

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-
NoDerivs 3.0 Licence.

To view a copy of the licence please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

RESERVE (832)

HOUSEHOLD RESOURCE ALLOCATION AMONG THE LUHYA
OF EAST BUNYORE: A CASE STUDY APPROACH

By

Douglas B. Paterson
WORKING PAPER NO. 351



(b)
INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
P.O. BOX 30197
NAIROBI, KENYA

MARCH 1979

Views expressed in this paper are those of the author. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Institute for Development Studies, or of the University of Nairobi.

This work is published under the Copyright Act, Cap. 130 of the Laws of

HOUSEHOLD RESOURCE ALLOCATION AMONG THE LUHYA OF
EAST BUNYORE: A CASE STUDY APPROACH

By

Douglas B. Paterson



ABSTRACT

This paper outlines a plan of research to study how one subgroup of the Abaluhya, the Abanyole, are adapting to the problem of scarce land resources in East Bunyore Location, Kakamega District. Many small farms in East Bunyore, cultivated by the commonly practiced techniques of subsistence agriculture are able to provide only a fraction of the total subsistence requirements of the household. Bunyore households are therefore very much dependent upon cash incomes from wage employment, self-employment, business, or sales of agricultural produce.

The research will first investigate the ways in which households have utilized their productive resources of land, labor, and capital in adapting to the current economic conditions of Bunyore and Kenya as a whole. Going beyond these substantive details of resource allocation, the research will be directed towards identifying social and cultural variables (e.g., beliefs and values) which play a significant role in influencing the economic behavior (i.e., decision making) of the people of Bunyore.

A case study approach, focusing on a limited number of household units, is suggested as the most appropriate method of obtaining the qualitative data necessary for a study of decision making. A sample of twenty households will be selected from a small but known universe (one village) so as to represent the range of variability of household units. Detailed records of these households' incomes, expenditures, and activities will be maintained and these will form the basis for further questions on decision making.

INTRODUCTION

The 1972 ILO report on incomes and employment in Kenya notes that, "Ninety per cent of the population of Kenya still lives in rural areas and earns its livelihood predominantly from agriculture" (ILO 1972:33). Yet in some of the most densely populated and most intensively cultivated areas of Kenya, it has become increasingly difficult to support a household from the produce of one's land and the opportunities for the young adults in these households for establishing smallholdings of their own have been severely limited by extreme shortage of land. Rural households have increasingly turned to non-agricultural sources of income to supplement that which they earn from their farms; while young adults now set their hopes on securing some form of wage earning employment. It has been estimated that as much as forty percent of the total rural income for 1969 was earned from such non-agricultural sources (ILO 1972:333). This additional income is used in a variety of ways - to pay children's school fees, make home or farm improvements, finance bride-wealth payments, provide for personal needs, and the like. For some smaller farms, an "extra" income may be crucial, allowing them to continue to operate even when, as is becoming more frequently the case, the subsistence needs of the household are not met from farm production.

For Western Province, it has been estimated that a family of six needs 3.5 hectares of farm land to fulfil their subsistence requirements and earn an annual income of £100 (given current farm technology). In Nyanza Province, the amount of land needed to meet this standard varies from 2.25 ha. in Kisii to 7 ha. in South Nyanza (Mbithi and Barnes 1975:88). Yet, if we compare the 1969 population figures of Kakamega District (Western Province) with the amount of land available for farming there we find the "average" family of six would only have 2.5 hectares. Similarly, in Nyanza Province as well as a number of other districts throughout Kenya, available land resources are far below the amount suggested as necessary to meet a family's subsistence needs and provide a net income of £100 per year. Within districts there is also considerable local variation in the size of land holdings. For example, in the Vihiga Division of Kakamega, where the average family size is seven, a 1970 survey estimated a mean farm size of approximately 1.2 ha., a median farm size of 1.0 ha., and the smallest farms to be something less than 0.2 ha. (P. Mook 1973:11). Thirty-nine percent of these farms were less than one hectare, forty-four percent

In the densely populated Luhya areas of western Kenya land scarcity has been a problem from early colonial days. Although it may have been a small plot, a young man in years past could generally count on having a share of his father's land or other clan lands; or at least having the opportunity to cultivate for himself, land belonging to clansmen or affines. If this wasn't sufficient to support a family, there were opportunities for opening up new lands in the higher elevations or obtaining land outside the Luhya area. Many men took advantage of the high demand for labor on the settler farms to work as wage laborers, often on a six month contract. Others worked on a more permanent basis as domestic servants or in various skilled and semi-skilled occupations in the towns. Wagner estimates that for 1932 about twenty percent of the Luhya men were away from home at any given time engaged in wage labor (1956:94).

Today, migration for employment has an even greater importance as an alternative for those without sufficient holdings in land. The percentage of the adult male population away from the Luhya area at any given time, either in employment or in search of employment has been estimated at fifty-five and sixty-seven percent in two densely populated sample areas (Weisner 1973:125 and J. Mook 1974:106). Most of these wage earners are sending substantial amounts of their incomes back to their rural households. On average, urban migrants (in Nairobi) were found to return approximately twenty percent of their earnings to their home areas (Johnson and Whitelaw 1969:6, cited in ILO 1972:33) and it has been suggested that at lower wage levels, this proportion is likely to be much higher.

While earnings from wage employment are an important supplement to income derived from agriculture, migratory wage employment is only one of a number of alternatives used by people to increase their total rural incomes. Many rural people are self-employed, earning money from long practiced skills and crafts such as wood carving, blacksmithing, basket weaving, rope making, thatching, brewing, and pottery. Some are working as carpenters, masons, woodcutters, and petty traders. Most of these jobs are likely to be only part-time occupations. A few opportunities for full-time employment in rural areas are provided in teaching, health services, and the civil service. Agricultural labor, within the local area, whether regular or on a casual basis, also provides another source of rural income.

For those who manage to accumulate capital through savings or by securing a loan, there are a number of ways farming can become more profitable using different inputs, for example, hybrid maize seed and fertilizer; and by modifying various agricultural procedures. In some cases, cash crops can be substituted for subsistence crops and substantially increase the value of farm produce. Others with capital resources may choose to invest in a business enterprise, two of the most common being provisions shops and transportation services. One long-term investment is to provide an education for one's children in the hope that it will enable them to obtain good jobs in the future and lend a measure of economic security to the parents in later years.

Another way of increasing farm output is, of course, to increase the amount of land one has under production. For those with sufficient capital resources it is possible to purchase land even in the areas where land is particularly scarce. Many other families have chosen to permanently migrate to other areas with greater land availability.

In summarizing the above, several points deserve emphasis:

1. Land scarcity is a serious problem in a number of densely populated agricultural districts in Kenya.

(a) Due to the small scale of farming operations, the agricultural output of the farm is barely keeping pace with the subsistence demands of the household and often falls short.

(b) For the generation now reaching adulthood, opportunities in agriculture are severely limited by the difficulties in obtaining a sufficient amount of land.

2. People have adapted to this situation in a number of different ways: through various forms of employment or self-employment, business, agricultural innovation, and permanent out-migration.

At the present time, urban areas are able to absorb about twenty to twenty-five percent of the new entrants to the labor market each year. The other seventy-five to eighty percent of these (mainly) young adults must find employment in the rural areas, predominantly in agriculture. This presents an especially difficult problem for districts in which land is already a scarce resource. In the Kenya strategy for rural development (see Mbithi and Barnes 1975:98-99), the cornerstone is better utilization of land (i.e.,

and employment levels. As these increase, the heightened purchasing power of the rural populace will create new opportunities for rural business and industry, thus providing additional employment, and hopefully, initiating a process of self-sustaining rural development.

For self-generating rural development, Mbithi and Barnes recognize land, technical skills, capital, and labor as resources which "must eventually be controlled by the operational rural production units--the farm household, the rural business unit, the rural community or a combination of these" (1975:98). While government can help with secondary inputs such as (1) advice and extension, (2) infra-structural development, (3) market development, and (4) research and technological transfer (1975:98), at best these can only work to create a favourable environment in which the rural production units can prosper. In the end, advances in the nation's output or in one's personal standard of living depend upon the efforts of individuals within these production units. Thus, the manner in which families choose to allocate the resources available to them is of crucial importance to the development process.

Research Objectives

It is the plan of the proposed research to study how one subgroup of Abaluhya, the Abanyole, are adapting or responding to current economic conditions in Bunyore and Kenya as a whole. The research focuses on the productive resources of rural households in Bunyore and will examine the variety of ways such resources are used in adapting to the current economic environment. Specifically, data will be collected so as to determine:

- (1) what resources are available to the household,
- (2) the ways in which resources are accumulated and allocated,
- (3) how decisions on resource allocation are made, and
- (4) how changing strategies of resource allocation for individual households affect the local community in terms of its economic and social development.

(1) Resource Availability

The study will first consider the range of productive resources available to rural families within the study area. It is anticipated that most households will have about the same variety of resources available to them--some land,

from farm or wage incomes, and a network of social relationships which can provide various forms of assistance to family members. The quantity or quality of these resources will differ however from household to household.

(2) Resource Allocation

With an understanding of the resources available to rural households, the next concern of the research is to look at how different households utilize those resources. This will begin with an examination of the range of subsistence and income generating activities of the households in the community. While the activities themselves may not vary much from household to household, for example, farming, wage employment, business enterprise, etc., the way in which people allocate their resources (labor, capital, land, etc.) toward these different activities and the contribution each activity makes to the total household income could vary significantly. Although two farmers may have approximately the same amount of land, the amounts of time they spend in farming, the crops they plant, and the technology they utilize may be quite different. And not all potential resources will be devoted to purely productive ends. While one farmer may choose to spend Shs. 30/= on hybrid maize seed, another may decide to forgo hybrid seed, choosing instead to spend an equivalent sum on beer.

In addition to looking at resource utilization, attention must also be given to the process of resource accumulation. Productive activities are often directed toward an intermediate step where resources, especially capital, are saved before being reallocated to other ends. Thus, a man might spend ten years as an urban wage earner in order to save enough money to return to his rural home and open a business. Another might devote a considerable proportion of his resources to maintaining good relations with his kinsmen and because of this, he is able to get their assistance in helping him put his children through school.

(3) Decision Making: Choosing Between Alternative Means and Ends.

Every decision concerning the allocation of productive resources must be made from a number of alternative possibilities. Whether to devote full-time to one's farm or take wage employment in an urban area or open a small shop in a trading center--these are major decisions as to how a

alternatives. Jobs open to some are closed to others because of lack of education or training. Some who would like to start businesses of their own will never have the opportunity because they lack the capital necessary to begin. Nevertheless, new businesses are beginning every day and large numbers of men having rural households are earning money in urban areas sending it home to the wives and children who work their farms. How is the decision made to take a job, start a business, or provide the funds for a child's education? Apart from such major decisions, there are the everyday decisions that are a part of the management of a household, a farm, or a business. On the farm, how are decisions made as to the crop mix; the amount of fertilizer to be used (if any); the time planting, weeding, and harvesting will take place; and how much extra labor need be hired? How does a shopkeeper decide his hours of business, what products he should stock, and how much help he should employ?

On the basis of formal economic theory, it could be argued that whatever course of action a person decides to follow, his choice reflects an attempt to maximize some desired end. A person chooses a strategy of resource expenditure which will bring him the greatest expected benefits relative to the perceived costs. The economist is usually able to express the costs and rewards of the various alternatives in monetary values. As the market economy has permeated the rural farming districts with trading centers, cash crops, wage labor, and the sale and purchase of land, monetary values can indeed be placed on many of the exchange transactions which take place in these districts. Yet, there are other sorts of transactions, still expenditures of resources to various ends, but which may not be readily perceived by researchers. If recognized, their significance often remains uncertain because there is no accepted way of assigning values to the costs and benefits of an exchange. For example, it is difficult to place a monetary value (or any absolute value) on either political support or social prestige. A generous contribution to a local project might elevate one's standing in the community while those who lend their political support to a leader might expect to receive benefits in return. Certainly those participating in such transactions understand the values of the different items being exchanged but, so far, there is no way for a researcher to talk about x units of prestige or y units of political support.

Because of the difficulties in quantifying social values, many researchers have tended to rely solely upon easily quantifiable economic valuations in their studies of household resource allocation and exchange relationships. In overlooking the importance of social values in their analyses, they are likely to acquire an incomplete picture of the decision making process which could possibly lead them to misinterpret their data. Peter Moock provides an example of this problem, suggesting two different interpretations of his study of resource allocation among Vihiga maize farmers. His survey data indicate a tendency on the part of Vihiga farmers to use too much labor and too little fertilizer (1973:242). He writes:

Apparent inefficiencies in the relative use of certain inputs may indicate that increased output is possible at no increase in cost, by improved allocation of production factors. Alternatively this finding may indicate that farmers face "hidden costs" and reap social and psychic returns, for which there are no conceptual categories in the economists' standard system of accounting (Moock 1974:4000-A).

Employing "too much" labor may be the "hidden cost" a successful farmer pays to satisfy what the community regards as a social obligation. At the same time, it can be an investment earning social rewards or simply the lack of negative social or economic sanctions. Thus, what at first appears in the statistical data as a misallocation of resources may, in fact, be an example of informed, rational economic behavior when it is interpreted in light of the community's system of social values.

The proposed research will make an effort to determine what the major considerations are in deciding how to accumulate and allocate the resources of the household. The researcher hopes to gain an understanding of what both the long and short term goals of family members are and how they would like the resources of the household used in working toward those goals. Particular attention will be given to the role social values play in resource expenditure (as per the discussion above). It is anticipated that a number of different patterns, or strategies of resource allocation for households will emerge from the data based on the kinds and amounts of resources available to each household.

(4) Resource Allocation and the Economic and Social Development of the Community

As rural households become more dependent upon income derived from

they are also increasing their dependence upon various segments of the national economy and becoming integrated into the market system. Many farmers are beginning to buy agricultural inputs such as seed, fertilizer, and insecticide. They also rely on commercial transport to get their crops to market where they are sold at prices fixed by the government or determined by national or international markets. Wage earners are dependent upon their employers and perhaps a union while businessmen must manage numerous transactions with not only their customers, but also with wholesalers, transporters, creditors, etc. In addition, all of them participate as consumers in the market economy purchasing food, clothing, household items, etc.

It is important to stress, however, that the extent to which rural households participate in and rely upon national economic institutions may vary considerably from one household to another. Those farmers with substantial commitments to cash crops, those people with business interests, and those with permanent wage paying jobs are likely to be quite well integrated into the national economy. This is in contrast to those with low paying and perhaps, temporary employment; and farmers primarily engaged in subsistence agriculture whose interests are undoubtedly more localized.

Despite the increasing importance of modern economic institutions in rural areas, their effect upon local institutions and social relationships remains unclear. For example, with regard to the use of modern farming

techniques, production of cash crops, and the level of farm output, is there a relationship between these three variables and the experience of labor migration or, perhaps more importantly, the input of a regular wage income to the household? As was pointed out earlier, over fifty percent of the adult males in some agricultural areas are away from home, participating in the labor market. We might predict that some of the income generated by this labor force would be allocated to farm modernization and that, in an absolute sense, it would be a much greater investment than that being made by households without incomes from wage employment. We might also expect to find that those having the wider experience of migratory travel might be more open to the acceptance of agricultural innovations than people who have not seen the wide range of viable farming alternatives. Thus, the migratory experience and/or wage incomes may be positively associated with more productive agricultural operations.

From Weberian sociological theory, we might also hypothesize that as people come to rely upon national economic institutions (especially in earning regular cash incomes), they become less dependent upon close (mutually supportive) ties of kinship. One of the important functions of close-knit kin groups has been to provide a measure of security to their members, giving assistance in times of need, whether it be social, political, or economic in nature. For those already having attained a relatively secure economic position in the cash economy, there may be little economic incentive to "invest" their resources in the maintenance of kinship ties. Instead, they adopt a more individualistic stance, relying on their own efforts and investing their labor, money, and skills in activities from which they will individually (as households) enjoy the benefits of success or the consequences of failure.

With regard to these same issues, a number of alternative hypotheses can also be formulated. For example, the fact that a household has a regular cash income does not necessarily mean that any of it will be devoted to farm modernization. For those businessmen or wage earners bringing home comfortable incomes, there may be little economic need to improve farm output. In addition, while women are typically responsible for much of the day to day activity of running a farm, men generally retain the role of decision makers. A man who devotes a large part of the time and energy to earning a non-farm income may have little desire to further complicate his management role with more complex farm planning and supervision of technical procedures. At the same time, he may be unwilling to relinquish his decision making role to his wife or anyone else.

The needs of most rural households require both their subsistence production and additional wage income in varying proportions and many households would be unable to live solely one or the other. To the extent that wage incomes have been able to make up the difference between shortfalls in farm production and the needs of the household, it could be argued that wage labor, in reducing the necessity for agricultural innovation, may, in fact, be retarding the overall process of agricultural modernization. It might also be the case that for such households, with only a minimum of resources available to them to invest, an allocation to farm improvements would yield insignificant returns. Instead, we might expect to find these households investing in networks of kinship relations.

Which of the preceding hypotheses have merit? Do wage incomes stimulate agricultural modernization or do they act as a conservative force, enabling farm practices to continue which are no longer, in themselves, sufficiently productive to maintain a household? Are national institutions (whether economic, political, social, religious, etc.) assuming functions provided by kinship groups and thus weakening kinship network? Or do kin ties remain a functionally significant part of rural life, perhaps taking on even new functions? These few examples represent greatly simplified aspects of extremely complex social processes. It is undoubtedly the case that none of these hypotheses is correct in itself, but it is quite possible that all may be true in some contexts for some segments of the population. It is hoped that from this research a more complete understanding of these issues and others like them can be achieved. Thus, while examining the varying strategies of resource allocation for individual households, attention will also be focused on the effect such allocations have on the economic (including agricultural) and social development of the

As indicated by sections (1) and (2) above, the proposed research will collect data on the kinds and quantities of resources available to rural households, the sources of those resources, and to what ends they are allocated (in addition to basic demographic information on each household). In holding these objectives, the research is not unlike many other economic surveys. Such surveys conducted in rural areas have generally relied upon questionnaires as their means of acquiring data. The strength of a questionnaire lies in its ability to be broadly administered, facilitating a large amount of data collection over a relatively short time span, and then allowing one to make generalizations and predictions about a much larger population. The use of a questionnaire implies, however, that the researcher already knows which variables are likely to be the important ones for the phenomenon under study. The task of the field worker then is to collect truthful responses to a set of questions about these variables. One of the major difficulties with survey questionnaires is in deciding just what the relevant variables for study should be and how questions on these should be written. The questions must be written in a form which will yield readily quantifiable answers. The failure to ask questions on matters that would otherwise have significant influence on survey results is one of the greatest problems of this sort of research. The kinds of questions which are most likely to be omitted from survey questionnaires are: (1) questions which could have been easily included but were not, simply because they concern matters outside the researcher's realm of experience and it never occurred to the researcher to ask them, (2) questions of a qualitative nature whose answers would be difficult to put in quantitative form, and (3) questions of an idiosyncratic nature which might reveal extremely important information about individual cases but would have no relevance to most of the subjects in the sample. It is argued here that without the kinds of data suggested by these three categories of questions, one's understanding of the economic behavior of rural people may be incomplete and some ^{important} / issues of rural development may be obscured.

The way in which people perceive their economic alternatives may be closely related to locally held beliefs and values. The perception of one's obligations to family, kinsmen, and community; ideas about the correct way to invest money, hold capital, manage labor; the valuation of certain attributes conveying status and prestige; notions of the hierarchy of authority - these are examples of a few social and cultural variables which might play a significant role in influencing the selection of a particular course of action from among numerous alternatives. These are the sorts of variables which are very difficult to get at using survey questionnaires. To assume that they are neutral or inconsequential is, at best, a risky proposition.

time and contribute money to a never ending series of funerals which, over the course of a year, might represent a considerable expenditure of time and wealth. While some dimensions of this process might be revealed in data collected using questionnaires, there may be no evidence of what might actually be the functioning of a sort of clan death benefit insurance program. Similarly, the social sanctions compelling people to participate in the system (and these could be considerable) might never be revealed by the questionnaire.

One cannot assume, either, that social and cultural variables are the same, or have the same impact, on all members of the society. The contributions of a poor family to the funeral system may, proportionally, be much higher than those of a wealthy family. Participation among wealthy families could also vary considerably. Those valuing high prestige in the community may find it advantageous to contribute generously. Others, not concerned with high community standing and confident that they can financially withstand a death in their family may prefer to withdraw from the system and save their money for other things.

The subject matter of this research includes not only the quantitative aspects of household resource allocation but also an inquiry into the decision making process underlying resource utilization. An understanding of some of the parameters of decision making is of more than mere "academic interest". Within rural areas, an increasing number of the possible alternatives for resource expenditure are coming from sources outside the rural community. While many of these alternatives result from developments in the Kenyan economy as a whole, others are the result of specifically designed programs for rural development. The response of rural people to such programs has often been less than enthusiastic, much to the disappointment of the planners and administrators of these programs. From the perspective of an outsider, the negative response to development alternatives might be regarded as irrational and attributed to rural "backwardness". But, as in the example of Vihiga maize farmers cited earlier, what at first appears to be the inefficient utilization of resources may, in fact, be seen as the most rational choice from among alternatives when these are understood within their complete cultural context.

Research Strategies

What is being suggested by the discussion above is that in order to investigate some aspects of economic behavior beyond those usually covered by questionnaire based research, an approach something akin to Polly Hill's

level of generalization associated with statistical surveys is sacrificed in favor of an approach which devotes intensive study to small, indigenous populations. This approach affords the researcher the opportunity to gain an in-depth understanding of the population. It enables one to identify important variables influencing choice, whether these are readily quantifiable or elusively qualitative in form. It allows one to acquire an understanding of people's beliefs and values which underlie the decision making process and most aspects of their behavior and it permits one to look at individual cases which might reveal important insights into ^{the} decision making process.

In order to attain the goal of an "in-depth" knowledge of the sample population, the size of the sampling universe will be limited to a single community, a "village" (having locally recognized boundaries) which will be studied for a period of one year. This should mean a universe of between 150-180 households and approximately 1000 people.

The first task of the research will be to describe the community as a whole, noting various physical attributes and the level of infrastructural development. After this initial period of familiarization, the focus will still be on the village as a whole, but the unit of reference will be the household. A survey, sampling 100% of the village households, will be conducted to learn the general demographic and economic characteristics of the community and to establish the range of variation with regard to income, education, employment, land holdings, family size, etc. among households. (A copy of the survey data sheet and a brief explanation follow as Appendix 1.)

Upon completion of the survey, twenty households will be selected for detailed study of their incomes, expenditures, and the ways in which they use their time. The twenty households will be chosen so as to represent different stages in the family development cycle, varying levels of income and income sources, different farm sizes, etc. The final criteria for selection will not be determined until the village survey has been evaluated. Households will be divided into four groups of five households, each group having a number of characteristics in common and which distinguish it from other groups. Information will be recorded in daily journals kept by each household and supervised in frequent visits by the researcher or his assistant. Some households without literate members will require daily visits.

Weekly visits to each of the participating families will be made to collect the data and discuss it with household members. These discussions will be particularly important. The household records will provide detailed information on resource accumulation and allocation. As major expenditures

of time (labor) or income are recorded, these will be discussed in terms of the expected and actual returns from such allocations and in the light of possible alternative courses of action. Special attention will be given to expenditures of resources whose primary return or benefit may be social (though in the long term, they may also have significant economic benefits).

In discussions with informants, they might sometimes be able to state that they chose x course of action because they believe y. But such relationships, if perceived at all by informants, are likely to indicate only one of many variables which have influenced a particular decision (and even this relationship could be false). While paying close attention to informants' statements regarding decisions they have made, it is recognized that some factors may influence decision making at an unconscious level. In addition to beliefs and values, various psychological needs might constrain or channel the process of decision making. The community's expected responses to alternative courses of action will certainly influence one's decisions. Such factors as social prestige, kinship and community obligations, social sanctions, etc. must also be considered in any attempt to understand decision making.

Over the course of the "20 households" survey economic profiles will be compiled on a number of income generating activities conducted in the area. These include various forms of cash cropping - coffee, vegetables, pawpaws, sugar cane; poultry raising for egg production; craft industries such as carpentry, basket making, pottery; trading in baskets and bananas; and retail shops. An understanding of these activities in terms of the requirements for entry into the field - money, time, abilities, and the potential returns on investment will be valuable in assessing potential economic opportunities within Bunyore.

One of the most interesting aspects to this research will be the comparison of households that are successfully engaged in one of these activities with households which appear to have the means to invest in such activities but do not. The recent introduction of pawpaws as a cash crop in Bunyore provides a good opportunity for studying the decision making process with regard to agricultural innovation.

The collection of income and expenditure records will continue for a minimum of six months so as to complete one maize growing season. Over this time, detailed information^{on} the economic history of each of the twenty households will also be obtained. Included will be any data which is relevant

past employment, business, and migratory experiences of household members; formal education or other training; land acquisition and transfers; major expenditures of wealth due to funerals, weddings, litigation, education, investment, etc.; major in-flows of wealth from inheritance, gifts, weddings, litigation, etc.; and information about the household head's family of birth.

Field Site

The site selected for this research is East Bunyore Location in Vihiga Division, Kakamega District. Underlying this choice were the following considerations:

- (1) Population density. The area has a high population density and accompanying scarce land resources that are central to the problem suggested for study. With a population density of 530 people per square kilometer in 1969, East Bunyore is one of the more densely populated locations in Kenya. It is characterized by small farms; over 42% less than one hectare, and 81% under two hectares.
- (2) Agricultural potential. Agriculture in Bunyore is primarily subsistence oriented, based on two maize crops each year. Other important food crops include bananas, beans, groundnuts, cow peas, kale, cassava, local potatoes, and millet. However, soil and climatic conditions in Bunyore are also favorable for the cultivation of a number of cash crops. At present, these are grown on a rather limited scale, the most common being coffee, pawpaws, sugar cane, and various vegetable crops. There is a coffee factory near the northern boundary of East Bunyore and there is a collection point for the latex tapped from pawpaws at Emuhaya, the administrative headquarters for East Bunyore. The potential for cash cropping should provide an important point for comparison between farmers who have adopted cash crops and those who are growing only subsistence crops. While most Bunyore farms are small in scale, P. Mook's (1971) farm survey data (which includes Bunyore) suggest that there is a fair degree of diversity in the way farms are operated.
- (3) Transport. There is a good network of roads within East Bunyore, well integrated into national lines of communication (potentially) allowing for easy transport of crops for marketing and enabling labor migrants to leave and return without difficulty. The rail line passing through nearby Luanda opens up the possibility for rail transport of goods and produce from Bunyore to other parts of Kenya and Uganda. Finally, good roads and close proximity to distribution centres (Kisumu and Luanda) plus the high population density of the area should also favor the growth of rural businesses and trading centers.

(4) Level of employment. As mentioned earlier, studies from other Luhya sample areas found that at any given time, more than 50% of the men are away from home, either working or looking for work. This is undoubtedly the case in Bunyore as well. In addition, there is a significant level of employment or self-employment within Bunyore (for example, teachers, watchmen, carpenters, traders, etc.) Such employment levels indicate the possibility that capital might be available for farm or business investment.

(5) Relevance to other research. In terms of its physical, cultural, demographic, and economic characteristics, Bunyore shares many things in common with other nearby Luhya areas (e.g., Maragoli and Kisa). At the same time, differences between Bunyore and other Luhya areas are not trivial. There are cultural differences indicated by different beliefs and practices which may have a significant influence on the course of development. P. Mook's (1971) farm survey data show, for example, so example, some important differences in the rate of adoption of various agricultural innovations between people in Bunyore, Maragoli, and Tiriki. In recent years, a number of researchers have looked at various aspects of rural development and economic adaptation among Luhya peoples (see, for example, Weisner 1969; P. Mook 1971, 1973; J. Mook 1974, 1976; Rukandema 1975; Migot-Adhella 1977). Aside from studies connected with the Vihiga Special Rural Development Programme, there has been relatively little research conducted on issues of development in Bunyore. The choice of Bunyore as a research site provides an opportunity for this research to build upon the findings of other Luhya based studies, to investigate new issues suggested by such work and also to look at some of the same issues from a different perspective.

With its small farms, scarcity of land, and high rate of migration for employment, East Bunyore is not unique from a number of other areas in Kenya. The data from East Bunyore may be useful in suggesting developmental trends and adaptive processes taking place in other Luhya locations and other places in Kenya with similar economic environments.

Appendix 1: Survey of Village Households.

The purpose of the village survey is to learn some basic economic and demographic information about the sample universe and to facilitate the selection of twenty households for detailed case studies from this universe.

A ^{household} household is defined as a group of people who regularly share the produce of the lands they farm. Also included in this group are those living away from the homestead for reasons such as work or education, having no other land base on which they depend. The plot numbers referred to on the data sheet (following) are taken from Preliminary Index Diagrams of the village drawn by the Survey of Kenya.

The names of all family members are recorded in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the data sheet. Deceased family members over age fifteen years are also recorded with a notation of the year of their death. When children have set up their own households, it is indicated by a "yes" in part F of section 5. The location of separate households belonging to sons is marked in 5G if it is within the village. Space is provided for the name of the place of residence of all family members. There is also a blank in which to write the highest level of formal education attained by all family members (or non-formal equivalents). For children currently attending school, the name of the school is also included on the form. If children are married, it is indicated by the year of marriage in 5F.

Section 6 is for listing all non-family members residing within the household.

Section 7 notes all buildings on the household plot(s), their use, construction, and other information on size, condition, or unusual characteristics.

Section 8 is for the number of cows the household owns and the number under its control.

In section 9 the church affiliation of household members is recorded.

The employment history and all other income generating activities of household members is written in section 10.

Section 11 includes notes on farming practices (e.g., use or non-use of hybrid maize), general comments on the household, detailed information on business practices, and any other miscellaneous inform-

Some of the main points that the survey should illuminate are:

1. the size and composition of both families and households as well as the level of education of all family members.
2. the level of consumption in the household, especially in food requirements and school expenses.
3. the income generating activities of all household members and estimates of household income.
4. indicators of wealth from the data on buildings, cattle, and land holdings.
5. farming activities/utilization of land holdings, whether cash crops or subsistence crops are grown, hybrid maize or local maize, whether people hire farm labor or sell their labor or both, etc.
6. clan ties - Do clans marry from certain other clans or places? Do some clans as a group have more land than others or appear to be better off economically?
7. employment patterns - Does permanent employment run in families or is it well distributed throughout the population? How does the level of education compare with employment or type of job?
8. church affiliation, included as a possible discriminator of social or economic position.

1. Date: _____

Plot # _____

11. Name of person interviewed: _____

Sequence# _____

Page _____ of _____

1A. House on plot# _____

1B. Separate Household Part of larger household

2. Other household plots: A. Plot Numbers, B. Size

A. a. _____ b. _____ c. _____ d. _____ e. _____

B. a. _____ b. _____ c. _____ d. _____ e. _____

3. Husband _____ 4. Wife _____ If other wives

A. Name _____

A. FA Name _____ A. Year Married _____ B. Year married _____

B. Birth date _____ B. Birthdate _____ C. Present marital status _____

C. Birthplace _____ C. Birthplace _____ D. Residence _____

D. Clan _____ D. Clan _____ A. _____

B. _____

E. Education _____ E. Education _____ C. _____

F. Residence _____ F. Residence _____ D. _____

5. Children

51. Name _____ 52 Name _____ 53 Name _____

A. Birthdate _____ A. Birthdate _____ A. Birthdate _____

B. Sex _____ B. Sex _____ B. Sex _____

C. Residence _____ C. Residence _____ C. Residence _____

D. Education _____ D. Education _____ D. Education _____

E. Married _____ E. Married _____ E. Married _____

F. Separate HH _____ F. Separate HH _____ F. Separate _____

54. Name _____	55 Name _____	56 Name _____
A. Birthdate _____	A Birthdate _____	A. Birthdate _____
B. Sex _____	B. Sex _____	B. Sex _____
C. Residence _____	C. Residence _____	C. Residence _____
D. Education _____	D. Education _____	D. Education _____
E. Married _____	E. Married _____	E. Married _____
F. Separate HH _____	F. Separate HH _____	F. Separate _____
G. If SHH, plot _____	G. If SHH plot _____	G. If SHH, plot _____

57. Name _____	58 Name _____	59 Name _____
A. Birthdate _____	A. Birthdate _____	A. Birthdate _____
B. Sex _____	B. Sex _____	B. Sex _____
C. Residence _____	C. Residence _____	C. Residence _____
D. Education _____	D. Education _____	D. Education _____
E. Married _____	E. Married _____	E. Married _____
F. Separate HH _____	F. Separate HH _____	F. Separate HH _____
G. If SHH, plot # _____	G. If SHH, plot # _____	G. If SHH, plot # _____

6. Others residing in HH: A. Name, B. Relationship to HH

61A _____	61B _____
62A _____	62B _____
63A _____	63B _____

7. Buildings on plots:

	mabati	thatch	mud	cement block	additional notes
A. Main house	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
B. Kitchen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
C. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
D. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
E. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
F. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
G. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
H. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
I. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

8. Cows

	Owned	borrowed	total
on premises			
loaned out			
Total			

9. Church Affiliations (s)

10. Employment or other income generating activities of HH members:

11. General comments/miscellaneous information:

References

- Court, David and Dharam Ghai, eds.
1974 Education, Society, and Development: New Perspectives from Kenya.
- Hill, Polly
1970 Studies in Rural Capitalism in West Africa. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- ILO (International Labour Office)
1972 Employment, Incomes, and Equality. Geneva: International Labour
Office.
- Johnson, G.E. and W.E. Whitelaw
1969 "Urban-Rural Income Transfers in Kenya: An Estimated
Remittances Function" Nairobi: Institute for Development Studies.
- Mbithi, Philip M. and Carolyn Barnes
1975 The Spontaneous Settlement Problem in Kenya. Nairobi: E.A.L.B.
- Migot-Adholla, Shem E.
1977 Migration and Rural Differentiation in Kenya. Unpublished Ph.D.
dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Moock, Joyce L.
1974 "Pragmatism and the Primary School: The Case of a Non-Rural
Village" In Court, David and Dharam Ghai, eds., 1974:105-122.
- Moock, Joyce L.
1976 The Migration Process and Differential Economic Behavior in
South Maragoli, Western Kenya. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,
Columbia University.
- Moock, Peter R.
1971 "The Vihiga SRDP Farm Level Survey: A Preliminary Report of
Findings" Nairobi: Institute for Development Studies Discussion
Paper 111, June.
- Moock, Peter R.
1973 Managerial Ability in Small-farm Production: An Analysis of
Maize Yields in the Vihiga Division of Kenya. Unpublished Ph.D.
dissertation, Columbia University.
- Moock, Peter R.
1974 Abstract of "Managerial Ability in Small-Farm Production...",
Moock 1973, In Dissertation Abstracts 35:3999A-4000A.
- O'Barr, William M.; David H. Spain; and Mark A. Tessler; eds.
1973 Survey Research in Africa: Its Applications and Limits.
Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Rukandema, F.M.
1975 "Some Economic Arithmetic of Poverty: Preliminary Farm Data
from Bukura and Shitoli Sub-locations of Kakamega District, Western
Kenya" Nairobi: Institute for Development Studies Working Paper
253, December.

Wagner, Gunter

1956 The Bantu of Western Kenya, Volume II 1970 edition. London:
International African Institute.

Weisner, Thomas S.

1969 "One Family, Two Households: Rural-Urban Ties in Kenya."
Nairobi: University of East Africa Social Science Research
Conference paper.

Weisner, Thomas S.

1973 "Studying Rural-Urban Ties: A Matched Network Sample from
Kenya" In O'Barr, William M.; David H. Spain; and Mark A. Tessler,
1973: 122-134.