Pathway into wealth and out of poverty
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Introduction
Pastoral counties of northern Kenya, just like all other pastoral areas, tend to be poorer compared to other parts of the country. These areas have low development indicators and high incidences of poverty (Republic of Kenya, 2012). This makes alleviation of poverty in the dry lands a key policy issue (Nyariki et al., 2002). Peoples' individual strivings for economic advancement, and their view on public policy is greatly influenced by their perception about causes of poverty, availability and opportunities of wealth creation (Kluegel and Smith, 2017). People view wealth as a product of individual effort or as a result of selective access to opportunities for a few due to structural barriers (Hunt, 2004). Peoples' beliefs about causes of poverty have a practical implication for the legitimacy and viability of anti-poverty policies (Van Oorschot and Halman, 2000).

Materials and Methods
The study was conducted in Turkana and Mandera counties in Kenya (see map). Mandera is situated in the north-eastern part of Kenya and it borders Somalia and Ethiopia. It has three main livelihood zones: a pastoral economy zone on the eastern side, an agro-pastoral economy zone on the western side and an irrigation zone on the northern end along the Dua River. Turkana County borders Uganda to the West, Sudan and Ethiopia to the North, Samburu and Marsabit Counties to the East and to the South it borders Baringo and West Pokot Counties. The main socio-economic activity in the County is nomadic pastoralism. A multi stage sampling approach derived 300 and 360 households in Mandera and Turkana Counties respectively. Households were grouped in wealth categories using information generated in Focus Group Discussions carried out in 10 villages and 13 villages in Mandera and Turkana respectively.

Results
Stages of progress among Turkana and Mandera pastoral communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth category</th>
<th>Turkana</th>
<th>Mandera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Poor            | 1. Buys food  
2. Buys clothes 
3. Buys one goat 
4. Increases goats up to 20 
5. Marries 
6. Builds a shelter 
7. Buys one donkey 
8. Buys a camel 
9. Buys one cow  | 1. Afford one meal a day  
2. Buy clothes for the family 
3. Own few animals (some chicken, 3 goats or 3 sheep) 
4. Take children to primary school 
5. Make own makeshift house (Herio) 
6. Make an improved better house (Harish) 
7. Buys a donkey or young cow |
| Average         | 1. Increases sheep/goats up to 150 
2. Increases number of camels up to 5-10 
3. Increases number of cows up to 6-8 
4. Pays dowry for the first wife according to Turkana customs 
5. Marries out the first daughter  | 1. Take children to secondary school 
2. Buy a farming land along the river 
3. Buy a plot in Mandera town 
4. Take children to paid tertiary colleges |
| Rich            | 1. Increases number of sheep/goats up to 400 
2. Increases number of camels up to 15 
3. Increases number of cattle up to 15 
4. Increases number of donkeys up to 10 
5. Marries a second wife  | 1. Buys a second hand vehicle 
2. Buys and transports livestock to other markets for sale 
3. Makes pilgrimage to Mecca 
4. Buys modern high class vehicle 
5. Settles the family in urban centre |

Conclusions and Implications
Pastoral households in both Turkana and Mandera counties follow similar pathways to move out of poverty, in which accumulation of livestock is pivotal. However, once they pass the poverty line, the two communities pursue different pathways. Immediately they cross the poverty line, the Turkana emphasize accumulation of livestock through all the stages of progression, while the Somali of Mandera focus on diversification into non-livestock strategies.

In undertaking poverty reduction interventions, a blanket strategy may not work across all the communities. To be successful, the peculiarities of the community and their perceptions must guide poverty reduction strategies.
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