarchy." He said that if someone at a higher level in the hierarchy steals and there is no consequence, then people at lower levels in the hierarchy see this injustice and decide that they can do the same thing. Lawrence felt that all levels of the hierarchy are susceptible to this phenomenon. Based on his experiences with development work, Lawrence also commented that "corruption comes when everyone does not care about what belongs to the people." He also felt that problems occur when nobody steps forward to take responsibility and when people are employed on the basis of friendship rather than on a need for labor. He thought that this created a situation in which "many people are paid for doing nothing."

has been returned to the fish farm for use.
Focus of Donor Projects

One consultant felt that the changing focus that occurred with each new donor project slowed the progress of the farm. He also expressed concern over the relevance of the research conducted at the farm and the health risks associated with the research.

Anthony discussed the change of focus that occurred with the presence of each new donor project as a hindrance to the progress of the farm. Anthony explained that in 1948 the fish farm primarily did research and that the farm was a reservoir for a high number of species of tilapia. He thought that the tilapia that were at the farm since 1948 were valuable and that he didn't understand why one of the donors drained the fish from the farm. He said that the loss of these fish caused a "technological gap" and that the "the permanent staff was dooped" because they were told that the fish that were drained were bad and should be disposed of. Anthony said that he didn't agree with the decision of the donor. He thought that Tilapia zilli (one of the species disposed of) tasted sweet, people had found that it grew well, and the permanent staff understood its feeding habits and handling. Anthony said that now Sagana Fish Farm only cultures one species of tilapia (Oreochromis niloticus).
Anthony also brought up donors carrying out research that is possibly not allowed in developed countries, research that is obsolete or not relevant to the host country, or research in which its environmental impact is not known. (He offered the example of research that uses hormones to reverse the sex of fish.) He felt that people had begun to question why the research was being done. He discussed research involving the chemically induced sex reversal of fish and said that nobody knows the effects of eating fish treated with hormones. He also said that he didn’t think the hormones that were used in donor research could be obtained in Kenya. He thought that the hormones were obtained from Asia and questioned how the fish farm would get the hormones once donor projects were gone.

**Relations of Production**

The following section covers the tensions that sometimes arise from relations of production introduced by donor projects. It also presents the various relations that exist between casual laborers, civil servants, contractors, and donor staff.
The Range of Relations of Production

The following section presents situations that created tension between donor project and civil servant staff in relation to 1) the payment of an allowance to civil staff, 2) donor staff management decisions, 3) the hiring of casual laborers by donor staff, 4) access to information and participation by civil staff in donor project work, 5) communication styles of donor staff, and 6) differential treatment of the civil staff by donor staff.

The Payment of Allowances

Overall, civil servants tended to value the presence of donor projects; their reasons for valuing the donor projects included structural development of the farm, the provision of employment for casual laborers, the provision of an inexpensive source of fish, chicken, and protein, and the opportunity for training and technology transfer. Though consultants cited benefits associated with donor projects they also indicated concern regarding, allowances and/or compensation for work, management decisions of donor staff, the hiring of casual laborers by donor staff, access to information and participation in donor project
work, communication styles of donor staff, and differential treatment of the civil staff by donor staff.

The following accounts of Anthony, Kevin, Gregory, and Michelle are associated with a donor project that operated at Sagana Fish Farm in the early- to mid-nineties. At its initiation, the donor project provided the entire civil staff (approximately 80 people) with an allowance for working with the donor project. The intention of the allowance was to stimulate civil servant involvement in the work of the donor project. Also, the donor project requested the use of fish farm land that some members of the civil staff had been cultivating. The management of Sagana Fish Farm had granted members of the civil staff permission to farm the land, so when civil staff members were requested to release the land for donor project use they were required to do so because they did not own the land. Within several months the donor staff realized that providing an allowance to the civil servants was not a sustainable practice and discontinued the allowance. During interviews with civil servants I was told that the donor staff had intended to reallocate the money (the allowance paid to the civil servants) to the fish farm’s zero grazing unit. A portion of the potential profit to be made from the zero grazing unit was then going to be returned to the civil servants; however, the civil servants never received a portion of the profit from the zero grazing unit. (I did not
speak with the donor staff that the civil servants referred to, so I do not know if the reallocation of money to the zero grazing unit and profit sharing with civil servants was the actual intention of the donor staff.) The effects of this experience created additional hardship in civil servants' lives for a period of time, affected the expectations civil servants held of donor projects regarding the payment of allowances, and generated ambivalence in the civil servants about the work of donor projects.

According to one civil servant, Anthony, prior to the arrival of the donor staff in the mid-nineties, the civil staff had been using Sagana Fish Farm's land for farming; the permanent staff had farmed for "so many years that they could have been deemed squatters." When the donor project arrived at the fish farm, it intended to maximize the utility of the land and subsequently requested use of land that the permanent staff was farming.

Additionally, the donor project gave the staff incentives for working with the donor project through compensation or an allowance. Anthony stated that both the junior and senior staff members (approximately 80 people) at the fish farm were given allowances for approximately a five-month period of time. Anthony explained that the incentives were not working, because the fish farm wasn't sustaining itself. When the donor staff realized allowances were not a financially
sustainable practice, s/he decided to redirect the funds to construct a zero grazing unit. The intention Anthony thought was that the profits from the sale of milk would be shared with the civil staff as an incentive. Anthony recalled that the donor project bought thirteen cows that provided milk and there were milk sales; however, the staff did not receive any incentive from the sale of milk. Anthony thought that this situation “brought about bitter feelings between the permanent staff and the [donor staff].” As a result of the bitterness, Anthony said that the permanent staff’s output decreased, because “people were generally demoralized.” Anthony said that members of the staff then complained to the government of the donor project, which then resulted in a mass transfer of civil staff from the fish farm. This event took place in the mid 1990s.

Kevin also relayed how he interpreted the events that took place with the donor project regarding the discontinuation of allowances. According to Kevin, after three months the payment to the staff was discontinued. Kevin was under the impression at the time that the discontinued money was going to be reallocated to the zero grazing unit; however, Kevin indicated that he didn’t feel the money was reallocated to the zero grazing unit. Kevin then described how the decision to discontinue giving allowances lead to people feeling “demoralized.” Kevin thought that the staff had become “very harsh” and “very tough”
because the donor staff excluded civil servants from the work of the donor project. The donor staff decided to buy cows for the zero grazing unit and hired casuals via contractors to do the work of the donor instead of employing civil servants at the farm to do the work. Kevin perceived that "the staff wasn’t happy" with what had transpired. Because of their discontent the staff wrote a letter to the embassy of the donor project. Kevin believed that the letter was actually intercepted before it arrived at its intended destination, due to a "leakage" among one of the civil servants at the farm.

Gregory provided another interpretation of the experience with the donor project regarding the donor project’s use of the land that the staff had been cultivating. According to Gregory, prior to the arrival of donor projects, fish farm staff in addition to "outsiders" (people from the surrounding area who did not work at the farm) cultivated the fish farm’s land; however "outsiders cultivating the land ended to avoid complications." Gregory explained that it was more difficult to "halt an outsider’s cultivation if they had two acres of sugar cane" so "outsiders" were removed from the fish farm’s land. With the civil staff it was easier to halt cultivation because they had to initially seek permission to use the land from the management of Sagana Fish Farm and understood that if the farm needed the land, they were required to turn it over. When the donor project arrived the civil staff released the land
they were farming for donor project use. Initially, the donor project cultivated the land, but then discontinued cultivation "because it was not profitable." Referring to civil staff members releasing their land by request from the management at Sagana Fish Farm, Gregory said "this farm [the management] very rarely moves staff from the land."

Regarding the donor project providing civil servants an allowance, Gregory stated the money was to "stimulate motivation [so the civil staff] would feel that there's a change." Gregory said that by providing the staff with an allowance the "staff became very active," but after the project withdrew the money the civil servants returned to "self setting," which meant that the "showing of work to be done went down."

Another civil servant, Michelle, recalled how she was affected by the donor project’s intention of providing allowances. At the beginning of the donor project work, according to Michelle, people "gave up their shambas" and in turn received an allowance. Michelle said that she had a shamba on the hillside. She said that "a lot of people used to farm there [on the hillside], but now only the monkeys use the land...nobody is using the land now." Michelle said that she "was having a hard life" when she stopped cultivating her shamba because the money that the donor project had been giving her was also discontinued. She explained, "the money stopped and then at the same time I had no shamba." Michelle said that with the arrival of the donor project
“everyone on the staff received an allowance,” but then after three months the allowance was discontinued. Michelle in regards to this situation said that “the [donor project] came to uplift the people, but all it did was spoil everything.” She said, “I thought donor projects would help us, but this was not so.” Michelle thought that because the members of the civil staff had not cooperated with the staff of the donor project, they were transferred. Michelle thought the people transferred had been “abused” by the staff of the donor project. Michelle explained how she defined abuse: “Instead of telling someone that they made a mistake or understanding that they are human they will tell them that they are stupid.” Michelle said that the Kenyan ministries do not want civil servants to be “harassed by mzungu;” She stated that mzungu may be asked to leave the country within 24 hours if s/he is “harassing the local people.” Michelle then stated, “We Kenyans are clever people...when you go back to your country tell people that we Kenyans are not rich like you. We are poor, but we are clever.” Michelle then asked, “If you’re not cooperating with the people then how can you manage to get anything done?” In regards to her feelings about the donor staff she said, “If I saw [him/her] in Nairobi it would be difficult to greet [him/her]...If some people saw [donor staff] they might want to beat [him/her]...I cannot say that [the donor staff] was a good person, [s/he] was a bad person.”
As a result of her experience with the donor projects, Michelle felt that overall “the projects that come to Africa don’t help us; they only help themselves.” Regarding the staff of one donor project Michelle commented that s/he “is now a millionaire because [s/he] was writing reports and cheating...you can tell [s/he] is doing well because when [s/he] arrived with the project [s/he] was thin and now [s/he’s] fat.”

Joel also discussed how he had expected an improved standard of living for all the fish farm employees with the presence of donor projects; however, he observed that only a few were benefiting. He said that there were a few employees that “anytime, anyday could ask for money and receive a loan [from donor staff], but not everyone benefits from the project being here.”

Management Decisions

One consultant, Bob, relayed a situation regarding a management decision at the fish farm that a donor had made and the social relations associated with that situation. Bob was in charge of a soya field and under his supervision the field had yielded 17 bags of soya, which was one of the highest yields of soya recorded at the farm. The staff of a donor project, however, decided to alter the management of soya fields
at the farm and changed the distance between rows of soya from twenty cm to nine cm. The location of the soya field was also moved closer to the farm. Bob hadn’t understood why the donor staff made this decision when the measurements for planting had already been determined by experts in Kenya. The donor staff, according to Bob, became “quarrelsome” regarding changes in how planting was done at the farm.

In a related conversation Anthony stated that based on his experiences donor staff seemed to show “an intolerance to constructive criticism.” An example of this occurred when a donor project had hired a contractor to do some work at the farm, and Anthony felt that contractor had been hired because he was friendly to the donor staff, rather than being hired on the merits of his work. The contractor then did poor quality work. According to Anthony, after members of the permanent staff at the farm informed the donor staff that the contractor’s work wasn’t high enough quality the relations between those permanent staff members and the donor “soured.”

The Hiring of Casual Laborers

In an interview with Kevin, the relations with the donor were discussed regarding the hiring of casuals to complete work rather than
relying on the civil staff to complete work. He described the decision made by the donor staff to hire casuals with their own tools rather than investing in tools for the farm as "harsh." Additionally, Kevin felt that donor staff hiring casuals or a contractor to complete work that civil servants had begun was "harsh." Kevin said that the donor staff had explained that the "work [of civil servants] was perfect, but too slow." The work of the civil servants was too slow, Kevin believed, because they didn't have the tools to make their work move more quickly; the civil servants had to do "manual labor," but the casuals were provided with the necessary tools to get the work done. Kevin indicated a distrust of the donor project. He suggested that the donor project didn't invest money in the farm; he thought that the donor project had credited itself with completing the construction of the fisheries offices when in reality the project could credit itself only with "washing tiles on the roofs of offices with Omo." Because of this perception he described one individual on the staff as a "thief;" the individual didn't want "Africans to go up...[the individual] wanted Africans to go down," and "[the individual] only wanted to make [the individual's] self rich and that was all."
Access to Information and Participation

Gary discussed his frustrations about how difficult it is for civil servants to access instructions to equipment and technology introduced at the fish farm. Also he discussed an experience in which he was pleased. He had assisted a donor with a construction projects several years ago and was content because he could still see that his work was standing and in good condition.

Joel (during a semi-structured interview) commented that the current donor project had been at Sagana Fish Farm for one year but he didn’t view the government-run portion of the farm benefiting from the presence of the project. “What I feel about the project is I don’t understand how the [government-run farm] is benefiting from the project. We don’t know what the [donor staff] is doing. Nobody is being trained on what the [donor staff] is doing. So I’m wondering what the benefit is once the project is gone.” Regarding training Joel felt that working with the donor staff is “sometimes a problem because people are quarreling with the [donor staff] everyday. [Civil servants] have been working with the [donor staff] but now [the donor staff] doesn’t want the officers over there and nobody understands why.”
Communication Style of Donor Staff

Several civil service officers, Anthony, Bob, Joel, and Gerald discussed how relations were difficult with donors one day after a specific incident. The officers were distressed when I arrived at the fish farm in the morning. I asked what had happened and was told that the donor staff had said that the farm could no longer use the project’s vehicle nor the project nets for seining ponds. I was told that the donor staff didn’t want the government casuats touching anything that the project had purchased such as nets, scales, and baskets. The donor staff had told some members of the permanent staff that the people using the nets were “useless yo-yos.” Anthony wasn’t sure what this term meant, so first he asked me its meaning and then he looked it up in the dictionary. Joel said that they didn’t like when donor staff came to work on Monday mornings because they never knew what the staff’s frame of mind would be. Anthony felt that when the staff came to work in a bad mood that the donor staff was “abusive.” Regarding the staff’s “abusive” moods Gerald commented, “thirty years ago we gained independence and we don’t like to be treated this way now.” Gerald also said, “it disturbs us very much to see these colonial relics [in this situation verbal harassment or abuse] of the past.” Bob commented that they were not sure what work they were going to do that day because they were
supposed to be handsexing fish, but they had no equipment now to accomplish this task.

Bob's comment then introduced a new topic. Joel described how government workers are often called "lazy" by donor staff, which he thought was "unfair" because they often aren't provided with the equipment and materials needed to do their work. Bob then asked "What are we supposed to do if they have no equipment?" Anthony expressed frustration regarding the sharing of resources and said that donors don't share its resources with the government farm yet there are civil servants who have done work for the donor projects. A suggestion was made that there be a meeting to discuss the concerns that both the civil servants and the donor project have, but several people countered that a meeting "would just make matters worse." The conversation then moved toward the problems with management at the farm and the problems in the civil service and Anthony stated that "in fact the [donor staff] is right in a way [regarding donor staff apprehension to share resources such as the project vehicle] because we have money to repair our vehicle and we're not doing so...In fact when the [donor staff] sees mismanagement then [donor staff] is afraid to leave [the] vehicle or allow the civil servants at the farm to use the vehicle."

Joel described being "harassed" by donor staff. "[The donor staff] will come and start quarreling with you if the [donor staff] finds you
sitting down. The [donor staff] will say [the donor staff] is paying taxes for you and say that people are doing nothing. We feel that the donor staff should challenge the problems through the bosses.”

Joel also felt that it was important that donor staff followed a code of regulations. “[Senior officer] is my immediate boss. A work plan is done every week. If there’s a problem [donor staff] should go to [the senior officer]. If somebody speaks to me in a high tone then I feel annoyed. The way that someone expresses [his/herself] matters.”

Joel also added that “people [donor staff] complained to Nairobi direct that people [civil servants] aren’t working. Instead of solving the problem through senior officers at the fish farm, the [donor staff] would go to the director and tell the director that so and so was a bad person. The [previous donor staff] used to do this and then people were threatened with transfers.” According to Joel, there had been only one general meeting in one year; he felt it was important that there be at least three meetings in a year.

Differential Treatment of Members of the Civil Staff by Donor Staff

In an informal conversation with Anthony he discussed how he felt that some members of the permanent staff viewed donor projects as
"saviors." Additionally, he described how sometimes permanent staff members will misinform donor staff about other members of the permanent staff. Anthony said this concerned him because sometimes donor staff would accept this information and then inadvertently make "wrong decisions." According to Anthony, permanent staff members formed groups that had more power than other groups of staff members and, as a result of that power, blocked the flow of information to the donor staff. "This kind of culture of misinformation," said Anthony had been passed on to the donor staff of the most recent project, but because of the approach of the recent project, the "culture of misinformation" was less likely to occur. He viewed the most recent donor project's approach to be one in which it works mostly with casual laborers and not with the permanent staff. The donor project staff only works with the civil staff when necessary.

Joel questioned the payment of the civil staff by the donor project. He said there are some junior officers who "feel discriminated against who have never worked over the weekend." He said the people chosen to work depend on whoever is in charge of the security roster. Additionally, he said "Some staff members who work over holidays are being paid and some are not. Nobody really knows why. When people ask why they hear the [donor project] has no money and that security is set at the ponds, but then some get money." Joel said that the fish farm
administration had proposed that staff, who weren’t receiving an allowance, take days off during the week to compensate.

In an informal conversation with Harold he asked if I would put in a good word for him with the donor staff. He asked me to do this because he thought that civil servants at the farm used their influence to remove other civil servants from the favor of donor staff. He said that he hoped that someday if he ever needed a loan that he would be able to ask the donor staff and he hoped that I could say something that would persuade donor staff to assist him.

**Descriptions of Positive Productive Relations**

Three consultants described relations between the donor staff and the civil servants that were amiable and without tension. Another consultant, based on his experiences with the current donor project, perceived the donor staff as “hardworking” and said that “[the staff] does excellent work,” although he still observed that the staff was “harsh” but also “very good because [the donor staff] loans people money with a written agreement.”

In an interview with Grace she discussed how she perceived civil staff relations with a volunteer organization that operated at the farm in
the 1980s. She thought the staff had good relations with the volunteers. The volunteers mainly worked in the hatchery producing carp fry.

In another interview with Ted he said that his experiences with donor projects had been “not bad” and that his most recent observation “people seem to be working nicely with the projects.”

The Provision of Allowance

This section presents civil servants’ discussions of how their established production routines, which maintain their livelihoods in a struggling economy, are altered by the presence of donor projects. Additional topics covered in this section are civil servants’ views surrounding the donor staff expectation that civil servants work for donor projects without pay, salary discrepancies between donor and civil staff, and civil servants feeling overworked by donor projects.

During an informal interview with Anthony regarding the decreased morale of civil servants at the fish farm he discussed how donor projects add a level of complexity to the situation of the civil servants. He stated that if a donor project arrives at the farm and “additional work is introduced and there’s no incentive” (extra income), then the staff views the project as “something that ties them down” and
doesn't allow them to do the activities (e.g., subsistence farming or a small business) which assist them to "bridge the gap." Additionally, he said donor staff expect the civil staff to work at the same level they work despite salary discrepancies between civil servants and donor staff. To emphasize this point, Anthony said, "[donor staff] don't have to worry about where they will get money for medicine for their children or how they will pay school fees: the money is at their fingertips." Anthony felt, in general, that it was important for donors to "address the issue of unequal pay," because he said, "otherwise relations get bad." The issue of unequal pay refers to the discrepancy in salary between donor staff and civil servants and additionally selected civil servants that receive allowances and others that do not.

Michelle also touched on the issue of donor staff not paying civil servants. She felt that "not paying [civil servants] anything creates problems between the donor project and staff [because] the staff only has its salary...Donor projects would build morale if they offered money."

Richard also discussed the issue of payment of civil servants by donor projects in the following comment:

With this project [the donor project at the time of this study] it is different...[the expected work] is too much in comparison with the low salaries that people receive from the Government...Staff members are lowly paid, [so] some will only do a small amount of work. When a project comes
there's a lot of work, but at the end of the day you still get the same salary. People work but they do so without morale.

According to Richard, at fisheries stations in places such as Nyeri and Kirinyaga where there is no donor project "people do not feel overworked."

Donor Project Casual Laborers' Descriptions of Relations of Production

This section presents donor project casual laborers' perceptions of the relations between contractors hired by the donor project and civil staff. Additionally, casual laborers discuss issues such as layoffs, supervision, bribes (*toa kitu kidogo*), and communication with donor staff.

Relations between Contractors and Civil Servants

Matthew said that during the previous donor project relations between the civil servants and the private contractors who were hired by the donor project were not good. Matthew said that the civil servants (only some of them he added) were interested in doing the work, but the
work was given to contractors. This created tension, Matthew thought, because the civil servants wanted to “learn the job and be given the money that the contractors were earning along with their government salary.” Matthew thought that the junior staff was willing to do the work, but he said there were senior staff members who only wanted to supervise and receive extra payment. Matthew said that during that time there were civil staff who hoped that the casuals would “strike” or that the contractor and supervisors would fail so that they could take over the work and receive payment.

The Layoff of Casual Laborers

Robert came to my house early on a Monday morning (near sunrise). He relayed that he was returning to Port Victoria because on the previous Friday all the casuals had been fired who worked for the donor. He said the casuals were fired because they didn’t get the work that was demarcated to them completed. Robert said, “We are treated like we are primitive.” He provided and example of what he meant by primitive. The casuals were constructing a dyke and he said that they would be given a certain amount of work to do on the dyke that was to be completed by the end of the day. He said, however, that the foreman
would assign additional work, which Robert said made it difficult for the casuals to get their assigned work done. Regarding the incident in which the casuals were fired, Robert said the casuals were unable to get the work finished because the area was very waterlogged and they had to first drain the area before they could work on it. Additionally, he said there was a lot of grass in the area too, so they had to slash. According to Robert, when the casuals’ foreman explained to the contractor why the work had not been completed, the contractor told all of the casuals to go home and not return to work Monday. The contractor said they could come get their paychecks on Saturday and that the casuals would only be paid for a half day of work on Friday (50 Kenya shillings). Robert didn’t think the contractor spent enough time at the ponds to know what was going on, and he was concerned that foremen told the contractor that the reason the work wasn’t finished was because the casuals wouldn’t work. Robert said that he and another casual had tried to explain to the contractor what had happened but they were told that “this is not a court” by the contractor.
Overall Supervision of Donor Project Casual Laborers

Isaac felt that supervision of his work was intense. He said for example that during the rainy season when the ground was very muddy that it is difficult to push wheelbarrows; the mud gets stuck in the wheels. He said that supervisors would still tell him to push even though he was stressed and tired.

At work, Howard said he doesn't feel that he "has time to inhale fresh air;" he said the work is continuous and there's no time to rest. Howard said when he's at work he's supervised all the time. If he wants to fetch water he said he has to be very fast because the casuals work in partners moving dirt for construction of the dyke. Howard compared his work with the donor to the work he had done at Dawa Chemicals, a company where he packed and sealed cartons. Regarding this work Howard said that it was an easy job in comparison with the work he does now at the fish farm; he said while working at Dawa Chemicals his work wasn't supervised and he could take a break. He said, "here the work is very hard" and sometimes he will not get a break. He also said that sometimes he will finish his work before the others, but he can't take a break and wait for the others, but must continue working. At the end of the interview Howard asked if people in America did work such as theirs, i.e., how "Israelites oppressed their workers in the bible."
Robert also discussed the intensity of the supervision he experienced while working for the donor project. Regarding his work with the donor project ponds, he said, "it makes me fatigued." Additionally, he said that he’d found some harassment since he’d started working. For example, he said that he receives threats while he’s working; "if somebody [referring to Kenyans] doesn’t like the work you do then they’ll threaten to throw you out." Robert said he didn’t understand why this occurred because he hasn’t been at the workplace for very long. "If you are harassed while at work then you come to hate the job...If you’re given work according to free will rather than throughout threats then you do your work freely." He then said that while sitting talking to me that he wished "time was running faster." He felt that anyone could do the labor that he was doing and suggested that the types of work should be more spread out, so that the labor was more "extensive rather than intensive."

Paul explained that people are threatened with being laid off if they do not do the work. Paul felt he’d be better off working on his shamba, where he thought in three months he could earn a profit of 25,000 Kenya shillings.

During an interview with Matthew, he said that although he experienced too much work and too much harassment, he found his work to be improved with the current project. With the previous donor
project people were given large portions of work; if you couldn’t finish the work then you were laid off. He also said that sometimes the supervisors would deduct money from the wages of the casuals. If a casual went forward asking for the money, then the supervisor would lay off the casual. Matthew said that “people never complained when money was deducted from their salary because they feared losing their job.” He also said that during that time there was a foreman who “was really no good” and would “abuse” them. Matthew didn’t want to discuss how the foreman treated the casuals because, he emphasized, “it was really no good.”

During an informal conversation with the staff of the development organization operating at the fish farm at the time of this research, we discussed how the staff would try and prevent casual laborers and people from the local community from messing with the weather station. The staff was going to put up a sign in Swahili that states danger. On the sign would be a picture of lightening bolts and a skull and crossbones. The staff said that the staff is trying to start a rumor that the lightening rod on the weather station is actually an antenna hooked up to a hidden camera, which is connected with the police station in Sagana. The staff of the development organization commented that the rumor was working because casual laborers walked
by the lightening rod and gave it a broad distance while viewing it with some suspicion.

Toa Kitu Kidogo

Andrew described a situation that arose while a donor project was in operation at the farm in 1995 or 1996. He said that during the operation of a donor project, casuals were expected to "give something small," toa kitu kidogo or TKK. According to Andrew, providing kitu kidogo stimulated a supervisor's "interest," kinua mgongo, in hiring. During this particular time, there were many people applying for only a few positions at the farm. Andrew explained that immediate supervisors of the casuals, who were operating via contractors or civil servants, were more inclined to hire the casual laborers who provided them with kitu kidogo. If casuals did not follow through and provide kitu kidogo, then they would lose their job. Andrew explained that supervisors usually said that they let casuals go because they were lazy in order to cover that they were laying casuals off who weren't providing kitu kidogo. Another method for letting go of casuals who didn't provide kitu kidogo was to assign a casual to a very difficult task or to demarcate an area of work such as slashing that was too large area for
him/her to complete in a day. Then when he or she didn’t complete the task the supervisor would let go of the person stating that he or she wasn’t working hard enough.

Andrew said that he did not have any experiences with having to pay a bribe, although he said he was “overworking.” Andrew said that he had worked in the hatchery, which was already on the timetable or his schedule of work, but at the same time he was given other jobs by his supervisors such as fishing, slashing grass, and maintaining the canal. He explained that while he was doing other assigned miscellaneous work, his work in the hatchery was still pending. Andrew said that he didn’t like to argue with his supervisors because it would appear as if he was “ignoring” them; he wasn’t happy with his situation, but he said he also felt he could not show his emotions to them.

Communication between Donor Staff and Casual Laborers

Casuals also discussed the importance of someone representing their needs to the donor projects. While talking with Oscar he suggested that the senior officers from the civil staff should speak on their behalf.

---

26 The Sagana Fish Farm office discovered what was going on and put a stop to *toa kitu kidogo* and since that time *toa kitu kidogo* has not been an issue.
to donor projects and that there should be a “chain of command” for communication.

Government Casual Laborers’ Descriptions of Productive Relations with Donor Staff

While casual laborers seemed to respect the work of donor staff, they also discussed feeling intimidated by the donor staff due to factors such as language barriers, the temper of donor staff, and an overall sense of being observed.27

In a conversation with Edward he told me that he thought donor staff had a temper and that “the casuals fear [staff].” Edward explained that he thought donor staff “get frustrated easily when people do not understand [them]...Sometimes it’s difficult for the casuals to understand [them] and then when the casuals don’t understand [the staff] gets harsh.” Edward then said that he thought donor staff had “high-powered binoculars and could see everything [that happened at the farm].” Edward said that this “makes the casuals nervous because they fear they are being watched and [donor staff] will sack them.”

27 The casuals then clarified what getting “sacked” meant. Getting "sacked" refers to situations when casuals are either laid off or fired. A casual can be "sacked" if the government has run out of money to pay him/her. In this instance it is possible to be rehired again when there is money. Casuals are also "sacked because of vices." The casuals used stealing as an example of a vice.
Tom discussed what he described to be "harsh" supervision that he'd experienced while working at the fish farm. He said that he and some other casuals had been doing some masonry work, which he thought was work that would take at least five days. At points during the day donor staff came to observe what was going on.

If the [staff] didn't like what was going on or didn't think the work was being done fast enough then [s/he] would stay and watch how people were working...[S/he] would talk with the contractor about who hadn't been working hard enough and then the same day those people would be sacked...The casuals feel fearful [staff come to observe work at the ponds] because they are expecting to be sacked.

Bob, a civil servant, said that the casuals also were fearful when "[Donor staff] comes to the ponds in a bad mood...[Donor staff] yell at people for not holding or using the nets the way [donor staff] likes, and threatens to not allow us to use the nets anymore." Bob added that when people are learning something new that they're going to make mistakes. He said that "[donor staff] will demonstrate to casuals how to use the nets a few times," but will also expect "the casuals to know how to use the nets perfectly." If the casuals make mistakes, according to Bob, then [the donor staff] will sometimes yell at them." Bob explained that he didn't think that "yelling at the casuals encouraged them to learn...it just makes them apprehensive about trying to learn."

---

28 Note: Bob informed me that "the casuals were fearful" when I spent time at the ponds because they thought I was evaluating their work.
During a soya boiling, Edward commented that donor project staff “loved fish more than people. We prepare all this soya for fish feed, but we can’t spare any fish for the people.”

In another conversation Edward said that the casuals were having lunch and they were looking up at the donor staff housing. He said that the casuals and he were joking about how the house of the donor staff was “tidy and methodical” just like the work of the donor staff. Edward then said that he really liked the work of the donor staff. “The donor staff is always thinking and calculating. [The donor staff’s] brain is like a computer...Always thinking about production and efficiency instead of human beings. [The donor staff] works very hard for the farm. [Donor staff] is not working for [him/herself], but instead the good of the farm. [Donor staff] always thinks about the fish, but not about human beings.”

Peter said that he admired the work of the donor staff; he felt the [donor staff] “wasn’t just working for [the good of the donor staff], [but rather donor staff] was working for the good of the farm.” He said, “It’s difficult for the casuals because they don’t know what the [donor staff] thinks about their work...They are always fearing being sacked.” He said the casuals had been thinking about designating a group leader who could communicate with the staff to get a sense about what they were thinking about their work. “If [the donor staff] thought the work was too slow [the donor staff] could let the leader know and then the casuals would know to pick up the pace.”
Participant Observations of Productive Relations Between Donor Staff and Casual Laborers

While observing casual laborers harvesting a pond I was told by the staff of the donor project present at the time of this research that one of the casual laborers had an "IQ that isn't even in double digits." The casual laborer had not picked up his net and had failed to hear the directions that the donor staff was yelling to him across the pond. The staff referred to him as "you in the purple hat;" however, he didn't realize he was being spoken to. It was at this point that the donor staff commented on his intelligence.

Productive Relations Among Donor Organizations, Fish Farm Staff, Casual Laborers, and Contractors as Discussed by Individuals Affiliated with Sagana Fish Farm but not Employed by the Farm

This section provides description as to why donor projects end up hiring casual laborers via contractors. Civil servants had difficulty supervising casual laborers because they either were not invested in the work of the donor project or they didn’t know how to supervise large groups of casual laborers. When donor staff realized that they were not meeting their expected level of production they hired a contractor to provide assistance.
Chris discussed his perceptions of donor projects at Sagana Fish Farm. He thought that it was important that donor countries "work hand-in-hand" with the local people. In Chris' observation of one donor project he felt that the donor staff supervised with too few government staff and didn't learn of the staff who could help. Chris said that "after six months the donor could not show any progress." Chris described a period when there were approximately "sixteen guys [casuals] who couldn't deal with the construction of a dyke; sixteen guys couldn't do the work." Chris described a period of time with the donor project when there "could have been hundreds of people doing nothing." He said the civil servants had "no seriousness about supervising casuals," because they were being paid on "mzungu's money; they were eating mzungu's money." Chris said that eventually the "corruption of the civil servants" lead to a contractor being called in by the donor. Chris said that once a contractor was called in, the A line ponds were completed in two to three months and that within six months the donor had "something to show and started inviting visitors." At this point Chris said that the permanent staff started to "become uncooperative, so much so that they started writing letters to the embassy, but these [donor staff] are very clever and send a copy of whatever they are doing to the other side." Chris said that "things were going OK" with casuals and contractors at the farm, but the "government staff was stealing the
[donors'] money." For example, he said that when lorries would bring three loads of balast to the fish farm the government staff would write that seven loads of balast had been brought and keep the excess money. Regarding civil servant expectations of donor projects, Chris said that "when a mzungu comes they expect so much from [him/her]; they think now the savior is coming and now their problems will be over but the projects do other things." Chris stated that when the expectations of civil servants aren't met "then they start politicking."

Chris felt that the donor staff was taken advantage of when trying to supervise the casuals. "[The donor staff] was trying to supervise one hundred twenty Kikuyus and they were just enjoying [the donor staff]." Chris said for example with moving soiling and compacting, "yes, you'll see them working, but nothing gets done...It's difficult to supervise everyone at the same time...Sometimes you'd find some casuals sleeping." Chris said for "every ten guys you hire, one will be a trouble shooter and another will be lazy." Chris said the lazy one hired will tell all the other guys to work slower so that his slow work will not be seen. Chris thought that people with "motives such as this want to be paid but don't want to work." Supervisors, Chris advised, "need to know who they are hiring and firing...Is it the right person? Have you hired a trouble shooter or a lazy one?"
Chris said that prior to the work of the contractor that “this place [referring to the excessive vegetation at the fish farm] was a place hyenas could hide.” He said that the donor projects’ money could also be felt; “around one hundred people were working here and it really promoted them.” Chris explained that there had been a dry spell and there was famine. The donor paid guys and over the weekend they’d rush to the mills for unga. Chris said that the same thing occurred when the most recent donor project came. He thought that donor money “helped economically and socially, but not politically.”

Chris also relayed to me his perception regarding the firing of a group of casuals working for the donor project. He said that the casuals had gone on “strike” or had done a “go slow” meaning that they had slowed their work to a halt at 3:00 on a Friday rather than at the usual time of 4:00 or when their areas of demarcated work were completed. Chris explained that the casuals were “feeling demoralized” because they knew they were going to be laid off. The casuals heard that the donor project had received a 40% budget cut. Chris explained that some of them might have made plans for the money they thought they would earn and felt demoralized when their plans were broken. Chris explained that because the casuals had done a “go slow” they were all sacked and told not to return to work. On Monday a new crew of casuals was hired—two of the casuals from the crew fired on the previous
Friday, Chris explained, were hired to work at the ponds again on
Monday because they hadn’t been “ring leaders” of the “strike” or “go
slow” that took place.

_Peceptions of Donor Project Administrators of Production of Casual Laborers_

During a conversation with two donor project administrators from the United States, one who is directly affiliated with the donor project and one who is indirectly affiliated with the donor project, I asked what their expectation was surrounding aquaculture in Kenya. They both agreed the resources were present—water, land, suitable climate—but there were constraints surrounding governmental structures. An individual can’t be promoted in the government, unless s/he has a certificate. It doesn’t matter whether or not the individual has the skills.

The administrators said that sometimes the only way to get projects going is through donor organizations from the outside. The administrators then asked about this research. I relayed that I was interested in the presence and effects of donor organizations. One of the administrators then asked if anyone at the fish farm saw education as a potential impact of donor projects and if the people I had interviewed
understood the questions I had asked. I replied that several consultants valued the skills development they could obtain from development organizations and that they understood my questions.

The administrators then asked what I thought about the possibility of the development of aquaculture given what I had found at Sagana Fish Farm. I said that I was concerned because most of the casual laborers that I had interviewed couldn’t afford to buy fish or milk from the farm. This lead one of the administrators to discuss the “poorest of the poor.” Many of the “poorest of the poor” were in their situations because they didn’t have the intellectual capacity to change their situation due to malnutrition at an early age. The administrators then relayed how the donor staff had discussed that some of the casual laborers didn’t seem to have the intelligence to do the work at the farm. One of the administrators then commented that he thought aquaculture was an enterprise that was likely to reach middle income families and farmers.

In the same conversation with the administrators I was told of how they and the donor staff had joked about sending the casual laborers who worked for the donor project to the US. The donor staff said there were some ponds at the donor staff’s university that needed renovation. The work couldn’t be done by machine, and it would be too expensive to hire manual labor. The donor staff had joked that the
casuals could be flown to the United States to do the work and it could be called training.

A Kenyan Perspective on Development

During a conversation regarding development, Gerald related that he thought "development should move slowly in Kenya, so that the social structure of the country wasn’t harmed." He said that he didn’t like the idea of the "American nuclear family"; “people in Kenya know their extended families” and as well “everyone knows everyone in the village or town.” Gerald then offered the example of a woman who had just died in Kamuthanga village. He explained how everyone from that village went to stay with her family day and night to console them. According to Gerald this (referring to consoling the family of the woman who died) would go on all the way up until the days of the funeral.
Who Benefits from Fish Culture in Kenya?

The Adoption of Fish Culture in Kenya

When employed as a fisheries officer with the civil service, Neill worked primarily with subsistence farmers whose priorities were livestock farming and growing coffee while fish farming was a supplemental enterprise. Based on his work experiences, Neill felt that fish farming suffered because the farmers "did not have enough knowledge." Additionally, he said that extension officers did not have enough aquacultural information to assist the farmers. Some of the problems Neill encountered with fish farming were: obtaining fingerlings and seed, equipment for harvest ponds, and infrequent extension visits. Also, he said that "often times vehicles were not available to fisheries officers to travel for extension visits."

Neill thought that fish farming was an activity that was generally most accessible to "middle class farmers, those who have money to spare." He explained that "the common man" will have other

Miller (1984) discusses the stratification of wealth and poverty. In urban areas he identifies three classes—the elite class, the urban middle class, and the "discontented, urban-dwelling", lower economic stratum. In rural areas he identifies a middle class of farmers and farmer businessmen, a "rural bourgeoisie," a class of "farmer-entrepreneurs," and the rural poor made up of small time farmers, farmer-herders, pastoralists, some
priorities and will not have "the financial resources to spare to do aquaculture." Neill said that some of the fish farmers he worked with were poor people, but they did not "manage their ponds nicely" because they did not have the gear to harvest their ponds or the money to buy feeds. He added, however, that the "middle class person is able to manage their ponds nicely."

Neill said that fish farming might be more accessible to the poorer classes if fingerlings were offered to them free of charge. Providing farmers with nets, he felt, might be another way to make fish farming more accessible. Neill felt that a "fisheries fund" was needed in the Kenya Government in order to invest money in aquaculture, and added that he thought aquaculture was not possible without money because feeds and fertilizers require money for purchase.

Neill said that he thought trainings, workshops, and demonstrations to share donor project information are important and

hunters and fishermen, and a sizable landless, near-destitute population." The elite class consists of educated individuals who have "attained wealth and position within one generation" such as lawyers, doctors, businessmen, civil servants, government ministers, clergymen, and high-ranking Kenyan employees of multinational corporations, the UN, and the international aid agencies. The urban African middle class are "the owners of small businesses, government employees at middle levels, nurses, artisans, mechanics, supervisors, and skilled factory employees. This class exhibits "very little political dissent" and is "willing to keep working toward an improved life style." The rural middle class of farmers and farmer-businessmen" are connected with the national economy and have accrued some savings. They are often "full-time farmers, farmer-traders, or farmer politicians and will often have served as local officials. The rural poor are characterized as "farthest out on the nation's periphery in terms of wealth, education, and access to health and government services...less participatory in a political sense, and more alienated from a central system."
will provide practical knowledge for farmers. He also felt extension agents should receive training too.

Who Eats Fish at Sagana Fish Farm?

During this research I observed who had access to fish produced at Sagana Fish Farm. On one afternoon I went with several civil service officers to sell fish and chicken. We stopped in several towns on our way to the District Office in Kerugoya. At these small towns we delivered fish or chicken to store owners. Upon arrival in Kerugoya, we parked outside the District Office and sold fish to higher-level civil servants, who were on their lunch break. Most everyone who purchased fish was dressed in suits or dresses and appeared to occupy the Kenyan middle class.

I also observed instances when higher level senior officers would purchase fish for lunch at Sagana Fish Farm's canteen. When schools visited the fish farm, teachers also tried tilapia for lunch. On one afternoon, there was a group of teachers from Nairobi who was trying fish. Several of the teachers from the Western Province, a region of Kenya where individuals traditionally eat fish, enjoyed the fish; however, the teachers from the Central Province, commented that they
were not comfortable with eating fish and that the bones made them nervous.

In a conversation with Ivan, a civil servant, he explained that casual laborers were not able to afford the fish produced at Sagana Fish Farm; however, he said that sometimes casual laborers would try to steal fish.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

THE EFFECT OF LARGE-SCALE ECONOMIC INEQUALITY ON THE FUNCTIONING OF DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS AT SAGANA FISH FARM

Development organizations and the employees of Sagana Fish Farm were involved in a larger-scale system of economic inequality. Relations between individuals from western (development organizations) and non-western nations (fish farm employees) were not solely the product of direct interactions of individuals. Within this system of inequality participants in the development process occupied particular positions influenced by cultural, economic, historical and political factors. Gramsci’s (Williams, 1977) discussion of practical consciousness is relevant to the encounter between Sagana Fish Farm and development organizations. Participants in the development process operated from different political, social, and economic perspectives that shaped their expectations and practices regarding work at the fish farm. Participants in the development process were affected by transforming power relations associated with development. Development organization staff and fish farm employees held different ideas and beliefs about the concept of development.
James Scott (1987) asserts that the development of expectations and assumptions in individuals from different economic positions creates an ideology of class relations. If participants in the development process do not act in a manner that is congruent with preconceived expectations, i.e., if participants deviate from the ideology of class relations, then tension ensues. If a development project fails to live up to its promises and/or the expectations of the fish farm employees (i.e., that the development project is the "savior" present at the fish farm to "lift up the people") and the employees fail to live up to the expectations of the donor project (i.e., that employees will work for a development project without an allowance in addition to their civil service salary), then disillusionment is created in both development project staff and fish farm employees. Ideological tension and disillusionment was evidenced in comments made by civil servants at Sagana Fish Farm and in interactions that occurred between donor staff and civil servants.
RELATIONS SURROUNDING WORK

Labor Relations without the Presence of Development Organizations

During an interview with a civil servant I was told that the ideal work relationship between casual laborers and civil servants was one in which the casual laborers worked hand-in-hand with civil servants. Such cooperation occurred in some instances at Sagana Fish Farm, but casual laborers were forced to work harder than civil servants because of their fear of losing their jobs. Casual laborers appeared to have some negotiating influence over the intensity of their work, but civil servants in supervisory positions ultimately had the final word. To some extent the casual laborers slowed down their pace of work because civil servants tended to be sympathetic to their work situation. Interviews with civil servants indicated that they understood why casual laborers might work slowly. Civil servants discussed the intensity of the work of casual laborers and the low pay casual laborers received. They also voiced concern about the casual laborers' health. Based on interviews and informal conversations with casual laborers in which they discussed their fears about being fired, I assert that they were aware, that if they did not complete work assigned to them by a supervisor, they faced the
possibility of being laid off. Casual laborers' awareness about the potential to be laid off kept them working at greater rate than civil servants.

Labor Relations During the Presence of Development Organizations

Civil Servant and Development Organization Staff

Donor organizations at Sagana Fish Farm entered a situation that had well-established work patterns among civil servants. The morale of civil servants was low due to a number of factors and production at the fish farm was suffering. Civil servants were engaged in work related to production at the farm as well as their own activities that allowed them to cope with their employment situation and also maintain their livelihood. Development organizations arrived at the Sagana Fish Farm and the staff of these organizations expected that civil servants would become involved with project operations, thus diverting civil servants' energy from well-established work routines. The introduction of work by development organizations introduced new social relations surrounding work at Sagana Fish Farm. At the time of this research,
several implicit assumptions about the level of intensity of work of the civil servants were made by development organization staff: 1) civil servants would involve themselves in development organization operations—operations that for some civil servants would not directly or immediately affect their livelihood; 2) civil servants would be content with their civil service salary and not expect an allowance for their work with development organizations, though civil servants would work for both the development organization and the government-run fish farm; and 3) civil servants would share the same values about aquaculture as the development organization and work with the project because it was for the benefit of Sagana Fish Farm.

Civil servants also made assumptions about development organizations: 1) development projects presented the possibility for immediate improvement of their livelihoods through financial compensation or skills development and 2) civil servants would work for the development project if they perceived their participation as directly and immediately beneficial to their livelihoods.

During the presence of the development project that operated at the farm in the early- to mid-nineties, at the onset the expectations of development project staff and civil servants were aligned. Development staff offered allowances and civil servants participated in the work of the development project; however, when the development
project realized that production was not at the intended level and the provision of allowances to civil servants was not a sustainable practice, the development project discontinued allowances and hired casual laborers to do the work of the project. This created tension at Sagana Fish Farm—tension that manifested itself in a variety of ways, including the slowing of production of civil servants (or a return to a low level of production that occurred prior to development organizations), a letter expressing discontent to the embassy of the development organization, and a mass transfer of civil servants from Sagana Fish Farm. All of these manifestations of tension were detrimental to the work of the development organization and as well to the operations of Sagana Fish Farm.

The presence of the development organization in the early- to mid-nineties created a set of expectations for civil servants and set a tone for the development organization currently working at the fish farm. The development organization currently at the fish farm has had to address the issue of allowances for civil servants. Additionally, civil servants have had to readjust their expectations surrounding development organizations and adapt to the approach of the most current development organization. With this development organization, as in the past, the expectations of staff of the development organization and fish farm employees were not in accordance in terms
of work relations. As civil staff realized that they weren't going to be paid for the labor they did in association with development organization, they resumed their previous low intensity of work and additional activities to earn money (e.g. farming or small businesses) typical of the past. Civil servants chose how they spent their time whether it was productive or non-productive, without much fear of losing their jobs. Staff of development organizations responded to the indifference of civil servants by hiring casual laborers to do the work that civil servants were intended to do. In some situations development organization staff expressed their frustration surrounding their work relationships to civil servants in a manner that civil servants perceived as hostile, abusive, and reminiscent of colonial relations.

Development Organization Staff and Casual Laborers

Donor Project Casual Laborers

Development staff recognized the importance of reporting completed goals and objectives to their funding agencies. If their goals and objectives weren't completed, then development staff risked losing
future funding. For example, at the fish farm the development project's immediate goals were to renovate and construct ponds. When development staff recognized that this objective wasn't going to be completed through the work of civil servants, development staff sought alternative routes for completion of their objectives and hired Kenyan contractors. Kenyan contractors in turn hired casual laborers. Kenyan contractors were in positions to better understand casual laborers' work habits and thus knew how to obtain greater effort from casual laborers. Because of this knowledge contractors achieved higher levels of production than the civil servants, who tended to not be highly motivated to carry out the work of the development organization.

Casual laborers working for the development organization at Sagana Fish Farm had very little power, if any, to assert their rights as laborers. "Go slows," which could be considered informal negotiations by casual laborers around the intensity of their work, or trade unionism without trade as discussed by Scott (1987), was discussed by individuals who supervised the casual laborers; however, casual laborers themselves did not discuss any of their activity at work as a negotiating tactic. Whether or not the actions of casual laborers, such as "go

---

30 One of the important things to realize about "go slows" is that the term "go slow" was provided by individuals who supervised the casual laborers. Interviews with casual laborers did not indicate that casual laborers were calculating "go slows" as a tactic for negotiating their production. Additionally, the term "go slow" implies that there was a somewhat organized resistance to labor on the part of the casual laborers. This may or
"go slows," were truly informal negotiations surrounding labor or a form of trade unionism, they were ineffective. Casual laborers who were perceived as participating in "go slows" were easily replaced by new groups of casual laborers. Casual laborers had no avenues to express their discontent or create change in their work situations; fear of firing had led casual laborers to not voice their needs.

As Kenya's economy worsens and the surplus of individuals seeking employment grows, casual laborers are becoming more dispensable. Casual laborers are typically from the poorest economic class in Kenya. Their poverty makes it difficult for them to find good jobs. Thus, they are easily exploited.

Though staff of the development organizations do not directly supervise the casual laborers, they have an indirect and powerful effect on their performance. Casual laborers are aware of the potential power of development organization staff. They realize that the staff of development organization relays their expectations of production to contractors who in turn ensure that the expectations are met. Also, the development organization staff sets the wage of casual laborers. Thus, may not have been the case. During one interview a casual laborer discussed how one particular day supervisors continued to add work on to the already assigned tasks for a given day, which made it difficult for casual laborers to finish their work. The casual laborer thought that the supervisors were unfairly trying to get more work out of the casual laborers.
the exploitative work environment of casual laborers is a situation for which the development organization shares responsibility.

**Government Casual Laborers**

The job insecurity experienced by casual laborers inflated their perceptions of the power of staff of development organizations. Whether or not development organization staff knew they were perceived as powerful, casual laborers were fearful of their power.

The "abusive" tone (as described by civil servants and casual laborers) that development organization staff at the fish farm sometimes used with casual laborers exacerbated the fear in casual laborers. Additionally, some casual laborers found the treatment they received from development organization staff to be dehumanizing. As a result, casual laborers described feelings of anxiousness in the presence of development organization staff.

Anxiousness and fear, the tenuous nature of their employment, and the sense that they were expendable caused some of the casual laborers to attempt to anticipate the motivations, expectations, and actions of development organization staff and develop a "consciousness of the other" as discussed by Judith Rollins (1997). To develop a
"consciousness of the other," casual laborers wanted to organize meetings with the staff of the development project to gain a sense of what their expectations were regarding the work intensity of casual laborers. Casual laborers did not feel they understood what was expected of them and hoped that a meeting would help them understand and also alleviate their anxiousness about their employment.

**THEORY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE RESULTS OF THIS RESEARCH**

**The Role of Development Staff and Fish Farm Employees in the Development Process**

Arturo Escobar (1997) discussed how the concept of development implies domination of third world nations despite all the shifts in the approaches to development that encourage participation. Regardless of the approach, development projects tend to eliminate difference rather than accept and work with difference. Based on interviews with civil servants, it appeared that the goals and objectives of development organizations tended to dominate over the ideas, thoughts, and suggestions of Sagana Fish Farm employees about how development activities should proceed.
Development staff and fish farm employees were not interacting and working together from equal positions. Development staff were perceived as powerful, developed, superior, wealthy, first world, advanced, and expert. Civil staff and casual laborers were perceived and sometimes treated as not developed, inferior, simple, and novice by development organization staff as was indicated by consultants' descriptions of relations with the staff of development organizations. The perceptions that development staff and fish farm employees held of each other placed development staff and fish farm employees on opposite ends of a continuum, which limited the exchange of ideas between development staff and fish farm employees. This impeded the possibility of collaborative and productive relations.

Race and Class in the Development Setting

Judith Rollins (1997) asserted that the racism of white employers led domestics who were black women to experience invisibility, ressentiment, and consciousness of the other. During my research I observed in some of the casual laborers what I thought resembled the dynamics of invisibility, ressentiment, and consciousness of the other. Two of the casual laborers I spoke with discussed how they felt that they
were expendable and were treated as if they were invisible to
development staff; they perceived the actions of the development staff
as racist. Casual laborers discussed the unfairness of their work realities
and had no avenues to express their frustration. They were fearful of
being fired and spent their energy trying to understand the actions of
development organization staff and as well civil staff supervisors.

Rollins (1997) discussed how an awareness of injustice and an
inability to voice anger and frustration are characteristic of relations
based affected by racism. I observed that casual laborers discussed
injustice, an inability to assert their voice, and loss of dignity with class-
related dynamics as well. One of the casual laborers discussed dignity
and how he felt that he was invisible to other Kenyans from wealthier
classes because he was from one of the poorest classes in Kenya.
Additionally, casual laborers had discussed how Kenyan supervisors at
the fish farm extracted bribes from them and hired and fired them as if
they were not human. Based on my observations of work relations at
Sagana Fish Farm it seems that the concepts—invisibility, ressentiment,
and consciousness of the other—which Rollins (1997) discussed as
emerging from relations that involve racism—also surface in work
relationships that involve class-related dynamics.
The Legacy of Colonialism and the Physical Layout of the Farm

A relic of colonial labor relations emerged from the physical arrangement of Sagana Fish Farm. During British administration of the fish farm, British officers supervised casual laborers from the hill overlooking the farm. The British government constructed Sagana Fish Farm so that the administrators lived on the hill and could oversee the activities of the entire farm from the hill. While this physical layout of the farm is not the same construction as Panopticon discussed by Foucault (1981) its effect is similar to the effects of Panopticon. The physical layout of the farm creates a "system of isolating visibility" and a "system of surveillance" (Foucault, 1981). Casuals who worked at the fish farm during British administration described being watched by administrators occupying the hill and the consequences of job loss or harassment associated with not working at the pace defined by the administrators. This style of supervision set up a situation in which casual laborers always feared that they were being observed. This fear of observation in the casual laborers served as a control over their production. They worked constantly for fear of the consequences if they stopped. A similar dynamic may exist at Sagana Fish Farm. Several casual laborers described feeling anxious about slowing their work because they were concerned that they were being observed by
development organization staff living on the hill that overlooks the farm.

What is an Acceptable Wage for Casual Laborers?

The policy of development organization staff to pay casual laborers the wage typically paid to casual laborers in Kenya, because it is the "standard wage" and, therefore, culturally appropriate in Kenya, is not acceptable when considered in the light of feminist anthropology's discussion of cultural versus moral relativity. Development organization staff justify the wage paid to casual laborers through the argument of cultural relativity—if the wage is acceptable in Kenya then a development organization offering the same wage should be acceptable too. The wage, however, is considered extremely low in Kenya and reflects the existing economic inequalities in Kenya. A development organization paying this wage, especially when it has the financial resources to pay casual laborers more, is participating in an economic system that perpetuates inequality Kenya, which is a moral issue. This issue is exacerbated when the economic inequalities that exist between Kenya and the country of the development organization are considered. While it is true that development organizations provide casual laborers with employment, development organizations are also
participating in a system that is exploiting casual laborers. Given the financial resources of the development organization, is it ethical for development organizations, in order to meet the requirements of their funding agencies, to pay casual laborers an unacceptably low wage and justify the wage as acceptable because it is the wage paid to casual laborers in Kenya? Also, is participating in a system that exploits casual laborers ethical when the casual laborers are the people who development organizations target? Additionally, casual laborers do not receive sustainable benefits from the work of development organizations. Rather casual laborers assist development organizations to achieve their objectives through piecemeal, insecure employment at wages that would be considered unacceptable in the developed world.

What is resistance?

I realized during my field research that there were actions that I observed or I was told about that could be categorized according to Scott's (1987) definition of resistance; however, during my interviews consultants never described their actions as resistance. What one individual (e.g. an anthropologist or expatriate working for development organization, or supervisor whether Kenyan or expatriate)
perceives as resistance may be something entirely different for the acting individual (e.g. a casual laborer or civil servant). The acting individual may be just living his or her life, attempting to exist or work within the realities of his or her situation. Employers or supervisors, however, who have specific goals that they would like to accomplish may view this action as resistance, something that's inhibiting the accomplishment of a particular goal. The relationships of anthropologists, development organization staff, supervisors, civil servants, and casual laborers are enmeshed in relationships of subordination and domination, so actions are perceived differently depending on the position from which they are interpreted. For example, if civil servants choose to not work unless they absolutely are required, is this resistance? Civil servants may have decided that they do not receive enough money and so have decided to work at a lower level and/or find alternative money making activities, which may mean they are just dealing or coping with their everyday realities. Because supervisors are interpreting this action from a different position, they may see this act as resistance.
Consultants' Experiences of Reality are Subjectively Defined

The findings of this research validate postmodernist assertions that reality is composed of discordant points of view and as well that reality is a subjective experience. Though the situation at Sagana Fish Farm was born from colonial politics that left a legacy of economic inequality in Kenya, individuals experiences within this larger context were affected by a vast number of factors such as class, age, education, language, ethnicity, political economy, and family history to suggest only a few.

One of the most difficult aspects of writing this thesis has involved the representation of the individuals I interviewed without losing the specificity of their responses and the uniqueness of who they were beyond participants in a study about the effects of development organizations. To organize the results section I extracted themes that emerged from interviews that were relevant to the questions asked in this study. I then went through interviews and placed consultants' comments into the various themes that came out of interviews. By doing this the context surrounding the points of view of consultants was diluted. For example, on one day I learned from a consultant of how Sagana Fish Farm employee interactions with development organization staff were reminiscent of colonial relations. A few days
later, with the same consultant, I learned of the pride he felt when he
looked around the farm and observed the infrastructure that resulted
from the work of development organizations. In the results section of
this thesis these points of view regarding development organizations
are separate from one another; however, it is important to see the points
of view together, because they show that consultants did not have
generalizable views of development organizations at Sagana Fish Farm;
their points of view were complex.

Comparisons of responses of civil servants and casual laborers
indicate that class affected consultants’ points of views regarding the
presence of development organizations. While civil servants were
citing the benefits of the employment generated for casual laborers,
casual laborers discussed feeling overworked and underpaid. Casual
laborers during interviews never described their employment with the
development organization as a “benefit” as did civil servants.

Ethnicity also affected consultants’ responses regarding the
presence development organizations. For example, most of the casual
laborers I spoke with were Kikuyu. They did not see tribalism as an
issue in their employment situation. One casual laborer, however, who
was from a different tribe felt that tribalism was an issue in the work
environment of casual laborers. He was the only casual laborer who
discussed tribalism. Is his point irrelevant because he is the only person
who commented on tribalism? Because a majority of casual laborers did not comment on tribalism and one casual laborer did, does this mean that tribalism is not an aspect of the working realities of casual laborers? It is important to not discount one consultant’s point of view, which is quite real to the individual, because s/he is the only individual who held this point of view.

Perceptions of the Poor

Bell Hooks’ discussion of representation of the poor seems important to consider in the context of development staff’s descriptions of civil servant employees who had chosen to not work for the development project. They were described as “lazy” and “useless yo yos.” These descriptions foster negative images of fish farm employees. Additionally, if civil servants criticized or questioned the development project’s decision to not pay allowances, they were described as individuals who “infect the others with their talk of perks and incentives.” I agree with Hooks’ (1994) assertion that an increasing number of individuals from poorer classes are “refusing menial labor in low-paid jobs” not because they are lazy, but because “it is not worth it to
work a job where one is systematically dehumanized or exploited only to remain poor." I suggest that this assertion was relevant to the situation of the civil servants, who were frustrated first by their employment realities in Kenya and then by development projects that did not pay an allowance in addition to their civil service salaries. Civil servants were seeking to improve their economic situations and this did not happen if they were working for development organizations without an allowance.

Conversations with development project administrators indicated that they thought that the poorest people in Kenya were poor because they didn’t have the intellectual capacity (due to factors such as malnutrition at an early age) to change their realities. This kind of depiction of poor people is also dangerous because it places the responsibility of poverty solely on the people who are experiencing it. Political, economical, and historical factors are completely disregarded in this depiction of how or why there are poor people in Kenya. It also allows individuals (such as development staff) from privileged backgrounds to avoid acknowledgment of the role that their government may play in the perpetuation of the economic hardships of developing countries.

Comment by development organization staff regarding members of the civil staff who criticized the policy of the development organization to not pay allowances.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Civil servant’s perceptions of development organizations were characterized by ambivalence. Civil servants valued the resources of development organizations; they appreciated the structural enhancements of the fish farm; and they thought that development organizations created work for casual laborers and sometimes civil servants. They were, however, concerned about the sustainability of development organization projects due to financial and human resource mismanagement in the Kenya civil service, a lack of information sharing and technology transfer by development organizations, and tense relations surrounding work.

The level of security of employment affected civil servants and casual laborers’ responses about their experiences with development organizations. Civil servants tended to speak more of the overall effects of development organizations, whereas casual laborers primarily focused on their immediate concerns with their employment situations with development organizations. Casual laborers did not comment on the structural enhancements made to the farm or the availability of an
inexpensive protein source at the farm. They discussed their immediate lives and concerns in their relations with development organizations as employers—insecure terms of employment, the intensity of their labor in contrast with their wage, and methods for improving their employment situations.

Overall, based on the information obtained from this research, it appeared that short-term benefits that lasted the life of a project were available to some fish farm employees; however, long-term sustainability of the work of development organizations seemed unlikely at the time of this research, given the concerns civil servants and casual laborers expressed about sustainability and tense relationships with the staff of development organizations. Additionally, dynamics reminiscent of colonial relations were observable between fish farm employees and the staff of development organizations.

Recommendations

Create Meaningful Development Plans

At the onset of a development project the staff of the development organization and Sagana Fish Farm should establish a
plan that outlines the future direction of the farm and the intentions, expectations, and plans for the progress of Sagana Fish Farm. Development organization staff and fish farm employees from all levels of employment should discuss what aspects of fish farm management had and hadn’t worked in the past; previous development organization activities and their effects; and objectives. Based on these discussions identify with the staff where constraints lie in project plans and what aspects of the plan are possible given the political, economic, and social factors affecting Sagana Fish Farm. Once the plan is developed monthly meetings should be held to ensure that decisions and actions made surrounding development project activity are in alignment with the plan outlined at the initiation of the development project. If changes are required of the plan, then they should be discussed and alternative plans should be brainstormed. Flexibility, respect, willingness to learn, and creativity are qualities that should be emphasized in meetings. Sustainability of the work of development organizations is more likely if the plans are meaningful to fish farm employees and employees feel that they have ownership of and are engaged in the operations of development organizations.
Improve Work Conditions for Casual Laborers

The casual laborers do high intensity manual labor for a low wage; their work environment at the time of this research was exploitative and did not facilitate productivity. During interviews I was provided with a number of suggestions that development organizations could implement to improve the working conditions of casual laborers. Casual laborers could be provided with a wage increase. Additionally, transport, lunch, protective equipment, and treated drinking water for casual laborers at their work sites would lessen the difficulties associated with their work. Furthermore, casual laborers could be provided with a discount on fish produced at the farm, so that the fish sold at the farm was affordable to them. Implementing these changes to the work situation of casual laborers would demonstrate the development organization’s interest in and respect for the well-being of the people participating in project operations. Also, the likelihood of tensions developing around work between development organizations and the casual laborers would be reduced, thereby resulting in more productive and sustainable work.
Culture Training

Casual laborers and civil servants expressed concerns about tense interactions with the staff of development organizations. These tensions impeded the effectiveness of the work of development organizations at Sagana Fish Farm. Development organizations need to hire individuals that in addition to their technological expertise have the capacity to facilitate communicative and healthy functioning work environments. Trainings need to be established that allow the staff of development organizations to develop an awareness of how their cultural, historical, economic, and political presence is perceived by both casual laborers and civil servants and how these factors affect their interactions. Additionally, development organization staff need to become aware of the cultural, historical, political, and economic situations of the local people. This awareness is especially important in cross-cultural situations in which there is an increased likelihood for misperceptions of actions and misinterpretations of words.

Establish Health Clinic

Casual laborers discussed disease (e.g., malaria and typhoid) and injury as concerns with their work situations. Additionally, both civil
staff members and casual laborers discussed medical expenses as major concerns. With the establishment of a health clinic, fish farm employees could learn about preventative health care and as well immediately take care of health issues that surface. The establishment of a health clinic would demonstrate the development organization's commitment to the well-being of the people participating in their project operations and also enhance the sustainability of project operations.

Examine Administrative Policies of Development Organizations

Administrative policies of development organizations need to be examined in terms of how they work within the context of development, which involves the economics, politics, and history of developed and developing nations. The different expectations of the civil servants and the staff of development organizations surrounding payment for work led to relations that were tense and as a result a number of civil servants were not invested in the work of development organizations. These relations reflect the large-scale economic inequality that exists between the governments of development organizations and Kenya. Civil servants are aware of the wealth of the
government of a development organization, and, through their contact with the staff of development organizations (representatives of those governments), developed a heightened awareness of the economic disparity between Kenya and developed nations. Civil servants expect or hope that they will financially gain from the presence of development organizations, which is not surprising given the history of foreign aid in Kenya and the conception of development itself. Development implies that developing nations will become “developed” nations—nations with greater economic prosperity. Development organizations need to consider their policies and how they represent themselves overseas to determine how they are participating in a larger system of economic inequality. Does the differential that exists between the salary of development staff and Kenyan civil servants exacerbate the awareness of economic inequality in Kenyan civil servants? Are there ways that development organizations could work to decrease the economic inequality that exists between Kenyan civil servants and the staff of development organizations? These are very difficult questions to answer; however, there needs to be dialogue about these issues between expatriate development workers, administrators of development organizations, and the governments of the countries in which development organizations work.
Provide Low Interest Loans to Facilitate Technology Transfer

During this research it became apparent that loans were informally provided to fish farm employees and that favoritism was a concern for some of the civil servants I interviewed. To alleviate favoritism, facilitate technology transfer, and foster a sense of investment in development project activities a loan program could be established (for which all fish farm employees are eligible, not a select few) in which loan recipients could participate in skill building activities and development project operations in exchange for low interest loans.
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INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR CIVIL SERVANTS AND CASUAL LABORERS

The following questions were used to guide my interviews with the civil servants:

1) Where are you from originally? Where's your family from? How often do you see your family?

2) What kinds of work were you doing prior to your arrival at the farm?

3) How long have you worked at Sagana Fish Farm? Could you describe significant positive or negative experiences related to the farm that you've had since you've been employed at the farm?

4) How does the presence of a donor project and the extra money that it brings to the farm affect the staff and staff relations?

5) Could you describe significant experiences working at the farm either positive or negative in relation to other farm employees, donor organizations, management of the farm, and/or the resources available at the farm?
6) Could you tell me any stories/myths/folklore that you've heard about Sagana Fish Farm or people that have been involved with the farm?

I used the following questions to guide my interviews with the casual laborers working for the PD/A CRSP:

1) Where are you from originally? Where's your family from? How often do you see your family?

2) How did you decide to work at Sagana Fish Farm?

3) Could you describe significant experiences (past or present) working at the farm regarding relations with other farm employees, donor organizations, management of the farm, and/or the resources available to you at the farm?

4) Could you describe other experiences doing casual labor and how those experiences compare to your work at Sagana Fish Farm?

5) What other types of work do you do in addition to casual labor?

6) Could you tell me any stories/myths/folklore that you've heard about Sagana Fish Farm or people that have been involved with the farm?
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS WITH ELDERS

1) How did you come to work at Sagana Fish Farm? Could you describe what it was like working at the fish farm?

2) How did you see the presence of Sagana Fish Farm affect your community?

3) How do you earn your living now?

4) Could you tell me any stories/myths/folklore that you’ve heard about Sagana Fish Farm or people that have been involved with the farm?

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1) Describe significant experiences you've had while working at the farm.

2) Tell me about how you earn your living with or without the resources of Sagana Fish Farm.