



Jumuga Journal of Education,
Oral Studies, and Human Sciences (JJEOSHS)
editor@jumugajournal.org
<http://www.jumugajournal.org>
Volume 7, No. 2, 2024
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35544/jjeoshs.v7i2.78>

Ethnic Fragmentation & Economic Development: A Multidimensional Exploration of Kenya Since 1963

Samuel Wafula Mukanda

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5171-9631>

Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya

&

Pontian Godfrey Okoth, PhD

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8369-9029>

Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya

&

Kizito Muchanga Lusambili, PhD

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5430-4558>

Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya

Abstract

This research article explores the multidimensional impact of ethnic divisions, and delves on issues of marginalization, inequalities, and disparities. It also seeks to elaborate on how government policies deal with marginalization; and lastly, the aspect of Africanisation and inequalities in Kenya. In its discussion, it employs the ideas of pragmatism philosophy and the Relative Deprivation Theory. Various literatures have been reviewed and the gaps identified. Methodologically, it has adopted a historical research design, as the research that culminated into this write-up simultaneously qualitative and historical. In its findings, it has established that marginalisation, inequalities and other forms of disparities are as a result of ethnicity and ethnic-based politics, which have been the central basis of discrimination in Kenya since the colonial era. Additionally, rural and urban inequalities in resource allocation and development were also noticeable, as were gender inequalities. It considers, the adopted distributive policies, seen during Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi's era, as that which targeted the marginalised and minority communities as well those in rural areas. It contends that marginalization in Kenya has been deeply entrenched, with certain ethnic groups facing systemic exclusion from political power, economic opportunities, and social services.

Keywords: Disparities, Ethnicity, Fragmentation, Inequalities and Marginalisation

Introduction

Ethnic fragmentation intersects with disparities in resource distribution and economic opportunities. Historically marginalized communities have faced limited access to education, healthcare, infrastructure, and economic resources. This marginalization has hindered their participation in and benefit from economic development initiatives, perpetuating inequalities and inhibiting inclusive growth. Kenya's devolution process, initiated in 2013, aimed to address regional imbalances and enhance local governance. By devolving power and resources to county governments, the hope was to promote more equitable development across the country. Ethnic considerations in the allocation of resources and political representation at the county level have both positive and negative implications for economic development.

Literature Review

According to Stren and Polese, the nature of ethnic fragmentation in a global perspective encompasses various dynamics and patterns that are observed across different regions and countries. Ethnic fragmentation reflects the diversity and plurality of the world's population. Different ethnic groups exist in virtually every region, often characterized by unique languages, cultures, and identities. This diversity contributes to the richness of global heritage and human experience.

Ethnic fragmentation is influenced by global migration patterns. Whether voluntary or forced, migration has led to the formation of diaspora communities and the spread of ethnic groups across different regions. This has resulted in the establishment of transnational ethnic identities and interactions. Ethnic fragmentation interacts with the concept of nation-states and national boundaries. The drawing of political borders and the formation of nation-states have often disregarded existing ethnic boundaries, leading to the inclusion of multiple ethnic groups within a single country. This can create challenges in managing intergroup relations and fostering a sense of national identity. It is therefore important to recognize that the nature of ethnic fragmentation in the global perspective is complex and multifaceted. It is shaped by historical, political, social, and economic factors, and its manifestations can vary significantly across different regions and contexts. Understanding and addressing the challenges and opportunities associated with ethnic fragmentation requires global cooperation, dialogue, and respect for cultural diversity. These pertinent issues have not been clearly addressed by Stren and Polese in his works. Therefore, this study looked forward to address the challenges and opportunities which are associated with ethnic fragmentation in Kenya since 1963.

Theoretical Framework:

The Relative Deprivation Theory

This theory was propounded by Runciman in 1966. Runciman was interested to see the attitudes to social inequality in the 20th century England. Runciman borrowed the term "relative deprivation" which was originally coined by Merton and Kitt who are the authors of "The American Soldier". The main assumption of the theory is that a people's satisfaction is conditioned by their expectations and measured in parallel with their reference group. Runciman said that "the proverbial way to make oneself conscious of one's advantages is to contrast one's situation with that of others who are worse off than oneself." "Revolution of the rising expectations" at a class or national level, Runciman believed that, people will be conservative when there is long term poverty. If people have been led to see as a possible goal the relative prosperity of some more fortunate community with which they can directly compare themselves, then they will remain discontented with their lot until they have succeeded in catching up. This is the so called 'revolution of the rising expectations'.

Methodology

The study employed historical research design since its qualitative in nature. In the historical research design, the writings are descriptive, and they begin with a chronological recounting of events. Their investigation focuses on the events' explanatory connection and effects. The study targeted all ethnic groups in 47 Counties in Kenya. Despite targeting 47 counties, it was carried out in 7 Counties which included, Bungoma, Busia, Kakamega, Kisumu, Kisii, Homabay, and Siaya which formed the sample size to the study. The study used convenience, purposive and snow ball sampling techniques to identify various respondents to be involved in the study. Secondary and primary data were used in order to enrich the study. Content analysis was used to analyse the data gathered by the researcher.

Discussion of Findings

This section discusses findings based on three key areas which include; first marginalisation inequalities and disparities in Kenya; secondly, government policies to deal with marginalisation and lastly, Africanisation and inequalities in Kenya. They are discussed as follows:

Marginalisation, Inequalities and Disparities in Kenya

Economic inequalities, regional or ethnic disparities and marginalisation in a society depend on a number of factors. This was also witnessed in the works of Brian Cooksey, David Court and Ben Makau, who attribute problems of inequalities to the economic mode of colonial development; the uneven spread of missionary activity; and, the variable intensity of local self-help activity. Cooksey *et al*, however, point out that the seriousness of these disparities as threats to nationhood and social cohesion

derived from the fact that they tended to coincide with ethnic, linguistic, religious and economic cleavages, which in turn found expression in particularistic loyalties and demands for a greater share of national resources. Wafula Wamunyinyi, a responder, informed this study that:

...attributes inequalities in Kenya to such factors as historical, natural resource endowments, political patronage, policy choices, cultural norms, and exogenous factors such as trade and technology, and even bureaucratic excesses. These factors become more pronounced in an environment where taxation and public expenditure policies, budgeting and governance institutions are weak and not impervious to political and bureaucratic manipulations.

In countries where oversight institutions are weak, distortions in public spending are not uncommon the budget is not immune to bureaucratic manipulations; senior civil servants misdirect public spending in favour of certain regions or projects, factors which contribute to misallocation of resources and inequalities. According to a responder, Namuma Nanguti, the study was informed that:

Ethno-regional disparities in Kenya, economic inequalities and marginalisation can be explained from a number of perspectives: The first is a nature based explanation where the origins of regional disparities are seen as the result of the migratory patterns of the various ethnic groups and differences in economic and resource endowment of the various regions that each group settled, as well as, the manner in which each group's cultural practices influenced capitalist penetration in the regions in which it settled. Weather and climatic conditions the settled regions continue to play an important role as well. Each community, therefore, settled in areas suitable to continue their practices.

That led a pastoralist life settled in areas with abundant grazing land, where they could raise their animals. Cultivators settled in areas with rich fertile soils for their crops. Some communities settled in arid and semi-arid areas while others settled in more fertile areas. Fish eaters settled alongside rivers or near lakes. Similarly, while some communities settled in resource rich regions, others settled in resource scarcity regions. Therefore, much of the marginalization and inequalities seen in Kenya have their roots in the migratory and settlement patterns of the various communities.

The second is a class-based explanation. Marginalization inequalities and other aspects of disparities have a class dimension as well. For example, according to Ogot, the distribution of the 1.2 million acres of land taken from the departing settlers with financing from the British government, the World Bank and the Colonial Development Fund and meant to settle families in the 1960s ended up being transferred to wealthy Africans organised in partnerships or limited liability companies, giving rise to a new land policy in Kenya that was based on class rather than race. The third explanation is in terms of access to public services such as education and health care provided by the government.

Indeed, access to education is particularly important to understanding the perpetration of inequalities since independence. While ascertaining this fact, a respondent, Asbon Matasi, affirmed to the study that:

Education has been universally accepted as the basis for material advancement and for enhancing one's prospects in employment, job advancement, salary and even status. Therefore, those communities that had access to schools, and those students who had access to high cost schools, had an advantage over the rest. In this regard, the education system reproduced, not altered, the economic, social and political structures inherited at independence. During the colonial period, education was used as an important instrument of discrimination and exclusion. Furthermore, education in Kenya was characterised by both segregated schools as well inequality in terms of quality, content, curriculum and infrastructure. European schools were better equipped, had better infrastructure, better teachers, more books and greater government spending than African ones. Although these formerly European schools were opened up to Africans, they were nevertheless made high cost, meaning that only the children of the emerging African elites could access them thanks to the high fees charged. These schools were also found in or near Nairobi and, therefore, only a few students knew of their existence.

Furthermore, the explanation of ethno-regional disparities, marginalization and other inequalities in Kenya are related to the state, the struggles to control the state and other institutions of the state as well as the state's discriminatory and exclusionary policies that were meant to either provide advantages to certain communities and regions or to discriminate against others. This observation was ascertained by another respondent, Simiyu Sharon, that:

This has taken a number of forms: First, political patronage and other policies pursued by successive governments in Kenya (including the colonial state) tended to provide state resources in such a skewed manner that they benefited mostly those that controlled the state and/ or certain regions. Second, the appointment and recruitment of state officers, which had favoured certain regions and ethnic groups since independence, gave regional disparities an ethnic basis. Third, disparities have been perpetuated by the unfair system of representation, which has seen certain areas being over-represented while others are grossly under-represented. This is because the creation of areas or units of parliamentary representation (constituencies as they are known in Kenya) was not based on population size or the size of territory but had, since independence, depended on the arbitrariness of the president.

Marginalisation, inequalities and other forms of disparities have also been the result of ethnicity and ethnic-based politics, which have since colonialism been a central basis of discrimination. Ethno-regional disparities and marginalisation

have been exacerbated by the discriminatory nature in which: the cabinet membership and other senior positions in government, the public sector and parastatal bodies have been allocated the discriminatory nature of public spending, especially the manner in which the government financed infrastructural development and other big contracts were awarded; national resource endowments; political patronage and corruption, bureaucratic discretion and elite excesses. Furthermore, the study established that, the latter reasons have influenced the manner in which public resources have been disproportionately used to provide public services such as education and health, which have exacerbated inequalities and marginalisation. Moreover, marginalisation and economic inequalities were (and still are) rife in different regions. Another respondent, David Obiri, informed the research study that:

Indeed, in almost every region in Kenya, besides the broader regional cleavages, there have been local social, economic and political divisions, which provided the basis for factionalisation, marginalization and inequalities even within regions and ethnic groups. Even in Central Province, the better-off region in Kenya, landlessness has remained a common feature of life in many parts.

It was noted, Kenya's political economy was molded by colonialism in which most of what was produced in Kenya was exported to Europe but the proceeds never returned to develop the country's economy or its people. Based on the preceding finding, a respondent, Jackson Kepue, informed the researcher that,

Colonialism also created a dual state in Kenya in which European settlers were provided with large fertile tracts of land while Africans were confined to reserves to be sources of cheap labour. In the segregated system, settlers were provided with the means and opportunities for accumulation, while Africans were denied the same. Segregation in the White Highlands did not just separate Europeans and Africans; Africans in the reserves were also segregated from one another, where they were treated differently, depending on their perceived level of cooperation. Those communities that cooperated with the colonial administration were treated better than those that resisted. The colonial state was also an "exclusionary" and "segregationist" one.

This report from Kepue, informed the research that, State sanctioned segregation and exclusion, or what Mamdani calls the 'bifurcated state', was replicated in the major towns where racial segregation went hand in hand with the ethnicisation of African settlements and reserves. The imposition of colonial rule in Kenya entailed a process of Westernization and capitalist penetration of the African economy, which saw the replacement of the African mode of production by a capitalist one and the integration of African economies into the Western capitalist system but in an exploitative and segregated manner that disadvantaged the former. From the duo, an FGD informed this study that:

Those areas of Kenya such as Central region and Nyanza region, which were penetrated earlier by capitalism and Western influences developed much earlier than those places where colonisation and Westernisation did not penetrate. Inequalities and marginalisation in Kenya, therefore, came into being as a result of the uneven penetration of capitalism and Western influence in the country with the onslaught of colonialism. The colonial government concentrated development only in a number of selected regions such as Central Kenya (Kiambu, Nyeri and Murang'a), Eastern (Machakos and Meru); Western (Kakamega and Bungoma); Nyanza (Kisumu and Kisii); and a few urban areas, namely, Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu and Nakuru. This left vast areas in the Rift Valley, Coast and North Eastern provinces undeveloped. These areas lagged behind in education, infrastructure and agricultural development, despite many of them being ideal for agriculture.

Thus, at independence, some parts of Kenya were "highly economically developed and modern, while others were still using indigenous modes of production". According to Ogot:

The uneven development under colonialism corresponded to and had been intersected by regional, ethnic and class factors. Due to their early and more intense penetration by capitalism, Central Province and parts of Nyanza developed much faster than the rest of Kenya. When the State of Emergency was declared and the development of Kikuyu regions slowed down, the Luo petty bourgeoisie and political elite took over the leadership of the nationalist movement, which also entrenched the Luo politically by the time of independence.

However, it was further noted that, owing to the disagreements between Jaramogi Oginga Odinga and Kenyatta, which ended in the former leaving KANU and founding the Kenya Peoples' Union, the Luo were subsequently marginalised politically and were, therefore, unable to control important institutions of the state. This explains their political marginalisation, especially in the post-1970 period. A respondent confirmed this stand by pointing out that:

In the Rift Valley and Coast regions, capitalism and colonialism was less developed and the petty-bourgeois classes much smaller and more vulnerable than their Central Province counterparts. Unlike the Luo, the Kalenjin of the Rift Valley lived in close proximity to the White Highlands and feared the possibility of the Kikuyu claiming the White Highlands or even "colonising" them once independence was gained.

Therefore, according to Ogot, this fear was fuelled by the tens of thousands of landless Kikuyu agitating for land in the area, as well as ongoing inflammatory speeches by radical Kikuyu leaders. Similar fears faced the coastal peoples who were afraid of being dominated by upcountry peoples, who already formed the bulk of the labour force in the region. The study

discovered that, according to Ogot, the coastal peoples, who had previously been dominated by the Arabs, were especially afraid of being dominated by the upcountry people as well. Based on the preceding argument, it was discovered by the study, through an oral source, Kelvin Ochola posited that:

This fear, to a large extent, was the reason the nomadic peoples of the Rift Valley, together with other minority groups, formed the Kenya African Democratic Union to compete with the Kenya African National Union that represented the interests of the more dominant ethnic groups. Colonial segregation created a racially tiered society in which Europeans and other colonial administrators were at the top of the pyramid, Asians (Indians, Pakistanis and Goans) and Arabs occupied the second tier, while Africans occupied the bottom level. While Europeans had all the privileges, Africans had none and were forced to work with little or no pay for the Europeans. Though Asians and Arabs did not have many privileges, they were nevertheless allowed to freely trade and engage in small businesses.

Therefore, Africans also had the privileged among them including teachers, clerks, lawyers, skilled workers, nurses and domestic workers. It was this group of Africans that was to later lead the nationalist movement. Additionally, another respondent, reiterated that:

At independence, these groups of petty bourgeoisie, in collaboration with the ruling elites, would use the state as an instrument for further accumulation. Further marginalisation of Africans occurred when they were denied access and participation in the profitable cash and export crop production as a way of forcing them to work for the settlers. The colonial administration also denied Africans commercial credits and alienated their land, which greatly limited African agricultural production and access to fresh land.

Further marginalisation of Africans was ensured through the introduction of Hut and Poll taxes which impoverished many and forced many young productive Africans to work in the settlers for little or no pay. In the article, *Governance Institutions and Inequality in Kenya*, Karuti Kanyinga points to the existence of a relationship between ethnicity and resource distribution and therefore, between ethno-regional imbalances and development in Kenya. Kanyinga shows the disparity in terms of development between and among the eight former provinces of Kenya and since some of the regions are home to a numerically large group, he concludes that there is ethno-regional disparity in development in Kenya. This means that some regions and ethnic groups are collectively poorer than others in that they have fewer opportunities to improve their wellbeing and enjoy fewer services while others are generally better off and have more opportunities. Looked at from a national perspective, the study discovered through an oral source that:

Central region is on the whole better off than the other provinces in terms of wealth and opportunities, while North Eastern and Coast region seem to have the least opportunities and are the poorest. The two provinces have the least opportunities and the lowest access to basic services for their people.

Kanyinga has presented data to show that marginalisation, inequalities and other disparities in Kenya can be explained in terms of a region's access or proximity to power and institutions of power. With data from four institutions, namely: Parliament, the Cabinet, the Judiciary and the public sector (Permanent Secretaries, the provincial administration, public corporations and parastatals), Kanyinga demonstrates a pattern of appointments to these positions in which regions where the powerful in government come from have benefitted more. In fact, Kanyinga points out that the four regimes that have governed Kenya the colonial government, the Kenyatta, Moi and the Kibaki regimes, deliberately favoured certain regions in appointments to key government positions. Kanyinga argues that inequalities in governance institutions have been an integral part of Kenya's social-political life. The study noted that:

First, inequalities in the composition and staffing of Kenya governance positions are the result of ethnicity and attempts by the governing elite to consolidate power by locking out members from other ethnic groups. Second, parliamentary seats are inequitably distributed among the main ethnic groups and that population size is not the main factor determining the number of seats a region or community will have.

From Kanyinga's work, the manner in which the distribution of seats has been done was deliberately constructed to over-represent those regions or communities from where the incumbent President comes. Since Moi came to power, the numerically smaller communities (Maasai, Turkana, Samburu and Somali) have also been over-represented in terms of parliamentary seats. Thus, appointments did not necessarily favour any one particular ethnic group or region to the total exclusion of others. Kanyinga's data reveal a number of interesting observations and paradoxes in the people and regions advantaged by incumbency. In service provision, Nairobi and Central provinces have a higher roads density than other areas while in terms of access to water, Nairobi, Central and Coast provinces had more people connected to piped water by 1989 than any other province. A similar phenomenon is observed in enrolments into primary school. Although Central Province has had some of the highest enrolment, its numbers are declining. Nairobi, Eastern and Western provinces had the highest growth

rate between 1979 and 2001, while Central Province had the lowest during the period. Therefore, as per this study, an important paradox in Kanyinga's findings is that minorities are not seriously marginalised in governance institutions. In Parliament, there is evidence that minorities are in fact more represented than the numerically large groups. This is because, during the Moi regime, conditions were created in which the minorities were put in relatively more senior positions in proportions that were higher than their share of the country's population. Kanyinga's findings clearly show that it is the large ethnic groups that were marginalised, especially if the number of positions they controlled was compared to the share of the incumbent. Therefore, the findings above are in tandem with pragmatism and The Relative Deprivation Theory. It was found by the study that Pragmatism philosophy emphasizes practical consequences and real-world outcomes in decision-making and problem-solving. In the context of Kenya's challenges, a pragmatic approach calls for solutions that address the immediate needs of marginalized communities while also considering the long-term implications.

This philosophy encourages policymakers to prioritize tangible actions that deliver measurable results, such as investing in infrastructure and education in underserved regions, rather than solely focusing on ideological or theoretical debates. The Relative Deprivation Theory provides valuable insights into the social dynamics underlying inequalities and disparities. According to this theory, feelings of deprivation arise when individuals perceive a gap between their expectations and their actual circumstances relative to others. In Kenya, where stark economic disparities exist between different ethnic groups and regions, the Relative Deprivation Theory helps explain why marginalized communities may feel disenfranchised despite national efforts at development. It underscores the importance of not only addressing material inequalities but also addressing the subjective experiences of injustice and exclusion. Together, pragmatism philosophy and the Relative Deprivation Theory offer a nuanced understanding of the complexities surrounding marginalization, inequalities, and disparities in Kenya. By embracing a pragmatic approach that acknowledges the subjective experiences of deprivation among marginalized groups, policymakers can develop more effective strategies to promote social inclusion, economic empowerment, and sustainable development. This requires not only addressing immediate needs but also fostering a sense of fairness and equity in society, ultimately laying the foundation for a more prosperous and harmonious Kenya.

Government Policies to Deal with Marginalisation

At independence, Kenya inherited a system with unequal distribution of services skewed in favour of prosperous areas. It was further noted by the researcher that, Europeans dominated virtually all positions in the civil service and were also the dominant class in industry, professions and commerce, although in the latter sector there was a number of Asian and Arab competitors. Rural and urban inequalities in resource allocation and development were also noticeable, as were gender inequalities. Successive regimes have attempted to address these inequalities with mixed results. The research article was further informed by a focus group discussion in Bosongo - Kisii that, indeed:

Since independence, Kenya's development strategy has been anchored on Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965 on "African Socialism and its Application to Planning in Kenya", and which has served as Kenya's development bible for decades. Sessional Paper No. 10 aimed to remove the inequalities inherited from the colonial period. It stated as follows: "The state has an obligation to ensure equal opportunity to all its citizens, eliminate exploitation and discrimination and (will) provide the needed social services such as education, medical care and social security". In African Socialism, the government committed itself to guaranteeing every citizen, poor or rich, full and equal political and economic rights to ensure the participation of every person in the running of the country, and that Kenya's resources would be used to benefit all Africans. The government also committed itself to train, educate and to mobilise all Kenyans to fully participate in the country's development. To develop the country, the government committed itself to improve key strategic and essential infrastructure and services, such as harbours, principal roads, railways, airways, broadcasting and telecommunications.

However, the manner in which these services were provided was not equitable and favoured certain areas, while other areas were opened up for more exploitation and investments. During Kenyatta's rule, infrastructure development targeted tea and coffee growing areas in his Central Province while neglecting most other areas, particularly North Eastern Province. His successor, Daniel arap Moi, pursued policies that targeted grain growers in his native Rift Valley. Kenyan policy makers adopted a laissez-faire development approach that did not concern itself with alleviating regional disparities in development, including education. Based on the preceding findings, a responder, Peace Chepchumba, informed this study that:

Since parents contributed significantly to the cost of education, it meant that certain communities had more access to education than others, thus increasing the marginalisation of those without adequate schools. This shifted the burden of meeting the cost of schooling to parents, which meant that education was increasingly becoming a preserve of the rich. With the help of donor funding, a number of boarding schools were constructed in marginalised areas.

In 1983, a quota system of admission was introduced at the district level to ensure local students had access to district schools. However, by the 1990s, disparities in the education system continued, especially in the arid and semi-arid areas. The Kenyatta government was more interested in growth and economic development in general than it was in redistribution. Hence, although at independence the Kenyan economy grew at a fairly steady pace, the benefits of this growth were enjoyed by a small number of elites and communities. In the 1980s, however, the Kenyan economy stagnated and Moi's conflicts with the donor community denied his government foreign aid. In conclusion, as part of the Structural Adjustment Programs, the government had to reduce public spending, forcing Moi to rely on domestic resources. The government introduced cost-sharing in the provision of public services, which disadvantaged the same marginalised people that were being protected. This was made worse by natural calamities that affected the country in 1983-5, especially, drought and famine that reduced maize, wheat and dairy production. The drought caused severe shortages, forcing the government to spend more on importation of essential goods, which took away resources that could have been used in marginalised areas. In the realm of government policies aimed at addressing marginalization, pragmatism philosophy and the Relative Deprivation Theory offer valuable perspectives to inform effective strategies. Pragmatism philosophy emphasizes the importance of practical consequences and real-world outcomes in decision-making. Applied to government policies, this philosophy calls for approaches that prioritize tangible improvements in the lives of marginalized communities. Rather than adhering rigidly to ideological principles, policymakers should adopt measures that have a measurable impact on reducing disparities and enhancing social inclusion. For instance, instead of focusing solely on broad-based economic reforms, pragmatism suggests targeted interventions such as affirmative action programs or community development projects that directly benefit marginalized groups.

Meanwhile, the Relative Deprivation Theory sheds light on the subjective experiences of marginalization and inequality. According to this theory, individuals feel deprived when they perceive a gap between their expectations and their actual circumstances relative to others. In the context of government policies, understanding the subjective nature of deprivation is crucial for designing interventions that address not only material needs but also the underlying sense of injustice and exclusion. Policies that incorporate participatory approaches, community engagement, and feedback mechanisms can help ensure that the voices and experiences of marginalized groups are taken into account.

By integrating pragmatism philosophy and the Relative Deprivation Theory into government policies, policymakers can develop more effective strategies to deal with marginalization. This involves adopting practical measures that deliver concrete improvements in the lives of marginalized communities while also addressing the subjective dimensions of deprivation and inequality. Ultimately, by embracing these frameworks, governments can foster greater social cohesion, promote inclusive development, and advance towards a more equitable society.

Africanisation and Inequalities in Kenya

The first important undertaking of the government was to ensure that the Kenyan economy and civil service, which had hitherto been dominated by European settlers and administrators, came under the control of Africans. A responder, Benard Juma, interviewed by the researcher retorted that:

This was done through legislation, licensing, the establishment of state corporations to provide finances as well as appointments to key positions in government and industry. Specialised government corporations (parastatals) were established to provide Africans with the necessary resources to fully participate in economic development. The Kenya National Trading Corporation handled import and export trade, the Agricultural Finance Corporation provided credit to Africans to buy and rehabilitate large scale farms, and the Industrial and Commercial Development Corporation provided industrial credit and other loans for development.

The Industrial and Commercial Development Corporation was to be the main vehicle for the government's participation in industry. Although these corporations enabled Africans to get a firm grip on the economy, the people controlling them and those that benefitted from their funding were disproportionately drawn from a select pool of elites or regions closely identified with the regime in power. As discovered by Ochieng, it was discovered that:

The credit from the Industrial and Commercial Development Corporation and AFC was skewed to benefit entrepreneurs from the political elite that controlled the state. As a result, the Africanisation of the Kenyan economy and civil service ended up benefiting President Kenyatta's close associates and kinsmen. As the International Labour Organisation (1972) and World Bank (1975) reports point out, Africanisation of jobs in the public sector and the transfer of farms and businesses to the Kenyan petty bourgeoisie and peasants in the first decade of independence "had only amounted to the replacement of a few Europeans, but this did not fundamentally alter the structure of the former colonial economy".

By the end of the Kenyatta era, "significant portions of the Kenya population still remained on the fringes of society". They felt deprived of a place of dignity in national life by barriers of class, ethnicity, gender or even geography. On the other hand, many Kenyans who were already enjoying the fruits of independence were reluctant or even opposed to sharing their fortunes with the disadvantaged groups. When Moi came to power, his first priority was to try to correct this. In the first decade of his administration, President Moi "designed, and implemented social, economic and political programmes aimed at incorporating those who were rapidly becoming alienated from the mainstream of national development." This included North Eastern Province, whose inhabitants did not feel they belonged to Kenya. Moi also mainstreamed other groups such as women, jua kali workers and the disabled into the national social and economic system. Through archival data interrogated by the research, the study was clearly informed that:

Moi adopted distributive policies that targeted the marginalised and minority communities as well those in rural areas. Harking back to the KADU policies of a devolved system of government (Majimbo) which Moi had pushed for as party leader at independence, as President, he introduced the District Focus for Rural Development to empower local communities at the beginning of the 1983 financial year. Under the District Focus strategy, planning for rural areas shifted from Nairobi to the districts. This was also meant to "broaden the base of rural development and encourage local initiatives in order to improve problem identification, resource mobilisation and project implementation".

Moi also created new areas of representation as well as new administrative units in an attempt to "bring government closer to the people" and reduce the historical marginalisation in the country. Moi also reached out to communities that had *hitherto* been marginalised. The study was informed by an oral source that:

His agricultural policies also shifted away from Kenyatta's, which had aimed at benefiting tea and coffee farmers in Central Province, to grain and cereal growers in the Rift Valley. In addition to providing the necessary infrastructure in the region, the Moi government placed Rift Valley elites in charge of the agricultural sector to facilitate the importation of cheaper inputs to the agriculture sector for distribution to farmers. Moi's redistributive policies switched resources from the cash/export crop growers (tea and coffee) in Central Province to grain growers (wheat, maize and beans) in the Rift Valley. Moi also tried to open up hitherto marginalised areas to cash crops to spur faster development. For example, Moi started tea plantations in Rift Valley and Western provinces, which were not traditionally tea growing regions. Moi also saw the expansion of university education and the construction of public and private universities among marginalised communities and regions.

Further, Moi introduced the District Focus for Rural Development, which was meant to not only decentralize development but also to make the district the centre of resource allocation. Additionally, Moi also tried to open up many of the marginalized areas through the construction of roads, telecommunications network and health facilities. The construction of the Eldoret International Airport and the tarmacking of a number of road networks in Rift Valley Province stood out in this regard. This was, however, overdone - with Rift Valley Province receiving the lion's share of funds for roads and health centers. However, even with this, a number of other areas remained marginalized. In fact, questions have been asked as to whether Moi acted as he did to ensure a more equitable distribution of public resources or for political reasons to favour his community. This is because, as we have seen, Moi tended to concentrate development in the Rift Valley, although he also tried to open up other hitherto marginalized regions. Secondly, by establishing universities outside Nairobi and Central Province, Moi ensured that even marginalized communities and regions had access to an important resource- university motivated small economies of consumption. In grappling with the complex dynamics of Africanization and inequalities in Kenya, the philosophical frameworks of pragmatism and the Relative Deprivation Theory offer insightful lenses through which to understand and address these issues. Pragmatism philosophy, with its emphasis on practical consequences and real-world outcomes, provides a pragmatic approach to tackling inequalities within the context of Africanization. In the pursuit of Africanization policies, such as promoting indigenous leadership and ownership of the economy, pragmatism suggests prioritizing measures that yield tangible improvements in the lives of all Kenyans, regardless of ethnicity.

This could involve initiatives aimed at enhancing access to education, healthcare, and economic opportunities for historically marginalized communities. By focusing on concrete actions that deliver meaningful results, policymakers can ensure that Africanization efforts translate into tangible benefits for all citizens, thereby reducing inequalities. The Relative Deprivation Theory offers additional insights into the underlying dynamics of inequalities within the framework of Africanization. According to this theory, individuals experience feelings of deprivation when they perceive a gap between their expectations and their actual circumstances relative to others. In the context of Africanization, disparities in access to resources, opportunities, and political power can exacerbate feelings of relative deprivation among marginalized communities. Recognizing and addressing these subjective experiences of injustice and exclusion is crucial for promoting social cohesion and inclusive development. By integrating pragmatism philosophy and the Relative Deprivation Theory into efforts to address

Africanization and inequalities in Kenya, policymakers can develop more effective strategies that prioritize practical outcomes and address the subjective experiences of deprivation. This involves implementing policies that not only promote indigenous leadership and ownership but also ensure equitable access to resources and opportunities for all Kenyans. Through such holistic approaches, Kenya can move towards a more inclusive and equitable society where Africanization contributes to shared prosperity and social cohesion.

Conclusion

Ethnic fragmentation has played a significant role in shaping the trajectory of economic development in Kenya since its independence in 1963. The country's diverse ethnic makeup, while a source of cultural richness, has also been a catalyst for marginalization, inequalities, and disparities. These challenges have posed formidable obstacles to achieving sustained and inclusive economic growth. Marginalization in Kenya has been deeply entrenched, with certain ethnic groups facing systemic exclusion from political power, economic opportunities, and social services. Historically marginalized communities, such as the Luo, Luhya, and Kalenjin, have often borne the brunt of this marginalization, perpetuating cycles of poverty and underdevelopment. Despite efforts by successive governments to address these disparities, progress has been slow and uneven. Government policies aimed at tackling marginalization have been implemented over the years, including affirmative action programs and initiatives to promote equal representation in government and public institutions. However, these policies have often fallen short of their intended impact, hampered by corruption, nepotism, and political patronage. As a result, marginalized communities continue to face barriers to accessing basic services and economic opportunities. The concept of Africanization, which sought to promote indigenous leadership and ownership of the economy, has also had mixed results in addressing inequalities in Kenya. While it aimed to dismantle the legacy of colonialism and promote economic empowerment among Kenyans of all ethnicities, it has sometimes reinforced ethnic divisions and favoritism, particularly in the allocation of land and resources.

References

- Bangura, Yusuf. "Ethnicity, inequality and the public sector: a comparative study." United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva.
<http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UNTC/UNPAN018646.pdf> (2005).
- Bedasso, Biniam E. "For richer, for poorer: why ethnicity often trumps economic cleavages in Kenya." *Review of African Political Economy* 44, no. 151 (2017): 10-29.
- Bozeman, Barry. *Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism*. Georgetown University Press, 2007, p.72.
- Burns, Tom. "Relative deprivation and social justice. A study of attitudes to social inequality in twentieth-century England." (1966): 430-434.
- Chimakonam, Jonathan O. *Ezumezu: A system of logic for African philosophy and studies*. Springer, 2019.
- Cooksey, Brian, David Court and Ben Makau. "Education for self-reliance and Harambee." *Beyond Capitalism Vs. Socialism in Kenya and Tanzania* (1994).
- Du Plessis, Hester Jeffrey Sehume and Leonard Martin, *Concept and application of transdisciplinarity in intellectual discourse and research*. Real African Publishers, 2014.
- Helsper, Ellen Johanna. "The social relativity of digital exclusion: Applying relative deprivation theory to digital inequalities." *Communication Theory* 27, no. 3 (2017): 223-242.
- Himbara, David. *Kenyan capitalists, the state, and development*. East African Publishers, 1994, p.43.
- Juma, Peter. "The role of community participation in the district focus for rural development planning strategy: A case study of Busia district Kenya." PhD diss., 2005.

- Kanyinga, Karuti. "Ethnicity, Patronage and Class in a Local Arena: "High "and "Low "politics in Kiambu, Kenya, 1982–92." *The New Local Level Politics in East Africa* 66 (1994).
- Kanyinga, Karuti. "Governance Institutions and Inequality in Kenya." *Readings on Inequality in Kenya: Sectoral Dynamics and Perspectives* (2007).
- Khabele, Matlosa. "Pouring salt into the Wound: the Crisis of International Election Observation and COVID-19 in Africa." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 56, no. 8 (2021): 1967-1981.
- Kipyegon, Arap Sigei Francis. "The District Focus for Development Strategy in Kenya: A case of Decentralization and the Changing Role of the Generalist Field Administration." PhD diss., 2015.
- KNA, DC/NN/2/4: North Nyanza Handing over Reports, 1955
- Mamdani, Mahmood. "Indirect rule, civil society, and ethnicity: The African dilemma." *Social Justice* 23, no. 1/2 (63-64 (1996): 145-150.
- Mertens, Donna M. and T. Wilson Amy. *Program evaluation theory and practice*. Guilford Publications, 2018.
- Mfum-Mensah, Obed. *Education marginalization in sub-Saharan Africa: Policies, politics, and marginality*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2018.
- Moja, Teboho. "Nigeria education sector analysis: An analytical synthesis of performance and main issues." *World Bank Report* 3 (2000): 46-56.
- Mulongo, Godfrey. "Inequality in accessing higher education in Kenya; Implications for economic development and well-being." *International journal of humanities and social science* 3, no. 16 (2013): 49-61.
- Nafziger, E. Wayne and John C. Yoder. "The economics of development." In *Mennonites and Post-Colonial African Studies*, Routledge, 2021, pp. 114-127.
- Ndirangu, Mwaura. *Kenya today: Breaking the yoke of colonialism in Africa*. Algora Publishing, 2005.
- Nyamu, Irene Katunge. "Child Protection Responses and Transformative Social Protection in Kenya and South Africa: Can social grants improve the wellbeing of children affected by violence and neglect?." (2023).
- Nyaura, Jasper Edward. "Devolved ethnicity in the Kenya: Social, economic and political perspective." *European Review of Applied Sociology* 11, no. 16 (2018): 17-26.
- Ochieng, William Robert. *Decolonization & [and] Independence in Kenya: 1940-93*. East African Publishers, 1995.
- Oginga Odinga, *Not yet uhuru*. Vol. 38. East African Publishers, 1995.
- Omulo, Albert Gordon Otieno. "Ethnicity, governance and socio-economic development in Africa: A case study of Kenya and its Luo community, 1963-2013." (2017).
- Pentland, Brian T. "Building process theory with narrative: From description to explanation." *Academy of management Review* 24, no. 4 (1999): 711-724.
- Rahman, H. U. and W. A. Runciman. "A crystal field calculation in uranium dioxide." *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids* 27, no. 11-12 (1966): 1833-1835.
- Reid, Robin S. Kathleen A. Galvin and Russell S. Kruska. "Global significance of extensive grazing lands and pastoral societies: an introduction." In *Fragmentation in semi-arid and arid landscapes: Consequences for human and natural systems*, pp. 1-24. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2008.
- Robin M. Williams, "Relative deprivation." In *The idea of social structure*, Routledge, 2017, pp. 355-378.

Rono, Joseph Kipkemboi. "The impact of the structural adjustment programmes on Kenyan society." *Journal of social development in Africa* 17, no. 1 (2002): 81-98.

Ross Gillard, Carolyn Snell and Mark Bevan. "Advancing an energy justice perspective of fuel poverty: Household vulnerability and domestic retrofit policy in the United Kingdom." *Energy Research & Social Science* 29 (2017): 53-61.

Stren, Richard and Mario, Polese. "Understanding the new sociocultural dynamics of cities: Comparative urban policy in a global context." *The social sustainability of cities: diversity and the management of change* (2000): 3-38.

T. B., H. A. Snyman, Solomon and G. N. Smit. "Cattle-rangeland management practices and perceptions of pastoralists towards rangeland degradation in the Borana zone of southern Ethiopia." *Journal of environmental management* 82, no. 4 (2007): 481-494.

Thuo, Lucianna and Caroline, Kioko. "Marginalisation in Kenya in historical perspective (1963-2021): The starts, false starts and the last promise." Kabarak University, 2023.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge their sources of information, peer reviewers who moved fast enough in reading the research article and offering useful ideas, and the editorial reviews who helped in reshaping this research article.

Ethical Pledge

The researchers confirm that they followed full ethical considerations and acknowledged their sources appropriately without plagiarizing or duplicating other people's works.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no financial or personal relationships or undue interests that may have inappropriately influenced them in writing this research article.

Author(s) Contributions

The researchers acknowledges that they are the sole authors of this research article.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this research article are those of the authors and not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated agency of the authors or the Journal itself.

Ethical Considerations Statement

This article followed all ethical standards for research without direct contact with human or animal subjects. No ethical clearance was needed and/or required for this article.