

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The Making of the Entrepreneur in Tanzania: experimenting with neo-liberal power through discourses of partnership, entrepreneurship, and participatory education

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6cj0p3dh>

Author

Boner, Elizabeth Helene

Publication Date

2011

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

The Making of the “Entrepreneur” in Tanzania: experimenting with neo-liberal power
through discourses of partnership, entrepreneurship, and participatory education

By

Elizabeth Helene Boner

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Education

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Claire Kramsch, Education, Chair

Professor Sarah Freedman

Professor Frances Vavrus

Professor Michael Watts

Spring 2011

The Making of the “Entrepreneur” in Tanzania: experimenting with neo-liberal power through discourses of partnership, entrepreneurship, and participatory education

© 2011

By Elizabeth Helene Boner

Abstract

The Making of the “Entrepreneur” in Tanzania: experimenting with neo-liberal power through discourses of partnership, entrepreneurship, and participatory education

by

Elizabeth Helene Boner

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Claire Kramsch, Chair

This study focused on educational efforts in Tanzania to use “partnership” to build the entrepreneurial capacity of those considered “left out” by globalization. In response to the perceived failures of previous efforts, many now argue that marginalized communities are uniquely well positioned to develop sustainable and socially relevant businesses if they can learn new entrepreneurial mindsets and partner with international actors to access missing capital, technology, and resources. Others warn that such partnerships will be inherently unequal and that rather than empowering citizens, entrepreneurial education actually imposes capitalist ideologies and produces entrepreneurial subjects who will serve, rather than contest, new forms of global neo-liberal governance (Rankin, 2001; Weber, 2006b).

My project demonstrates that the reality is rather more complex. Instead of asking whether entrepreneurial practices are either tyrannical or empowering, this research examined what actually happens when they are put into practice: for one year, I studied the efforts by an American development organization to work in partnership with a Tanzanian community to spread the ideas and practices of environmental entrepreneurship and build a green economy. Using methods of institutional ethnography and critical discourse analysis, I examined how American and Tanzanian “partners” each made sense of, negotiated, reshaped, or contested these discourses of partnership, entrepreneurship and participatory practices by observing how they constructed their partnership meetings and learning spaces.

To track the complexity of this process, I used a close linguistic analysis to reveal the many creative ways Tanzanians used global discourses of participation, partnership, and entrepreneurship: even as Tanzanians used entrepreneurial discourses to make claims on their American “partners” and to contest relations of inequality, the discourse of “equal partnership” prevented the Americans from listening to and engaging with the questions of inequality and relationship their Tanzanian “partners” sought to raise, thereby resulting in a renewal rather than a challenge to inequality. Moreover, the social positions of the least educated and poorest Tanzanian “partners” prevented them from accessing and making use of the resources, knowledge, and new language and literacy practices which were “made available” through global partnerships and de-centered

learning activities, thus reproducing and legitimizing, rather than overcoming inequalities, even as the discourse of “partnership” obscured this fact.

By illuminating the micro-linguistic practices in which entrepreneurial discourses and participatory practices were used to discipline educational subjects, this research brings the problem of global governance down to the level of the micro-practices by which actors at multiple scales articulate themselves in “partnership.” Through a close linguistic analysis of how actors actually made sense of, contested, and manipulated entrepreneurial discourses and practices, this study brings governmentality down to the ground level. Finally, by illuminating the subtle ways in which participatory and entrepreneurial practices potentially discipline the very subjects they were meant to empower, this study raises new questions and concerns for critical educators and contributes to our understanding of de-centered learning spaces especially in contexts of inequality.

Dedication

In honor of Tega members and their families,
Who inspired me to conduct this study.

In memory of Peter Kabimba,
whose leadership and commitment to social change was an inspiration throughout.

And in memory of my Zadie Rossen,
Whose many sacrifices made this educational achievement possible.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Research.....	1
1.1 Background to the Problem.....	1
1.2 Getting to Mlimani, Tanzania	4
1.3 Situating the Research Problem in Tanzania: “It’s Time to Change the Mindset!”	6
1.4 Defining the Object of Study: The Making of the Entrepreneur in Tanzania ..	13
1.5 Organization of the Dissertation.....	14
Chapter 2: Positioning the Research in Relation to the Literature	16
2.1 Introduction.....	16
2.2 Situating Entrepreneurship Within a Historical and Political Context.....	17
2.3 The Perspective of Critical Theorists.....	30
Chapter 3: Positioning the Researcher	45
3.1 Introduction.....	45
3.2 Rationale for Research Approach: Institutional Ethnography and Critical Discourse Analysis.....	46
3.3 Data Collection.....	47
3.4 Data Analysis	74
Chapter 4: Becoming “Partners”	79
4.1 Introduction.....	79
4.2 Eco-preneur and Saccos: Partners in Theory	80
4.3 Eco-Preneur and Saccos: Theorizing “Partners”	84
4.4 Eco-Preneur and Saccos: Partners in Practice	86
4.5 Producing and Contesting Partnership Through Language	89
4.6 Getting to Partnership.....	91
4.7 Data.....	95
Chapter 5: What’s in a Metaphor? “No Strings Attached”	109
5.1 Introduction.....	109
5.2 Linguistic Strategies for Discussing Money.....	112
5.3 The MEEP Community Partnership as a Site of Mediation.....	116
5.4 Living Within Contradictions	122
5.5 Conclusion	137
Chapter 6: Knowing the Market: A Conversation of Struggle	140
6.1 Introduction.....	140
6.2 Data.....	146
6.3 Discussion.....	170
Chapter 7: Conclusion	180
7.1 Returning to the Research Problematic and Questions.....	180
7.2 Significance and Suggestions for Future research.....	191
7.3 Limitations of Study	196
Bibliography	198

Acknowledgements

I owe the greatest thanks to the many people who participated in this study. Maria and Terisita of Saccos and Melissa and David of Eco-Preneur, I will forever be grateful for your permission to observe and record your meetings. Because you shared your vulnerabilities and challenges, the rest of us can learn from your challenging interactions. I also want to thank the many development practitioners, local government officials, entrepreneurship experts, and training participants who made time in their busy schedules to share their insights and organizational practices with me. To the farmers, produce sellers, and merchants of Mlimani, I thank you for your daily greetings, your incredible efforts to save special fruits and vegetables for me, and for showing me a different model of business based on hospitality, friendship, and loyalty.

This project would not have been possible without the unbelievable support and guidance of Adam Mkarafu, who taught me the meaning of *Tuko pamoja*; thank you for “being together” with me. I truly appreciate the many long hours you spent conducting this research, how you pointed out cultural norms that I had failed to observe, clued me in to occasions in which I was being ridiculed or cheated; and helped me physically and metaphorically across many slippery logs and around deep rain puddles in the dark. I couldn’t have done this without you.

I also wish to thank Mama Bankika, who opened her home to me, a complete stranger, for eight-months simply because I was a friend of her friend, modeling a very important lesson about the meaning and extensiveness of African friendship and hospitality. Your home was an oasis away from a long day of research and I have many fond memories of cooking together, sharing recipes, and telling stories.

I feel incredibly lucky to have met Toni Majembe a lecturer at the University of Dar es Salaam, who shares similar interests in Critical Discourse Analysis. I truly appreciate your incredible generosity—lending me your brand new computer when mine died, providing valuable feedback on my project, assisting me with translations and transcriptions, connecting me with Professors at UDSM, and helping me to find my way in Tanzania. I am also grateful for your family—your wife, Mama Helen, your brother, Ndurumah, and your children, Keya, Egebert, and Helen, for welcoming me like family to Dar es Salaam.

To my dear virtual friends: Hajj Mohammad Hajj, Richard Mollell, Andrew Mushi, Inessa Hadjivayanis, and the others from the Tanzanian listserve, this has been an amazing collaborative project across great distance. I truly appreciate all of your support, feedback, translation assistance, and engaging discussions about Ujamaa, Ujasiriamali, Education, and much much more.

To Ngesa, I am so thankful that like me, you were unable to force yourself on any of three overly crowded dala dalas leaving us with no other choice but to share a taxi together. I will never forget the healthy meals of brown rice, vegetables, and papaya you prepared for me in your apartment surrounded by your incredible library of rare revolutionary books.

And to the local tour guides of Amani: Severine Mallya, Godfrey Mathew, Africa, Adam Mkarafu, Abduel Kajiru, and Peter Kabimba. Thank you for teaching me everything I know about rural life in Tanzania. The times we spent planning Tega activities, teaching composting, traveling to Lushoto, and visiting your farms and your

families, were some of my most memorable experiences and keep me coming back time and time again.

I offer a very special thanks to Shedrick Mashauri, who has been a mentor to me for the past ten years. The questions and concerns that I raise in this dissertation were inspired by our many hours of discussion about local participation.

I feel fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with such a knowledgeable and supportive committee. To my advisor, Sarah Freedman, thank you for all of your support and guidance throughout my long journey as a doctoral student. I very much appreciated the interest you showed in my learning, your patience, and the confidence you had in my scholarship. To Claire Kramsch, I am quite sure that your incredible teaching, love of language, and attention to the most difficult and provocative social questions, inspired my interest in language and critical discourse analysis. I benefited greatly from the many social and intellectual spaces you created both within and beyond your classes. To Michael, thank you for asking difficult questions and providing insightful feedback that pushed my project in important ways. To Francis Vavrus, I can't thank you enough for your mentorship, your support during my time in Tanzania, the close readings of my dissertation proposal and dissertation draft, and your guidance at CIES and within the field of international education.

To Aaron, there may not be words to thank you for all of the support you have shown me throughout this dissertation process. Discussing my research and writing with you has been one of the most exciting interdisciplinary learning experiences of my life. I feel so fortunate to have been able to share every step of this writing journey with you.

I also want to thank Jean Lave for her support at particularly key moments. I am so thankful for our discussions and your interest in my project. Your commitment to social practice theory, learning, and people's everyday lives continues to be an inspiration to me.

I am also grateful for the support of my cohort who offered valuable feedback, insight, and support for many years. To Hodari Toure, I couldn't have done this without your encouragement and support. To my study buddies, Kathryn Young, Linn Posey, Charlie Carroll, Gabriela Segade, and Greta Kirschenbaum, Kathryn Moeller, Cecilia Lucas--struggling through this with you made it all the more fun. Rose Vilchez, you were there with me from the start and continue to be such a good friend even long distance.

I also want to thank my many friends and family who helped me to remember that there is life outside of graduate school. To Kathryn and Trish, Naila and Kia, Christi and Gabor, Rachel and Ben, thank you for inviting me into your homes when I was couch surfing, cooking numerous tasty meals, keeping me in a regular exercise and meditation routine, and most of all for your long-time friendships. Thank you to Margi, Calla, Terry, Maris, and Kathleen for always being there to talk through challenging situations and giving me much-needed perspective.

My family has been a constant source of support. Mom and Dad, I am so grateful that I had this opportunity to return home to live with you. The long walks on the beach, the delicious home cooked meals and conversation, and your consistent encouragement throughout helped me get to this final moment. To my grandmother--your phone calls, cards, and amazing words of support have sustained me for many years and I'm so happy to share this accomplishment with you. To Aly and Sharon, my dear sisters, and Jorge

my brother-in-law, thank you for sharing this long educational journey with me; and to Racquel and Ruben who were born and grew during this process, much love.

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Research

1.1 Background to the Problem

By the 1990s, few scholars and key actors in development institutions would deny that economic liberalization, global integration, and free trade, characteristic of structural adjustment programs implemented by the World Bank and IMF in the 1980's had not lived up to their promises. Especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, huge populations had failed to benefit and, in many cases, were experiencing even greater poverty. Following both massive protests throughout the world and internal critiques by some of its own key actors, global institutions like the World Bank and IMF suffered from what has now been widely seen as a "crisis in legitimacy."¹ The "Washington Consensus" which prescribed neo-liberal economic policies as standard reform throughout the developing world came to be pejoratively known as "market fundamentalism," while poverty became a new indicator for "market failure," and thus justification for new forms of state and NGO intervention.

Rather than challenge the principals of economic liberalization, however, many international development organizations attempted to retain legitimacy by expanding their narrow focus on economic growth and the liberalization of national economies to include a variety of related human development concerns, particularly poverty, gender inequality, environmental degradation, and education. In doing so, they have tended to re-locate both the problem and its solution onto the site of the local (Mohan & Stokke, 2000; Peet & Watts, 1993). One reason that economic liberalization might have produced disappointing results, they posited, could be that local communities were finding themselves ill prepared to compete in newly-globalized "knowledge" economies which, after all, require different forms of competency and relationship than the protected industrial economies of the past. As a result, development practitioners have come to place great new emphasis on education as a powerful means of addressing these concerns, "building capacity" by teaching local communities the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to successfully compete in global markets (Prahalad, 2006; Tanzania, 1997; United Republic of Tanzania, 2005a; World Bank, 2004)

More than merely a means of addressing "market failure," re-emphasizing the local has allowed both development and private business consultants to argue that marginalized communities are often uniquely well positioned to be successful entrepreneurs and should, for that reason, not need to depend on patronizing government and development institutions to meet their needs. By learning a new "entrepreneurial mindset,"² making use of locally available resources, and partnering with those who can provide missing capital, information, and technology, it is claimed that "local entrepreneurs" will be able to scale up innovative approaches to social problems

¹ most notably Joseph Stiglitz, the chief economist of the World Bank

² This is a term that I regularly heard used by NGO practitioners and entrepreneurship training facilitators within my research site and in several other civil society organizations through out the country.

(Bornstein & Davis, 2010b) and thereby realize untapped business opportunities (Prahalad, 2006).

Is this optimism well placed? Some scholars have argued that, rather than empowering the poor, multiple stakeholder partnerships geared around entrepreneurial development only impose capitalist ideologies and practices, aiming thereby to produce entrepreneurial subjects who will serve, rather than contest, new forms of global neo-liberal governance (Fernando, 2006; Rankin, 2001; Weber, 2006b). Leon Tikly for example, warns that “what we are witnessing on a global scale is a new form of western imperialism that has as its purpose the incorporation of populations within the formally so called second and third worlds into a regime of global government,” and argues that education plays a critical role as “one of the key practices used to render populations economically useful and politically docile.” (Tikly, 2004)

By emphasizing only the positive or the negative, critics and optimists alike fail to recognize the inseparable unity of individual agency and governing structure (Bourdieu, 1977; Chaiklin & Lave, 1993; Giddens, 1979; Holland & Lave, 2009). When optimists see only the potential for individual entrepreneurs to remake themselves and their conditions according to their own social and economic goals, they fail to take seriously power imbalances and tend to overlook the subtle ways through which power operates to govern, limit, or direct individual goals and actions according to the interests of the powerful. But when pessimists see power as exclusively exploitative and tyrannical, and argue that it must be *resisted*, they close their eyes to whatever emancipatory possibilities these new configurations might make possible. And as James Ferguson points out, representing power as monolithic and inherently evil leaves us with a sterile political plan of action: when our only move is to denounce power, we forfeit any chance of considering how power can be improved upon, experimented with, and redeployed towards more liberatory ends (J. Ferguson, 2008).

By employing Foucault’s notion of *dispositif* – what he calls a “thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble” of discursive and material elements (Michel Foucault, 1980) -- I seek to avoid seeing development power as monolithic. Development ensembles might operate to achieve overall effects (such as making entrepreneurs in the service of capital), but because the ensembles are made up of *heterogeneous* elements, which act on and emerge through the actions of a *multitude* of subjects, they can neither operate entirely in concert nor be easily predicted or summarized (Brigg, 2006, p. 68). Addressing the constitutive complexity and heterogeneity of such ensembles allows us to leave open the possibility and potential that elements of the development ensemble could be redirected towards new ends. And because effects are not simply predictable, we are enabled to explore -- rather than presume to know ahead of time -- how efforts to “build the capacity” of local entrepreneurs might actually operate when set in relation to the complex ensemble of institutions, discourses, resource flows, programs, projects, and practices that we actually find in practice. (Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Ferguson, 1994; Li, 2007; Mosse, 2005)

For this reason, rather than presume the outcomes of entrepreneurship trainings and global-local partnerships aimed at building entrepreneurial capacity and increasing Tanzanian participation in global practices, I examined the heterogeneous extent to which local people exploited new opportunities even as their conduct was being conducted. At the same time, I questioned the extent to which pre-existing structures of power and

wealth inequality managed to reproduce themselves, through and in contention with new logics and practices.

Since what has so often been missing in these debates is a concrete examination of how entrepreneurial capacities are built (how they are taught/learned in practice) and how people make sense of new entrepreneurial discourses and practices, I examined the specifically situated social practices through which entrepreneurial discourses and practices were being introduced and negotiated. In particular, I focused on formal entrepreneurship trainings (facilitated by Tanzanian facilitators) and partnership meetings (between representatives of American and Tanzanian development organizations) oriented towards developing new social and environmental enterprises within one small town, which I will call Mlimani, in Northern Tanzania.

I was particularly interested in conducting this study in Mlimani because I was familiar with -- and invited to observe -- several local development organizations offering formal entrepreneurship and savings and credit trainings. Also, I was interested in the recent efforts of an American environmental organization, Eco-Preneur, which sought to “work in partnership” to inspire and design new environmental enterprises *with* the Mlimani community, rather than to teach individual beneficiaries in the context of formal instruction. To this end, Eco-Preneur worked to initiate a community-wide partnership which was to bring together representatives from government, local women’s groups, and several environmental and poverty alleviation organizations. By sharing ideas, talents, knowledge, and resources among diverse Mlimani stakeholders, Eco-Preneur hoped that the community partnership would be more likely to develop more innovative and responsive solutions to poverty and environmental degradation than any one organization could do individually. Eco-Preneur also extended their own global networks of environmental entrepreneurs, thus broadening its capacity to share information, resources, and technology at the level of the local community, rather than individual beneficiary.

While exemplifying the new forms of educational practice that seek to de-center pedagogical hierarchies and inequalities, this learning partnership, therefore, with its diverse Mlimani stakeholders and strong ties to American development practitioners, donors, and entrepreneurial networks also provided a unique “contact zone” in which to observe the movement, restriction, and negotiation of global and local entrepreneurial discourses. By redesigning their own practices to engage more equitably with the local community and manipulating entrepreneurial practices towards social ends, Eco-Preneur is the perfect example of an organization seeking to “experiment” with traditional forms of development and market power. And as interrogating the practice of partnership allowed me to explore, Eco-Preneur wasn’t alone in their experiment: their efforts to work in partnership with diverse community actors, thereby spreading entrepreneurial discourses and practices that could question and destabilize hierarchy and expert knowledge, opened up an ideal space in which to question and explore new forms of engagement and experimentation by diverse Mlimani partners. By considering these sites of exposure as “contact zones” (Freedman & Ball 2004; Pratt 1999), I explored how diverse partners (American and Tanzanian development practitioners, international donors, Tanzanian beneficiaries, and Tanzanian entrepreneurs) with varying orientations, (contradictory) interests, and degrees of power encountered each other and negotiated the multiple global and local discourses and practices they brought to their interaction,

thereby forming a heterogeneous ensemble.³ It was through participation in these heterogeneous “contentious local practices” that Tanzanians were learning new ways of seeing the world, relating to others, and representing the world. But – as Foucault’s formulation encourages us to remember – the outcome should never be seen as either never predetermined or predictable. Learning is neither a simple nor neutral process, and I considered the formal trainings and informal learning within global-local partnerships aimed to build entrepreneurial practice as sites of struggle (Femia, 1987; Freire, 1986; Giroux, 1993; Luke, 1996). Although the language, literacy, and learning practices promoted in entrepreneurship trainings and partnerships by both American and Tanzanian development practitioners were highly valued within current development and global business discourse, they often required social relations and representations of the world, which conflicted with alternative local logics. My research paid close attention to these tensions. I was interested in how interlocutors negotiated socio-linguistic and discursive differences; learned, reshaped, and resisted entrepreneurial and linguistic practices; policed and overcome rules and norms; and how all subjects were not only re-made (as entrepreneurs or otherwise) but how they re-made themselves using and redeploying the available discursive tools and practices.

I asked the following research questions:

1. How do Tanzanian and American “partners” representing different social and economic classes understand, make sense of, and negotiate differing conceptions of partnership?
 - a. For what purpose do they employ and or contest a discourse of partnership?
 - b. How are discourses of partnerships expressed and contested linguistically?
2. How do Tanzanian and American “partners” representing different social and economic classes understand, make sense of, and negotiate entrepreneurial discourses?
3. How do poor Tanzanian women and middle class American development practitioners understand, make sense of, and negotiate entrepreneurial learning spaces and participatory practices?
 - a. What are entrepreneurial learning spaces and how are they constructed discursively?
 - b. How and for what purpose are participatory educational practices used and manipulated?
 - c. How do participatory learning practices facilitate access or create barriers to entrepreneurial behaviors, attitudes, practices?

1.2 Getting to Mlimani, Tanzania

My interest in the “the making of the entrepreneur” in Tanzania developed during previous visits. I first came to Tanzania in 2001 to visit a cousin whose Tanzanian husband was conducting ecological research at the Amani Nature Reserve, a newly

³ In Lave and Holland’s terms, these are the “enduring [historical, political, social] struggles” which are mediated through local contentious practice, or contact zones.

protected rainforest. During my visit, I met the “local tour guides of Amani,” young men and women who had been recently selected to give tours as a means of generating income for themselves and for the twenty villages from which they were selected, surrounding the protected forest. During three subsequent visits to Tanzania, I worked with the tour guides to help them develop their eco-tourist business, travelling with them across the Northern region to learn from other eco-tourists projects and to visit local NGOs, whose mission was to support local participation in conservation efforts. During these visits, the guides were regularly and repeatedly told that they would need to shed their *Ujamaa* socialist mindset and re-make themselves as entrepreneurs, a process which required, among other things, “taking inventory” of their strengths and weaknesses, working as individuals rather than as a cooperative group, gearing their efforts towards attracting investment (rather than donor support), and writing project proposals which would demonstrate evidence of initiative and measurable outcomes, instead of simply *need*. While the guides told me they regarded such advice as the “*blah blah*” or the “*siasa*” (politics) of NGO’s – who they saw as seeking only to “feed themselves” -- these interactions piqued my interest. There seemed to be a contradiction between development discourses that emphasized the participation of marginalized communities and the steep requirements for that participation, the necessary literacy and language practices and orientations towards the world, which limited access in practice. Precisely because these discourses did not speak to the “local guides of Amani,” they were prevented from accessing the global networks that were intended to help them attract investment and better their situation. It was through these experiences that I came to understand the discourse of participation as a site of struggle, rather than the relatively obvious and unproblematic good that I had, as an educator, assumed I could help my friends address.

In 2005, Eco-Preneur contacted me to discuss local environmental enterprise projects in the area. Through our discussions, I learned about their efforts in Mlimani to build a community wide partnership and spread the principals of environmental entrepreneurship, and my interest in how entrepreneurial discourses and practices could be taught (by Americans like me) to Tanzanians who (like the guides, who considered such discourse plain nonsense) eventually led me to Mlimani, the site of Eco-Preneur’s entrepreneurial development efforts, and to the question of the “Making of the Entrepreneur.”

Tanzania was also an ideal site to study how efforts to increase local participation in global processes through building entrepreneurial capacity because of its historical resistance to capitalism and deep-rooted nationalist discourses denigrating the idea of the entrepreneur. And until the late 1980’s, when World Bank structural adjustment reforms required privatization and trade liberalization, educational interventions to increase participation would have meant cooperative activities in socialist villages, while educational practices were aimed at understanding global capitalist relationships in order to resist them. This historical experience not only exists in tension with prevailing accounts of how local individuals are able to gain access to global networks by participating in global free-market capitalism (Shivji 1991; Tickly 2004; Vavrus 2003), but the conversations produced by this dissonance between *Ujamaa* past and Globalizing present provides an illuminating site from which to analyze how ideological struggles over global participation and entrepreneurial discourse and practice proceed.

1.3 Situating the Research Problem in Tanzania: “It’s Time to Change the Mindset!”

A vignette will help to set the stage. In February 2007, I was invited by Kato, the director of a local NGO and a well respected Tanzanian entrepreneurship trainer, to attend a meeting that he would facilitate, but which was organized by a local women’s group. As part of their efforts to engage local communities in “protecting the global environment,” the UNDP-GEF program, (a partnership between the World Bank, United Nations Development Program, and the Global Environmental Facility which gives grants to developing nations to protect the global environment) had funded the women’s group to create environmental groups for rural school children living in areas recognized as global biodiversity hotspots. The GEF wanted to fund a *community-based* women’s organization to form environmental school groups in *rural villages* as a reflection of current trends in development thinking, which now particularly favor participatory and locally directed initiatives.⁴

However, even with funding and support from a powerful global institution, the women found they could not simply ignore the local government and administrative structures as they carried out their mission. So before entering into rural village schools, the urban women’s group had to first “sensitize” the village leaders and school administrators of their plan and the importance working in “partnership” towards their shared environmental goals. The meeting had been organized for this purpose.

Part of the story was told by spatial arrangements. As village leaders and school administrators arrived from their respective villages, the women busily rearranged the meeting hall to meet them. They dragged chairs and tables from the elevated stages where government officials would normally speak down to the people to re-arrange the room so that everyone could sit together. But despite these efforts to produce an egalitarian seating arrangement, male leaders from the village sat on one side while the women’s group sat on the other, as is common in most local social gatherings.

Moreover, before the meeting, Kato repeated several times for participants to “feel free and to talk amongst yourselves” and encouraged us to “take this opportunity to get to know each other,” but the hall waited in awkward silence for the training to begin. We listened as he instructed us that “*Hii siyo semina*⁵” (this is not a seminar) and

⁴ “SGP is rooted in the belief that global environmental problems can best be addressed if local people are involved and there are direct community benefits and ownership. SGP is convinced that with small amounts of funding, members of local communities can undertake activities that will make a significant difference in their lives and environments, with global benefits, in contrast with top-down, expert-reliant development interventions.... Participation, democracy, flexibility, and transparency are cornerstones of the SGP approach.” (“The GEF Small Grants Programme,”)

⁵ The seminar was conducted in Swahili. Although I am not a native speaker of Swahili, by the time of the seminar, I had gained an advanced proficiency such that I could both understand and participate. I also checked my transcription and translations with my research assistant, a native Swahili speaker. In some cases, I also verified these translations with a lecturer of linguistics at the UDSM, also a native Swahili speaker. Many of the development concepts have only recently been translated into Swahili and are not widely recognized. In these cases, I checked my understanding with development practitioners in the field. While in subsequent chapters, I conduct thorough linguistic analysis and therefore provide complete English/Swahili translation, my intention here is to provide a vignette, which simply introduces the reader to the learning space, and demonstrates the use and translation of current development discourse into Swahili.

reminded us that “*ni ushirkiano*” (it is a partnership). And although Kato explained, “*hakuna mwalimu*” (there is no teacher) and “*sisi sote ni mapatna*” (we are all partners), we acted like students as we faced the front and waited for his power-point presentation. Finally, as if he could command us to shout the terms of our new relationship into being, Kato led us in a call and response:

Kato:	“ <i>sisi ni nani?</i> ”	who are we?
Participants:	“ <i>mapatna</i> ”	partners
Kato:	<i>Nani?</i>	Who?
Participants:	<i>mapatna</i>	partners
Kato:	<i>siwezi kumsikia</i>	I can’t hear you (plural)
Participants:	<i>PATNA!</i>	

But at every stage, his presentation emphasized a “partnership” that proved difficult to obtain in practice. He emphasized that when women go to the villages they should work together as partners, but he expressed these expectations in an unmistakably authoritative manner. He sought to “lead through partnership” by asking the oldest man in the room to give some historical context to the meeting, to explain how things were in the past; presumably, the oldest man in the room would have the authority of age? But then when the old man began, “Hapa zamani” (here in the past), Kato interrupted him, using the generic story opening to introduce his first slide and his own *personal* interpretation of “Where we came from.”

Kato’s account broke decisively with the past: as he declared, what the “countries of the East” had in common (as opposed to the “countries of the West”) was an unproductive past that had left them poorly positioned to compete. Green font highlighted the positive consequences of the West’s private sector, while red font illustrated the negative consequences of the East’s nationalized economies. As he explained the difference, “While the west conducted business through a private sector, businesses in the east were nationalized and run by the state. As a result, services in the West were paid for and of good quality; while services in the East were free but of poor quality.”¹ Their unproductive past set the stage for a presentation of Utandawazi, or globalization, as inevitable: “The whole world is becoming a village,” he announced, and told the familiar story of farmers confronted with high quality imports in local markets (in this case, farmers traveling to Dar es Salaam to find beautiful apples from as far away as South Africa selling quickly, while their own less attractive apples rot).

When he reached his final slide, “*Tafsiri yake kwetu sisi ni nini?*” (What are the implications for us?), it took little to convince the group that, “It’s time to change the mindset!” Instead of waking up each morning and greeting each other with ‘*tupo bwana*’ [we are here comrade], he said, “we must be *moving from here*.” In order to survive in a global world, they would have to have new strategies: “We must change our thoughts, our vision, and our action. We must strengthen our private sector, plan to take care of ourselves, and become entrepreneurs.” We can no longer just farm; we must farm businesses. “Moving from here” Kato demonstrated would require more than a declaration of a new global world order or an assertion of new partnership relations; change would require new practices. In particular Tanzanians would have to manage their own lives by conducting everyday activities like businesses.

1.3.1 Ambiguities of post-development. This meeting was representative of common kind of partnership in Tanzania, the convergence of a variety of partners to move beyond three intersecting spheres of centralized power: the Tanzanian state (and particularly a socialist Ujamaa state), powerful global institutions of development and governance, and teacher-centered education. Yet the problems and obstacles this group encountered were also representative. A partnership between local government officials from rural villages and local schools, women from a nearby urban women's group, a trainer from a local Tanzanian non-governmental organization, and the (absent, but undeniably still influential) UNDP could not be taken for granted, and cannot be understood without taking into account the variety of different visions, expectations, and histories each of the "stakeholders" brought with them. Participants didn't simply accept new arrangements, but responded and maneuvered within this reconfigured meeting space—a place which was actively being constructed as much by the new visions and expectations of UNDP, the absent funder as by the intersecting and conflicting histories and expectations of the diverse actors who had organized or been invited to the meeting. Their collective effort to negotiate new, more egalitarian relations had to be understood within this complex of evolving historical, political, socio-cultural, and economic contexts, what Foucault would have called a "*dispositif*."

For one thing, while the meeting took place in a *government* hall, Kato carefully reminded his audience that "there is no more Ujamaa" and presented Tanzania's socialist policies and state controlled economies as part of the negative history, which the participants would have to overcome. The group therefore reconfigured both the physical space (by moving the chairs of officials down from elevated stages) and the political space it represented, as women of a local women's group (rather than the district or central government) sought to imagine their own development interventions. They first sought to partner with Mr. Kato (the director of a local NGO) to write a funding proposal, with the UNDP to receive the capital, and only *then* did they partner with local village government officials.

Yet while de-emphasizing the state might change the frame through which we analyze power, power (and even the state) is certainly still present. Even with the support of a powerful global institution like UNDP, the women still needed the local village government's cooperation before entering the villages. And the women needed Kato's support to secure UNDP funding in the first place, since a development practitioner who spoke English like Kato had the access they needed both to new calls for proposals and the knowledge to write those according to expected conventions. The women therefore did not operate as the autonomous empowered individuals they sought to be; instead, they gained access to UNDP funding and the "environment" and school children only by moving through and in relation to established power relations.

The state was present in other ways; a move away from state-centered development would mean that the state would no longer take responsibility for providing a variety of social services and supports that Tanzanians have come to expect from their government. And by defining the state as the problem, Kato encouraged "local" Tanzanians to shift their focus to the "global" by imagining themselves to be *unconstrained* by the state: as entrepreneurs, he claimed, they should shift from subsistence to business activities to acquire enough money to pay for the education, health, and agricultural support which the government no longer provides. By partnering

with global institutions and foreign and local investors, he argued that local Tanzanians could access capital, technology, and information to scale up their innovative ideas to simultaneously address economic, environmental, and social ends. By partnering with UNDP and with the director of a local NGO, the women's group exemplified this sort of non-state partnerships. Yet even as our meeting was convened to explore new ways to get things done in the context of a "weakened state," students at Tanzanian universities were protesting the government's decision to cut student tuition subsidies, to which university administrators responded by suspending the protesting students and refusing to allow them to return to their studies until they agreed to pay their share.ⁱⁱ Can all government services be replaced by local partnerships and individual initiative? Will such change be tolerated? These questions were more complicated than Kato's presentation allowed.

More than that, if the shift beyond a centralized state has also enabled new roles and greater influence for global institutions, their rising influence has not gone unchecked. International critiques of Washington-designed interventions have led the UNDP to refrain from directing environmental conservation efforts themselves; instead, the UNDP works to "partner" with a local women's group, thereby empowering them to work with their communities to find their own locally relevant and sustainable solutions to "global" environmental problems. There were therefore no representatives of UNDP at the meeting. But while UNDP's *physical* absence might potentially have allowed diverse local partners to control how the meeting and environmental intervention proceeded, UNDP's expectations and interests in protecting environmental biodiversity (rather than issues related to global resource inequality) still powerfully shaped local environmental "innovations."

Parts of the agenda were already set, in other words by the assumptions and expectations of the absent funders. Since the women's group sought to make their proposal competitive, they had to anticipate the expectations of absent funders (and, indeed, partner with people like Kato to enable them to do so). And while funding women -- rather than an NGO expert or local government -- might produce more innovative interventions and more egalitarian social relations, that potential had first to be negotiated between the women and their diverse "partners" according to well-established local norms and constraints. As such, the consequences of UNDP's physical absence coupled with their significant role in providing financial support to some actors-- but not others -- can neither be taken for granted nor simply summarized.

Instead, we would have to examine how engaging school children in environmental groups through women's leadership and global support operates in its particularly situated contexts. For example, although the male village leaders and school administrators attended the meeting organized by the women, their reasons for attending may have had little to do with an acceptance of UNDP's mission, the women's leadership, or a desire to create environmental groups for school children. Development workshops provide "sitting fees" to their participants, and the sums involved are often larger than the government's daily wage, a legitimate way to boost one's income. Attending this meeting could therefore be seen as the performance necessary to access global funds, since global donors often prefer to provide workshops (teaching a man to fish) over material handouts (the fish)(Swidler & Cotts Watkins, in press). Once in attendance, of course, participants might have found Kato's presentation inspiring and useful. But what they understood and learned at the training, as well as how (and if) they

implement these new ideas and practices after the training, must be examined in relation to the varied and often competing interests that brought them there in the first place.

It's also worth noting the paradox that education -- long the provenance of the central state -- has become a means of giving people the values, knowledge, and practices necessary for neo-liberal economies and the shift beyond centralized state and global institutional power. And development projects oriented towards creating new entrepreneurs for participating in a global capitalist system often employ aspects of the participatory educational approaches -- like those of Paulo Freire -- which were historically developed as radical alternatives to dominant education, built support for independence struggles, and used to critique (rather than increase the participation in) capitalist practices (Shivji, 1991; Tikly, 2004; Vavrus, 2003). To understand the effect of this practice, however -- as when Kato sought to create opportunities for students to learn from each other -- we would have to situate it in its particular context.

For example, educational projects seeking to build entrepreneurial capacity draw from socio-cultural theories of learning, which were born out of Marxist theoretical traditions, and associated with progressive and critical education. They take from social practice theories, which posit that participants learn through regular participation in everyday activity, as they are increasingly exposed to and socialized into the practices, knowledge, and values of the "community of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Yet while these socio-cultural theories of learning were *initially* developed as ways of better understand the practices of every-day learning in mostly homogenous community settings, corporations and development institutions have redeployed these theories by changing their function, using them to create "communities of practice" as a means of retooling and socializing workers into the values, practices, and discourses required of decentralized workplaces (Gee, Hull, & Lankshear, 1996). While some might celebrate the less dogmatic student or worker-centered learning community as a successful strategy to overcome hierarchy, others would consider such examples as forms of manipulating and controlling workers while appearing to do just the opposite. Like the examples above, shifting away from formal and top down education, doesn't necessarily get us past "power," rather power is manipulated in new ways. The question is how it is done.

More importantly, this sort of either-or distinction misframes the question. Learning doesn't require a school or a teacher, but rather occurs out of necessity through participation in everyday social practice. And by "dialoguing with partners," and constantly assessing available resources and tools, entrepreneurs *do* figure out new ways to address their own social and economic problems, as Tanzania's vibrant informal economy even under strict socialist policies will attest (Tripp, 1997). In this sense, while Kato explicitly authorized a new kind of learning space ("This is not a seminar; this is a partnership"), and used direct teaching methods to deliver a power point presentation that explicitly built a case for self-initiated learning activities -- as part of a practice needed to "farm a business" or find solutions to environmental problems -- his facilitation also *did* create a space for participants in which new values, practices, and knowledge was implicitly introduced. By moving chairs from elevated stages to the floor level, participants *did* engage with each other from new physical perspectives. And by publicly introducing themselves and stating their learning expectations, participants practiced asserting themselves (rather than simply following the directions of the instructor). It is because learning potentially happens more effectively when participants actively engage,

but are not fully conscious of the process through which they are being inculcated with new values and orientations to the world that scholars such as Hull, Lankshear, and Gee, raise concerns about how participatory and constructivist educational practices once employed for progressive purposes are now being used by corporations and entrepreneurial development projects.

Kato may have had a heavy hand in facilitating the meeting, but he also never claimed to have all the answers. Like the partners, he saw himself as merely one piece of a larger effort to develop new strategies for life in a global village. And although he wrote the proposal (and had the skills and access to networks in which calls for proposals routinely fill his email box), it was a single woman, (who perhaps emulates the practices populated by Kenyan political activist Wangari Mathai) who saw the potential for environmental groups to protect the forest. By planting new trees and instilling conservation values in young school children she saw and put in motion the possibility of a new future for the increasingly degraded environment.

As the example shows us, being “post” development doesn’t mean that we are “post” power, but a “post-development” framework may suggest certain possibilities and openings, which warrant further examination. If the simple act of moving chairs didn’t overcome power relations, neither should we ignore the fact that these village leaders and women group members were practicing seeing each other from new perspectives. Similarly, while village leaders and school administrators may have attended the training in order to boost their incomes through sitting fees, it matters that they were therefore exposed to new discourses, practices, and social relations. Finally while the women may not become the new leaders of development, the fact that UNDP, rather than the government, funded the women, and not Kato, is significant. Kato did not become irrelevant. But it was only by assisting a local women’s group to write a funding proposal to create new trainings (using popular women-centered, participatory, and neo-liberal global ideologies) that he was able to create employment for himself⁶. The women’s proposal included a budget for training, appealing to western ideals (give a man a fish, he’ll eat for a day, teach a man to fish he’ll eat for a lifetime), while simultaneously enabling Kato to fund his own work. In other words efforts to shift beyond centralized power matter, but as each of these examples illustrate, power doesn’t go away but, rather, is reconfigured through struggle within particular and situated contexts.

1.3.2 Locating the local between tyranny and empowerment. Current development trends are to locate the discontents of development in “centers of power,” like the Tanzanian state, and powerful international development organizations like UNDP, World Bank, and IMF (as well as in authoritarian and teacher-centered education of the past), thereby (re)locating the solution at the site of the “local” (the rural village, environmental groups of school children, the individual woman strategically partnering with the UNDP, or the partner in the meeting who has a particularly innovative idea to share). When Kato suggests (and the participants verbally affirm) that “it’s time to change the mindset,” it is towards this particular understanding of the “local”: rather than depend on the government or international development agencies, the responsibility for development is to be shifted to individual Tanzanians, who “must change their thoughts, actions, and vision to live as entrepreneurs” by strategically managing their own daily

⁶ Kato assisted the women to write the proposal, but part of the budget includes payment for his training.

activities (from farming to environmental conservation) and partnering with anyone (regardless of status, gender, or ethnicity) to solve social problems and compete in global markets.

My research critically analyzes this popular site of “the local” by observing entrepreneurship trainings and partnerships between diverse stakeholders, which each emphasize individual agency as a solution to overcoming centralized power. As Anna Tsing reminds us, the global and the local are not dichotomous sites, but are rather co-constructed through complicated interactions and “sticky engagements,” (Tsing, 2005) By considering local practices and particularly the micro-interactions through which entrepreneurial capacity is being built as a site in which economic, cultural, and political structures (operating at multiple, intersecting scales) are given together with individual subjectivities, I seek to challenge popular, yet problematic binaries between global and local, structure and agency, good power and bad power, in order to capture the complex ambiguity of interactions in which power operates relationally between them. And by paying attention to the multiple and diverse histories, contexts, political scales and linguistic markets to which interlocutors simultaneously orient, (which Blommaert calls “layered simultaneity),” I seek to contribute to recent scholarship in sociolinguistics of globalization (Blommaert, 2010).

There is, perhaps, something to learn from each side. Many (especially practitioners) argue that projects such as this one lead to empowerment by increasing local access to and participation with global information, capital, and technology (Prahalad 2005; Sachs 2005), and we should not discount the extent to which this is true. Yet more critical development theorists claim that, by hiding issues of power and politics, these participatory projects effectively function to secure consent for predetermined neo-liberal projects (Rahman 1995; Mohan and Stokke 2000; Hildyard, Hegde et al. 2001; Cleaver 2004). Particularly through Foucauldian analyses, several critical theorists argue that, as a discourse, “development” (mis)represents problems so as to enable interventions by and for the interests of the powerful that conduct the conduct of the weak (Cruikshank, 1999; Escobar, 1995; Li, 2007).

Certainly Kato’s seamless presentation of a failed socialist government -- omitting the fact that Tanzanians have grown poorer and less educated and healthy since its decline -- was followed by an introduction to globalization as the present condition which negates the past and becomes the basis for new mindsets, and could be understood through this theoretical framework.

Yet we still need to actually determine whether this is the case *in practice*. For this reason, more useful than the simplistic “tyranny” versus “empowerment” binary are a third group of scholars who take seriously these critiques but by stressing the agency of participants in remaking and reconstituting rules and institutions as they negotiate, manipulate, assimilate, and resist given discourses and practices according to their own interests suggest that new forms of participation may still be transformative (Cornwall, 2004; Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Hickey & Mohan, 2004).

In the example I’ve described, we don’t simply find the new “global” (introduced through global international organizations) replacing the old “local.” Tanzanian hierarchical structures did not simply give way to egalitarian relations, regardless of the discourse of partnership and practices of egalitarian seating arrangements, which may suggest otherwise. Nor would it be right to characterize Ujamaa as opposed to local

empowerment, since the rhetoric (at least) of the socialist state was fundamentally rooted in village empowerment (however centrally directed). Social actors, strategically negotiate new relations and development practices according to their own contradictory, intersecting, and divergent interests. The question to ask, then, is how effectively they do it?

My research takes these concerns seriously by drawing on a notion of hegemony (Femia, 1987; Gramsci & Forgas, 2000) which suggests that because constructions of reality are unstable and full of contradictions, even discourses like participation, partnership and the entrepreneur which are constructed in the interests of global capitalism can be manipulated in ways that can serve local interests (Cooper, 2005; Fairclough, 2001). I particularly draw on works from studies of globalization that emphasize the complexity and diversity of global flows to suggest that a globalized world is not simply homogenized, but rather a mode in which global practices contend with local logics and practices as they re-embed within particular situated contexts. But unlike the numerous educational studies that rejoice in the possibilities of globalization, my research pays close attention to the points of friction, restriction, and blockages, in which global flows don't necessarily move freely (Cooper, 2001). Particularly in Africa, globalization is inconsistent as capital flows through particular consenting networks while hopping over and working to produce nearby areas of poverty (J. Ferguson, 2006). And particularly in Tanzania, where socialist development took education as its primary means of mediating between historical underdevelopment and global capitalism, current development education sits at the intersection between flows of global knowledge, practices, discourses, funding and development agencies and their "shadow," global poverty, thereby providing a unique space for understanding how education negotiates the global and the local in the context of globalization.

1.4 Defining the Object of Study: The Making of the Entrepreneur in Tanzania

By titling my project, the "making of the entrepreneur", I seek to emphasize the complex processes through which Tanzanians were being encouraged to take on new identities, mindsets, practices, and relationships characteristic of an "entrepreneur." While global, national, and local interests shape and structure these efforts, the process of becoming a new kind of person is full of contradictions, tensions, and struggles between these interests and others, thereby leaving open the possibility that entrepreneurs might not be made or the person they do become, is not the one intended or represented by global development discourse.

While new identities are mediated through the practices of a local site, as Lave and Holland have argued, this identity making process is never *only* a matter of local practice, local institutions and local history. Local struggles are also always part of a larger historical, cultural, and political-economic struggles. These larger struggles, which Lave and Holland refer to as "enduring struggles," do not exist separate from local practice, but rather are worked out and mediated in "contentious local practice, in particular local [contentious] ways (Holland & Lave, 2009, p. 3). In my research therefore, I look at both the local interaction in relation to the contexts in which the interaction takes shape.

Although Kato's training exemplified the "making" of individual entrepreneurs through education, within a particular local site, the project of making entrepreneurs did not begin or end at the site of the local. Instead, the making of the entrepreneur in Tanzania has required massive social transformation--and to a large part--new discourses through which to understand, represent, and constitute this change. My emphasis on discourse as a form of representation and a social practice is an attempt to bring these different understandings and multiple scales together. In this study, I focused on how entrepreneurs were being made at the scale of the local within formal and informal trainings as Tanzanians are learning new entrepreneurial practices and mindsets; at the scale of the community, as local development and government institutions were encouraged to practice and model entrepreneurial behavior conducive to creating the institutional conditions to encourage and support individual entrepreneurial activity; at the scale of the nation where the Tanzanian state has changed and continues to negotiate and rearticulate socialist economic policies in favor of liberalization and has worked to create an ideological space to define the entrepreneurial subject, rather than the socialist state as the leader of economic transformation; and finally at the global scale, particularly emphasizing the discursive aspects of neo-liberal transformation, which rearticulate the place of Tanzania in the global order by constituting those who have failed to benefit from the promises of globalization as individuals among the global "bottom billion," rather than members of a collective "third world" or a particular nation state.

My research on informal and participatory learning practices in which global discourses are negotiated among diverse (in terms of class, ethnicity, gender, national origin, education) actors illuminates challenges to education in the context of globalization, which are both significant and timely. On the one hand, the connections and flows made possible through new technologies provide opportunities to access and produce knowledge independent of teachers and classrooms; allow for new forms of participation and interaction that may circumvent previous boundaries and hierarchies, and spur new forms of creativity and innovation that have the potential to address social problems in new ways. At the same time however, these processes of greater connectivity, simultaneously produce new spaces of disconnection and exclusion and education has become one of the key practices used to render "marginalized" populations economically useful and politically docile (Tikly, 2004). The possibilities and challenges of globalization, and the role of education in facilitating different outcomes must be understood simultaneously. My research addresses these important and timely concerns by illuminating the tensions and contradictions that are often hidden behind rosy pictures and positive discourses of global connectivity, while not losing sight of the very real desire for access to global processes (and thus the particular literate and language practices), which can be considered symbolic of claims to membership in a global world and rights to its resources; thus raising significant questions in education related to justice and equity.

1.5 Organization of the Dissertation

In the chapters to follow I examine the making of the entrepreneur as a contentious practice and project in Tanzania. Chapter Two situates current interest in "making of the entrepreneur," in relation to contemporary and historical definitions; shifts in development thinking; entrepreneurship with an overview of my theoretical

framework. Chapter Three describes my position as the researcher in relation to this study. In addition to describing how I approached this study using methods of institutional ethnography and critical discourse analysis, I also address methodological challenges related to my role as a translator, my position as an American, and the difficulties in finding actual entrepreneurship trainings to observe. Chapters Four, Five, and Six offer a micro-linguistic and critical discourse analysis of conversations between Maria and Terisita of Saccos (a local women's savings and credit group) and Melissa and David of Eco-Preneur (the American NGO which came to work in partnership with the community) as they strategically negotiated their relationship using discourses of entrepreneurship. After describing the imagined, theoretical, and practical links between them, chapter Four demonstrates the inherent contradictions and challenges of unequal partnership by describing just how difficult it was to get to begin their first meeting. Chapter Five analyzes their conversation about a sum of money to examine their different philosophies of money, to demonstrate how they strategically negotiate these differences linguistically in order to achieve their respective material interests, and how discourses of "free" disembedded capital have become required within development interactions even as they misrepresent reality. Chapter Six examines Eco-Preneur's efforts to build Maria and Terisita's entrepreneurial capacity, by engaging them in typical entrepreneurial conversations and practices.

Chapter 2: Positioning the Research in Relation to the Literature

2.1 Introduction

There are many different perspectives and ways of theorizing the “making of the entrepreneur” many of which have developed in isolation and fail to reach beyond disciplinary boundaries. Because no single perspective is sufficient to understand the “making of the entrepreneur,” my study draws on literature, and radically different and contradictory perspectives from diverse academic and non-academic fields. My intention in this chapter is not to take up a single perspective, but rather to lay out and learn from different perspectives, which will eventually advance a more nuanced understanding of the “local contentious practices” through which “entrepreneurs” are being made/not made/kind of made.

I have organized these different perspectives in three different sections. Together these sections allow me to develop a theoretical framework, which attends to both the “local contentious practices” (Holland & Lave, 2009) in which Tanzanians are potentially becoming new kinds of people, as well as the multiple national and global contexts, which shape and enable particular practices and struggles within the local site.

The first section describes the socio-cultural and political context of the “making of the entrepreneur.” I begin by drawing on literature from business and history to describe the different historically situated definitions of entrepreneur in relation to Tanzanian and European economic history and more recent socially oriented definitions used in framing solutions to poverty and increasing participation of marginalized population in global processes. Next, I use literature from development and critical development studies to describe recent shifts in global development thinking and examine the promotion of entrepreneurship as a part of a global project to remake development (as decentralized with a human face) and (in relation to) capital (as serving the interest and creating markets for the poor).

While in the first section I seek to show the multiplicity and diverse understandings and perspectives of entrepreneurship as the context in which entrepreneurs are made, in the second section, I take a more critical approach. Drawing on theories and literature from critical development studies, I consider these contexts, not as innocent “background information” through which to better understand my data, but as powerful discourses, which constructs poverty in particular ways that legitimize interventions that ultimately serve the needs of capital. I use critical development literature which uses Foucault’s notion of governmentality to show how the agency celebrated by those who consider entrepreneurial practice as empowering, could also be understood as a new form of governance, using education as a key tool to “conduct the conduct”(Michel Foucault, 1982) of others in the service of global capital. And finally in this section, I discuss recent advances in the anthropology of development by theorists who also use Foucault, but in seeking to complicate notions of development as monolithic, emphasize the contradictions and unpredictability of discourses and practices and explore the ways in which actors exploit those contradictions for their own purposes. By making visible the political nature of entrepreneurship as a development intervention,

this section highlights the social, political, and economic struggles, or “enduring struggles” which are then mediated within entrepreneurship trainings or the “local contentious practices,” (Holland & Lave, 2009) in which entrepreneurs are made.

In the final section, I draw from theories of discourse, social practice, and socio-cultural learning to describe how people are socialized and disciplined through discourse and practice. Although such theories suggest that Tanzanians could become “new kinds of [entrepreneurial] people” without explicit instruction and full consent, I also draw from theories which suggest that taking on a new discourse or practice, especially if it requires social relations and orientation that conflict with other valued ways of being, is full of struggle and never simply determined. Finally, I describe recent scholarship in sociolinguistics of globalization, which considers discourse as a valued linguistic resource whose use must be understood in relation to the marketplace in which it operates. The contexts described in sections one and two however are not separate from the identity making and learning processes I describe here; contexts (situated histories, definitions, orientations, relationships, struggles) shape and are shaped by local practice.

2.2 Situating Entrepreneurship Within a Historical and Political Context

2.2.1 Defining “entrepreneur,” “social entrepreneur,” and “environmental entrepreneur.” Following socio-cultural theories of discourse and practice, in this project, I consider “an entrepreneur” a social identity, which can only be understood within its situated context of use in relation to the actual practices and relationships through which this social identity is recognized (Gee, 2002, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wortham, 2001). Because entrepreneurship has recently attracted the interest of actors from communities as diverse as academia, business, philanthropy, social movements, environmental activists, government and non-governmental poverty alleviation organizations an “entrepreneur” (and especially the more specific “social” and “environmental” entrepreneur) therefore, does not have a single definition.

Drawing on different histories, class and social positions, and national and global conversations, people employ entrepreneurial discourses and practices for different and even contradictory purposes. Despite these differences however, the various discourses and perspectives on entrepreneurship are not unrelated. Rather they draw from and develop in response to a single economic genealogy associated with an inter-European tradition of capitalism.

Prior to the seventeenth century, people did not have the scope for independent trade and had little freedom or incentive to use their enterprise. The origins of entrepreneurial practice and thought are often described in relation to the challenged traditional structures of power maintained by Crown monopolies, the Church, the feudal lords, and the guilds.

The term “entrepreneur” originated in French economics as early as the 17th and 18th centuries and referred to someone who “undertakes,” a significant project. As Bornstein and Davis describe, it was not until the seventeenth century following major structural changes in Europe, that people had the freedom or incentive to use their enterprise. Prior to this time, the Crown monopolies, the Church, the feudal lords, and the guilds had restricted commercial activity, discouraged innovation, and tied people to land and parishes. The period of Enlightenment, gave rise to new religious and philosophical

beliefs, particularly the advent of political liberalism and John Lockes' theory of natural rights to "life, liberty, and property," which "provided a moral and conceptual foundation for modern economic and democracy which helped to demarcate a new sector of society—a private sector—in which individuals could reorganize the patterns of production in order to capture the benefits of their enterprise" (Bornstein & Davis, 2010b, p. 3).

In the 19th century, the term came to be identified with individuals who stimulated economic progress by finding new and better ways of doing things. The French economist most commonly credited with giving the term this particular meaning is Jean Baptiste Say. For Say, "The entrepreneur [is one who] shifts economic resources out of an area of lower and into an area of higher productivity and greater yield." While Say focused on finding economic opportunities within the current system, Joseph Schumpeter emphasized the role of entrepreneurs in changing the system itself. Writing in the 20th century, Schumpeter described entrepreneurs as innovators who drive the "creative-destructive" process of capitalism, by "reforming or revolutionizing the pattern of production" (J. G. Dees, 2001).

In both cases, the entrepreneur was defined in the context of a capitalist system. Precisely because of its association with capitalist expansion (and the colonial imperialist project it fueled in the former German and British colony), the entrepreneur did not share the same positive connotations in Tanzania. Julius Nyerere, the first president of Tanzania explicitly sought to build a socialist nation *against* the principles of capitalism (Nyerere, 1962). He considered practices such as private land ownership (which prevented others from using the land to earn a livelihood), and wage labor (which allowed the exploitation of one man by another) foreign to the communitarian practices of traditional Africa and envisioned a set of socialist principles—"Ujamaa or Familyhood,"—to be the basis for "our socialism." He described Ujamaa as a return to and extension of traditional African Values of the past: equality and respect for human dignity; sharing of the resources which are produced by our efforts; work by everyone and exploitation by none (Nyerere, 1962, p. 2).

Since the entrepreneur is an identity indexing a capitalist system of inequality and exploitation, the entrepreneur's status was not only denigrated, but also explicitly forbidden: under Ujamaa, the government controlled the economy and distributed the fruits of Tanzanian's collective labor. All Tanzanians were expected to work hard and in return received equal compensation for their efforts, regardless of occupation, expertise, intellectual talent, or market value of their contribution (Nyerere, 1962). Producing for private gain was antithetical to the goals of Ujamaa and therefore illegal: until the 1980's most Tanzanians sold their goods through government markets and those who bought and sold illegally on the parallel "black market," did so at risk of imprisonment (Tripp, 1997).

That said, while one would not use the term "entrepreneur" to describe the behaviors and practices conducive to building a socialist nation under Ujamaa, many of the practices, which Nyerere considered central to the building of the socialist nation, do actually resemble those of an entrepreneur described above. Self-reliance and innovative problem-solving was to be the foundation of Tanzania's "war on poverty" and socialist development (Nyerere, 1962, p. 17), necessitated by Tanzania's financial limitations and Nyerere's reluctance to accept gifts or loans from the international community (which he believed would compromise Tanzania's socialist ideals and independence). Instead of investing in costly machinery and developing urban industry, Nyerere located the engine

of development within rural agriculture and called on Tanzanians to find innovative ways to make use of the resources that they had in abundance: land, physical strength, and intelligence. To this end, Nyerere prioritized resources for education—even over resources for industrial development—particularly “education for self-reliance” which would emphasize local innovation and preparing students with “enquiring minds who could think for themselves (Nyerere, 1967). Arguing that there was no single book that could provide the answers to all the detailed problems that a Tanzanian would likely encounter, Nyerere proposed education not unlike current entrepreneurial learning theories, emphasizing learning in the world and adapting new principles to everyday practice.

For Nyerere the basic difference between a socialist society and a capitalist society was not in the methods of producing wealth, but in the way that wealth was distributed (Nyerere, 1962, p. 2). Practices commonly associated with entrepreneurs such as innovation, self-reliance, and independent thinking therefore, were not antithetical to the socialist project. The big difference between the entrepreneur and the self-reliant villager was in the purposes of their innovations: The Ujamaa citizen practiced innovation for the good of the socialist nation, whereas the entrepreneur produced for himself.

In 1984, Nyerere refused IMF and World Bank loan packages because he believed that the conditions for acceptance (opening up Tanzania’s protected markets and cutting government spending) would undermine the very principles of Ujamaa. But as Tripp argues, Tanzania’s eventual acceptance of structural adjustment policies in 1986, was not simply an imposition by the IMF and World Bank, but also was a response to Tanzania’s internal politics following severe economic decline. By the 1980’s Tanzania was in economic crisis: real wages fell by 83% (between 1974-1988) and Tanzanians were forced to pursue other strategies outside of the formal regulated economy, engaging in parallel jobs within what was considered the “black market.” Teachers tutored and doctors saw patients privately after hours, while farmers addressed growing food shortages by selling their produce through informal markets. Since an estimated 90% of household income was earned outside of state controlled markets, the state found it simply could no longer control or regulate the economy and still maintain legitimacy, so the state either legalized activities like private buses, or ignored the activities which were so antithetical to the state’s socialist policies it could not condone them (Tripp, 1997, p. 5). Since almost every Tanzanian depended on and engaged in economic activity outside of the sanctioned public sphere, the government could no longer maintain the moral distinction between the formal nationalized economy and the private “black market” (Tripp, 1997). In 1986, when the Tanzanian government accepted IMF and World Bank’s economic assistance and economic reform package in 1986, the structural adjustment and trade liberalization policies were antithetical to the development policies and socialist goals that Nyerere had outlined in the Arusha Declaration. The Tanzanian government therefore replaced the Arusha Declaration with Tanzania’s current economic and social development vision, Vision 2025.

While many of the Vision 2025’s overarching goals are similar to those of the Arusha declaration (“achieving high quality of life; peace, tranquility and national unity; good governance; an educated society imbued with an ambition to develop, and sustained growth for the benefit of all people,” (p. x) the Vision 2025 sees sustained growth the

result of a “competitive market,” necessitating the kinds of competition, inequality, individual enterprise, and incentives which Nyerere’s socialist policies strongly opposed.

Whereas the Arusha Declaration had characterized Tanzania’s relationship to the global world as one of exploitation, inequality, and oppression-- and had articulated nationalist development policies of self-reliance as a response -- Vision 2025 accepts conditions of global competition and warns Tanzanians of the necessity to improve and strengthen themselves “if [they] are to be active participants within a competitive global world” (Tanzania, 1997, p. 1).

With the government’s redefinition of “good” economic development, the Tanzanian entrepreneur (once referred to as a bloodsucker or capitalist) was given new status. Vision 2025 regards the private sector as the “driving force” for building a productive economy and instead of hardworking socialist farmers, declares that “self-initiating, creative, innovating and competitive entrepreneurs” have become the new economic heroes, while the government working with international multilateral and non-governmental organizations seeks to transform the informal economy (former “black or parallel market) into a formal private sector based on capitalist market-based principals.

More recently, in 2005 the government created a second organizing framework, Mkukuta, which put even greater emphasis on private sector development and entrepreneurship as a mechanism for stimulating equitable growth and reducing poverty. Inspired by Vision 2025 and committed to the UN’s Millennium Development Goals, Mkukuta is an “outcomes approach strategy: that encourages “collaboration” between sectors (i.e. development organizations, government, and the private sector). “The basic tenet [of Mkukuta] is that growth is necessary but not sufficient for poverty reduction;” instead, “Tanzania needs fast but equitable growth, focusing on reducing inequalities, increasing employment, and enhancing livelihood opportunities for the poor” (United Republic of Tanzania, 2005a, p. 26).

By equitable growth, Mkukuta does not question the inequalities and exploitation on which a competitive economy is built, as Nyerere did, but rather seeks to provide greater access to and incentives for favorable participation in the competitive environment. That is: “improving the access to and use of productive assets (particularly financial services) for the poor and marginalized groups (youth and women); addressing geographic disparities (“by identifying economic potentials of disadvantaged districts, providing incentives for private investment in infrastructure, and supporting exploitation of these potentials”); and ensuring equal access to universal and public services” (2005a, p. 30). The government’s role therefore is no longer one of economic redistribution or guardian of equality, but rather to meet the need for “a change in mindset of the bureaucracy toward private sector development” (2005a, p. 8). Specifically the government should ensure a “credible, enabling policy environment, to enable informal businesses to formalize their enterprises, specifically guaranteeing property rights and enforcing contracts” (2005a, p. 14)

In order to for marginalized people (especially youth, women, rural people) to access new opportunities and adapt to changing global conditions, Mkukuta highlights the need for transformation to a “self development mindset and empowering culture.” This new mindset and culture is specifically defined as entrepreneurial and described in terms of entrepreneurial practices and attitudes:

“a progressive and development oriented culture needs to be evolved to link the people’s way of life to the attainment of the goals of the development vision with particular regard to cultivating and nurturing a *culture of entrepreneurship* and self development through *creative and innovative* hard work, responsibility, discipline, respect for life, education, *saving and investment* and fostering self-confidence and self esteem among individuals.

Mkukuta describes education as a “strategic agent for mindset formation” and argues that “education should be restructured and transformed with a focus on promoting creativity and problem solving.” Particularly in rural areas in which poverty is still disproportionately high, Mkukuta describes a vision to reduce poverty by “imparting organizational and entrepreneurial skills to rural inhabitants to turn non-farm activities into viable sources of livelihoods” (United Republic of Tanzania, 2005b, p. 6)

The following quote from a paper delivered at the National Dialogue on Trade, Development and Poverty illustrates this tension. According to Nyoni, a professor of University of Dar es Salaam

“Entrepreneurship is defined as a process of innovation and new-venture creation ... Entrepreneurship involves seizing opportunities and converting them into marketable ideas capable of competing for implementation in the (modern) economy.” (Nyoni, 2006)

By making explicit that entrepreneurship involves seizing opportunities for realization in the (modern) economy, we can assume that by entrepreneurship they are not referring to the innovative and creative modes of exchange that operate according to a different set of principals in the “informal” or “traditional” economy. The Tanzanian government also articulates a critical role for entrepreneurs, but rather than turn a blind eye to entrepreneurial practices which it could not condone under Ujamaa, the government works to formalize a private business sector through regulation and taxation.

Globally, current theorists of entrepreneurship offer new definitions, but most remain true to the Say-Shumpeter tradition while adding their own variations on the theme. Drucker for example starts with Say’s definition, but emphasizes exploitation of opportunity rather than the innovation implied by Shumpeter’s “creative-destruction.” According to Drucker, the entrepreneur always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity” (J. G. Dees, 2001). In Tanzania, trainings for new entrepreneurs most often adhere to this definition. As I observed in my study entrepreneurship trainers emphasized the positive aspects of change, encouraging Tanzanians to change their mindset, in order to see competition (resulting from economic liberalization), or shifts in welfare policies (which required individuals to pay for health and educational services) as an *opportunity*, rather than something to fear and resist.

For Tanzanian entrepreneurs with limited resources, seeing competition (with South African apple growers who’s high quality produce competes in local Tanzanian markets for example) as an opportunity required a new understanding of how an entrepreneur can access resources. By adding an element of resourcefulness to Drucker’s opportunity-oriented definition, Howard Stevenson, a leading theorist of entrepreneurship at Harvard University demonstrated how entrepreneurs need not be limited by their

current resources, but rather mobilize the resources of others to achieve their entrepreneurial objectives. Stevenson contrasted the resourcefulness of entrepreneurs with “administrators,” who allow their existing resources and job descriptions to constrain their visions and actions (J. G. Dees, 2001).

As part of efforts to “change the mindset,” in my observation of entrepreneurship trainings, participants engaged in activities, which required them to “move outside of the box,” shedding traditions (especially norms of hierarchy and rigid work titles), which limited their vision and mobility necessary to recognize and exploit opportunities. Attracting “partners” who had access to the knowledge and capital needed to scale up “good” and “marketable” ideas was a key practice for poor entrepreneurs to overcome current material conditions. By accessing the resources of others, society would also have the benefit of the products and services derived from the best ideas, rather than limited to those who had the means to produce and market them.

Just as Tanzania was making a shift from a socialist-based economy to a market based economy, in the late 1980’s, the concept of entrepreneurship was being developed even further as entrepreneurial principals were being applied to new contexts throughout the world. Within the new field of social entrepreneurship, rather than innovate and transform markets for the purpose of securing economic profit, social entrepreneurs use entrepreneurial practices (innovation, creative-destruction, resources shifting, strategic partnership) to solve social and environmental problems (Bornstein, 2007; Bornstein & Davis, 2010a; G. Dees, 2003; J. G. Dees, 2001; Drayton, 2006).

While much of the academic writing about social entrepreneurship is still dominated by western academics, according to Timothy Ogden, many of the most important social innovations over the past twenty years, have been developed and spread through the global south. For example, by convincing Banglaeshi banks to provide loans to poor women, Mohammad Yunis pioneered the modern micro-finance industry, which has spread to almost every country in the world. The business model that allowed the near-universal penetration of cellular phones into poor communities was born in Bangladesh as well. M-Pesa, a mobile-to mobile money-transfer service, was developed in Kenya and has become a model worldwide (Ogden, 2010).

According to Dees, who is often referred to as the father of social entrepreneurship education, “social entrepreneurship combines the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and determination commonly associated with the high-tech pioneers of Silicon Valley.” While some scholars use the term broadly to describe many forms of social businesses other scholars use the term to characterize only those with uncommon creativity, which produce large-scale transformational change (Bornstein & Davis, 2010b, p. 2).

Social entrepreneurs measure their success according to the social value and impact they create, rather than the profits made on social products. What distinguishes a social entrepreneur from a more traditional social service provider is that the social entrepreneur, is not simply driven by a social need or compassion, but rather by a vision about *how* to make change. A social entrepreneur uses business principals to transform the social sector, deconstructing traditional aid relationships between donor and beneficiary and building new visions for social change (G. Dees, 2003).

Building on Stevenson’s notion of “resourcefulness,” social entrepreneurs skillfully leverage their own limited resources by partnering with others not only in the

social sector, but also within government and private business sectors. Although they are strategic in developing resources that ultimately support their social missions, they willingly explore all resource options from pure philanthropy to commercial methods of the business sector. In this way, as their name implies, social entrepreneurs take advantage of the blurring of sector boundaries.

Learning also plays a critical role in developing an effective solution to a social or environmental problem and social entrepreneurs regularly seek out opportunities to share and learn from other social entrepreneurs as well as their consumers. They welcome feedback and critique, which they see as opportunities to make their approach even stronger. Seeking to scale up the ideas of individual entrepreneurs as part of a vision to make large-scale social impact, the field of social entrepreneurship takes seriously the importance of building communities of entrepreneurs who can support and learn from each other. As part of funding competitions, social entrepreneurs are regularly asked to describe how they envision sharing their ideas and scaling up their projects to serve greater numbers of people and larger geographical areas. As such, as part of their individual practice, social entrepreneurs have become leaders in developing and making use of elaborate on-line communication and learning networks (Drayton, 2006).

2.2.2 Millennial development: A decentralized project conducive to entrepreneurs. Tanzania's national interest in "making new entrepreneurs" and promoting social entrepreneurship in Tanzania must also be understood in relation to the global context. In her new book, *Poverty Capital*, Ananya Roy traces current global enthusiasm to address poverty, particularly by financing entrepreneurial activity through micro-finance institutions, to shifts in developing thinking and practice. Roy argues that in response to a "crisis in legitimacy" (particularly following severe critiques that IMF and World Bank structural adjustment reforms brought greater poverty and undermined third world economic sovereignty) development is being remade as a "kindler and gentler process," one that is as concerned with human development (poverty, environmental degradation, universal education, global partnership) as previous eras were strictly concerned with economic growth. She calls this new form, Millennial Development (Roy, 2010, p. 7).

As an outspoken internal critic, Stiglitz, the former chief economist of the World Bank, has become an important voice in shaping Millennium Development's thinking and practices. Challenging the basic tenets of the "Washington Consensus" Stiglitz admitted the failure of pure market capitalism, demonstrating the inability of markets to provide collective goods. Offering a new explanation, Stiglitz argued that poverty was an instance of "market failure," and proposed new interventions, which unlike the pure market orthodoxy characteristic of structural adjustment reforms provided a role for state and civil society. In addition, Stiglitz argued that development interventions could no longer be designed in Washington, but rather that developing countries must actively participate in and take ownership over development projects (Roy, 2010, p. 17 citing Stiglitz 1998 p.33). Yet as Roy points out, with these internal critiques Stiglitz became an important architect of a *new agenda*—that of decentralized development, equipped with ways of thinking, discourses, and practices, many of which still originated in Washington.

A new focus on human development required a new set of indicators than those, which focused narrowly on a particular nations' economic growth. In the context of

Millennium Development, poverty is measured according to an international poverty line, constituting a new global category “the bottom billion,” and a new object of concern--creating the conditions to spur the entrepreneurial activity of individuals who make up this new global conglomerate (Roy, 2010, p. 17) .

Millennial Development Goals provide a global framework for national and international actors to measure and track poverty alleviation. The goals include ending poverty and hunger, achieving gender equality, ensuring that every child has access to universal education, improving maternal and child health, combating aids, addressing environmental sustainability (including access to safe water), and building partnerships between donor and developing countries. Partnerships emphasize the role for the private sector to give access to global markets, increase in aid and debt reduction, increase in access to ICT, and access to affordable drugs.⁷ Unlike the complicated economic statistics of previous periods, The Millennial Development goals are intentionally accessible to ordinary citizens around the world, who “seek to hold their governments and wider international community accountable for their achievement.” (Roy, 2010, p. 8 quoting UNDP 2003a: vi).

While providing a framework of accountability, however, The Millennium Development goals also have the potential to limit how projects can be imagined. In my study, for example, Tanzanian practitioners regularly described their current projects and mapped out their future objectives according to how each was in line with these Millennium goals. So while Stiglitz insisted that countries should manage and own their development interventions, because international donors often decide funding priorities in relation to Millennium development goals, local development organizations have little choice but to design their projects to fit with these global goals.

This accessibility to understand poverty as well as the global consciousness and will to “make poverty history,” has effectively mobilized diverse global actors who each find a place and purpose in the global project despite their ideological differences. Roy calls this phenomenon, the “democratization of development.”

“Millennium development,” she argues involves the formation of a parallel apparatus of development in which global philanthropic foundations, global justice campaigns, and global non-governmental organizations, commanding resources, power, and influence that far exceeds the scope of most nation states, lead the fight against poverty. Today poverty agendas are shaped not only by powerful multilateral organizations such as the World Bank and IMF, but also by iconic figures such as Bill and Melinda Gates, Bill Clinton, and Bono. Individual global citizens also have a role to play by making conscious decisions about their consumer and investment habits (Roy, 2010, p. 10). By choosing to “buy red,” for example, global citizens can ensure that part of the sales of their red iPod will be used to buy low-cost HIV treatments in Africa⁸. They can make an even more direct investment by providing a loan to an entrepreneur of their choice, and monitoring the returns on their investment, by tracking the progress of the business and the rate of repayment over time.

Circumventing traditional circuits of power is a common Millennial Development practice and rather than coordinating efforts with the Tanzanian Government or other more influential and experienced local NGO’s, global citizens often seek to work directly

⁷ <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/global.shtml>

⁸ <http://www.joinred.com/aboutred>

with individuals and communities. In Tanzania there has been a proliferation of international NGO's as global citizens throughout the world, come to Africa to do their part.

2.2.2.1 The new consensus on poverty: entrepreneurial activity as the solution to poverty. Despite heavy critiques of the market fundamentalism implied by a Washington consensus, which shifts in development thinking and decentralized practice intended to overcome, Roy argues that there is actually a new Washington consensus on poverty. Using this term consciously as a counter point to Stiglitz's argument that critiques of the Washington consensus has brought about a 'post-Washington consensus consensus' she argues that "there may be a new consensus, but its still centered in DC and promotes a market based approach to poverty." In particular she is referring to the unusual prominence of micro-finance and promotion of entrepreneurial practice, which has become the "panacea of choice," as an antidote to pull the "bottom billion" out of poverty among institutions and theorists regardless of divergent ideologies (Roy, 2010, p. 20).

Although I agree with Roy's assessment that the promotion of entrepreneurial practices and market based approaches to development represent a new "consensus," the theories and approaches to how to best to support entrepreneurial activity differ both in the academic and micro-enterprise literature and among the participants in my study.

One of the key differences among those who promote market-oriented development is the question of whether markets work independently or whether they require state or global intervention. Furthermore, as Roy points out, the debate about whether markets work or fail, also involves an imagination of places where it does work or fail. Africa has taken a particularly prominent place in this regard. Once viewed as 'heart of darkness' burdened by corrupt states and failing markets, today Africa is imagined, as a place that was wronged by development and globalization, and as Benetton's ad depicts, holds great promise (Moyo, 2009; Roy, 2010, p. 20).

Jeffery Sachs of Columbia University is a key representative of the camp who believes that markets don't operate well independently and supports intervention to ensure more widespread participation. Sachs is one of Millennium Development's influential figures, whose texts and advice have shaped the consensus on poverty. As head of the advisory board of the Millennium Project, he was commissioned to develop a global action plan for the world to achieve the Millennium Goals and outlined many of his recommendations in his book, "The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for our Time.

Sachs describes markets as "powerful engines of development," but mirroring the critiques of Stiglitz, drew from Keynesian economic principals to argue that without certain preconditions: basic infrastructure (roads, power, and ports), and human capital (education, and health), "markets can cruelly bypass large parts of the world, leaving them impoverished" (J. Sachs, 2005, p. 3). He described development as a ladder, with different countries on different rungs, invoking development metaphors of modernization theories popularized in the 60's and 70's. Countries climb up the ladder to prosperity by building on science, technology, and markets. Sachs argued that 1/6th of humanity are not yet on the ladder; they are caught in a "poverty trap"(2005, p. 19). The bottom billion are unable to save or invest in growth, because they must consume the fruits of their labor, or

use wages to buy basic necessities. This prevents them from participating in the productive progress promised by globalization.

Suggesting that it is in the interest of those on the ladder to help them, he tells the western world “it is our task to bring them onto the ladder of development, at least to gain a foothold on the bottom rung from which they can proceed to climb on their own” (2005, p. 2). His recommendations lay the groundwork for legitimizing global intervention by those on the ladder, while at the same time setting up expectations by the “bottom billion,” for the aid they should receive.

Entrepreneurship projects vary, but unlike in Bangladesh, few poor Tanzanians begin their upward climb with immediate access to capital; rather they attend to even more basic “pre-conditions” for participation in the ladder of progress. Education is often the first step in becoming the kind of person who could eventually access capital. As I observed in my research, entrepreneurial trainings teach a “new entrepreneurial mindset,” and direct participants to practice financial literacy and discipline by generating their own savings in small groups, called Saccos. Once they have independently generated enough collective capital from their individual savings, they loan out their collective savings to members of the group, who take turns starting and expanding small micro-enterprise projects and return the capital with *riba* or interest. Those who successfully manage their micro-enterprise projects will have greater opportunity to access more comprehensive financial services, thus beginning their climb up the ladder.

A second key approach regarding the “consensus on poverty” is represented by Easterly, a professor of economics, who writing against Sachs argues that markets work independently, without state and international intervention, but that you have to let them work. Unlike Sachs and Stiglitz, Easterly understands the problem of poverty as one of bureaucratic failure, rather than market failure. He criticizes Sachs and the international development community for dreaming up and implementing large scale utopian plans (using Sach’s plan to “make poverty history” as his prime example), which usually have little relevance to the people and particular context, which their good intentions are meant to serve. Rather than big plans driven by “planners” (top down bureaucrats) and standardized global objectives (such as the Millennium Development Goals) Easterly favors small, localized improvements, driven by “searchers” (bottom up pragmatists) who can assess the needs of a particular environment, analyze and evaluate a particular small scale intervention, and either refine or abandon accordingly. For Easterly, a scheme, such as micro-finance that is successful in a particular location, cannot be considered a magical panacea that can be translated and spread across the globe, but rather represents just one creative response (Easterly, 2006).

Nevertheless his definition of a “searcher,” one who pays attention to local conditions and develops innovative responses through a process of experimentation, reflection, and revision, characterizes the very entrepreneurial practices and mindsets which entrepreneurship trainings encourage. As I sought to show in the previous discussion of definitions of “entrepreneur,” entrepreneurial practices were not limited to business creation; Easterly’s argument suggests that even development practice could benefit from an entrepreneurial orientation. This was the case in my research as international donors seek to build the entrepreneurial capacity of NGO’s so that they operate using a business rather than a development model. According to a business model, NGO’s can no longer count on automatic funding to serve their constituents or

beneficiaries, who often have no recourse but to take what is being served. Instead, in order to stay in business, NGO's must compete for clients and customers and therefore must develop innovative services, which customers and clients are willing to even pay for.

Despite their different theoretical understandings of markets and development, Easterly, Stiglitz, and Sachs are all economic professors writing specifically to a development audience and engaged specifically with the problem of how to address poverty. Even Easterly, who levels strong critiques against large-scale development intervention, still offers suggestions for how one should intervene as a "searcher." In contrast, however, Prahalad, as a professor of business represents a new, powerful voice—one which speaks from outside the development field, yet by reconceptualizing the relationship between development and capital, offers a provocative new development frame, which has shaped current development thinking and practice.

Speaking to both a business and development audience, in his book, "The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid,"(2006) Prahalad articulated what he considered a critical role for the private sector in addressing poverty. Multi-national corporations should help the poor, he argued not through development interventions and corporate responsibility, but rather through "win-win partnerships," whereby the multi-national corporations profit while providing consumer goods and services to those in need. In this way Prahalad sought "to convert poverty into an opportunity for all (Prahalad, 2006, p. xv)."

Like Easterly, Prahalad critiqued development planners for assuming rather than learning about the particular needs of their poor constituents. He worked to dispel the myth that poor people were not brand conscious or that they weren't willing to pay for more efficient services. He encouraged the private sector, (motivated by profit incentives, which global and national development institutions lack), to use their talents (like Easterly's "searchers") to develop products and services, which would respond to consumer's needs and facilitate purchasing capacity despite their inconsistent cash flow.

Prahalad sought to develop markets for the poor, an idea which built on his previous life's work, which demonstrated how businesses could be more competitive by thinking about their businesses from the customer's point of view. By first recognizing the poor as potential customers, and then taking seriously their feedback and needs, he argued that businesses should "co-create" new marketable products with the poor (2006, p. xiv). By shifting an idea and practice from one sector (business) and retooling it to fit another (social development) Prahalad exemplifies the entrepreneurial and searcher mentalities described by Easterly and Dees and the blurring of boundaries, which have become central to social entrepreneurship.

Given the ideological diversity of Millennial Development actors, their particular choice of language provides a window into how we might understand their differences. Shifts in development thinking are not only represented linguistically by new discourses such as the "bottom billion," or the "poverty trap," but Prahalad in particular recognized the power of language to constitute new understandings of the world, new identities, and new ways of interacting with each other.

In contrast to Roy's sense that the unprecedented visibility of poverty has fueled a global interest in "making poverty history," Prahalad (approaching the problem from a different (business) orientation, argued that 'poverty alleviation' and the 'poor,' are terms that are loaded with problematic meaning and historical baggage. Instead he argued, "If

we stop thinking of the poor as victims or as a burden and start recognizing them as resilient and creative entrepreneurs and value-conscious consumers, a whole new world of opportunity will open up” (p. 25). And in contrast to critiques by Stiglitz that market oriented structural adjustment policies *served* the interests of multinational corporations and caused poverty, Prahalad argued that the poor have been “*ignored* by multinational companies” and therefore have been *forced* to depend on poor quality goods and local markets controlled by slum lords (p. 29). Access to markets, he argued does not cause poverty, but rather liberates the poor from miserable conditions giving them more *choice* and *access* to global standards. According to Prahalad, paying attention to the poor will not only provide them with high quality products at affordable prices, but “will give them recognition, dignity and choice as consumers.” Access of this sort he argues “will build their self-esteem and the entrepreneurial drive” (2006, p. 21). It is likely not a coincidence that Prahalad, seeking to make his business principals relevant to a development audience described the benefits of markets at the bottom of the pyramid using discourses such as dignity, choice, recognition, and self-esteem which appeal to Millennial Development’s human development focus.

By “world of opportunity,” Prahalad therefore spoke not only of what multinational corporations and consumers stand to gain from new markets at the “bottom of the pyramid,” but also he described new opportunities for local consumer and entrepreneurs. Prahalad regarded consumers as “equally important joint problem solvers,” who had a stake in how markets would be developed and could give valuable feedback about which products and services were needed. Also because of their knowledge about current market conditions and consumer needs, local entrepreneurs could etch out businesses specifically in places that multi-national corporations were unable or unwilling to go.

Calling for “increased participation” of marginalized people, has become a popular focus in the context of Millennium development’s efforts to shift development out of Washington and empower communities to design and take ownership over their own development interventions. But as Prahalad, Easterly, and theorists of social entrepreneurship argue, unlike entrepreneurs, who compete for investment and customers and thus have clear incentives to seek out and respond to the feedback of their clients or beneficiaries, development practitioners and government officials, receive their salaries regardless of their performance and the consequences of their interventions, and therefore do not have the same incentive to take “participation” seriously. In contrast, Prahalad argued, multinational corporations would fail to profit unless they managed to produce products, which were relevant and useful to their consumers. For this reason, Prahalad regarded participation of marginalized communities, (their potential customers), not as an option, but a necessity.

Multinational Corporations however did not know this new customer base, and therefore saw an important role for large and small firms, governments, civil society, development agencies and the poor themselves to work together in developing BOP markets. According to Prahalad, designing useful products was only one part of the equation in ensuring profitable markets as BOP markets would also require “creating the capacity to consume”(2006, pp. 40-42) among consumers with inconsistent and limited cash flow. By teaching savings and crediting practices and developing entrepreneurial

mindsets, he believed NGO's and other community advocates could play a critical role in developing markets and innovative entrepreneurs.

Multi-national corporations also play a role creating markets at the bottom of the pyramid by providing funding and expertise to potential entrepreneurs. Exxon Mobil for example, partnering with Ashoka, a global association of leading social entrepreneurs, and the International Center for Research on Women⁹ provides investment capital and business expertise to a select group of women entrepreneurs who have been chosen through their business competition "Women, Tools, Technology: Building Opportunities & Economic Power Challenge." The competitive process is intended to inspire the most "innovative solutions for catalyzing women's economic advancement, using technology to make significant improvements for the lives of women in developing countries" (Gaynair, 2010). Women, who are selected, receive on-going training and mentorship in order to ensure that they have the capacity to implement, and "scale up" or spread their good ideas.

Considering that "Four billion poor can be the engine of the next round of global trade and prosperity," (2006, p. 25) addressing the needs of the poor through markets, according to Prahlad is neither philanthropy nor social responsibility, but "just good business." It is here within "inclusive capitalism" that development and capital converge and the boundaries between civil society and a private business sector are blurred.

I locate my research here at this intersection between the interests of multi-national corporations, Millennium Development, local and international NGO's, local consumers and potential entrepreneurs at the Bottom of the Pyramid. While I didn't work directly with multi-national corporations, they were often present as the imagined but invisible investor who could potentially invest in a good idea, and whose imagined but invisible standards an entrepreneur need to meet. Multi-national corporations sometimes sponsored competitions for local entrepreneurs to develop innovative business plans, and participants in my study not only applied to these competitions, but these competitions served as guiding texts for the kinds of entrepreneurial practice and ideas that local practitioners taught.

Despite their different approaches and disagreements about how and whether to intervene, each of these Millennium development theorists take for granted capitalism and markets as a positive mechanism of exchange. Critiques, such as those of Nyerere, that capitalism is by definition unjust and operates by creating and reproducing the very marginalization, inequality, and poverty, which these Millennium development actors endeavor to solve, have no place in this particular conversation. While some will admit, (as Stiglitz did) that unfettered capitalism may have caused these problems, they consider poverty as a result of particular instances of "market failure," which they argue can be "fixed" with technical supports (capital, training, win-win partnerships), and a greater attention to human development. And once on the ladder, the system of capitalism can be harnessed towards positive social ends for all.

⁹ see also <http://www.changemakers.com/technologywomen>
http://www.exxonmobil.com/Corporate/community_women_techuse.aspx

2.3 The Perspective of Critical Theorists

The conversation between Millennium development actors differs from the conversations between critical development theorists in the academy. In the social science disciplines, theories of development often begin with critiques of capitalism and describe how development operates in complex and often invisible ways in its service. Although my research informants (both Tanzanian and American) would position themselves in relation to the mainstream conversations described in the previous sections, I will place these conversations in dialogue with a more critical set of social science theory in order to take seriously the limitations and insights of both sides. In this sense, while I use the insights of critical development theorists to critically examine popular entrepreneurial development discourses in practice, I also want to pay close attention to the powerful promise and possibilities real people believe social entrepreneurship offers.

Following Ferguson's *Anti-Politics Machine* (1994) several development theorists have shifted their focus from deciding whether development is good or bad to examining how different forms of knowledge critically shape how development can be imagined and practiced (Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Li, 2007; Tsing, 2005). They demonstrate inability of development practitioners and academics of critical development to speak to each other to illustrate the radically different forms of knowledge that are brought to bear in understanding producing "development." Stepping back from ideological rhetoric and deciding who is right or wrong, Ferguson asked how it was possible that educated development practitioners could make statements, which while acceptable to other development practitioners, would be considered absolutely absurd in academic settings. By the same token, he questioned why acceptable statements from the realm of academic discourse and even on the ground observation taken from Lesotho, fail to find their way into the discursive regime of development (Ferguson, 1994, p. 67).

Like many critical development theorists, Ferguson drew from theories of discourse developed by Michael Foucault to explain how development practitioners first came to "know" Lesotho as an object of development and how that knowledge facilitated particular development interventions. According to Foucault a discourse is a *system of representation*, which governs how an object should be understood and meaningfully talked about (Michel Foucault, 1978). Just as a discourse defines acceptable and intelligible ways to talk, write, or conduct, it rules out, limits and restricts other ways of talking, writing, and conducting, giving rise to new regulatory practices and laws, through which people come to define themselves. According to Ferguson, development practitioners and academics belong to different discourse communities, whose different logics make it difficult if not impossible to talk to each other.

Development agencies construct problems, in ways that allow them to use their expertise. For this reason, seeing the problem in ways that practitioners are unable to address, defeats their institutional purpose. For example, As Ferguson explains:

"An analysis which suggests that the causes of poverty in Lesotho are political and structural (not technical and geographical) that the national government is part of the problem (not a neutral instrument for its solution), and that meaningful change can only come through revolutionary social transformation in South Africa has no place in development discourse simply because development

agencies are not in the business of promoting political realignments or supporting revolutionary struggles” (Ferguson, 1994, p. 69).

Similarly academic discourse has its own rules, which require academics to respond to their own institutional and ideological constraints. While we are often rewarded for our objectivity and complexity of our critiques, we are not in the business of responding to the real everyday needs of people and communities, so we do not have to engage with the same kinds of immediate concerns faced regularly by development practitioners. For this reason, development practitioners often regard critiques and theories, which originate in the “ivory tower,” as out of touch with the realities “on the ground.”

The disconnect between these communities of experts expresses a variety of ideological positions. On the one hand there are those who believe that the development industry is a good thing, and scrutinize the development apparatus in order to make it better (Sachs, Stiglitz and to some extent even Prahlad and Easterly); on the other hand, there are those (mostly academics), who consider the development industry imperialistic - set up to govern third world peoples according to capital interests (Tikly, 2004). They seek to find political alternatives to development (Escobar, 1995; Rahnema & Bawtree, 1997; Rist, 2002; W. Sachs, 1992). I align myself with a third group, which takes seriously the critiques of development, but also recognizes the possibilities for development techniques to be reshaped towards new ends (Cooper, 2005; Cornwall, 2004; Crewe & Harrison, 1998; J. Ferguson, 2008; Li, 2007).

2.3.1 Situating local entrepreneurial innovations within global governance.

When it comes to the “making of local entrepreneurs,” and development of “green economies” a particular kind of deadlock has developed. While many practitioners within Millennium Development would consider activities which simultaneously serve the interests of both business and development as “win-win partnerships,” critics argue that partnerships between unequal partners are inherently contradictory and could therefore, never be mutually beneficial. They describe these partnerships as a new form of tyranny, locating efforts such as those of Exxon-Mobil (which has one of the most egregious track records for environmental pollution and human rights abuses) to “empower local innovation” as part of a discursive project to legitimize global capitalist expansion and quell resistance (Apple, 2006; Giroux, 2008; P. McLaren, 2005; P. McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005; P. L. McLaren, 1993; Tikly, 2004).

My work builds on the approaches of those who argue that by considering entrepreneurial innovations as *locally* embedded poverty reduction schemes, which respond specifically to “*local*” problems, enthusiasts have failed to consider the *global* interests and contexts, which shape these “local” projects and even contribute to the problems in the first place (Brigg, 2006; Weber, 2006a). Weber, for example locates the global spread and support for entrepreneurial projects and micro-finance not within development, but rather as part of a governance agenda, which she describes as “a disciplinary approach which aims to lock in local livelihoods in accordance with the imperatives of restructuring capitalism on a global scale” (Weber, 2006a, p. 43). But while my research focuses on the *local* practices in which entrepreneurs are being made, I consider local practice and the discourses through which local practice is mediated and

constituted, as organically connected to global contexts, as the site, in fact, through which global politics are fought, negotiated, disrupted, and reshaped (Holland & Lave, 2009).

While many development practitioners consider Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) to be non-state actors (as their very name explicitly states), I join critics in examining the important governmental functions these organizations fulfill (Ferguson, 1994; Igoe & Kelsall, 2005; Li, 2007; Weber, 2006a). Structural adjustment reforms, which were intended to roll back oppressive states and liberate a more democratic and economically civil society, gave rise to many new NGO's which have taken advantage of donor policies to shift funding from mistrusted state bureaucracies into what was understood as more direct or grassroots channels of implementation (Ferguson, 1994). Although NGO's appear to be opposed to neo-liberalism and neo-classical economics, as Briggs warns, the rising presence of NGO's is complex and should not be simply understood as a sign of emancipation (Brigg, 2006, p. 73). By eschewing the involvement of state bureaucracies in the lives of local people, NGO's (with their roots in Western populisms and notions of civil society) spread discursive representations and facilitate projects which end up being consistent with the aims of structural adjustment, reproducing the conditions of poverty they were meant to address.

As several critical development theorists argue, "development with a human face," represents an effort by IMF and World Bank to respond to worldwide resistance and a crisis of legitimacy while finding new ways to preserve the old order (Roy, 2010; Weber, 2006a). Weber traces the origins of micro-finance and the promotion of entrepreneurial practices to this effort. Rather than provide social services (as States had once done) to cushion the burden of what Stiglitz referred to as "market failure," the micro-finance approaches, employed by private and individual NGO's have become the "handmaiden" rather than the antidote to structural adjustment and neo-liberal globalization (Roy, 2010, p. 32) "adjusting to what transnational neo-liberal structural adjustment policies have helped to create—fewer jobs and the marginalization of the poor" (Isserles, 2003).

Such entrepreneurial projects suit the same objectives as the original Washington Consensus even while the "post-Washington consensus" claimed to offer radical alternatives. Despite his insistence that development projects should be designed and owned by local communities, for example, Stiglitz failed to consider the many ways in which global institutions, corporations, and Washington actors like himself still define and monitor the rules of a new "post-Washington Consensus." Although intending to bring attention and shift ownership and agency to those who had been marginalized by the first Washington Consensus, global efforts to support individual entrepreneurs and their innovations, still tend to require local communities to articulate their innovations in relation to standards and "best practices," which are set by global funders, investors, and global monetary institutions in the West (Gould, 2005). Since these institutions monitor and distribute funds based on *their* assessment of a project's value, local practices may be "local" in name only.

Foucault's concept of "governmentality" is useful in conceptualizing how governmental powers are exercised without the presence of a state actor. Foucault regards government as "all endeavors to shape, guide, and direct the conduct of others," which also includes the (subtle) ways one might be urged or educated to bridle one's own passions, control one's own instinct, or govern oneself, a practice he calls the "Conduct

of conduct” (Cruikshank, 1999, p. 205; Michel Foucault, 1982; Rose, 1999, p. 3). The objective of government therefore is not to dominate others, but rather to enhance their capacity for action such that by “following only their own self-interest people will do as they ought.’ And because people are not necessarily aware of how their conduct is being conducted or why, in many cases the question of consent does not arise (Li, 2007, p. 5).

The work of neo-liberal governmentality is therefore the constitution of the “free subject,” a person who is “produced as s/he is acted upon and acts upon her or himself without the need for the operation of power as imposition or interdiction” (Brigg, 2006, p. 71). My research considers efforts to educate entrepreneurs in this context. Against the arguments for social entrepreneurship as a tool to inspire local innovation and change, I explore how entrepreneurial education can function as new “technologies of government,” (Cruikshank, 1999; Michael Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1999) producing a neo-liberal subject, the entrepreneur, through which the conduct of Tanzanians is conducted in ways that further entrench (rather than overcome) neo-liberal globalization.

2.3.1.1 Governing through development discourse. While I will ultimately argue that power is unpredictable and needs to be studied rather than dismissed, my analysis begins with the ways development discourse shapes and constrains how people understand and engage in the world, how “free subjects,” come to understand themselves and their situation, and how they conduct their conduct accordingly. Neo-liberal discourses recast problems and material conditions in ways that shift the burden for poverty, illness, and unemployment into the individual’s domain, thereby rendering individuals as responsible for themselves. And by presenting entrepreneurial practices and subjectivities as basic requirements to live in this “new” global world, discourses have the potential to lead and control the individuals who take seriously new discursive representations of the world and attempt to align themselves accordingly.

I draw from and seek to contribute to the work of critical development theorists who demonstrate the role of discourse in producing and managing “the Third World.” By questioning the very category of development, these theorists seek to illuminate how seemingly neutral representations of the world effectively constitute new social and economic relations (neo-liberal globalization), new identities (entrepreneurs) and relationships (partnership), by creating new conceptual categories through which development institutions intervene and consequently govern the Third World (Brigg, 2006, p. 66; Escobar, 1995, p. 5; Ferguson, 1994).

In other words, these theorists show how discourses reproduce relations of power: By privileging one form of discourse, development institutions ignore alternative discourses, representations, and knowledge, forcing all who wish to speak (and be heard) to use a shared vocabulary and conceptual categories (Escobar, 1995; Ferguson, 1994) Through repetition and use, discourses of development eventually become “common sense” (Fairclough, 2001) despite their misrepresentation of reality. Interventions are designed in relation to these common sense understandings and seen as legitimate and appropriate as long as these discourse continue to be accepted “truths.”

The American and Tanzanian development practitioners and government officials in my study employed “commonsense” global discourses of entrepreneurship to talk about and address the “particular problems” (environmental destruction, corruption, poverty) facing Mlimani, my research site. In doing so they demonstrated how as Roy argues, “local” entrepreneurial interventions are actually part of a larger global discourse,

“poverty capital,” which has become the “currency of poverty experts” (Roy, 2010, p. 32). Representations of poverty, which propose entrepreneurial mindsets and practices as the solution have become truth—“understood as certain, legitimate, and undeniably correct.”

Development expertise produces consent to its policies by using the very language (lack of access, empowerment, marginalization) that has embodied the critiques of neo-liberal ideology and practice (Isserles, 2003). Micro-finance and entrepreneurial solutions exemplify the work of development discourse to represent neo-liberal globalization in attractive terms. For example, according to current development discourse, “The poor are no longer poor, because they are lazy or culturally deficient, but because they lack access to certain resources, specifically credit, education, and training” (Isserles, 2003, p. 45). And given the right tools, anybody can become economically successful. Additionally, entrepreneurship projects are accompanied by a “rhetoric of empowerment” and “self-help jargon,” often claiming that by bringing the marginalized and poor people into the financial system, access to micro-credit and entrepreneurial practices give people confidence, self-esteem, responsibility and self worth (2003, p. 45).

Although couched in positive discourses of change, this popular construction of “poverty” locates the problem and the solution at the site of the individual and the local, and ignores the many ways that the poor are already entrepreneurial and hard working. A narrow focus on individual behavior as the means to overcoming poverty also does the work of hiding alternative interpretations, which consider poverty as a structural problem and a consequence of how society is organized and policies and decisions are made through relations of power and domination (Weber, 2006a). Furthermore, constructing poverty as the consequence of “unfilled market potentials,” legitimizes interventions aimed at “breaking down barriers,” to create the appropriate market conditions (Weber, 2006a, p. 51). Liberalization policies, which “free” protected markets and attract foreign investment aid in this process, but as Prahalad also pointed out, functioning markets depend on the participation of consumers and entrepreneurs at the bottom of the pyramid who also must be “freed” from social constraints in order to participate. As Weber argues, “Breaking down barriers” to capital flow therefore also includes the breaking down of socio-cultural barriers: local traditions which emphasize non-competitive business practices, Islamic perspectives on interest, legislation which reflect redistributive foci, or other inhibitors to marketization” (Weber, 2006a; 51).

In this sense, I explore how global discourses of development are constructed by “experts” prior to and out of the context of the actual development interactions. Because development practitioners articulate problems in ways that match their expertise and make sense according to their own discourse community, my research shows how they often deny (or fail to see) politics and the actual material conditions in which real people live, effectively re-imagining political problems, such as poverty, in technical terms (Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Escobar, 1995; Ferguson, 1994; Li, 2007). My research adds to the body of work that shows how even if the interventions are unsuccessful in terms of their initial goals, they have the unintended effects of “depoliticizing everything they touch” (Ferguson, 1994, p. xv). Framing problems and solutions in technical and non-political terms in turn facilitates the generalization and spread of expertise, which seen as “free-floating” and “untied to context,” can so easily be inserted into any given situation (Ferguson, 1994, p. 258).

A popular mantra from my research in Tanzania: “it’s time to change the mindset,” for example, operates to inspire individuals to adapt to structural adjustment policies, welfare cuts, and growing poverty. Such a statement has to be understood as part of a larger global project in which subjectivities are being remade to serve these interests of capital, while simultaneously responsibility for failure or success is shifted to the individual effectively quelling social resistance.

Yet it would be dangerously simplistic to regard global development discourses as a simple expression of power. In the context of poor government services, growing corruption, and visible benefits for those who were able to successfully harness global capital, for example, it is not difficult to imagine how such a mantra might seem attractive.

In this sense critics of “Millennial Development” have often produced the mirror opposite of those they critique: By emphasizing the power of discourse, they have ignored the agency of the individual. While my theoretical framework is strongly informed by these critiques of development discourse, therefore I am also attentive to the contradictory nature of discursive power and particularly to the ways that individuals do not passively accept new representations and practices, but rather how they actively experiment with new forms of power, exploiting these contradictions.

2.3.1.2 Toward a non-monolithic understanding of discursive power. While I consider the potential of discourses to operate as key techniques of government capable of conducting the conduct of Tanzanians, I heed the caution of critical development and globalization scholars, who argue that development is neither monolithic, nor simply imposed (Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Li, 2007; Mosse, 2005; Tsing, 2005). Because discourses require the consent and participation of their governed (even passively) in order to be effective technologies of government, they derive their meaning (and consequently their power and influence) only in relation to specific local practices. For this reason, global practices cannot be seen as simply imposed on a complacent local.

I therefore work to place global entrepreneurial discourses and interventions, in context with the local logics and practices they encounter and must engage with in their particular situated contexts (Appadurai, 2001; Inda & Rosaldo, 2002). Because discourses are only effective to the extent they make sense and are accepted as “truth,” global discourses must re-organize themselves in relation to alternative competing logics and practices. And since it is difficult for global development discourses to match local practices (especially if they were developed outside of the context of use according to different needs, beliefs, and social, political, and economic contexts) they must be reorganized so that they do make sense and attract diverse constituents which means that the development apparatus is heterogeneous and not necessarily unified. It is in that space of reorganization that there is possibility for transformation.¹⁰ In other words, I am studying the “limits of government”(Li, 2007, p. 17)

By describing development as a *dispositif*, a heterogeneous ensemble of discursive and material elements...” (Michel Foucault, 1980, p. 194) we can consider development’s complexity and contradictory nature. Development discourses do not work in isolation, but rather in relation to other elements including, “institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific

¹⁰ Therefore, while NGO practitioners facilitate the spread of global discourses through their interventions and travels, their misunderstanding and misdiagnose can lead to multiple unintended consequences.

statements, philosophical, moral, and philanthropic propositions (Brigg, 2006, p. 67 quoting Foucault 1980). And although the material and discursive elements of the *dispositif* work in relation to each other, they do not always work in concert. This creates openings for unpredictable outcomes.

Moreover, as Ferguson demonstrates development discourses are not simple projections of the rational interests of a single class, institution, or knowing powerful subject. Instead, because they serve multiple and even contradictory interests, they are themselves not unified or unifiable. As he argues, “Interests are a key part of the machine [or *dispositif*], but they are not its master term,” (Ferguson, 1994, p. 275) such that while the *dispositif* derives its effectiveness from its ability to operate despite contradictions, these contradictions also create vulnerabilities, which if not contained, become spaces of new possibility, “switch points,” (Rose, 1999, p. 192) which redirect the *dispositif* to serve new interests (Brigg, 2006, p. 70).

Finally, as Tanya Li argues, government is limited by the extent to which global practices and discourses are accepted as truth, since by misrepresenting and depoliticizing reality, the very process of governance may also inspire critique. In *The Will to Improve*, Li further challenges our assumptions of development as tyrannical, unified, all powerful, or uni-directional arguing that we must see development as a “project and not a secure accomplishment” (Li, 2007, p. 10).

Li shows that while practices of government have the effect of closing off alternative ways of understanding, diagnosing, and addressing problems, full closure and thus government is never complete. *Problematization* (discursively constructing problems and identifying deficiencies that need to be rectified) and *rendering technical* (developing procedures, calculations, and techniques to address these problems in specifically technical and non-political ways) (Ferguson, 1994) are routine practices for development experts, and yet the questions that experts exclude, misrecognize, or attempt to contain do not simply go away (Li, 2007). These misrepresentations become the responses, the politics, and eventually the challenges to which government must again respond. In this way Li argues, government (rendering technical) and politics (the critical challenge) are mutually constitutive (Li, 2007).

By considering arts of government and politics as mutually constitutive my research overcomes problematic false binaries between development *structure* and the *agency* of the [entrepreneurial] individual. Rather than focus only on discourse from the point of view of government (and assume that discourses are imposed on ignorant and unknowing masses to serve the interests of a few), I consider development discourses as tools, which both define and necessitate struggle. Securing consent for a new entrepreneurial discourse does not happen naturally, but rather requires effort to overcome alternative local discourses and to coordinate alignment between contradictory discursive representations, subjectivities, and material conditions. For this reason, I consider the “*making* of the entrepreneur” as a project which not only has not yet and may never be accomplished, but which is actively performed rather than passively reproduced by both development expert and beneficiary, a performance that is conducted in local practices, to a large extent through language (which I will describe in section 3).

In this sense, following James Ferguson, I shift my focus from critiques of discourse and representations of power as something we must resist, to instead examining how real people actually use development discourses as resources to “experiment with

power”(J. Ferguson, 2008). Because power/discourse is never complete, as Ferguson argues, discourses can always be used towards new ends and he explores how neo-liberal governance might -- as Li suggests -- inspire a kind of productive politics. In the context of neoliberal global capitalism, development presents itself in new ways, co-opting the language and interests of critique in order to gain consent and overcome resistance. Yet by appealing to -- rather than controlling -- local interests, new political spaces might be created in which individuals can produce new and unexpected outcomes. Rather than simply critiquing and rejecting neoliberal tactics, therefore, I consider how actual people engage with and attempt to transform them. My study of the “making of the entrepreneur,” then, raises the question of how neoliberal efforts at conducting the conduct of Tanzanians -- promoting entrepreneurial practices, for example -- might also create spaces in which entrepreneurs might make themselves, as a kind of entrepreneur suited to their own practices.

As Cooper and Scott have already shown, the oppressed have always used structures of oppression as their mode of resistance and discourses of the powerful to couch their critiques (Cooper, 2001, 2005; Scott, 1985, 1990). This may be just as true in an era of neoliberal ascendancy, where entrepreneurial discourses have become the currency of development experts and private business; might not this “poverty capital” also be used by the poor themselves? When development experts and investors seek out “fundable” entrepreneurial subjects, the fact that local beneficiaries adopt the necessary fundraising discourse might suggest something other than their domination. Instead, I suggest that by strategically employing popular development discourses, Tanzanians might potentially manipulate and redefine development interactions and redirect resource flows towards new ends.

To answer this question, I consider discourse as *situated language use* and examine how discourse, as a social practice (Blommaert, 2005, 2010; Fairclough, 2001; Fairclough & Chouliaraki, 1999; Gee, 2005; Pennycook, 2010) becomes the means by which development discourses might be contested and reshaped. Adopting the language of development expertise does not necessarily mean adopting the social practices, belief systems, identities, etc, which they might index in World Bank publications or even in the minds of the people who first use them. Especially if we shift the focus of discourse from structure to function (Blommaert, 2010, p. 2), and consider development discourses as valued commodities (Heller, 2010) which can be used to serve various functions, we may find that Tanzanians are not simply governed through discourse, but rather remaking themselves and their social practices using the valued “currency of development”(Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991; Roy, 2010) in order to serve their own interests.

2.3.3 From abstract discourse to discourse as local social practice. Both those in favor of Millennium Development and its critics tend to approach this question in the abstract, and to locate power in one of two places: at the site of the local subjective experience (thereby regarding the promotion of entrepreneurial practices as empowering) or as representing a unified development apparatus, governing and constraining subjects toward global capital interests (thereby regarding the promotion of entrepreneurial practices as domination). To sidestep this dichotomy, it is more useful to situate entrepreneurial discourses within the practice to which actors actually put it. Shifting the focus from abstract debates about the promise and dangers of building entrepreneurial

capacity, I examine the actual practices and everyday interactions in which discourses have meaning and the conduct of Tanzanians becomes both the object of government and the site of political struggle. Because social practices are constituted to a large extent in and through language, my study also considers discourse as a linguistic practice and uses micro-linguistic (discourse) analysis to examine the role of language in producing, contesting, and reshaping entrepreneurial discourses, practices, and knowledge according to varying interests.

By paying close attention to both *discourse* (as linguistic resources, and ways of using language) and the social practices in which discourses are negotiated and come to have meaning, my study also contributes to efforts within discourse studies to overcome dichotomies *between* discourse and social practice approaches. As such, I consider language not only as a tool for actively negotiating and contesting global and local social relations in a particular situated site (which is the emphasis (and limitations) of social practice), but also used “on site,” in the service of discourse to constitute those practices as well as the identities of those involved, and the relationships between them (Blommaert, 2005, 2010; Fairclough, 1992, 2001; Gee, 2005). Social practices, however, are also not separate from larger structural contexts. Social practice and discourse theorists both seek to transcend a stale opposition between structure and agency by approaching social life as both constrained by social structures and actively produced in social practice (Blommaert, 2005; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Chaiklin & Lave, 1993; Fairclough, 2001; Giddens, 1979). But while some social practice and discourse theorists still take social structure and subjective experience -- or the sites of the local and the global -- to be separate units of analysis (and examine the relations *between* them) I take it that the *structure* that shapes practice and *subjects* who creatively experiment with that structure are already “given together in the world, in practice, as integral, interrelated aspects of social life” (Lave, 2011, p. 3 citing e.g., Bernstein’s exegesis of Marx, Fajans & Turner 1988, Chaiklin 1993, Ollman 1971). And precisely because they reflect and are constitutive of global structures, I consider local social practices, and particularly discourse, or language in interaction as an ideal site for observing the active and contentious arts of government, which both constrain individual innovation and provoke strategic experimentation.

According to Lave and Holland, “local practice comes about in the encounters between people as they address and respond to each other while enacting cultural activities under conditions of political -economic, and cultural-historical conjuncture” (Holland & Lave, 2009, p. 3). In my study, American and Tanzanian development practitioners, government officials, and representatives of women and youth groups co-constructed new social practices and negotiated the meaning of entrepreneurial discourses as they came together articulating a shared purpose of creating and promoting new local environmental enterprises in the Mlimani community. The language of “newness” – which all partners endorsed -- however, could cause us to overlook, however, the way, in which as Bourdieu describes, “new” moments of social practice bring together multiple forms of history (Bourdieu, 1977). Or as Holland and Lave put it, “[h]istory is brought to the present moment of local time/space in the body/mind of actors,” (Holland & Lave, 2009, p. 3) actors who draw on previous experiences, cultural knowledge and models, discursive practices, and cultural-historical tools even as they address new conditions and new “partners” who arrive at the practice with often very different expectations and draw

on their own cultural historical models and tools. Situating the various social actors too deeply within particular histories of experience or social practice could cause us to overlook the extent to which these historically-situated actors were not “stuck in culture,” and simply “following scripts,” but rather negotiating, experimenting, and attempting to transform their practice in the moment, much of which is done through language (Francis & Hester, 2004).

In my study because the promotion of entrepreneurial practices brought together very different kinds of people, who were drawing on very different cultural historical practices, knowledge, and tools, it was necessary to examine how participants separately understood the activity and explore how they might *not* share the same goals and orientations. My project therefore built on the insights of cultural historical activity theory (or CHAT), which emphasizes the goal-oriented activities (entrepreneurship trainings, partnerships, meetings) and the cultural historical tools (especially language) participants use to mediate their activities (Cole & Levitin, 2000; Engestrom, 1999, 2001; Werstch, 2007). Because interlocutors use language to index the cultural historical frame(s) under which they expect their utterances to be interpreted, I used theories and methods from sociolinguistics: framing and footing (Goffman, 1974, 1981), indexicality (Blommaert, 2005; Hanks, 1996; Ochs, 1992), and contextualization cues (J. Gumperz, 1992) to highlight how interlocutors conveyed and managed their own activity frames and interpreted the activity frames of their interlocutor. While emphasizing the importance of cultural activities in framing human cognition and social activity, however, a social practice and discourse analysis lens allowed me to also “inquire into how historically situated persons (which Lave and Holland refer to as history in person) develop in practice,” (Holland & Lave, 2009) and thus were not simply stuck in culture. This approach allowed me to pay close attention to the way diverse actors move within and productively create *new* cultural/historical practices as they learn from and respond to the diverse cultural-historically structured tools and orientations brought by their interlocutors.

Although social practice theory and cultural historical activity theory both consider the importance of language as a situated tool to negotiate practices within cultural historical activities, they often do not pay enough attention to the ways that language use not only mediates practices, but actually *constitutes* the practices and the identities of those who participate and structures the interactions between them (Blommaert, 2005, 2010; Fairclough, 1992, 2001; Fairclough & Chouliaraki, 1999; Gee, 2010). For this reason, I also used theories and approaches from critical discourse analysis, which bring together social theory and theories of language use to emphasize the role of language in mediating and constituting social practices both within and beyond the local site of interaction. It is through language that partnerships are negotiated; global language and literacy practices are introduced and contested (Canagarajah, 1999); new identities are constructed and maintained (Goffman, 1967; J. J. Gumperz, 1982; Norton, 1997; Wortham, 2001); and relationships of power are maintained and reorganized (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991; Fairclough, 2001). While these studies describe negotiation within face to face interaction, my research contributes to recent studies on the consequences of globalization on language use and interaction (Blommaert, 2005) by describing partnerships in which local interactions involve global and national actors, who although not physically present or even recognized, wield

significant power as they speak through and constrain what can be said by the co-present interlocutors (Kramsch & Boner, forthcoming).

2.3.4 Learning as changing practice. With its emphasis on the development of actors in situated practice, social practice theory has made significant contributions to socio-cultural theories of learning, particularly the kind of learning that I observed in development contexts, which takes place outside of formal schooling. In contrast to traditional theories of learning based on behaviorist, cognitive-psychological, and individualistic models, socio-cultural theories of learning understand learning as a social activity (Chaiklin & Lave, 1993; Lave, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990). Early ‘social’ theories of learning (Vygotsky, Cole, John-Steiner, & Scribner, 1978) considered the ways individuals internalized attitudes and skills after experiencing them first socially, thus shifting the focus of learning from something that happens in the mind, to something that happens in the social cultural context.

Lave and Wenger critique the emphasis of Vygotskian learning theory on an individual’s “zone of proximal development” by arguing that it was so focused on the individual learner that it contained “no account of the place of learning in the broader context of the structure of the social world” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, pp. 48-49). In their foundational work *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* (1991), Lave and Wenger sought to resolve this problem by focusing on learning as an integral part of its situated context. They described learning as a process of changing participation and becoming a part of a “community of practice.” As newcomers move from more peripheral to more engaged positions, they gradually take on greater responsibilities, while acquiring expected orientations, practices, values, and beliefs of the community, until finally they become recognized as full members. In this view, what is at stake and of particular interest to my study is that building entrepreneurial capacity is not primarily about individuals acquiring particular skills or information in isolation, but rather becoming new kinds of [entrepreneurial] people, who engage in their everyday practices, orient to the world, and relate to each other in new ways. And with its emphasis on “transforming mindsets” and building an “entrepreneurial and empowering culture,” this is what Tanzania’s current development vision *Mkukuta* and all the development practitioners who align their projects with its goals intend.

As Lave and Wenger describe, learning involves much more than acquiring knowledge and disembedded skills: Learning implies:

becoming a full participant, a member, a kind of person. In this view learning only partly-and often incidentally—implies becoming able to be involved in new activities, to perform new tasks and function, to master new understandings. Activities, tasks, function, and understandings do not exist in isolation; they are part of broader systems of relations in which they have meaning. These systems of relations arise out of and are reproduced and developed within social communities, which are in part relations among persons. The person is defined by as well as defines these relations. Learning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these system of relations (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 53)

Seeing learning as situated and embedded within social relations and activities also raises the question of whether new entrepreneurial practices can be taught -- or acquired¹¹ -- in situations where actors lack the ability, access, or resources to put them into practice. Lave and Wenger argue that a learner requires what they call a “legitimate peripheral position” from which to access and participate in the community’s activities and thus learn its practices.

Since my project examines efforts to build entrepreneurial capacity through learning partnerships between participants who often had wildly different levels of social standing and access, I question how problems of access to a legitimately peripheral position could limit the access of partners to learning itself. Without legitimate positions within and access to the interactions through which development discourse is put into practice -- the trainings and conversations by which participants are being socialized into the “new mindset” -- “entrepreneurial” subjects might have no ability to acquire or even understand the discourses which nevertheless shape their “global” marketplace. For without access to entrepreneurial discourse and practice, how would it be possible to reshape and redefine the manner in which those discourses shape the world in which they live? For this reason I focused on subjects who wanted and worked hard to gain access, but who would normally be excluded from or held limited positions within these very development interactions and entrepreneurial partnerships that were designed to include them.

As Blommaert argues, the question of access must also be understood at multiple scales (Blommaert, 2010). Not only did my research informants have different access to face to face partnership meetings, but their access to different global and national hierarchical scales through which language, development discourse, and different kinds of valued communicative practices flow, shaped what they could understand in those meetings and how they could participate. Especially with its emphasis on knowledge flow and co-construction of knowledge, social practice learning theories designed to prepare students for the knowledge economy privilege those who have access to free flowing knowledge.

2.3.4.1 The question of access. The question of access also fuels concerns and new pedagogical practices of educators who seek to prepare students to participate effectively in a global knowledge economy. In taking up and adapting social practice learning theories to pedagogical practice, participation has been seen as critical. Instead of transmitting static knowledge in classrooms (which is no longer sufficient for global contexts in which information is constantly changing and actors must negotiate meaning with diverse participants), educators and development practitioners use the theories of “communities of practice,” to design informal (sometimes called “participatory” or “experiential”) “learning communities” in which learners participate in meaningful real life or simulated projects and activities which mirror those they are likely to encounter beyond the learning space. Participation in these spaces provides the opportunity to *practice* the kinds of skills, attitudes, and mindsets they will need as they manage not only their business life, but also their everyday practices within a global knowledge economy.

¹¹ The question of whether discourses can be taught or acquired has also been the subject of contentious debates in education. See (Delpit, 2001) and (Gee, 2002)

This approach to learning as a social practice is also central to entrepreneurial ideology and practice. It is often said that you cannot teach a person to be an entrepreneur and when I first expressed interest in observing how Eco-Preneur taught entrepreneurship to Tanzanians, they responded: “What do you mean by teaching? We don’t teach. We open up spaces for Tanzanians to dialogue and learn from each other.” Theorists and practitioners of entrepreneurial development explain that entrepreneurs develop [naturally] as they participate in entrepreneurial practices and engage with the world around them: identifying problems from their daily observations, observing and dialoguing with other entrepreneurs, adapting current practices to solve new problems, reading market conditions, examining the needs of potential customers, and experimenting with available resources to develop new innovative products and service. Entrepreneurs don’t need, and it would not be possible to teach the kinds of information an entrepreneur will need to discover before taking calculated risks and investing in new innovative products and services. Instead, they acquire the knowledge they are looking for inductively, through observation, dialogue, and practice.

Much Millennium development, and particularly efforts to build entrepreneurial capacity seeks to transform everyday practice while avoiding the language of teaching and the practices of formal teacher-centered education. For this reason while I observed several formal trainings, which explicitly taught entrepreneurial skills and attitudes, I was most interested and concerned with the less explicit practices through which Tanzanians were learning to be entrepreneurs. The American organization that I observed in fact, were most concerned with learners who could learn independently by participating in practice, without requiring (or desiring) formal, top-down instruction.

2.3.4.2 From Access to potential manipulation. My interest in examining informal learning spaces, as political spaces of struggle and potential sites to “conduct the conduct” of Tanzanians, has been significantly informed by the work of Gee, Lankshear, and Hull. In The New Work Order: behind the Language of the New Capitalism, the authors show how corporations have drawn from socio-cultural theories of language and learning in order to engineer new work practices through which to inculcate their workers with new values, attitudes, and orientations required by “Fast [flexible] Capitalism.” By learning the procedures, values, and orientations, *inside* everyday work practices, rather than teaching workers overtly *about* them, corporations seek to overcome the paradox that if articulated explicitly, workers would likely not identify with their goals or values (Gee, et al., 1996, p. 13). In other words, workers are not only learning how to do new kinds of activities: by adopting positions, orientations, and values, workers come to recognize their own interests in relation to those of the corporation, thereby managing themselves independently according to the needs of the corporation. While being framed as no more than “provid[ing] the space and opportunity to practice being an entrepreneur,” therefore, informal learning spaces, partnership meetings, and conversations between development practitioners and beneficiaries can still be considered “educational” in this way, as means of socializing and disciplining participants into new practices as a matter of “conducting their conduct.”

Even in Kato’s training, Tanzanians were not simply learning *about* the entrepreneur or the skills and knowledge necessary to be an entrepreneur: by *participating* in new entrepreneurial classroom practices, they were potentially seeing the world and each other in new ways. By requiring participants to sit facing each other in a

circle, discuss their ideas and thoughts with their classmates, identify themselves according to their business practices rather than their familial or social status, and address each other and the facilitator as partners, they were both participating in entrepreneurial practices, and becoming (if even for a moment) new kinds of [entrepreneurial] people.

These questions concerning access to acquisition of new discourses and practices, on the one hand, and the use of social practice learning spaces to inculcate participants with values and practices which serve particular interests, on the other, might seem to mirror the abstract debates in development about empowerment and tyranny which framed this study. But just as I suggested then that we'd be missing a great deal if we chose between sides, once again, I found it more useful in my study to take each side seriously, to employ Foucauldian theories to illuminate the contradictions within discourse while also examining how real people are actually experimenting within social practice and learning processes.

For this reason, I drew from theorists who emphasize local practice and learning as “contentious” (Giroux & McLaren, 1989; Holland & Lave, 2009) and who characterize the process of acquiring a new discourse as full of struggle (Fairclough, 2001; Gee, 2005). In addition to the challenges of access, described above, the fact that adopting new practices and discourses also implies taking on its values and orientations means that a participant may not be interested in acquiring discourses and practices, whose orientations and values may conflict with their own. And as Heller (2010) and Blommaert (2010) suggest, a globalization in which discourses travel across distances and disconnect from original practices means that people will not acquire full language systems and the ideologies and orientations that they index, but will much more likely use “bits of language” as commodities to be used, traded, and transformed on a global market place. Because of the popularity of entrepreneurial discourse within Millennial development, I considered these discourses to be commodities as a way of examining how actors used them to experiment with power.

Just as Lave and Holland explains how enduring political, economic, and historical struggles are negotiated in situated local practice, actors experiment with power within social practice, precisely by engaging with contexts and resources that exist in time and scales beyond the present site of practice. It is therefore crucial to examine local social and discourse practices through and by reference to the multiple contexts and scales by which those practices are constituted.

Although critical discourse analysts share this view, Blommaert (2005) questions the extent to which discourse analysts actually pay attention to context or have the tools to do so. For this reason, I follow Blommaert's advice and use ethnographic methods to look *across* sites of learning to consider the aggregate effect of multiple and hierarchical scales which shape local practices and the different scales to which interlocutors orient their practice. This was particularly important in my study as the American practitioners introduced and evaluated their partners using communicative practices and discourses which implied access and orientation to a scale, the “knowledge economy,” in which not all Tanzanian partners had equal access.

My study sought to address the critiques that critical social theorists do not pay enough attention to actual practice by using ethnographic methods, Foucauldian theories of discourse and knowledge, and paying attention to the historical, socio-cultural, and political contexts in which entrepreneurial discourses and practices have become popular.

My study also engages with and seeks to address critiques within education and discourse studies that researchers have not paid enough attention to context. These positions are not disconnected, however, taken together, they allow me to consider the local and global, theory and practice, structure and agency in relation.

Chapter 3: Positioning the Researcher

3.1 Introduction

Rather than assume that building entrepreneurial capacity was either empowering or tyrannical, my study examined what actually happened in practice, as Tanzanians were encouraged in partnerships, development meetings, and trainings to take on entrepreneurial mindsets and practices. A central assumption of my research was that the meanings of entrepreneurial discourses and practices were not shared across global or local contexts nor taken up for the same purpose by the diverse stakeholders (American and Tanzanian development practitioners, beneficiaries, elite and poor) who made up the “entrepreneurial partnerships” and informal learning spaces through which entrepreneurial discourses were being promoted and spread. Meanings were constructed in (often unequal) interaction and negotiated in relation to one’s present and non-present interlocutors, as well as the social, political, and economic contexts of use. By understanding how Tanzanians and Americans of varying social and economic status understood and made use of entrepreneurial discourses and practices, my research seeks to offer a more nuanced analysis of the spread of global entrepreneurial discourses and the participatory educational projects and partnerships aimed at developing entrepreneurial capacity through which these discourses are introduced and negotiated.

To understand this the varied meanings and uses of entrepreneurial discourses and practices, this study addressed three research questions:

- 1) How do Tanzanian and American “partners” representing different social and economic classes understand, make sense of, and negotiate their different conceptions of partnership? (Chapter 4 and Chapter 6)
 - a. For what purpose do they employ and or contest a discourse of partnership?
 - b. How are discourses of partnerships expressed and contested linguistically?
- 2) To what extent do entrepreneurial discourses and practices shape, organize, and/or orient development practice in Mlimani (the “ruling relations”)?
 - a. How do Tanzanian and American “partners” representing different social and economic classes understand, make sense of, and negotiate entrepreneurial discourses?
 - b. How are entrepreneurial discourses negotiated with respect to embedded and disembedded social relations? (Chapter 5)
- 3) How do poor Tanzanian women and middle class American development practitioners understand, make sense of, and negotiate entrepreneurial learning spaces and participatory practices? (Chapter 6)
 - a. What are entrepreneurial learning spaces and how are they constructed discursively?
 - b. How and for what purpose are participatory educational practices used and manipulated?
 - c. How do participatory learning practices facilitate access or create barriers to entrepreneurial behaviors, attitudes, practices?

This chapter begins by describing the rationale for combining approaches of institutional ethnography and critical discourse analysis. I then explain my approach to data collection, emphasizing the implications of viewing knowledge as co-constructed and socially situated, rather than objective and static. Given my view of research as interaction and knowledge as co-constructed within that interaction, I begin my description of data collection by positioning myself, making as explicit as possibly my own motivations, previous experiences, and social relations which shaped this study. After describing the research sites and the kinds of data collected, I describe the process of data analysis and conclude with observations about my role as an American researcher working in rural Tanzania.

3.2 Rationale for Research Approach: Institutional Ethnography and Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) studies, Institutional Ethnography each inform my interest in and approach to examining how global discourses of participation, partnership, and entrepreneurship shape and are shaped by local practice. These approaches critique social theorists for working in the abstract and not paying enough attention to what actually is going on at the micro-scale. Although they start at different points within the micro-context (CDA begins with the text, and IE begins with everyday practice), they each use the micro as a way of examining social phenomena occurring at macro-scales.

Central to CDA is an understanding of discourse as “socially situated,” language, embedded in and inseparable from social practice. Discourse is not only a component of the social world, but a window to that world which provides insights into how micro and macro contexts shape and are shaped by people’s everyday lives. A critical discourse approach emphasizes language as a tool or window through which to examine the interaction between micro and macro contexts in which texts and their contexts of production are mutually constitutive.

Fairclough’s framework for understanding and analyzing discourse theoretically is useful in seeking to trace the spread of global entrepreneurial discourses in Mlimani. Fairclough considers any instance of language a “discursive event,” which is simultaneously an instance of text (language use at the micro-level), a discursive practice (a process of text production and interpretation in which interlocutors draw on experiences, knowledge, and other discourses gained from outside of the immediate conversation), and a social practice (the institutional and social circumstances which constrain and enable the discursive event (Fairclough, 2001, p. 4). It is here that he links the micro and macro scales.

CDA allowed me to link the social and linguistic processes, in which “partners” negotiated entrepreneurial discourses and practices within entrepreneurship trainings and dialogue in Mlimani, to the macro national and global contexts, which create the conditions for use. Despite the popularity of promoting entrepreneurial practices worldwide, these practices must contend with alternative logics and orientations and Critical Discourse Analysis provided the tools to illuminate such struggles.

Although Fairclough emphasizes the interconnectedness and mutually constitutive properties of the three dimensions of discourse, Fairclough has been criticized for being overly linguistically motivated—focusing too much on the text, and failing to adequately

pay attention to the context in which discourses are produced. In order to bring into focus the “invisible context,” Blommaert (2005) recommends that discourse analysts combine linguistic approaches with ethnographic methods. I found the ethnographic approach of institutional ethnography (IE) useful for my project.

While CDA begins with the text to explore social relations beyond the text, Institutional Ethnography begins with the everyday lives of people. Not unlike CDA, Institutional Ethnography seeks to find out “just how people’s doings in the everyday are articulated to and coordinated by extended social relations that are not visible from within any particular local setting and just how people are participating in those relations” (Smith, 2005, p. 36). Rather than assume that people are being *dominated* by global discourses or *resisting* the discourses, ‘institutional ethnography’s program is one of inquiry and discovery,’ (Smith, 2005) which begins with the concerns and interests of the people themselves. Although I.E. begins with the interests and concerns articulated by people in local situated contexts, it does not end here. Discourses and texts play a prominent role for an institutional ethnographer, as “texts” embody and mediate the ruling relations, which organize local practice trans-locally, a practice Smith calls “textually-mediated social organization.” An institutional ethnographer *discovers* which texts are meaningful to the participants using ethnographic methods (observations and interviews) and then uses these texts to trace the ruling relations and discourses that organize and shape local practice.

By focusing more attentively to the everyday lives of people, Institutional Ethnography allowed me to potentially address critiques that in focusing so heavily on language, critical discourse analysts either ignore social context or impose rather than discover political and ideological orientations to the data.

3.3 Data Collection

Both Institutional Ethnography (IE) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) take post modern approaches to knowledge production, replacing a search for “true” or fixed meanings with an emphasize on “descriptive nuances, differences, and paradoxes” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 218). Especially after the difficulties I had initially in actually finding the kinds of entrepreneurial trainings I had heard about from several Tanzanian development practitioners and global literature, I found Kvale and Brinkman’s description of research as a “craft,” (p. 17) and as a “journey,” useful in eventually letting go of strict rule governed methods which seemed to prevent me from being more open to what was going on. Considering an interview as “literally an inter-view or interchange of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest,” (p. 2) they emphasize how knowledge is co-constructed through interaction, rather than ‘collected’ or ‘mined’ by the researcher who “unearths the valuable metal” from the “subjects interior, uncontaminated by the miner” (p. 48). In contrast to the “miner”, they propose the metaphor “researcher as traveler,” (building from the original Latin translation of conversation, which means “wandering together).” A research is one

“Who walks along with the local inhabitants, asking questions, and encouraging them to tell their own stories of their lived world. The potentialities of meaning in the original stories are differentiated and unfolded through the traveler’s interpretations of the narratives he or she brings back to home audiences. The journey may not only lead to new knowledge: the traveler might change as well” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 48).

Although this positive and seemingly unproblematic description of “wandering together with research subjects,” raises some of the very questions this dissertation seeks to uncover, the metaphor of journey and co-construction of knowledge could not be more appropriate for how I wish to describe my research methods here. My journey began long before I became a researcher; during previous trips to Tanzania, I was becoming the researcher I would be when I entered Mlimani. For this reason, I describe these early experiences and the more extensive time line in which my field study in Mlimani was embedded. In the spirit of approaching research as interaction and knowledge as co-produced, I have analyzed my role within the research interactions and make explicit these findings within the analytic data chapters themselves.

3.3.1 Preliminary research and timeframe. In addition to the literature which I described in the last chapter, the conceptual framework for this study was significantly shaped by previous visits and experiences in Tanzania: first as a tourist in 2001, then as a participatory educator in the summers of 2002 and 2003, as a student of Kiswahili at University of Dar es Salaam in 2006, and during preliminary research study during that same trip. It was through these experiences that I came to understand the discourse of participation as a site of struggle, rather than an inherently positive and unproblematic goal under which I assumed I could address by facilitating access to global language and literacy practices. In 2005, I came in contact with Americans who shared similar interests in using participatory education in efforts to increase “local” participation in conservation and alternative income generation. These contacts and initial discussions eventually led to my site selection and heightened my interest in understanding how other Americans understood and engaged in their educational practices.

Becoming Mzungu: summer 2001 June. My ambiguous racial and ethnic background has constantly been a source of question and confusion in the United States as I’m regularly constituted through the projections of others as “passing”, non-white, a person of color, mixed, light-skinned--depending on the day, the year, and the context. Living on the margins of racial and ethnic spaces in America has shaped my consciousness and heightened my awareness and concern for recognizing and if possible learning social practices and ways of being that would mark me as an insider, or at least an ally. But during my first visit to Tanzania as a tourist, I was immediately given an unambiguous identity as Mzungu, a (white) foreigner. Learning what it means to be Mzungu has been an ongoing process: It has in many ways meant learning anew what it means to be white and particularly white in Africa. While in every new situation upon meeting new people, I continue to be first and foremost, Mzungu after nine years, I have become to some people and in some contexts, Liz or Eliza. Becoming Eliza, the person who conducted research in Mlimani in 2007 required learning a whole new way of being, talking, seeing, dressing, eating, and relating to others. I learned by making serious mistakes, asking questions, and receiving the supportive guidance of a few Tanzanian friends, who over time became close enough to tell me when I was way out of line. I learned through contradictions and struggles as the world from my position in Tanzania rarely matched my expectations.

My first visit to Tanzania, I came as a tourist. But unlike many Wazungu tourists who come to see Mt. Kilimanjaro and the national parks, I did not travel through the same tourist circuits, nor was my movement controlled by tourist businesses. I came to see my cousin, who was living with her Tanzanian husband and baby in Amani, a small

remote village in the Northeast region of Tanzania. My cousin's husband was completing his PhD studies in the United States and was at the time conducting two years of ecological research. Through these connections, I had the opportunity to stay with Tanzanians in their homes and travel as a guest, rather than a tourist.

In 1998 just a few years before I had arrived, Amani had been recognized as an international bio-diversity hotspot and gazetted as a nature reserve, thus limiting forest use by the villagers. As part of efforts to increase local villagers' participation in forest management, among other projects, the Tanzanian government in partnership with the Finish Government set up an eco-tourist business. Youth representing each of the twenty villages surrounding the reserve were selected to receive guide training and be "on duty," ten days of the month in case there were tourists who wanted a guide. Twenty percent of the profits would go to the government officials (who already earned a government salary, but would use the money to manage the advertising and guest services), another twenty percent would be divided by each of the twenty villages surrounding the reserve to use for community development, and the guides would divide the remaining sixty percent.

During my one-month stay in July (the high season) however, I was the only tourist so the benefits to the villagers were clearly small. It was during my walks with the local tour guides that I first learned about the politics of "participation" particularly the contradictions between the official discourse of increasing participation, and the realities I saw and learned from the tour guides. As they did not have phones, offices, or access to the Internet, they depended on salaried government employees to advertise their business and respond to simple questions from tourists who would call or email wanting to make reservations or get directions to Amani. As the guides sat *outside* (unlike the government officials, the guides did not have an office) waiting for the promise of eco-tourists, their families in nearby villages, farmed without their assistance.

Although I was unable to hire the guides on a daily basis, given my profession as an ESL instructor, I offered to assist them with their English. During our English classes, the guides brought examples of difficult and socially awkward encounters with tourists and together we discussed the nature of the problem, the cultural implications for the interaction, and role played possible solutions. It was through these meetings in which the guides raised concerns about wazungu behaviors, dress, attitudes, and perspectives (many of which characterized me or people I knew) that I received my initial social training in *tabia nzuri* or good conduct.

Becoming a participatory educator: summers of 2002, 2003, 2004. I returned to Tanzania the following two summers and winter holiday to conduct a participatory education project with the seven remaining guides¹² who were seeking to build their tourist business. Although there had been a "gender balance" of male and female guides, by the time I arrived, several of the women guides, had quit or taken positions as cooks and hotel workers.

I initially framed the problem of the guide's participation in managing and building the eco- tourist business as one of lack of skills and resources and I intended to work with them to figure out how to develop their eco-business. I knew very little, however about tourism, and even Tanzania for that matter, as at that point, I had only spent time in Amani. My goal was to find other eco-tourist businesses and other

¹² The other twelve tour guides decided that with so few tourists, guiding was a waste their time

Tanzanians with whom the guides could exchange ideas and learn more about how best to build their own tourist business. Many of the guides had at that point not been outside of the immediate region and had never visited any of the common tourist destinations, which they only heard about through their textbooks and from the stories of the tourists. Together the guides and I went to Arusha, Moshi, Lushoto, Karatu, the Ngorongoro Crater and Pangani to observe other eco-tourist businesses and to inform tourist businesses about the beauty of Amani.

We also visited NGO's in the cities which claimed to address issues of sustainable development, global education, AIDS education, rural development in hopes of finding projects which could have been useful to the villages the guides were supposedly representing. Although when I went alone to visit these organizations, employees spent much time explaining to me the purpose and practices of their organization, when the guides arrived at these same organizations without me, they received different treatment--sometimes they weren't even allowed into the waiting room. Although the guides had warned me of this *tabia* (behavior) of the "big potatoes," (as they called the elite), who looked out only for themselves, I was slow in learning the contradictions between the rhetoric of participation on the one hand, and the realities for the "targeted populations," such as the tour guides, who themselves were also poor village farmers. Seeing development through the eyes of the tour guides, significantly informed my research approach, the kinds of questions I asked, and the more critical stance I took in conducting research in Mlimani.¹³

Although we did make some contacts with eco-tourist businesses who promised to send their tourists to Amani, we still had not solved the problem of how the guides would attract and communicate with tourists in the future. Concerned that it was unsustainable and impossible for me to provide funding for the guides to first travel to the city where they would find an internet café, and then pay the fees to use the internet, I raised funds from my friends to purchase two cows through the Heifer Project, an NGO which has years of experience training people in cow husbandry and cow project management. Although Heiffer Project usually works with church groups and educated elite who manage the project¹⁴ I had expected that the tour guides could manage the project on their own. Even this partnership turned out to be wrought with contradictions and problems. Although my intention was to provide a resource through which the guides could be in a better position to independently engage with tourists and thus build their business, by working through Heiffer project, the guides suddenly had to be accountable to and dependent yet another group of elite.¹⁵ Hearing the tour guides' critiques of

¹³ Interestingly before beginning field research and agreeing to participate in my study, Melissa of Eco-Preneur asked me whether or not my experience with the tour guides would "bias" my research. [not sure whether to talk about this here—tensions between wazungu about who is more down with the people, and the threats to each other because of our respective connections. I got this a lot. And have several examples. Not sure if it is important to share]

¹⁴ The church usually decides who will get the baby calves, and monitor each recipient to ensure that the "gift (the cow) keeps giving" (the recipients take good care of the cow, and return the baby calves as gifts to the next recipient).

¹⁵ First the guides were given a cow that was not pregnant and even after the guides sent several emails and phone calls, Heifer Project would not resolve the problem until I accompanied the guides in person. Then, once the cow did give birth, Heifer Project informed the guides that they would have to return two calves as interest for having received the first cow. At that point they preferred to return the cow (which had been

Heiffer Project's practice of giving a "gift" of a cow, yet expecting two calves in return, peaked my interest in learning more about how beneficiaries and practitioners make sense and negotiate capitalist oriented development practices which provide "loans" or resources with conditions and strings attached.

After attending a bio-intensive farming training in Arusha, the guides decided they would conduct a training in one of the villages of one of the tour guides, where the catholic nuns (with whom I was living) had received funding for a women's clinic for women and children. The clinic planned to have a farm outside the clinic to grow vegetables for sale and discuss nutrition. The guides and I had significantly different understandings of both the practice of teaching and the meaning of "women's clinic." While I wanted to use participatory approaches to "facilitate" a training, building on the "strengths and knowledge" of the village participants, the guides were adamant that we should not ask these "uneducated" women questions, which may show that they did not know the answer. Our differences in approach to learning, led to my interest in exploring how learning expectations were negotiated in other participatory projects.

Becoming an institutional researcher: 2005, 2006 and 2007.

Situating my experiences with the guides academically 2005. My challenges in facilitating a participatory project with the tour guides led me to explore questions of participation further and I finally decided to focus my dissertation research on this topic. I conducted a literature review on participation and designed an orals area that critically analyzed discourses of participation and marginalization in education. Employing critiques of participation found in the literature and methods of critical discourse analysis, I analyzed one of the conversations I had with the tour guides following our compost training at the women's clinic. Only after using CDA to analyze our heated conversation about why only women were invited to the training at the women's clinic, did I realize the extent to which I was not, and perhaps was unable, to listen. Despite my genuine intentions to build on local knowledge and practice, my assumptions about what a participatory practice should look like, and how women in particular should be positioned or "empowered," within the learning practice, prevented me from hearing the guides descriptions about their learning practices and situated understandings of medical clinics, family structures, and the role of father in relation to caring for their children's health. It was in realizing through this analysis the extent to which I was controlling and directing our conversations and meetings together, that led me to investigate further how other development organizations negotiate differences in learning expectations, ideological orientations, and power, within participatory projects aimed at privileging local practice. Additionally, this analysis demonstrated how even self-proclaimed radical educators could use progressive social justice discourses in radically disempowering ways. From this experience, I learned first hand that discourses are powerful and do shape the way we see and intervene in the world.

My concerns about the disempowering use of participatory practices and the privileging of certain discourses of development (entrepreneurship, women's

given as a "gift,") than to have the responsibility and incur the costs of feeding a cow whose calves would not even be their own.

empowerment, SWOT's analysis¹⁶) informed my dissertation proposal. I began to search for a research site, which would allow me to examine these concerns further by observing how other foreign practitioners use participatory practices and negotiate different understandings of development discourse. It was at this point that I reconnected with Tracy of Eco-Preneur, an American Environmental Organization who had contacted me the previous year when they came to Mlimani for the first time, asking for suggestions of Tanzanians who could conduct trainings in sustainable/green technologies. (Eco-Preneur is described below) Initially I explained my research stating that I wanted to observe how Eco-Preneur teaches environmental entrepreneurial practices. With what seemed to me to be serious disgust, she asked (as I remember), "What do you mean by teach? We don't teach, we open up spaces for diverse stakeholders to learn from each other." Her response, which seemed to be a mixture of Friirian participatory discourse (emphasizing student-centered learning, dialogue, and anti-banking teaching) and neo-liberal discourse of equality which assumed the simplicity of "opening up spaces for diverse actors" made me want to study Eco-Preneur even more. We continued to discuss the possibility of my doing research on their participatory work for the next year and a half.

Preliminary pre-dissertation research May 2006-August 2006. Expecting to participate in a "learning journey," organized by Eco-Preneur, I returned to Tanzania in May of 2006. Eco-Preneur sought to bring development and environmental experts from several African countries and the United States to study about the importance of environmental enterprise to micro-enterprise development, by visiting and reflecting together on environmental enterprises throughout Tanzania. Eco-Preneur invited me to participate in this experiential learning workshop as a means to get to know their work better as well as an opportunity for them to meet me and better understand my research intentions, before ultimately deciding if and to what extent they would be willing to allow me to do research with their organization. Unfortunately, just after arriving in Tanzania, they informed me that the learning journey had been cancelled, as they were still waiting for funding. Although rearranging my research schedule (I had planned to return to Tanzania much later) and flying across the world on a student budget specifically to observe a training that would not take place, was frustrating, this experience was not an isolated incidence, but rather exemplified the challenges of not only researching, but also working according to the inconsistencies of international development funding.

Fortunately, while in Tanzania, I learned that I was awarded a Flas Fellowship to study Kiswahili in Tanzania, and spent the next six weeks studying at the University of Dar es Salaam. Because of my interest in development discourse and language, my language study focused on development issues and development discourses. As part of my studies I visited several environmental and entrepreneurial projects in Dar es Salaam, read current newspaper articles related to development issues, and interviewed students and professors about their understanding of "participation," "women's empowerment," and "partnership."

I reconnected with a former employee of the Amani Nature reserve who had been instrumental in starting the tour guide program. In 2006 he was working for the World Bank and specifically on a project to increase the participation of "local people" in

¹⁶ A S.W.O.T analysis is an assessment of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. This assessment practice was taught in several trainings which I observed encouraging Tanzanians to assess themselves, their business, and any other social practice.

conservation efforts, specifically in the Eastern Arc Corridor where Amani was located. His task was to advertise and recruit “local people,” to write conservation proposals which would address and involve local people in managing conservation efforts. He strongly encouraged me to work with the tour guides to develop a proposal, as “they were just the kind of group that they were looking to fund.”

It was in the process of writing a proposal to the World Bank with a group of tour guides who wanted the funding and had a great idea for a project that I saw even more clearly the conflict between the social relations and orientations embedded in development texts and institutions and the social relations and orientations of the “local people,” they sought to attract. To begin with, the call for proposal was written in English. The tour guides spoke and read English, so they were in a better position than most “local” people who had not attended secondary school. But even with a command for English, the questions assumed social relations and orientations, which made little sense to the tour guides. As the guides explained, such words were the “blah blah” of development experts who used these particular words and English to restrict the participation of those who did not know them or more simply to “line the pockets of those who already have the knowledge” (personal interview). After three hours of just reading through and discussing the meaning of the proposal questions

Working through the text illuminated many contradictions, which were otherwise assumed unproblematic by World Bank Experts (even those like the former employee of Amani Nature Reserve whose master’s thesis focused on the role of local people in forest management). Like this former employee of the nature reserve, I have heard many experts complain that while there was money to be distributed, “local people,” choose not to write the proposal or fail to come up with a fundable project. This argument reminded me of so many in U.S. contexts, blaming the poor and people of color for not taking advantages of opportunities, rather than examining the many barriers to access.

Finally, I spent the last two weeks of this preliminary research trip in Mlimani, visiting environmental and poverty alleviating non-governmental organizations, meeting with government officials, and with beneficiaries of a savings and credit group to learn about their work and the possibility of conducting research in the area.

Continued study: data collection 2; January 2007-August 2007. I arrived in Mlimani in late January. I visited, interviewed, and observed the trainings and daily activities of several environmental organizations, poverty alleviation organizations, a tourist business, and several savings and credit groups. Eco-Preneur practitioners did not arrive until late February at which time I began to also meet with them, observed their meetings with local partners, and attended the trainings they facilitated.

3.3.2 Site selection: Mlimani. I chose to conduct research on entrepreneurship trainings and partnerships in Mlimani for several reasons. First as a resource-rich site of dense forests and fertile soil, Mlimani has historically been and continues to be central to land use struggles between farmers, charcoal producers, lumber mills, herdsman, conservationists, and government projects. I imagined Mlimani would therefore provide an interesting site in which to consider the potential opportunities and conflicts related to the promotion of environmental enterprise. Second, Mlimani sits at the confluence of numerous local, district, national, and international conservation and poverty-alleviation interventions, and thus brings together stakeholders of diverse and often oppositional interests and histories offering a unique context in which to study the ways in which

current discourses of participation, partnership, and entrepreneurship come to be defined and practiced. If such NGO's existed in Amani, I would have done my research there. Third, during preliminary research, I learned that several environmental and poverty alleviation organizations emphasized entrepreneurial practices, provided entrepreneurial training, and addressed both poverty alleviation and environmental conservation through entrepreneurial projects with both women and youth groups. I therefore expected I would have ample opportunities to observe multiple and diverse entrepreneurial trainings and practices. Fourth, Mlimani was the site of a unique community environmental enterprise partnership called *MEEP*, which brought together diverse stakeholders representing poverty alleviation and environmental organizations, women's savings and credit groups, government departments, and local businesses for the purpose of assessing new environmental enterprise projects for the community. Fifth, I had connections (both to farmers and professionals) in Mlimani who could facilitate my access to research informants and their diverse perspectives as well as provide some social support: 1) Growing up in a nearby village, my research assistant knew the area, the local language, and cultural norms. He could potentially share important insights about language use, social and political conflicts and alliances, and locate people, places, and organizations 2) A close Tanzanian friend had been living in the area for several years could introduce me to his friends and potential research subjects.

3.3.3 Locating entrepreneurial partnerships, entrepreneurial trainings, and ruling relations. Using an institutional ethnographic approach I focused my initial efforts on examining how the practitioners and participants of the four focal institutions talked about and practiced their daily work activities. In order to locate the "ruling relations" to which these local institutions orient their practice, I paid particular attention to the texts: proposals, brochures, procedures, policies, training books, websites, and discourses with which they described and oriented their practice. Although this procedure led me to the national and global policies, institutions, and discursive practices which were meaningful to my informants, I also collected data at sites beyond Mlimani, in order to gain a broader understanding of the national and global "context" in which entrepreneurial discourses and practices are being promoted. The following describes the data I collected at the micro scale (Mlimani), the meso scale (Tanzania), and the macro scale.

Locating an appropriate *site* in which I would have access to observe ongoing entrepreneurial trainings and partnerships aimed at developing new enterprise proved more difficult than I had initially imagined. First, my access to Eco-Preneur's participatory educational practices and efforts to develop environmental enterprise in partnership with the Mlimani community was uncertain. I had already experienced flying to Tanzania to participate in their learning journey, which they cancelled just after I arrived and was hesitant to depend on them as a key research site. Given their concern that my presence as a researcher would interfere with their attempts to build trusting relationships with their Mlimani partners, they were not sure that they would grant me access. Second, although I had been assured by one educational organization, during my preliminary research trip in June of 2006, that upon returning in January of 2007 I would be able to observe six months of weekly entrepreneurial trainings for women's savings and credit groups in the surrounding villages, when I arrived in January, I was told by the organization's director that the trainings had been completed. He did offer however to

organize a training on my behalf explaining that calling a teacher and bringing beneficiaries would be absolutely no problem.

Although an institutional ethnographic researcher may have recognized this offer to help as a meaningful practice to understand—performing training for the American researcher-- I initially experienced his response as a significant challenge to my practice as an educational researcher, and continued with frustration in search of a “legitimate”¹⁷ educational site. My assumptions and expectations about the purpose and meaning of training kept me from being able to see what was really going on-- how development practitioners and beneficiaries not only made sense of entrepreneurial discourses but also how they made sense of and found use for entrepreneurial trainings. This director’s willingness and openness to perform training, suggested that training was not simply an unproblematic static space *in which* I could conduct research on something else-- the negotiation of entrepreneurial discourses--rather as I would discover, trainings themselves were highly valued discursive practices, given value by international donors who preferred to “teach a man how to fish rather than give a man a fish.” As such, holding trainings could be a significant resource through which an organization could represent itself favorably to international donors and American researchers like myself.

I didn’t let go of my interest to observe entrepreneurial trainings, but I did at this point need to step back and be even more open and flexible to the inquiry process. I shifted my focus from finding a specific site of study (entrepreneurial trainings) to looking more generally at what was going on in development organizations and interactions and how entrepreneurial discourses and practices organized local practice: how they were being defined, reshaped, and deployed by diverse development actors. I cast my net wide, and followed many different organizations and participants letting their activities guide me, until finally I felt comfortable to use a “purposeful sampling procedure” (Patton 1990, 2002) to select participants or organizations which either 1) *provided entrepreneurial training* (in which to observe how entrepreneurial discourses and practices were being introduced, understood, and negotiated by Tanzanian beneficiaries 2) *defined their work or organizational purpose in entrepreneurial terms* (in order to understand how entrepreneurial discourses and practices shape and organize local Tanzanian development practices) 3) *identified themselves or organization as one which was working in “partnership” with other individuals or organizations* to examine the meaning and practice of partnership. This resulted in twelve organizations, eleven of which were members of the community wide partnership initiated by Eco-Preneur.

I began by visiting and conducting interviews with each of the local environmental, development, and educational organizations in Mlimani town. Rather than assume that local organizations employed entrepreneurial discourses and practices (and thus ask about their entrepreneurial trainings or practices), I asked practitioners to describe their organization and work practices with hopes of learning if, how, to what extent, and for what purpose entrepreneurial discourses and practices were meaningful to them and their work efforts.

I was aware that several of the local organizations were part of a community wide partnership initiated by an American organization (Eco-Preneur) for the purpose of

¹⁷ By legitimate, I meant trainings in which the participants came and the facilitators taught because of their belief in entrepreneurial education. What I saw in many cases was that participants were paid to attend trainings; NGO’s claimed to provide trainings, but in fact they often didn’t exist

developing environmental enterprise, but I did not know which organizations were participating. I wanted to hear (rather than ask) how the organizations might describe their relationship with this international American environmental organization and the purpose of their work together. If a Tanzanian practitioner did identify themselves or their organization as working in partnership with either another local or international organization or described entrepreneurial practices or trainings, which were integral to their organizational practices, I asked more specific questions about the nature of these partnerships and trainings. I also asked permission to observe their partnership meetings and trainings. Using a snowball sampling strategy (Miles and Huberman 1994 and Patton 2002) I asked the practitioners to refer me to other local experts and organizations that were also promoting entrepreneurial activity. From this initial strategy, I located all of the eleven organizations, which were participating in the community-wide environmental enterprise partnership (MEEP) initiated by Eco-Preneur and could therefore develop relationships with these partnering organizations distinct from and prior to the arrival of Eco-Preneur's practitioners, Melissa and David.

Because of their particular interest and ongoing engagement with the issues and practices of entrepreneurship and partnership, I spent most of my time focusing on the interactions, practices, and perceptions of the practitioners and beneficiaries from the following organizational sites: 1) *the entrepreneurial trainings* provided by Rural Empowerment Solutions to understand how entrepreneurial discourses and practices are taught by a Tanzanian practitioner and understood by Tanzanian training participants 2) *Maria and Terisita* (as representatives of a women's savings and credit group, Saccos) to examine the meaning of partnership and entrepreneurial discourses and practices for poor women who were on the one hand considered "partners" representing youth and women within the MEEP partnership, but who had also been the beneficiaries of many of the partnering organizations. 3) *the members of the Mlimani Environmental Entrepreneurship Partnership (MEEP)* to examine the meaning of partnership among varied and diverse stakeholders and their use of entrepreneurial discourses and practices within their partnership and their individual organizations 4) *Melissa and David of Eco-Preneur* to examine their efforts to work in partnership to spread environmental enterprise principals with individual organizations and with the community wide partnership (MEEP) Although I often used their different perspectives of entrepreneurship and learning practices as a lens through which to gain deeper understanding of the meaning and purpose of entrepreneurship in Mlimani, these organizational sites were not chosen as case studies and my intention was not to systematically compare them or their effects.

In the following section, I describe each of these sites in greater detail, highlighting the purpose of their organization or partnership, some relevant history about the organization and their relationships to the other organizations, my interest choosing them as part of the focus of my research, and the particular work activities, which I observed.

3.3.3.1 "Rural empowerment solutions." According to the director Kato¹⁸, Rural Empowerment Solutions worked to "engage rural people in the process of development." Of primary importance for the organization was to give rural people the resources and tools to survive under new conditions in which they could no longer depend on the

¹⁸ This is the same Kato from the entrepreneurship training described in the introduction

government to provide social, health, and educational services. Kato conducted entrepreneurship trainings for numerous local organizations, youth and women's groups, farmers associations, and government offices in Mlimani and in towns across the country. He had a degree in agriculture and development studies, and had over fifteen years experience working in and consulting for international development organizations. In addition to providing entrepreneurship training, he also assisted groups and individuals to prepare funding proposals, project evaluations, and strategic organizational planning.

I was particularly interested in conducting research on the activities of this local organization because 1) Kato was providing observable training 2) he described their work practices in entrepreneurial terms, emphasizing the importance of developing new entrepreneurial mindsets as a means of participating in a global world 3) Kato was well respected in the community and recognized by students and by the other NGO practitioners for creating meaningful and useful trainings 4) Kato was Tanzanian and lived in the community. He was a Swahili speaker and as a member of the community, and could introduce new entrepreneurial discourses and practices using locally relevant narratives and examples. As such his trainings could provide a useful lens through which to examine how Tanzanian practitioners understand the meaning and purpose of new entrepreneurial discourses practices. 5) Kato was a member of the MEEP partnership and served on the coordinating committee. By observing his trainings and those of the Eco-Preneur, I hoped to see if and how entrepreneurial discourses and practices would be translated across training contexts from Eco-Preneur to MEEP, to Tanzanian training participants by Kato, a Tanzanian practitioner.

3.3.3.2 Maria and Terisita of the Women's Savings and Credit Group (Saccos). The Women's Savings and Credit group, or *Saccos* was a group of 25 women who came together to invest their small savings in a collective savings account. Each week they purchased between one and three *hisa* or "shares" for 500 shillings, approximately 35 cents each. Once their collective account reached 100,000 shillings, they began to make loans to each of the group members, who had to return the loan after three months with interest. At the end of the year, they divided the money according to their individual contributions.

Maria was the chairperson of the group, and Terisita was the vice-chairperson. I often saw them together as they attended meetings and trainings at development organizations, served as representatives of their women's group at community-wide functions, and worked together selling used clothes to the people of Mlimani. They credit Eco-Preneur for "giving birth," to their Women's Savings and Credit group and their clothing business, because it was in a training with them that they learned savings and credit practices and then formed the Women's group.

At the time of the study, Maria was a twenty six year old single mother and had one daughter. She and her daughter rented a small room near the edge of Mlimani. Maria had a primary school education. She described how when she first came to Mlimani from her village, she was desperately poor, selling tomatoes and barefoot in the street. She was "rescued" by a local NGO, given computer and entrepreneurial training and now had had a small business with Terisita selling used clothes in Mlimani. Terisita was married with four children and also lived just outside the town. She too had only a primary school education. She was very active with her church. She worked with Maria selling used clothing.

Maria and Terisita received only a primary education, but their success with their Savings and Credit Group and their regular attendance at any training to which they were invited, earned them popularity within the local development community. In an international development climate that favors participation of all community stakeholders and mandates gender balance, their status as uneducated poor women who ran a successful savings and credit group, seemed to earn them a seat at the table when international and local development agencies came to town looking for projects to support or new ideas to share. Within community “partnerships,” their presence among educated elite stood out and MEEP members often pointed to their presence to demonstrate the overall sensitivity and progressive thinking of the MEEP partnership.

Although Maria and Terisita had recently registered their SACCOS with the local government as an NGO, unlike the other focal NGO practitioners in my study, Maria and Terisita in many ways exemplified the typical beneficiaries of the local NGO’s, rather than the development practitioners. Although I locate them here in relation to their now registered NGO: SACCOS, my focus was primarily on *them* and their relationships with 1) Eco-Preneur 2) MEEP 3) the Savings and Credit Group 4) their status and experiences as beneficiaries of several local NGO’s 5) their experiences as entrepreneurs selling used clothes. I was interested in learning more about their understanding of entrepreneurship and the numerous entrepreneurial trainings and related youth groups in which they were participating. Also, I was hoping to learn more about their perspectives of the MEEP partnership as I had heard in meetings with several of the other local NGO’s that Maria and Terisita were members representing their Women’s Group.

3.3.3.3 Eco-Preneur. Eco-Preneur was an American non-governmental organization (NGO), which sought to address problems of environmental degradation and unemployment throughout the world by spreading the ideas and practices of environmental entrepreneurship. Eco-Preneur articulated a vision that went beyond Say’s notion of embracing and exploiting current conditions and drawing on the Schumpeter model, emphasized “creative destruction.” They sought to “flip” or transform current markets, which relied on unsustainable environmental resources, in order to build an entirely new green market. This new market could produce not only economic, but also social and environmental value. New markets they believed could change the mindset of consumers towards one that valued environmentally friendly and sustainable products and as a result further inspire new “green” innovations and products. By emphasizing full scale market transformation and locally-initiated innovation, Eco-Preneur’s vision contrasted with the more popular “alternative income generating activities” which were typically standardized projects often introduced (without regard to the market) by international organizations to provide alternative sources of income (fish ponds, eco-tourism, zero grazing cows) as a means to decrease the dependency of poor people on forest and other environmental resources. Eco-Preneur’s practitioners had concerns that these activities would benefit only a few people, and sought instead to work towards larger scale market transformation, which they believed had the potential to ultimately serve greater numbers of individuals and the environment.

As an organization, Eco-Preneur not only modeled a social enterprise, but social entrepreneurship was the service and product that they provided. As part of their vision, they sought to spread the ideology of social and environmental entrepreneurship by

inspiring and supporting (through technical assistance) entrepreneurial individuals in the community who they believed had the potential to make large-scale change.

As part of their efforts to support social entrepreneurs institutionally, Eco-Preneur set up “learning communities” between their partners throughout East Africa and also encouraged collaborative learning and sharing among diverse stakeholders and sectors within Mlimani. But at the same time, Eco-Preneur’s practitioners saw and positioned themselves as learners. As such, while they introduced their ideas about environmental entrepreneurship and shared practices from other locations, they were quite open about the fact that they did not have all of the answers, and were dependent on their local partners to give feedback and direct them to make appropriate adjustments.

They were particularly interested in working with youth and using environmental enterprise as a means to address youth unemployment. They received funding for their projects through foundation grants, personal donations, and income generated from conducting private workshops for development practitioners and private consulting for large global development institutions. As a small organization, they had only four full time staff, most of whom were in their mid to late twenties and thirties. Several employees worked as interns or volunteers and were provided with the opportunity to learn about environmental enterprise and development while contributing to the organization.

During their first visit, in 2004, Tracy, the former project manager of Eco-Preneur taught a three-week course for underemployed youth in the principals of environmental enterprise. They taught the course in partnership with a local education organization, the Mlimani Global Youth Education Center (MGYEC). The MGYEC was one of five centers¹⁹ of an American based organization seeking to provide access to educational resources that increase the capacity of young people to become employable in today’s global market place.²⁰ Through simulation games, interactive activities, and reflexive discussions, the twenty-five youth, learned and practiced environmental principals such as “reuse and recycle.”²¹ Rather than teaching a particular entrepreneurial business practice, (as is often the case in other international development projects) Tracy encouraged the youth to assess their own surroundings to determine how to create an environmentally friendly for-profit business that leverages available resources, cultural practices, and local knowledge. For their first business, the youth collected and cleaned the plastic bags that littered the town and resold the bags to charcoal makers who used them to bundle charcoal for their customers. Importantly these businesses didn’t require initial capital investment and thus were accessible to any person with the entrepreneurial spirit, especially in this case, the youth. Their teaching philosophy and participatory

¹⁹ The other four centers were located in Africa, South America, North America, and Asia.

²⁰ Because of my efforts to find NGO’s which could provide global education for the tour guides, I made contact with the International Branch of the Youth Education Center which put me in touch with this local branch, which I visited with the tour guides in 2003 prior to Eco-Preneur’s partnership and training. When preparing to come to Mlimani for the first time, Tracy was given my contact information by the international headquarters (with whom they shared an office), in case through my work and travels with the guides I could direct her to Tanzanians who could provide training in environmental technologies for her workshop at the Education Center.

²¹ Maria and Terisita were part of this training and state that the training “gave birth to” their clothing business and savings and credit group.

practices provided a site in which to examine if and how Tanzanians access entrepreneurial practices and develop locally relevant enterprises through experience.

While teaching this youth entrepreneurship course, Tracy realized that several local organizations and community members were already well versed in entrepreneurship practice and still others were quite familiar with conservation technologies and practices. The problem as she saw it, was that information wasn't being shared. Local organizations weren't aware of the expertise available in their own community, and therefore were spending considerable time appealing to international funders to send experts to teach environmental technologies and practices that could just as easily have been provided locally.²² Following Tracy's lead, Eco-Preneur shifted its focus from direct teaching and training of individual youth, to working in “partnership” with the Mlimani community.

Eco-Preneur proposed to facilitate a community wide partnership, the Mlimani Environmental Enterprise Development Initiative, or MEEP, as a learning space in which information and technology could be shared. Mlimani would be the site of one of three similar community wide environmental enterprise partnerships in Tanzania. In early 2006 Tracy left the organization and Melissa was hired in her place. In April 2006, Melissa and her boss, the director of Eco-Preneur returned to Mlimani to facilitate an Environmental Enterprise Capacity Building workshop for the purpose of 1) planning collaborative projects for the community partnerships 2) design the organizational structures of the three community wide partnerships 3) receiving training in environmental enterprise development.

In April 2007, Melissa returned to Mlimani with David, a temporary employee who was hired to assist Melissa in facilitating their participatory work with the MEEP partnership. Eco-Preneur had received funding from a small American Foundation which focuses on empowering women in Africa to 1) work with and coordinate the activities of American expert who would train five women’s groups from the surrounding villages in alternative briquette production 2) conduct participatory market research with the MEEP partnership to decide if these alternative briquettes were marketable in Mlimani or elsewhere in Tanzania. 3) Facilitate a “learning journey” which would bring together briquette producers in Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania who could exchange recipes, production practices, and marketing strategies.

Because of Eco-Preneur’s emphasis on self-reflexivity and commitment to engaging with community knowledge, while not imposing their own, I believed that Eco-Preneur would be an interesting organization to potentially observe not only the contradictions and tensions within entrepreneurial partnerships but also the possibilities that local Tanzanians might have gained through these interactions. Eco-Preneur was also an ideal site of study because they were spreading discourses and practices of entrepreneurship through informal and participatory practices rather than formal trainings.

Melissa and David. Both Melissa and David were recent college graduates in their mid-twenties. Melissa graduated with a degree in biology. She came to understand the tensions between forest conservation and the needs of the local people when as part of a

²² When Tracy first came to Tanzania in 2004, she contacted me to share my contacts of Tanzanians in the area who could teach environmental technologies

university semester abroad program she visited one of the remote villages located in the protected forests surrounding Mlimani. She felt strongly that without alternative economic opportunities, villagers would have no choice but to engage in destructive forest practices such as charcoal making, animal grazing, and clearing the forest to plant food. Eco-Preneur offered her the opportunity to address these concerns, but as a biologist and not a social scientist nor a trained development practitioner, she expressed concern from the beginning that she may not have been prepared or had the social skills to facilitate a community wide development project.

David had a bachelor's degree in Peace and Conflict Studies and came to Eco-Preneur after having gained experience working for one of the world's largest and most influential social entrepreneurship organization. He had never been to Tanzania, nor had he worked in development, but brought a solid understanding of social entrepreneurship. He had been employed for two years at the leading social entrepreneurship organization, Ashoka. He was eager to share his experience, knowledge, and skills and collaborate with the community partnership to solve environmental and economic problems through entrepreneurship.

Although they sent updates and received some feedback from their boss in the U.S. office, for the most part, Melissa and David, who had little development experience, were on their own to decide how best to engage with this community wide partnership and diverse stakeholders. Melissa sometimes complained, however that she had too little direction and support. But as her boss explained in an interview with me, there isn't a recipe for how to conduct participatory development, and she had only hoped that Melissa and David would be the right kinds of employees to take on this project. Describing themselves as entrepreneurs, Melissa and David positioned themselves as learners rather than experts, and believed they were given the opportunity to do this work because they were prepared to act creatively in relation to what they would learn from their partners, the environment, and their growing understanding of local business practices. Although Melissa was at times somewhat disturbed by her lack of preparation and direction, David described his lack of development experience as an opportunity to model the kinds of learning behaviors and practices characteristic of self-reflexive entrepreneurs. According to Eco-Preneur's philosophy, the best way to learn entrepreneurial practices was to be exposed to them and have the space in which to practice.

Because of their critique of teacher centered education, Western driven development, and their particular understanding of the potential of capitalism to be put to social justice ends, Eco-Preneur provided an idea site in which to study the spread and negotiation of global discourses and practices of entrepreneurship, partnership, and participation. Although as a small organization their impact would likely seem limited, they represented a growing trend in development of individuals and private development organizations that operate in Tanzania, often entering the country as I once did, as "tourists" with the best of intentions, but without supervision or formal channels of accountability. They are symbolic of the idealistic Millennials described by Roy, not constrained by their lack of experience, but rather driven to innovate because they were not held back by traditions, rules, expert knowledge, or clear direction to follow.

3.3.3.4 Mlimani Environmental Enterprise Partnership MEEP. The MEEP partnership brought together multiple and diverse stakeholders and organizations (see table below) to exchange ideas, share information about successful environmental enterprise projects, assist each other in drafting funding proposals and implementing projects, attend trainings offered by their respective organizations, and collaboratively assess environmental business opportunities and development priorities for the Mlimani community. The idea for developing a community wide environmental partnership came from Eco-Preneur, who believed they could be more effective in spreading and supporting environmental enterprise mindsets and practices by working in collaboration with community partners and organizations who were in the best position to determine the needs and resources of the community.

The position of Eco-Preneur within the partnership was rather ambiguous and often a point of contention which I explore in the data analysis chapters. Prior to arriving in Tanzania, the Tanzanian practitioners described Eco-Preneur's participation as one of partner among many, one that because of its international status could provide key access to international funding and knowledge. At other times, the Mlimani partnering organizations described Eco-Preneur as an international organization, which was supportive and instrumental in initiating their partnership, but nevertheless separate from and outside of their local partnership. Melissa and David also described Eco-Preneur's position ambiguously: while they always referred to the local organizations as their "partners," they shifted between describing themselves as a member of the partnership to an outside organization which sought to support local partnership.

In March 2006, after providing training in "value chain analysis" "adding value," Eco-Preneur encouraged each of the different MEEP members to reflect on how they might be able to create new green products by "adding value" to non-valued resources which were otherwise taken for granted or considered waste. While traveling, one of the MEEP members learned about a briquette factory, which produced briquettes out of sawdust. Unlike the particular factory he had visited which needed to buy sawdust and have it delivered to the factory, Mlimani already had a large supply of sawdust which had been left behind after several lumber mills shut down. MEEP members saw the potential of a briquette factory to simultaneously clean up the waste (which according to the health officer had become home to disease spreading rats) and provide a green alternative to the more destructive charcoal.

The MEEP partnership drafted a proposal, which they shared with their international "partner," Eco-Preneur, who assisted them in revising their proposal and finding potential funding for their briquette project. At the same time, one of the MEEP member organizations, "Village Enterprise" wrote their own proposal for the same project to the UNDP. In the end both organizations received funding. Because the same project had been funded by two different funding sources, MEEP members assumed that the budgets for the project would have significant duplication. "Harmonizing" the two budgets became a key focus of their initial partnership meetings and therefore a critical focus of the data I collected on their partnership.

The MEEP partnership proved to be an ideal site in which to observe the meaning of partnership between diverse local and international actors. Because of its emphasis on building entrepreneurial capacity through dialogue and practice, The MEEP partnership

also provided a space in which to examine the possibility and challenges of learning in community.

The following table lists the names of the participating organizations, describes the organizations' focus, and describes my initial entry into the organization. Those organizations listed with bold letters (Eco-Preneur, Rural Empowerment Solutions, and Saccos) represent focal organizations, which I focused on in greater depth, both in terms of the organization's individual work and their relationship within the MEEP.

Table 3-1: MEEP Mlimani Environmental Enterprise Partnership

Organization	Purpose	Connections
Mlimani Tourism	Eco-Tourist Collective. Percentage of earnings go to local villages	I was directed to this business by a former employee of the Amani Nature Reserve who was instrumental in starting the tour guide business in Mlimani and Amani. The guides of Amani and I visited the tourist business for the first time in 2004 as part of our efforts to locate and learn from other NGO's and tourist businesses which could support their business in Amani. I visited the tourist organization in 2006 as part of my pre-dissertation research
Global Youth Education Center	Provided entrepreneurship training, savings and credit training, computer courses, and English. Once part of an American international NGO focusing on providing youth educational resources necessary to participate in a global economy.	The Amani tour guides and I visited the Education center in 2004. I visited the education center as part of my pre-dissertation trip. I was invited at this time to observe entrepreneurial trainings for women in surrounding villages, which would begin in Jan 2007.
Saccos: Maria and Terisita	Savings and Credit Group for 25 women (mostly farmers selling produce). They received savings and credit training from the Global Education Center and entrepreneurship training from Eco-Preneur and Rural Empowerment Solutions. Maria and Terisita were group leaders and represented the group on the MEEP partnership. They were also members of the Youth Entrepreneurship Club.	I met Maria and Terisita in 2006 during pre-dissertation trip while waiting to visit the Education Center where they were attending computer classes. They told me about their entrepreneurship and savings and credit classes. When I returned in 2007 I ran into them at the Youth Entrepreneurship Club. They asked me to assist them in translating their constitution which had paid the director of Global Education

Table 3-1: MEEP Mlimani Environmental Enterprise Partnership (cont)

Eco-Preneur: Melissa, David, Tracy	American Environmental Organization promoting environmental enterprise throughout the world. Initiated the MEEP Partnership	My first encounter with Eco-Preneur was when Tracy, the former project manager contacted me prior to going to Tanzania for the first time. Because of my work with the tour guides in Amani, the director of the Global Youth Education Center in the United States gave her my number so that she could learn about other environmental experts in the area. Once I decided to do research on environmental training two years later, I contacted Tracy about using Eco-Preneur as the research site.
Rural Empowerment Solutions (REP): Kato	Provide entrepreneurial training to government officials, women's groups, agricultural associations	I visited this organization in 2007 during phase 1 of 2007 data collection and was invited to observed three entrepreneurship trainings.
Paradise Eco-Hotel	This hotel has made efforts to conserve surrounding area and conducts several conservation projects on the hotel property	The hotel manager worked closely with the Mlimani Tourism business and I met him with the tour guides in 2004.
Office of Development	This government office	I met this government officer during the first MEEP meeting.
Office of Waste	This government official set up procedures to keep the local market clean and safe. He was working with Eco-Preneur to set up city wide composting efforts.	I met this government officer through participation in the first MEEP meeting and conducted two follow up interviews about the MEEP organization.
Village Enterprise (CV)	This organization provides entrepreneurial training and initiates savings and credit groups in remote villages surrounding Mlimani. They drafted their own	I visited this organization during phase 1 of data collection.
Youth Development Club	This club is a part of the business support services organization and focuses specifically on youth unemployment	I observed two club meetings and interviewed several club members about their work. Maria and Terisita are members.
Business Support Services	Provide ongoing "incubation" services to support new businesses. Partner with University of Dar es Salaam	I visited this organization in 2007 during phase 1 of 2007 data collection

3.3.4 Methods for collecting data.

3.3.4.1 The use of a Tanzanian research assistant: Adam Mkarafu. Because of the significant role my research assistant Adam played in both conducting the research and assisting to make sense of our observations, I describe his role here. Adam assisted me to translate meetings, took his own set of field notes, and discussed with me his observations daily. Since we discussed and processed our understanding of entrepreneurial discourses and practices while travelling together, eating most of our meals together, walking through villages and towns together, and attending trainings and meetings together, our interactions in many ways, both with each other and with the world characterize the very informal learning that we set out to study.

Although many researchers employ trained and college educated research assistants, I chose to work with Adam for both practical and political reasons: 1) I had known Adam for five years and trusted him. I first met Adam in 2002 when I returned to Amani as he was a tour guide. 2) He knew the area and the local language. Adam was born and raised and attended secondary school in a village not far from Mlimani. But because he had not been living in the area for ten years, he was not likely to be enmeshed in the local politics, which may have been a problem for informants 2) my research questions and motivations had been shaped by many conversations and experiences working with Adam as part of the Amani tour guide group. Seeing my research partially through his eyes and his assessment as a “peasant²³” and typical “target beneficiary,” of many of these development projects kept me grounded and connected to a positionality and orientation, which I wanted to keep central to my project.²⁴ As I had already experienced in traveling with the guides, as a Mzungu I was treated differently. I assumed that Adam would be able to offer different perspectives and contexts in which to understand the interviews and observations. 3) I hoped that perhaps in doing this research with me, Adam would gain access or at least a seat at the table from which to view the kinds of development spaces and practices from which he had otherwise been excluded. I often return to the words of Andrea Cornwall who argued that while simply sitting at the table should not be considered full participation, there is no telling what people take from their experience at that table that can be put towards more transformative ends in other spaces (Cornwall, 2004, p. 4).

While Adam’s perspectives and knowledge were instrumental in this research, I also hoped that by employing Adam I would have both provided a needed salary and given him the opportunity to learn research skills (using a computer, transcribing, recording, interviewing), which could facilitate access to further employment for the many international researchers who often need good and reliable research assistants. In this way, I had many of the same hopes, goals, and assumptions about “learning in practice,” as Eco-Preneur did.

3.3.4.2 Participant Observation. For each of the institutional sites, Adam and I took notes on the interactions between the different participants within the various trainings and partnerships. We focused specifically on the content of what was being said, the context in which the interactions were taking place, and the activities or

²³ This is the term he used to describe himself and other poor people.

²⁴ It was my experience with the guides that had prompted this research. Keeping this focus and perspective central, gave me an anchor to return to when at times, my research seemed lost in theory and discourse.

materials which guided interactions. We paid careful attention to who was speaking/not speaking, the physical positions participants took, and different kinds of alliances or disjunctures which were made between participants. We also paid attention to the reactions that participants had to the introduction of practices, narratives, and content. I highlighted places in trainings or meetings in which someone made comment to how the world has changed, new forms of participation, the necessity and justifications for mindset change. We recorded all of these meetings with a digital audio recorder.

Because I lived in the area, I was also able to observe instances of “participation,” or partnership that both validated and contradicted the norms articulated in trainings or meetings. Adam and I regularly referred back to meetings or training narratives to describe how interactions we were having with other community members in our daily lives were in line with or ran counter to those which were being emphasized in the research site. I kept regular field-notes of these conversations in which I described the nature of the conversations and reflected on how these conversations were situated in the larger questions of participation. In some cases, I recorded our discussion of these observations.

3.3.4.3 Interviewing. While participant observation allowed me to observe the interactions as they took place, interviews gave me the opportunity to ask more specific questions about the nature or historical context of a conversation, the meaning of a particular word or phrase, or other specific details related to what I had observed. In addition to interviewing people about their participation in particular meetings or trainings, I also conducted more general interviews about entrepreneurship development and the meaning and practices of participation and partnership. Although I did not use an interview protocol, before beginning an interview, Adam and I discussed the focus of the interview and developed guiding questions. Adam was able to offer critical feedback, additional questions, and insights into the appropriateness of the questions. For example, he explained that it was not culturally appropriate to ask only questions without somehow sharing your own opinions or giving some acknowledgement of acceptance and understanding of given responses. As such, my interviews were flexible--more like a dialogue than a formal interview. I often gave examples or narratives of the kinds of familiar conversations, which had prompted my questions.

Before beginning each interview, I carefully explained the purpose of my research. I requested to record the interviews and explained that informants could ask to delete information or turn off the recorder at any point they wanted. In all but one interview, I was given permission to record.

Although I am not a fluent speaker of Kiswahili, I have high intermediate-advanced speaking skills, and was comfortable in most cases conducting interviews, reviewing documents, and observing trainings in Swahili. This skill allowed me to shift between English and Swahili depending on the needs and preferences of the research informants. I always began interviews in Kiswahili, and switched to English following the lead of the informant. If I didn't understand something, I was able to ask for clarification in Swahili. Adam also aided in our conversations by rearticulating my questions into more fluent Swahili or explaining something in more simple Swahili if I hadn't understood. Switching between Kiswahili and English was not just a matter of comprehension, but rather code switching has become a common practice even among

native Kiswahili speakers. While code-switching was not the focus of my research, I did note when code-switching occurred.

During the meeting, Adam and I both took notes, which we wrote up into more detailed field-notes after the meeting. We discussed our perceptions of the meeting and taped our dialogues about our reflections (especially if we had a long walk home), which then became part of the data set. We also read through our field-notes together comparing insights and understandings. At this point, Adam could explain in greater depth the subtle meaning of proverbs or narratives, which indexed contexts, social practices, ideologies, or discourses, with which I was unfamiliar.

3.3.5 Types of data collected. With an eye to the research questions outlined above, I collected various types of data about the practices of each of the four focal institutions and the promotion of entrepreneurial practices in Tanzania in general.

3.3.5.1 Data collected in Mlimani.

Rural empowerment solutions: interviews. I conducted two interviews with Kato, about the history and nature of Rural Empowerment Solutions' work and the importance of entrepreneurial practices. After observing his trainings I also conducted reflective interviews about them. Because Kato was also a leader in the MEEP partnership, I also interviewed him regarding his perspectives on the MEEP activities, and MEEP members' interactions with the American organization Eco-Preneur, their efforts to build the capacity of "weaker organizations" like Saccos, and the meaning of partnership in general. Given the importance of social relationships in Mlimani, many of my visits to Rural Empowerment Solutions were informal: I often stopped by to greet Kato on my way into town. It was during these informal meetings that we often had very productive conversations about Tanzanian politics, entrepreneurial trainings, development relationships, and the MEEP partnership.

Participant observation. Kato invited Adam and me to attend three entrepreneurship trainings. I was introduced as a researcher and Adam as my research assistant. Most of his training involved lecture and presentation, but in cases in which we were asked to discuss or conduct some activity with a partner, Adam and I participated in these activities either with each other or in small groups with other participants. In one training, the women's group paid him to be their note taker and asked him to write their report for the UNDP. In addition, Adam was asked to prepare a presentation each morning for the training participants reflecting on the previous day's activities. Periodically, training participants (especially those with limited education) asked Adam for assistance to complete a written activity or explain something which they didn't understand. While Adam assisted the facilitator, my participation was limited, allowing me to focus more carefully on the interactions within the training: the kinds of questions and struggles students were having and sharing with Adam, and the training itself.

After first asking permission, I recorded the trainings using an audio voice recorder. Adam and I both took notes in the training. At the end of the day, we sat together and compared notes, discussing each part of the training, and elaborating in more detail about our observations. Adam provided critical insights into cultural and political references. I recorded these discussions and wrote field-notes, which included both my observations of the training, Adam's notes, and my discussions with Adam.

I observed the following trainings:

1. *Nulu Women's Group*. Kato was hired as a consultant to facilitate a one-day eight-hour entrepreneurship and leadership training for the Nulu Women's Group and their "partners" representatives of local government and administrators from primary schools from twelve villages where the women's group intended to start environmental clubs for youth. The women received funding from the UNDP Small Grants Funds for the training and the creation of environmental clubs.

2. *Shambangeda Women's Group Tree Planting Training*. This training lasted six full days. This was a group of women who after receiving training from a German NGO to make jam from local fruits, created a business selling the jams locally and in several nearby towns. With Kato's assistance, the group wrote a proposal to the UNDP Small Grants Fund to facilitate conservation training on the importance of planting trees. During the first two days of the training, they invited their "partners," fruit sellers and charcoal producers. The charcoal producers were a group of six husbands and wives who came from a rural village located high in mountains. The men make the charcoal, and the women carry enormous bags of charcoal each morning to sell at the market or to regular customers like Shambangeda. These charcoal producers were not formally organized nor recognized by the government, and therefore unlike the Women's group, could neither receive funds nor request training. Although they had been invited by the Women's group to attend a full week of training, at the end of the second day—the culmination of the tree planting training, the president of the women's group made an announcement thanking the briquette producers for their participation, and explaining that they were no longer needed, and that they were free to leave (after only two days of training and having received only two days worth of their allocated participation stipend).

Not only did Adam and I observe this training, but we also visited and interviewed the charcoal producers in their village to understand how they perceived the training and their relationship with the Women's group, and to learn more about their lives and work as charcoal producers. It was against their work, described as "destructive and dangerous," that the MEEP partnership decided to propose alternative fuel sources and the Shambangeda Women's Group was awarded funding to teach them how to plant trees to protect the environment, thus it seemed important to interview them about how they perceived these trainings and environmental changes.

The visit lasted about three hours. First the charcoal producers gave us a tour of their land where they had personally planted many trees which they used to make charcoal. Then we were invited into the home of one of the briquette producers and offered tea. Before beginning the interview, the village chairman came and interviewed us about our intentions, before giving us permission to continue the interview. The interview lasted an hour and a half.

3. *Entrepreneurship training for Shambangeda Women's Group*. During the final five days of the Women's group training, Kato taught entrepreneurship and facilitated a strategic planning workshop so that the jam makers could reconsider their business practices and organization. As part of this workshop, we did a "study tour," to visit the orange growers in the lowland villages. Following Kato's entrepreneurship training, the orange growers who had been selling directly to exploitative buyers organized themselves into an orange association. I audio recorded and took notes on this meeting

between the women's group and the orange growers as the orange growers discussed the adoption of "new entrepreneurial mindsets" and practices, which they believed, were integral to their current success and progress.

4. Tree Nursery Association. Kato facilitated a similar seven day entrepreneurship training for youth seeking to start businesses selling tree seedlings. As part of the training, in addition to learning basic entrepreneurial principals, he assisted the youth in organizing small associations, writing a constitution, and pursuing official registration of their association.

Maria and Terisita of Saccos. Translating the constitution: Maria and Terisita asked me to assist them in translating the constitution to their newly registered NGO. Not knowing how to write a constitution (which they needed to register their women's group with the government), they paid a local expert, who wrote the constitution for them in English. We met on two different occasions to translate the constitution from English to Swahili line by line. But in the tedious translation process, it became apparent that the constitution would not answer the kinds of questions that they had: They wanted to know the methods and requirements for reporting on their groups activities to the government and to an American funder who had recently given them two hundred dollars. Upon this realization, they asked me if I would be willing to translate a meeting for them with Eco-Preneur which they believed were somehow connected to the money that their women's group, SACCOS had received. Especially given the common feeling in Tanzania that western researchers only come to take, and have nothing to provide in return, I was happy to be able to provide this service.

By agreeing to translate, Adam and I were able to observe the meetings between Saccos and Eco-Preneur. We observed and translated seven meetings between them. Three of these meetings were organized specifically for the purpose of assisting Maria and Terisita to assess the market potential for a briquette business. The other meetings were related to their concerns about the MEEP partnership: Maria and Terisita were advising Melissa and David how best to negotiate their relationship with the other MEEP members during conflict, Melissa and David were discussing the details of a learning journey to Kenya with Maria and Terisita, and Melissa and David were encouraging Maria and Terisita how to take a more assertive stand in the MEEP.

Because translation required Adam and I to play even more active roles than I had initially intended when agreeing to translate, I considered our positions and utterances as data and presented this analysis in the first data chapter.

MEEP meetings: I paid particular attention to Maria and Terisita's role and interactions during MEEP meetings. On a few occasions, they asked me to translate the meetings for them (rather than asking any other Meep member to translate)

Interviews. I conducted several formal and informal interviews with Maria and Terisita, initially to learn about their daily activities including their used clothing business, their role at the church, their participation in multiple development organizations, their participation in MEEP. Later, after observing their interactions with MEEP and with Eco-Preneur, I interviewed them about their perceptions of the meeting: what they were learning, how they were positioned, and asked for clarification of something I had not understood during the meeting.

Melissa and David of Eco-Preneur: interviews. Prior to meeting Melissa and David, I conducted several phone interviews about Eco-Preneur's environmental

entrepreneurship work in Tanzania with their previous employee Tracy, who had been the facilitator of an environmental enterprise training and the initiator of the MEEP partnership. Once she left, I also conducted several phone interviews with Melissa who was hired in her place. In Tanzania, I interviewed Melissa and David about their understanding of environmental enterprise, the work of Eco-Preneur, the purpose and practice of “working in partnership,” with local organizations and the goals of the MEEP community wide partnership. I also asked them questions about their teaching and facilitation philosophies and about their previous development training and experience. I often interviewed them about their understanding of the meetings and trainings in which they participated and as time passed, the challenges of working in partnership.

Participant observation: MEEP meetings. Initially Melissa and her boss were strongly against my participation and observation of their activities. This became a particular problem when MEEP members invited me to “their” MEEP partnership meeting, and then Melissa asked me not to attend. She was hoping during this first meeting that *without my presence* (because of my prior relationships with the partners and my ability to speak Swahili) she could develop stronger relationships with the MEEP partners. After having already being asked by Kato and Maria and Terisita to attend the first meeting, I was caught between these two contradictory interests of my research informants (and my own—I did want to be there). Initially she asked me to pretend that I had malaria and couldn’t attend, but it soon became untenable to lie to MEEP members who at this point expected me to be there. Not attending, especially if I explained that I didn’t have consent form all members, would raise questions especially in the context of constant talk about transparency and good governance. What would the Americans not want me to see? Who should make the decision about who could and could not attend a meeting? Yet as a researcher, would it be ethical to attend the meeting if Melissa had not volunteered her consent? Did it matter that the Tanzanian members wanted me to be there? As I had already decided prior to this meeting, if I did not have the consent of the American organization to observe their practices, I would need to design the research in such a way that I observed the partnership from the perspective of the consenting Tanzanians, and if I did not get consent, would not be able to use data from the meetings that included the words of the Americans.

Fortunately however, just before the meeting, Melissa changed her mind. Even so her change reflected her necessity to listen to her partners, rather than her personal interest in having me at the meeting. Her change in heart happened just after she and I were walking together and ran into a MEEP member, who informed me, in her presence, about the MEEP meeting. Although I said I wasn’t sure that I’d be there, he encouraged me more than once to come. After realizing that it would not be so easy for me to simply avoid the meeting, she allowed me to observe. Soon after this meeting, especially as she and David encountered more complex and challenging situations and misunderstandings with their partners, they recognized the value of my cross-cultural research and both agreed to participate in my ongoing research and voluntarily signed a personal consent form. They also appreciated my willingness and ability to translate and began to depend on me more and more for this service.

I observed all other MEEP meetings, all of which Melissa and David were also in attendance. During these meetings, except for occasionally translating for Maria and Terisita or at times when asked to give some context to Melissa and David’s

explanations, I merely observed and took notes on the meetings, which I recorded using a digital recording. Many of these meetings were heated debates over the distribution of money, the division of labor, and the conflicting expectations of MEEP members and Eco-Preneur. I paid special attention to how Melissa and David were positioning themselves in relation to the funder, their boss and Eco-Preneur, and their local partners in describing the plans and funding for the briquette project.

Briquette training. Like the first meeting, whether or not I could/should attend the briquette training became a source of conflict. The MEEP partners felt strongly that they should be the ones to decide who did or did not attend the training. I attended the seven-day training. I took notes and audio-recorded the introductory remarks by politicians and government officials and the questions and closing reflections by the training participants, but for the rest of the rest of the training, I was assigned a work team and learned to make briquettes with the rest of my assigned group. During the training although MEEP members were also asked to participate by making briquettes, I observed the different roles taken up by the different MEEP members in the training: While Maria and Terisita made briquettes, elite members like Kato made the announcements, facilitated discussions, organized food, sat and socialized and cheered us on.

Meetings with Maria and Terisita. Although Maria and Terisita were the first to ask me to participate in their meetings with Melissa and David in order to translate for them, after the first meeting, Melissa and David also began asking me to organize and translate meetings with Maria and Terisita for them. It was at this point that they agreed to become consenting informants for my study. As participant observers, Adam and I translated their meetings with Maria and Terisita.

Learning journey to Kenya. Adam and I travelled with Melissa and David, Maria, and two other MEEP members to Kenya to dialogue with briquette producers from Kenya and Uganda who met in Nairobi. I took field notes and audio recorded the formal meetings and discussions between the participants about the particular conditions in which they each make and sell briquettes. But I also observed, took field notes on and audio-recorded discussions by the participants about their assessment, critiques of the learning journey, Melissa's facilitation, and the lack of payment for their participation.

MEEP: interviews. I conducted interviews with each of the MEEP partnering organizations (often prior to my knowing that they were MEEP members) about their organization's practices and goals. After observing MEEP meetings, I interviewed MEEP members about their understanding of the meeting and their understanding of the purpose of the MEEP partnership, their relationship with Eco-Preneur, and their understanding of the briquette project and funding. I also conducted follow-up interviews on the nature of this relationship, usually in the context of trying to understand more about the nature of the conflict and misunderstandings, which characterized most of the full MEEP meetings.

The "observer's paradox." Although the focus of my research was on the meaning of partnership, especially between diverse local stakeholders and an international organization, four different MEEP members actually sought me out requesting to be interviewed. In these cases, the members explained that they felt it was important that I knew the whole story, and began to disclose "their side of the story" sharing information about the workings and internal conflicts within the MEEP itself. Just as my ability to speak Swahili shaped what the research would become, so too, did my position as an American, affect how people represented themselves to me. Despite

my efforts to observe and learn, my presence as a researcher was meaningful and consequential not only for how people interacted with me, but even how my presence affected the MEEP meetings, the relationships between members, and the projects practices. For my research informants, being an American likely meant that I had personal ties to future funders and that I could one day be in a position to represent them and their projects (both favorably and not). Because funding for projects is extremely competitive, their disclosure about the “corrupt” and “non-transparent” practices of other MEEP members, which they shared in contrast to their narratives about their own good practices and even in one case a “transparency of the year award,” may have been a strategy to set themselves apart from their competitors. Those who described themselves as having received fewer benefits from the partnership had less to lose if for some reason Eco-Preneur decided to stop fundraising on their behalf, and therefore may have felt that they also had the most to gain by openly sharing their concerns with either me or Eco-Preneur, expecting we had the power to change the flow of money. Additionally, in some interviews, I was told that there were concerns that I was being given misinformation. If dirty laundry had in fact been aired, in some cases members wanted to make sure that I knew that what I was told wasn’t true (which was usually followed by even more disclosure about the person(s) (who provided false information) and their intentions and in other cases, some members wanted to make sure that I, (as an American, who may have even had connections to Eco-Preneur, or certainly other American funders on which they and their projects depended), knew exactly where they stood in the situation and all they had done to try and stop the poor behavior. Exposing the “truth” about how MEEP operated, particularly how it spent its money, or assessing the honesty or integrity of each of the MEEP members, seemed to be the project that my presence set in motion. Although finding out the “truth” was never *my* interest, the amount of effort in making sure I had “the truth,” demonstrates the importance of discourse and representation in forging, managing, and experimenting with relations of development power. As this example illustrates, our interactions and identities were to a large extent defined in and through discourse and structured by the histories and expectations that preceded us. And for this reason, although I could never erase myself from the research effects, I have made great efforts to make my presence visible and an object of study.

Participant observer: in addition to the trainings of Kato and the work practices and learning activities of Maria and Terisita, I also attended meetings and trainings other MEEP members.

Meep Meetings: If there were MEEP meetings that existed outside of the ones organized specifically by or for Melissa and David, I was not invited or did not ever hear about them. During the meetings with Eco-Preneur, I focused on who was and wasn’t speaking, how MEEP members articulated their expectations of the briquette project, defined “partnership” with each other and with Eco-Preneur, used entrepreneurial discourses to articulate their arguments and visions.

3.3.5.2 Data collected in other parts of Tanzania.

Interviews with “experts.” In order to understand how entrepreneurial education is articulated at the national level, I interviewed two professors at the entrepreneurship training and research center at the University of Dar es Salaam, a researcher at REPOA (research on poverty alleviation), two project coordinators of Techno-Serve (a project which offers entrepreneurial training and access to markets for poor entrepreneurs), and a

development officer at the World Bank. In addition to asking them specifically about the nature of their individual entrepreneurship trainings, I asked them to describe: the history of entrepreneurship in Tanzania, the meaning and the purpose of entrepreneurship in Tanzania today, the challenges to building entrepreneurial capacity, and the kinds of people who are being trained to be entrepreneurs (who is left out? Targeted?), the supports beyond training that are offered to build entrepreneurial capacity.

Documents. In addition to primary data sources collected through interviews, participant observation, and focal group discussion, I collected secondary sources in which discourses of participation and partnership were articulated including national and international policy papers: UN Millennium Development Goals and MKUKUTA: the Tanzanian Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, and Development Vision 2025. Many of these texts were selected because informants told me in interviews that they used them in order to inform their practice or write their proposals.

Reports. I collected research reports related to entrepreneurship development in Tanzania. Given the popularity of discussions about Tanzanians position in the East African Community, I also have collected postings from Tanzanian listserves related to the importance, challenge, and entrepreneurial capacity of Tanzania

3.3.5.3 Global discourses of entrepreneurship. I was not only interested in the particularities of how individuals and local Tanzanian organizations made sense of and spread entrepreneurial discourses and practices in Mlimani, I was also interested in how development practitioners, corporations, and individual global citizens make sense of entrepreneurial discourses and practices in the United States. I considered the making of the entrepreneur as a project that involved multiple and diverse interlocutors who use entrepreneurial discourses and practices for multiple and sometimes contradictory purposes. For this reason, it has been important for me to examine how entrepreneurial discourses shape my own world and everyday practices as I am fed images of African entrepreneurs with my coffee at my local café.

Document collection. I have collected images, brochures, and posters in the United States, which refer to developing the entrepreneurial capacity of poor African entrepreneurs. Building entrepreneurial capacity and supporting entrepreneurial endeavors in the Third World, is not simply the role of development and aid institutions; rather private corporations and campaigns encourage U.S individuals to contribute to this project.

Summary of Meetings and Trainings Observed and Interviews Completed			
Meeting	Observed What	Interviewed Who	Documents Collected
Meep and Eco-Preneur interactions	2 meetings about harmonizing budget meeting to choose who will go to Nairobi 1 week briquette training three meetings between American staff and ea. individual MEEP organizations	-each MEEP member before and after the arrival of Americans -2 American Staff about their understanding of partnership -2 American staff about the specifics of each MEEP meeting -each of MEEP members about their understanding of the meetings	-mission statements of Eco-Preneur and MEEP organizations -emails between partners prior to American staff arriving -letter from Eco-Preneur about meaning and expectations of partnership -letter from MEEP member about the problems with partnering with Americans
Eco-Preneur and Saccos	6 meetings between American staff and Saccos leaders	-2 American Staff about the philosophy that guides their interactions -2 different interviews about American and Tanzanian reflections on meetings	No documents collected
Rural Empowerment/Jam and Charcoal Makers	-7 day entrepreneurship training -1 day entrepreneurship training	2 formal and 10 informal interviews with trainer focus group interview with 6 charcoal makers/sellers	-pictures of flip charts used in training -training manual

3.4 Data Analysis

Combining institutional ethnography with methods of critical discourse analysis, I used two different, yet complementary approaches to data analysis. As is common to ethnography, I engaged in an iterative interactive process of data collection and data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This interactive process was informed by and also informed my linguistic analysis of the data. On the one hand, using a discourse analysis framework provided a useful lens through which to create descriptive and interpretive codes, allowing me to focus on both linguistic and non-linguistic practices. On the other

hand, the process of coding data (which is not common to CDA) informed both the *selection of texts* to analyze using fine-grained linguistic analysis, as well as the *analysis of texts*, providing much needed context in order to understand the texts, especially as the interlocutors often oriented to contexts and practices which were located outside of the interaction.

According to Miles and Huberman, data analysis should not be isolated from the rest of the study, nor a linear series of steps, but rather a “continuous, iterative enterprise”(Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 12). I therefore began my data analysis while conducting data in Mlimani. I transcribed key interviews and meetings, regularly reviewed field-notes and interview transcriptions, and wrote memos describing emerging themes. These reflective memos informed future interviews and observations.

3.4.1 Transcription. I did several stages of transcription. During the first round, I was most interested in documenting content. I did not paraphrase, but rather wrote verbatim what informants said. In places of significant excitement, disagreement, or change in activity, I also noted word emphasis, pauses, and significant rise and fall in intonation and places in which interlocutors were talking at the same time, interrupting each other or jumping in just after the previous speaker has completed their utterance (Atkinson, 1984). Once I had selected focal transcripts, I did a more careful and consistent data transcription. And finally, when analyzing texts in relation to arguments I was developing for the written chapters, I checked the transcription a third and fourth time.

I found transcription to be one of the most effective and powerful tools of analysis. Especially after returning back to the United States, transcription allowed me to almost enter back into the research site and capture the sights, sounds, movements, the general conditions, which while conducting research, I had come to take for granted. While listening to audio recordings, I wrote analytic memos and notes (in comment boxes or separate documents) of ideas that arose through the process of listening (in ways that were different than reading the transcript). I often listened to interviews and meetings during long car rides, walks in the forest, and daily runs as a way of reconnecting with the data at different stages of analysis, checking newly developed insights in relation to previously analyzed meetings.

Considering transcription as a critical step of analysis, I did my own transcription. While I transcribed all of the interviews with MEEP members, experts, Maria and Terisita, Melissa and David, the meetings between Saccos and Eco-Preneur, and the MEEP meetings, I did not transcribe the entire briquette training or the trainings of Rural Empowerment Solutions. Using my field-notes as a guide, I transcribed only pieces of each of these trainings. I selected places of conflict and disagreement as well as moments in which learners were asked to reconsider their daily activities, their identities in new ways.

Much of the data was in Swahili, and because I am not a native Swahili speaker, Adam checked my transcriptions for mis-hearings, misspellings, and missing words. Rather than change what I had written, he noted the differences, so that I could go back and listen again, checking my mistakes. Because of my interest in discourse analysis, I did not translate the data except as a final step in making the language accessible to the reader. Adam and I did much of this transcription while in Mlimani, but once I returned

home, Adam continued to check my transcriptions, which we sent back and forth over the internet.

3.4.2 Coding. While I came to the study with particular orientations and questions, I used an inductive approach to data analysis, seeking to be open to ‘surprises’ presented by the data rather than searching for evidence to fit my research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 61). I began this process by reading through field-notes and transcriptions and assigning “descriptive codes,” or labels to segments of texts representing “a class of phenomena” (p.57). Initially I read the data asking myself, “what is going on,” which led to descriptive codes of practice. Seeking to describe, rather than interpret, at this stage I developed codes using the language, metaphors and discourses of the interlocutors. I made a list of these initial descriptive codes and then organized and categorized the codes according to the patterns I was discovering, which led to even more interpretive codes. The processes of developing descriptive and interpretive codes were not discrete but rather informed each other: new understandings developed through initial readings, informed subsequent passes over the data and refining of descriptive and interpretive codes.

After coding inductively and developing and refining interpretive codes, I used the following questions recommended by Gee (2005, pp. 11-13) to focus my attention more specifically on language and how language was used to index identity, activity, relationships, connections, politics, knowledge:

- 1) How is this piece of language being used to make certain things significant or not and in what ways
- 2) What activity is this piece of language being used to enact (ie. Get others to recognize as going on
- 3) What identity or identities is this piece of language being used to enact, (or get others to recognize as operative)?
- 4) What sort of relationship or relationships is this piece of language seeking to enact with others (present or not) ?
- 5) What perspective on social goods is this piece of language communicating (ie. What is being communicated as to what is taken to be “normal”, “right”, “good”, “correct”, “proper”, “appropriate, “valuable,” “the ways things are,” the way things ought to be,” “high status or low status,” “like me or not like me”)?
- 6) How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things; how does it make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another
- 7) “How does this piece of language privilege or disprivilege specific sign systems?”²⁵ or different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief?

3.4.3 Data organization. As I described in the data collection section, it was initially unclear where I would have access to observe the meaningful negotiation of discourses and practices of entrepreneurship. My focus became clearer as I began to

²⁵ I focused here on technical vs. everyday language, discourses of a knowledge or industrial economy.

engage more consistently in sites and meetings, which included the same participants orienting to similar shared activities. As I began coding, I organized the data in four separate data sets, (and 4 separate binders) which reflected these separate but interrelated sites of interaction. Although I initially analyzed the data within each set, I also moved between sets, analyzing data from one in relation to the other or following leads and references made in one data set, to something that was located in another data set. For example, as Maria and Terisita had attended several of Kato's entrepreneurship trainings (prior to my research), they used vocabulary, phrases and narratives, which I recognized and could verify from Kato's training. Also it became clearer through interviews with national "experts," that the "local practices," of Mlimani development organizations were orienting to and shaped by national discourses and visions which emphasized entrepreneurship.

- 1) Maria and Terisita: This included field-notes and transcriptions of the meetings between Maria and Terisita and Melissa and David and interviews with each participant about each meeting. I also included observations of Saccos meetings and interviews with Maria and Terisita about other aspects of their lives, savings and credit practices, relationships to other development organizations.
- 2) MEEP: This included interviews with each of the MEEP members, interviews with Eco-Preneur practitioners about their role and purpose for initiating MEEP, field-notes and transcriptions of five meetings between Eco-Preneur and MEEP members, field-notes on the briquette training and the learning journey to Kenya.
- 3) Rural Empowerment Solutions: Here I placed curriculum from trainings, field-notes and transcriptions of trainings, interviews with Kato about the organization and the trainings. (Interviews with Kato about MEEP or Eco-Preneur went in the section on MEEP)
- 4) Experts: In this data set I included field-notes and transcriptions of meetings with government officials, non-MEEP members, experts of entrepreneurship, practitioners of development pertaining to the purpose and challenges of entrepreneurship development in Tanzania.

3.4.4 Selecting focal texts. Although I analyzed and intended to write separate chapters based on each of the four data sets, I underestimated the depth of critical discourse analysis and in the end, my data chapters focused more specifically on Maria and Terisita. When I began writing, I chose to write first about Maria and Terisita because unlike the other MEEP members, Maria and Terisita were actively *seeking out* entrepreneurship training and partnerships with Eco-Preneur; their interest in starting an actual environmental business as well as their expectations and challenges in partnering with Eco-Preneur gave me something tangible and meaningful to write about.

While the process of inductive and interpretive coding was productive in discovering critical themes, methods of critical discourse analysis led me even deeper into the data, and it soon became clear, that I would not be able to write about Maria and Terisita in a single chapter. Only in the process of writing did I truly discover the challenges and the critical importance of attending to and simultaneously representing both the micro-linguistic and the rich ethnographic context. In order to describe what was happening at the micro-linguistic level, it was necessary to draw on my ethnographic

analysis of the other three data sets. The ethnographic analysis did not simply describe the backdrop or the context of the conversations; rather the context, both distant and near became the very resources with which Maria and Terisita, and Melissa and David negotiated their relationship and their shared activity. Therefore, in choosing to focus the data chapters on Maria and Terisita, I didn't abandon the other three data sets, rather I used the experiences of Maria and Terisita as a unique lens through which to view MEEP and Eco-preneur, critically analyze the meaning of partnership, witness the inconsistent spread of entrepreneurial discourses and practices, and observe the challenges of popular participatory educational practices especially for the weakest members.

Chapter 4: Becoming “Partners”

4.1 Introduction

They traveled the same roads: Melissa and David of Eco-Preneur, an American organization promoting environmental enterprise, and Maria and Terisita, young entrepreneurs who sell used clothes and belong to a Saccos, a women’s savings and credit group. Traveling by foot along the same muddy pathway from their hillside neighborhood on the outskirts of Mlimani town²⁶, they passed vegetable plots arranged in perfect rows and using the same wobbly log to cross the overflowing fishponds. Melissa and David worked to spread ideas of environmental entrepreneurship in local development and environmental organizations, while Maria and Terisita sold used clothes in the streets of Mlimani. So when they arrived at the paved road in Mlimani town, they went their separate ways.

Or did they? Local and global networks kept them both connected and distinct. On the one hand, development partnerships and entrepreneurship trainings brought them into the same rooms and conversations. But, on the other hand, their socio-political positions *within* these networks gave these Tanzanians and Americans different levels of access to different kinds of practices, knowledge, ideas, and relations, differences which often prevented them from sharing the same orientation towards the same physical space, same activities, and same conversations. They were walking along the same paths and networks, but were they just walking past each other?

Despite everything they had in common -- they frequented the very same poverty alleviation organizations, belonged to the same community wide environmental development partnership, and had the shared goal of using briquette making as a business solution to an environmental problem -- even something so apparently simple as getting physically into the same room (and mentally on the same page) not only required a tremendous amount of work – and the development of completely new tools and modes of relation -- but brought into the open the problems and differences that kept them separate. While such work is usually hidden, I explore both the obstacles to their partnership in practice and the work they did to make participation possible in order to reveal what is so often buried under the positive discourses used to describe such educational and development projects, so often presuming that partnership between diverse stakeholders is not only possible but mutually beneficial. I will use their five meetings with each other to demonstrate in this chapter as well as the following two data chapters not only how inequalities of access get reproduced in the very spaces of partnership which are intended to overcome them, but make visible how working together in partnership is often the very means by which these inequalities are perpetuated.

In this chapter, I begin by locating the material positions and daily activities of Melissa and David of Eco-Preneur and Maria and Terisita of Saccos in relation to the transnational networks of environmental entrepreneurship ideas and practice which brought them together. While some links between them were obvious and mutually recognized, many were at most understood differently by each party. Their different understandings of their relationship had consequences for how they participated in their

²⁶ All names and places are pseudonyms. “Mlimani” is located in northern Tanzania.

meetings together. By analyzing their first meeting, the second part of this chapter demonstrates their relationship in practice. Getting to the meeting and sitting at the table together, however, was a challenge; so before showing their actual linguistic interactions, I first describe the infrastructure which had to be constructed and the barriers which were overcome in order for the meeting to take place.

4.2 Eco-preneur and Saccos: Partners in Theory

All the participants were united by the theory and practice of entrepreneurialism, but they came to what they had in common from different directions: while Melissa and David discussed developing a green economy in local internet cafes, restaurants, and the offices of community development organizations, Maria and Terisita moved through the streets putting “green” principals of “recycle and reuse” into practice by selling mitumba, or used clothing. This meant that while the economies they engaged in were fundamentally interrelated, they oriented towards them in different ways. While Melissa and David were able to traffic directly in *theories, ideas, and information*, Maria and Terisita were limited, in practice, to exchanges of *goods*. Selling used clothes exemplified the kind of environmental business practices promoted by Eco-Preneur, since Maria and Terisita made a profit while conserving the environment: the clothes sold by Maria and Terisita had been “recycled” in the first world and are now “reused” by Maria and Terisita’s customers. But their relationship was also structured by this difference between the economies of ideas and theories in which Melissa and David trafficked and the used clothing marketplace where Maria and Terisita made their living.

Within the larger Mlimani development community, they might have frequented the same environmental and poverty alleviation development organizations, but they also came for different purposes and engaged in different activities. Melissa and David, for example, met with the practitioners and leaders of the various organizations to discuss ideas and share knowledge related to potential business projects that could simultaneously address youth un/underemployment and environmental degradation. And Maria and Terisita were prime examples of the poor urban underemployed youth to which Eco-Preneur and their local development partners referred when assessing community and project goals or discussing potential environmental business projects. But this meant that Maria and Terisita arrived ready to participate as beneficiaries, or *walengwa*, literally the “object” of the project goals which were being shared and formulated by Melissa and David and the Tanzanian development practitioners.

Eco-Preneur’s philosophy emphasized the capacity building possibilities in exchanging ideas, and this belief led to the creation of a community wide environmental enterprise development partnership in which Melissa, David, Maria, and Terisita were each members. The idea for the partnership, in fact, came from Eco-Preneur’s desire to put local practices at the center of development work. A former employee of Eco-preneur had decided -- while teaching a course on environmental enterprise -- that Mlimani had a lot of knowledge about environmental and business practices and didn’t necessarily need an organization like Eco-Preneur to *teach* them new practices. Instead, she diagnosed the problem in much the same way as has been articulated in Tanzania’s current development policy, Mkukuta, and has become popular in Millennial Development texts and practices in general: Knowledge and information were inadequately shared and that problems such as environmental degradation and poverty alleviation were being addressed by discrete

and isolated organizations, often without the input and critical perspectives of all stakeholders. Her solution was to “open up” a community learning space in which multiple stakeholders (such as government officials, NGO practitioners, and representatives like Maria and Terisita from women’s and youth groups) share ideas and information in order to promote environmental entrepreneurship and address overlapping social issues more collaboratively. Eco-Preneur was aware of their limited knowledge of local practices, and believed that they could be more effective in spreading the ideas of environmental entrepreneurship by partnering with local organizations who were more familiar with the local context, everyday practices, and particular needs of their constituents.

This plan reflected the popular idea within global development networks, the notion that diverse stakeholders should work in partnership to set the pace for groups like the local Mlimani development community. But this structuring framework for development was itself partially the product of those very global development networks, not simply the local communities themselves.²⁷ And at the same time, seeing the problem simply as an *absence* of a space for knowledge sharing often meant little or no awareness of the local politics through which different stakeholders both purposefully withheld knowledge and information or shared it sparingly in ways that sustained and reinforced pre-existing social hierarchies.

In theory, Eco-Preneur understood this problem: their new orientation necessitated forming partnerships that could facilitate Maria and Terisita’s access to new sites of development participation as “partners,” rather than beneficiaries, of the elite. This “partner” status was to allow Maria and Terisita to exchange ideas with their partners, rather than simply be the object, *walengwa*, of the ideas formulated on their behalf. Yet this very emphasis on exchanging ideas as equals also resulted in their marginalization: Maria and Terisita’s social status and limited access to the means of communication and information technologies limited their participation in practice, even as the theoretical discourse of “partnership” rendered this limitation invisible.

After all, Maria and Terisita were young women with no formal education, who did not speak English, who did not have email, and who often lacked the money to make phone calls. When a meeting was called or information related to entrepreneurship was sent by email to theoretically equal members of the partnership, Maria and Terisita were, in practice, dependent on the other members to pass on and translate information (which was invariably written in English). The partnership meetings were usually conducted in English or a Swahili-English mix which was only translated to Maria and Terisita periodically. And although they were called “partners,” and invited to sit at the table with other, mostly elite partners, their presence was particularly valued not for the *ideas* that

27 While in this case, the efforts to encourage local community partnerships have been informed by shifts in global development discourse and practice and reflect current contradictory interests in the “local,” it is important to acknowledge here Tanzania’s long history of community participation and self-reliance at the local level, particularly in relation to the ujamaa socialist project. As discussed in Chapter 2, global discourses of participation and partnership can be seen as a response to pressures at local levels for greater participation. Current discourses of partnerships and participation, build on and incorporate aspects of previous discourses, but at least in the case of Mlimani, they are introduced *in contrast to* top down socialist participatory practices as a “new way” of doing development.

they could exchange, but because it demonstrated the partnership's willingness to include diverse stakeholders.²⁸

In contrast, David and Melissa were college educated Americans, wealthy by Tanzanian standards and perception, who did not speak Swahili but regularly used email and phone to communicate with their partners within the community partnership, MEEP.²⁹ Maria and Terisita were the only MEEP members who could not speak English or be reached in their offices by email or phone. In ways that Maria and Terisita could not, David and Melissa could engage in global-level discussions on environmental entrepreneurship and development practice and they had access to the latest development thinking, expectations and values of funders, knowledge of current best practices, and expertise in valued literacy practices (proposal and constitution writing). Eco-Preneur's and Saccos' knowledge came from different places: while Maria and Terisita had knowledge of local needs and resources, and potentially innovative entrepreneurial ideas, the knowledge that Melissa and David brought to the partnership was how to *design* environmental businesses and especially in how to represent and organize local organizations in ways that could ultimately attract national and global investment. In this sense, while participating in the sharing of information within the partnership was ostensibly free and open, it was prohibitively difficult for Maria and Terisita, who lacked either the status to freely approach or contest the more elite members of the group, the English in which to contribute their perspectives, or the kind of specialist knowledge and information that the partnership.

The different kinds of knowledge that they each were able to bring to the partnership reflected the kinds of networks through which they conducted their everyday activities: while Melissa and David exchanged ideas with distant interlocutors and were able to access specialist knowledge through seemingly invisible technologies, Maria and Terisita exchanged goods through face to face interaction and relied on "common" business sense rather than "expert" or "modern" knowledge.³⁰ And even though they conducted these practices in very close proximity to each other, and could see each other working, their work practices networked them with very different kinds of people (those that exchange ideas vs. those that exchange goods), interconnected but different global networks (development, educational, and environmental vs. manufacturing, transportation, retail), different technologies (information technology vs. transportation technology), and different kinds of workplaces (offices and hotels with access to electricity vs. streets and homes without electricity), all of which resulted from but reproduced different kinds of access.

28 Elite informants often described the uniqueness of their community partnership by their willingness to include Maria and Terisita in particular as the "weakest link," suggesting that through their participation they would be empowered. Maria and Terisita, however, expressed frustration that they were invited to the partnership only to show that the partnership was "participatory," and also sensed that if it had not been for Eco-Preneur who suggested to the elite that they include them, they would not have been included.

29 MEEP: Mlimani Environmental Enterprise Partnership was the name of the community partnership initiated by Eco-Preneur

30 Maria and Terisita regularly referred to their knowledge and everyday practices as "kawaida," (or average, common) in contrast to their reference to knowledge *ya kisasa* or modern knowledge of Melissa and David and the other elite development practitioners. Melissa and David however would not have made this distinction, preferring instead to recognize all partners as having and bringing different kinds of expertise.

Sometimes the differences in position and orientation was even more literal. For example, Melissa and David were often to be found sitting on the patio of the Lutheran Hotel, a popular European tourist destination on the main road, sipping fresh passion juice or ginger chai while they worked on their computers or met with their local partners. Yet while Maria and Terisita could see Melissa and David networking with local development “partners,” they had neither the means to sit at the same table nor even drink the same juice unless they were invited.³¹ They could see the computer from where they were, working to sell clothes, , but they lacked access to the global networks and information flow that Melissa and David had, literally, at their fingertips. Maria and Terisita were accustomed to exchanging goods with people they knew, with whom they had long-term relationships, while Melissa and David were used to exchanging ideas with people they didn’t actually know personally, but with whom they regularly interacted around their particular shared interests in spreading the ideas of social entrepreneurship.³² In a sense, Melissa and David were not alone in their interactions with local partners, but were shadowed by powerful non-present actors, to whom they were required to orient their practice. They often sent updates and reports to their boss and the funder of the project, who directed their practice from afar. As such in meeting with their local partners they were not only attending to the local context and the interests of their local partners, but also to a distant context which was invisible and unknown and thus inaccessible to their local partners (Kramsch & Boner, 2010).

Melissa and David served as the concrete link to this virtual world and willingly shared the ideas and knowledge that they accessed through these virtual meetings, meetings that only few in Mlimani could access, or even knew existed. By sharing the knowledge and information they had unique access to, Melissa and David believed they could extend the local environmental enterprise expertise and experience even further, learning about sustainable environmental technologies and environmental business practices that were successful in other parts of the developing world and sharing this knowledge to inspire new ideas and similar interest in Mlimani town. Yet Melissa and David would have to look away from their computers to see their “partners,” Maria and Terisita standing at the center of town showing off their new bundle of *mitumba* or used clothing.

From where Melissa and David sat, they would have been able to see women stopping on their way to and from their jobs in government offices, prisons, and schools, digging through the two large piles of material, and holding up large printed bed sheets of every size and color and trying on the assortment of used Western clothing over their colorful locally tailored *kitenges*. But they would have had to leave the hotel, find a translator, and spend time with Maria and Terisita in order to *understand* the complexity of their daily interactions, the tacit knowledge in which they handled interactions with customers of varied status and familial affiliations appropriately, the practice of selling on credit, the balancing of accounts to ensure for both the purchase of new product and

31 As will be discussed in the last chapter, Maria and Terisita referred to their social status by expressing their inability to drink juice (in particular). The juice sold in the hotels required electricity: It was made with electric blenders and chilled in refrigerators. Not being able to have this juice, indexes their lack of electricity, means to sit at the hotel, and a simple yet powerful marker of the differences between Melissa and David and Maria and Terisita, namely inequality.

32 Social entrepreneurship is a kind of business that attends to triple bottom line: making profit, conserving the environment, and providing socially beneficial products and services

the purchase of food for the family, and the regular negotiation of the daily unplanned opportunities-the arrival of guests and misfortunes-the illness of a child.

No less than that of Melissa and David, Maria and Terisita's daily work practices (the selling of *mitumba* within Mlimani) were part of extensive but hidden global networks. But while the networks where Melissa and David worked were produced by the exchange of abstract ideas and services, the networks Maria and Terisita participated in were characterized by their exchange in goods. The term "*mitumba*" literally means bale or bundle, which indexed the form in which these used clothes arrived in shipments at the ports of Tanzania. By contrast, abstract ideas about entrepreneurship, recycling, and potential innovative green businesses traveled instantly through informational technologies that linked the development and educational networks in which Melissa and David participated, the physical movement of *mitumba*, which depends on transportation technologies and face-to-face exchange, was more gradual.

The network in which the *mitumba* traveled was no less extensive, however. The clothes were most likely made in Asia, worn in the United States, and donated to non-profit organizations such as Goodwill Industries and Salvation Army. Set in motion by ideas about global recycling that were spread through U.S. oriented development networks, the movement of clothes from the first world to the third world put these ideas in practice. Unable to manage the growing surplus of clothing (and recognizing the profitability of selling used clothing in bulk), non-profit collection agencies sell more than half of the collected clothing to middlemen--textile salvagers and recyclers who employ low-skilled laborers to sort and clean clothing before packaging the clothes in bundles for shipment to the ports of Africa (Hansen, 2000). According to Hansen, the movement of used clothing throughout the commodity chain partially relies on at least tacit deception, since the suppliers of used clothing often believe that charitable organizations distribute the "donated" clothes freely to the poor rather than through an extensive commodity chain (which has become a lucrative business for some). Charitable organizations (churches and NGO's) in Tanzania also play a role in the used clothing business, and like Melissa and David, use information technologies to make requests through email to secure such donations on behalf of the AIDS orphans, refugees, and rural poor. But most of the clothing moves through for-profit commodity chains, and in Tanzania, it is no secret that the clothes reach their "target population" through the informal economy.

4.3 Eco-Preneur and Saccos: Theorizing "Partners"

The links between these partners were visible as they engaged in development practices like attending entrepreneurship trainings facilitated by Eco-Preneur or attending the same Mlimani partnership meeting as "partners" together. But they did not share the same understanding of these links. The different ways they framed access to information exemplified this difference: it was unclear who was responsible for the creation of their *mitumba* business or their women's savings and credit group because both sides attributed the responsibility to each other, employing diametrically opposed understandings of how information flows. While Maria and Terisita positioned information as concrete and objectified, as a thing that was transferred from Eco-preneur experts in trainings, Melissa and David positioned information as a flexible free flowing

commodity that Maria and Terisita chose to pick up in training and reshape, in this case to see the profitability and conservation benefits of a *mitumba* business.

Maria and Terisita emphasized their *dependency*, explicitly characterizing Eco-Preneur -- and a former employee, Tracy, in particular -- as “giving birth” both to their *mitumba* business and to their Women’s Savings and Credit group at a three-week training given in environmental entrepreneurship and savings and credit principals. Describing how Eco-Preneur taught them the principals of “recycle and reuse” (a phrase they say in English), they fondly recalled how Eco-Preneur showed them to put these principles into practice by guiding them to brainstorm ideas about available resources that could be reused and resold. Maria and Terisita credited Eco-Preneur for showing them the way to what they call “*biashara ya kisasa*” or modern business practices.

However, while Eco-Preneur may have taught these women general business skills and savings and credit principals, they would be careful never to claim to have “given birth” to the Women’s group or to the business. Eco-Preneur had internalized the common critique alleging that international organizations like them actually work to impose their own ideologies and practices on (by implication vulnerable and impressionable) Tanzanians, and for this reason it was very important for Melissa and David not to claim direct responsibility. Instead of teaching particular business or development practices, they believed that individuals were free to pick and choose from a range of ideas according to their particular needs and interests. In doing so, they drew from popularized socio-cultural learning theories indexed by terms like “communities of practice³³” and sought to foster learning spaces in which individuals could engage freely with abstract ideas. Rather than setting up a more traditional hierarchical relationships between teachers and students (or as Maria and Terisita seemed to suggest-- between parent and child), Melissa and David expected that participants themselves could sift through information and assess potential businesses according to their own local knowledge of available resources, potential social and environmental benefits and risks, and market viability.

Melissa and David emphasized Maria and Terisita’s own efforts in creating an innovative business or group that reflected their own local needs and interests, and intended to foster self-reliance and independence by giving access to *general* ideas rather than creating relationships of (informational) dependency. Rather than “giving birth” to their savings and credit group, by offering material resources and loans, Eco-Preneur described their role as “spreading seeds,” a metaphor which they used to emphasize self-sufficiency and local autonomy. As they saw it, they were freely sharing the information, knowledge, and decontextualized practices that would be necessary to empower the women to start their own businesses and build their own collective capacity.

In Tanzania, in contrast, the concept of “empowerment” was much more directly associated with the provision of specific resources that were to make a project possible.

³³ As I mentioned in the literature review, Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (1991) developed the concept of “communities of practice” to describe the dynamic context in which new members are apprenticed by more competent “old timers,” into the meaningful social practices of a community. Such communities of practice come about organically as people have reason to come together in practice. As the concept “Communities of practice,” has gained popularity, it has lost many of its theoretical roots however, and has taken a life of its own: picked up and spread throughout educational and development networks and used to create more equitable, informal, flexible learning spaces, such as the ones practiced by Eco-Preneur.

“*Kuwezesha*” is a relatively new Swahili word coined to reference “empowerment,” and while it literally means to give someone the ability to do something, the root word (“*uwezo*”) simply means resource, once the infinitive (*ku*) and causative case (*sha*) have been stripped away. Using the concept of “resource” as its base (as opposed to “power”) the Swahili word for “empowerment” is understood as a process of providing resources, *not* the disinterested spread of information for the development of self-reliant mindsets which Melissa and David intended. This disconnect helps explain why the Tanzanians I interviewed often referred to new concepts like empowerment as the “blah blah” of development practitioners, likening them to politicians who brought big new words but no substance, another common contrast between mere information and concrete resources (and mistrust of the former without the latter).

In *theory*, then, we can see how the partners had difficulty coming to an understanding of their partnerships. To look more practically, we now look at what it took to get them physically in the same room, and once they were there, how difficult it was to get oriented to the same purposes and activities.

4.4 Eco-Preneur and Saccos: Partners in Practice

Eco-Preneur and Saccos appeared to have compatible interests and shared objectives in theory: the Americans wanted to “build the capacity”³⁴ of local entrepreneurs by facilitating the development of a locally relevant green economy, and the Tanzanians wanted to start a green business. They might be expected to partner well, and both partners began with high hopes. Maria and Terisita seemed to exemplify the “natural entrepreneur” that Melissa and David intended to support: not only did they have a successful used clothing business, but they were active participants in both a local women's group and an entrepreneurial youth group, and they eagerly sought out any entrepreneurial opportunity and training that was made available to them. Additionally, despite their lack of English or familiarity with development operations, they were able to register their Women's group as an NGO and initiate meetings with Eco-Preneur, illustrating their ingenuity in partnering with “right people” to facilitate their participation. And in Eco-Preneur, Maria and Terisita expected the same kind of direction and good ideas that they had already received from them in previous trainings. They knew that Eco-Preneur had returned to Tanzania with funding to facilitate a briquette training and project, and were hopeful that by building alliances with them, they would have a greater chance to attend the briquette training and receive ongoing business support in the future.

In practice, however, their meetings often ended inconclusively, after hours of frustration. Neither party was willing or able to engage in the discussion according to the terms and expectations set by the other. On the one hand, Maria and Terisita felt they were wasting their time because they never acquired anything concrete: no resources, no

34 In Swahili, building capacity is translated literally to *kujenga uwezo*. Building *uwezo* is similar to the verb *empower*, to cause someone to have *uwezo*, as it shares the base *uwezo*, which means ability and resource. While Melissa and David saw building capacity as a process in which Maria and Terisita would learn through the experience of picking up and using tools as they dialogue with others, Maria and Terisita understood the process of building their capacity in terms of providing concrete resources: advice, knowledge, material resources would will then make it possible for them to engage in business activities.

ideas, no directions. During an interview after the third meeting, Maria and Terisita actually suggested that the Americans might have been asking so many questions because they were trying to steal their ideas! As Maria and Terisita explained, “They only want our ideas, but when we ask them a question, they don’t answer. They came to do their own research, as they said, they want to do business.” On the other hand, the Americans told me that they sought to “invest in impact, not in people,” because with “limited resources” they shouldn’t “waste their time” meeting with Maria and Terisita, who they came to realize were not *real* entrepreneurs because they were “too dependent” on them and were “too focused on concrete daily existence” to be the kinds of entrepreneurs that could generate new ideas and new profitable environmental solutions. Instead, they decided they could be more effective in building a green economy by working with “real entrepreneurs,” those who “love knowledge and are driven to solve problems creatively.” Real entrepreneurs, as David explained, naturally pick up ideas and adapt them to the needs of the market and the community, and in doing so these entrepreneurs could eventually employ people like Maria and Terisita.

How do we understand this failure to connect and engage together in shared activities in their meetings? Several possibilities seem plausible. Was the problem one of misunderstanding due to a lack of shared language? It was certainly true that a lack of a shared language made communication more difficult. Melissa and David did not speak Swahili and Maria and Terisita did not speak English, but even with Adam (my research assistant, a Tanzanian, native Swahili speaker) and me available to translate, the problem of translations actually revealed new dilemmas. The words that each side used indexed contexts and expectations that were often unknown to the other, and it was almost always necessary to add words to describe these hidden contexts and expectations. And while Adam and I were uniquely well positioned to observe (if unable to solve) these problems, neither side was ever in a position to be able to see things as we did. Even if they did share the same language, in fact, as activity theory helps us to see, because they had different goals for the meeting and understood the meeting to be different kinds of activities, they would likely still orient to different expectations of each other and of their meetings together.

Could their failure to connect reflect unbridgeable differences in worldview? This was definitely part of the problem. Melissa and David were raised and educated in big cities in the United States in which individual material success was common. Stories of entrepreneurs whose hard work and innovation were rewarded with success fuel the psyche of Americans like Melissa and David, and they believed that *anyone* could be an entrepreneur. In contrast, Maria and Terisita grew up on farms in rural Tanzania where resources were scarce, and stories of deserved upward mobility are just as rare. Like all children in the area, they attended local elementary schools, and only recently moved to small town Mlimani in search of better opportunities. And while they certainly *were* entrepreneurial -- regularly innovating and partnering with others as they encountered daily challenges to meet basic needs -- their goals were derived from their low status, not great expectations: with little access to resources, they only looked for achievements commensurate with their material *means* rather than appropriate to the inherent value of their *ideas*. It would not be impossible for Melissa and David to better understand the world in which Maria and Terisita live, but it would be much more difficult for Maria and Terisita to understand the way Melissa and David oriented towards the future: it was

precisely their lack of access to that world that prevented them from better understanding it, which in turn prevented them from being able to access that world.

Might these meetings therefore illustrate mismatched orientations towards their business strategies? This, too, gives us some purchase on the problem. The ideologies of American entrepreneurial capitalism and of the socialist and traditional moral economies³⁵ characteristic of rural towns like Mlimani conceptualize different social purposes for business, and thus demand different kinds of business strategies. Whereas the goal of business in the capitalist sense is to continually grow the capital, a more socialist sense of business demands that profit be reinvested in society, thereby serving the needs of friends and family. Rather than being fed stories about successful individuals who picked themselves up by their bootstraps, Tanzanians would likely be much more accustomed to stories warning about individual wealth as a sign of danger, greed, and superstitious luck (Ferguson, 2006). This basic difference was most clear in the effort that entrepreneurship trainings put towards teaching people that “you are not your business,” as they put it, the argument that business capital had to be saved and re-invested, not spent. Participants would reflect on the importance of selling rather than giving away their products to friends and families that came to “visit” their stores, and they were encouraged to use their personal savings and earnings from the business in order to buy gifts, rather than to assume that the money (capital) of the business belonged to them and could be used to share with those who needed. In fact, the training's attention to this difference illustrates precisely that it was far from impossible for the participants to understand these differences. These explanations are all at least partially valid. Yet each positions the Americans and Tanzanians as passive, as if imprisoned by incompatible cultural norms which kept them apart and prevented them from engaging in the objectives and activities they all shared. I will argue that bringing into focus the structural relations and material inequalities between these Americans and Tanzanians helps make visible the ways that the relationship between them was, in fact, one of constant negotiation and active contestation, failures to connect that were far more produced by contradictory vested interests than any simple inability to understand. Their relationship, in other words, was structured by *both* their material inequalities and cultural differences – the two, in fact, are inseparable -- and both parties actively worked within the logic of their positions to reinforce that logic, using language as a tactic to construct arguments and make claims on their interlocutor for the purpose of achieving particularly understood interests. They took up subject positions according to differing preferences of what was necessary and differing perceptions of what was expeditious, all the while contesting the subject positions and relationship suggested by their interlocutors. In short, they strategically understood what they needed to understand, and strategically misunderstood what it would be inconvenient to “know.”

As I explained in the literature review, activity theory provided a lens through which to illuminate their different objectives and cultural-historical orientations to the activity (their meetings) they engaged in a single local site. By situating their face-to face interactions within global flows, histories, and structural inequalities, I could also provide greater nuance to their cultural historical and material interests and objectives, which were oriented to practices across sites and within multiple scales. Using approaches from conversational analysis allowed to attend to the movement and struggle within their

35 Chapters five and six explore the consequences of these different economies in greater depth.

interactions as each side attended to both their separate cultural-historical expectations of the activity and their interlocutor, while also learning from their interlocutor in order to make effective claims and direct the meeting according to their own interests.

4.5 Producing and Contesting Partnership Through Language

As the following excerpts demonstrate, both partners attempted to linguistically shape and re-construct their relationship so as to achieve what they were interested in achieving, as they differently defined it. Because they did not share the same expectations or understanding of either “learning” or “entrepreneurship,” the linguistic tools they used oriented them towards irreconcilably different activities. The *metaphors* they used to organize their relationship and the manner in which they exploited the *translation* process allowed them to say that which could otherwise not be said and to ignore what they preferred not to understand.

4.5.1 “Spreading seeds” and “giving birth.” Both the Americans and Tanzanians used metaphors of reproduction to describe their relationship, but these metaphors had irreconcilably different implications: as I have said, while Maria and Terisita attempted to place a parental responsibility on the Americans to help them -- highlighting inequality as a means of addressing it -- Melissa and David sought to *avoid* questions of inequality by limiting their role to simply “spreading seeds.”

For the Tanzanians, describing the Americans as having “given birth” to their women’s group was a way of construing their relationship through a hierarchy of dependence: since the women depended on the Americans, their *walezi* (literally, “guardian”), they sought to imply that the Americans had a responsibility to care for and direct their beneficiaries. In describing themselves as the “Walengwa,” of Eco-Preneur, Maria and Terisita were using a term which literally translated to mean “the people who are the object of a goal,” thus suggesting that they were the objects or target population of Eco-Preneur’s goals, rather than as Eco-Preneur had intended, the active participants or partners with whom they would jointly engage.

In contrast, Melissa and David used the metaphor of “spreading seeds” to describe the fundamentally distant and disinterested attitude they sought to adopt towards their partners. Unlike a parent -- whose nurturing responsibility continues long after giving birth -- David explained that the Americans did not intend to “baby sit one seed.” They only wanted to work with partners whose agency and self-initiative made “baby-sitting” unnecessary, thereby placing the responsibility for growth on the one who chose to pick up the seed, rather than the one who delivers it. The Americans sense of commitment was not to individuals but to the community in general: they intended to freely share their “seeds” -- their ideas, knowledge, technologies, and access -- but they saw these as free offerings to be picked up or not by any entrepreneurial individuals who could reshape them according to the local needs and interests without outside interference (or responsibility). From a certain perspective, the metaphor of “spreading seeds” might seem to position Eco-Preneur as a “deadbeat dad,” or one who spreads his seed without parenting. David did not see it this way: to him, such a position would be patronizing, and by contrasting his position with that of a “babysitter” (rather than parent), he dismissed the parent’s nurturing role. By both de-emphasizing the one who spreads the seed, David and Melissa emphasized the power of the individual seed and the agency of

the farmer who *chooses* to care for the seed through his labor, a tactic to downplay the kind of authoritative positions they tried hard not to assume.

While these metaphors *might* also express culturally rooted difference in how authority and hierarchy were perceived, they were unquestionably being deployed in ways which served each group's different sense of their material interests. Maria and Terisita wanted to maintain a close, patrimonial relationship with Melissa and David because they wanted the direction and resources a parental figure could provide (and as they had received in the past). And by presenting their activities in entrepreneurial terms - - even while stressing their low status - Maria and Terisita aimed to please and match the expectations of their walezi so as to encourage future aid: by naming themselves as *watu wa kawaida* (average people) and explaining that "*hatuna elimu* (we don't have education)," they sought both to constitute their position as subordinate and to position the Americans as patrons. They emphasized their shared history by recalling how the Americans "gave birth" to their Women's group, inviting them to a training when they were barefoot and selling tomatoes by the side of the road, and implied that future interventions would similarly raise their status.

At the same time, despite their stated objective of embracing local ideas, however, the Americans resisted occupying the position their local partners sought to place them in: since they had no intention to meet the expectations which accompanied that role, they emphasized equality rather than hierarchy. In calling Maria and Terisita their "partners," they emphasized working with partners in partnership as a break from Eco-Preneurs' formerly direct provision of training. Moreover, as employees new to Eco-preneur, Melissa and David didn't know or share in the previous history which Maria and Terisita tried to claim with Eco-Preneur, and as we will see in the next data chapter, remained unresponsive to the personal connections and social obligations which they tried to assert.

4.5.2 Exploiting the gap: the strategic use of translators. As demonstrated by the double meaning that a word like "seeds" might have - depending on the context in which it was being used - translation was a problem, both the basis of communication and a point where it broke down. In fact, the meetings might not have taken place at all had Maria and Terisita not requested that Adam and I arrange a meeting with Eco-Preneur and translate for it. We agreed to facilitate, but once the meetings began, Adam and I soon realized that we could not remain on the sidelines as impartial or neutral translators: we were repeatedly pulled into separate side discussions by both partners, where we were used as sounding boards and cultural experts to assist in formulating and executing the strategies used by each side. Unlike unmitigated or non-translated conversation -- in which interlocutors themselves must attend to complex contextual cues and respond quickly and carefully in the moment -- the Americans and Tanzanians strategically exploited the gap produced by the translation process to leave the challenge of "face-work" (Goffman, 1967) up to their translators. Adam and I had no choice but to make decisions about how to deliver their messages, how to negotiate social obligations and norms of politeness. Both their lack of shared language -- and their lack of attention to each other while translation was taking place -- produced separate enclaves or huddles in which each side negotiated meaning, planned their next utterances, made assessments of the meeting, asked for our opinions of cultural appropriateness, and even criticized each other and the process. At times we were asked not to translate what was said in these

huddles, and at other times, translation was given of utterances which could not have been said directly (because of pragmatic norms of speaking/issues of power), but which -- since it was voiced in the huddle as an assessment and not as a direct utterance -- had to be creatively interpreted by the translators. In these moments, we *outsiders* -- since we were not tied to the specific demands or norms -- were able both to give voice to issues that might otherwise not have been articulated and reveal issues that were being strategically unspoken.

4.6 Getting to Partnership

The difficulty of translating between these partners reflects the larger difficulty in making the partnership happen at all. This point is important: while popular development discourse emphasizes the obvious benefits of partnerships between diverse stakeholders (Pralhad, 2006; J. Sachs, 2005; United Republic of Tanzania, 2005b), the efforts required to bring Melissa and David of Eco-Preneur and Maria and Terisita together were substantial and have to be addressed as an important datum in their own right. The fact that partnership is neither easy nor natural can be seen through the work that was necessary to overcome it. Working in partnership required building new infrastructure: 1) creating new institutional identities 2) translators and translation tools not only to translate between English and Swahili, but also to maintain often contradictory conversational and social norms 3) constructing a physical space which would meet the differing concerns and interests of the two parties.

4.6.1 Constituting institutional identities for partnership. I first learned of Maria and Terisita's interest in meeting with Melissa and David when I agreed to meet with them to help them translate the constitution of their newly registered Women's Group. According to Maria and Terisita, this was the first step to partnership: registering with the government would give the women's group the status to access government and international funding, but it also changed their status from one of "beneficiaries" to "practitioners" who were in a position to serve other beneficiaries. This status was crucial to being considered potential partners such that they could then access the knowledge, resources, and networks of Eco-Preneur and other international organizations. Such organizations generally preferred to meet with local NGO's, assumed they were more effective in reaching their constituents than international organizations could be if they provided services to beneficiaries directly.

Becoming eligible for local "partnership," in other words, often required specialized knowledge. Registering with the government as a non-governmental organization (NGO), however required writing and submitting a constitution, something which Maria and Terisita did not know how to do. And since the specialized knowledge required to write a constitution was a highly valued commodity, one which few people in Mlimani possessed, Maria and Terisita had no choice but to pay two hundred dollars to an *mtaalum*, or expert, to write their constitution for them. He could have written the constitution in Swahili, but he likely cut and pasted pieces from other constitutions, which like many official documents were often written in English. But despite the access to information they had purchased, the very production of this document in English, a language which Maria and Terisita could not read, effectively further marginalized and undermined the stated purposes of the constitution itself: to facilitate democratic

participation, clarify the workings of their organization, and demonstrate practices of good governance.

While Melissa and David's had initially assumed that bringing together diverse stakeholders to collaborate, share information, and learn from each other was a matter of simply "opening the space," Maria and Terisita were quite aware of the politics that limited access to the spaces where sharing knowledge took place. They were often the select few in the partnership who did not have equal access to the knowledge necessary to write a funding proposal, communicate with donors, or write reports.

For example, because the constitution writer was also a member of the partnership -- and had close ties to Eco-Preneur -- Maria and Terisita assumed that he would not want me to know that he had a business writing constitutions. Because constitutions indexed "good governance," and were supposed to be developed through democratic group process to represent a group's collective goals and governing bylaws, selling premade constitutions, especially one written in a language (English) which none of the group members spoke, may have reflected poorly on this constitution writer who otherwise was held in high esteem by Eco-Preneur. Therefore Maria and Terisita led me in circles around the market and through the neighborhoods before arriving at a hotel where, after closing all the shades, I could assist them in privacy.

It was during this first meeting that Maria and Terisita shared with me another problem they were having with institutionalized partnership. They were confused about what kinds of constraints or imperatives defined how they were to use some money that they had received from the Lobelia Foundation (an organization I knew nothing about). As I later learned from Melissa and David, the Lobelia Foundation had been directed by Eco-Preneur to Mlimani to learn more about the MEEP community partnership. During their visit the foundation was particularly impressed by the women's group and much to the surprise of Maria and Terisita, gave the group two hundred dollars. But during this first meeting, Maria and Terisita only explained their concern that they were unable to communicate with the English speaking foundation so they were dependent on the MEEP partnership members to explain the conditions for use of this money and reporting requirements. They didn't completely trust their "local" Tanzanian partners, several of whom were pressuring them to hire them as facilitators and to use the money to pay for costly entrepreneurship trainings. They hoped that their constitution would help them to understand how to use this money, but needed my assistance to translate the English so that they could receive the direction that they had assumed the constitution would provide. They also were looking forward to meeting with Melissa and David when they returned to Mlimani, who they assumed would be able to provide clarification about the conditions and purpose for use of the money. They also hoped that as entrepreneurial experts and trainers, Melissa and David could help them to decide how best to use this money in a way that would be most profitable and appropriate given the conditions.

In the end, they asked me to assist them in translation so that they could meet directly with Melissa and David, without having to rely on the MEEP partners. It was through this relationship with Maria and Terisita and their request for translation, that the meetings between Eco-Preneur and Saccos were possible.

4.6.2. Translating partnership. Before coming to understand the politics of the MEEP partnership, I thought that my offer to translate for Maria and Terisita was simple: I took on the role of translator to provide a service that would be meaningful and valuable

to my informants, but which would not distract from the importance of the event itself. In fact, there was nothing simple about it. In this case, the partnership's use of English and practice of limiting the spread of information operated in such a way as to maintain hierarchical relationships, and my effort to translate inevitably embroiled me both in that process and in Maria and Teresita's efforts to overcome it. Weaker members were dependent on the elite in order to participate at all, since having access to information and translation of meetings changed the nature of participation. And while the MEEP partnership needed Maria and Terisita in order to show how participatory they were, they also didn't want them to illuminate the inequalities *within* the partnership, especially to Eco-Preneur. If I had not translated, therefore, Eco-Preneur would not have known how the MEEP works (because Maria and Terisita would not have had the means to tell them) and Maria and Terisita would have likely not engaged with the kinds of informal learning practices considered necessary for participation in a knowledge economy (which will be described in greater detail in the following two data chapters). Translation turned out to be a very significant activity, one which not only brought unlikely partners together but illuminated the factors that *made* such partnerships unlikely.

For a start, the partners had different senses of what "translation" entailed. Since they saw the relationship as hierarchical, Maria and Terisita saw the role of the translator as mediating between *experts and beneficiaries*. Experts were those who knew the language and conversational conventions of Kiswahili and English, American expectations, participatory learning practices, and entrepreneurial discourses. Their *beneficiaries* were those that didn't know. As such, Maria and Terisita expected the translator to make the questions and practices of the Americans comprehensible to them, to facilitate the transfer of knowledge. This was a problem because literal translations of words or concepts from English to Kiswahili would not have produced the information out of which the Tanzanians could have adequately formulated their responses; terms which were foreign (and therefore assumed social relations and worldviews that contradicted those presumed by the Tanzanians) could not be simply translated without some form of intervention on the translator's part, even by omission. If Adam and I expected to be recognized as competent speakers, and respectful human beings -- who, from the position of power we were seen as occupying -- we could not just let Maria and Terisita struggle to make sense of the foreign and unfamiliar moves and practices of the Americans on their own. In fact, doing so would have been read by them as a purposeful action to expose their lack of understanding (and all that this might index in terms of their limited education, lack of English, subordinate position etc) and would be equated with a choice to publicly humiliate them. Adam and I therefore had no choice but to take active roles in translation, often embellishing literal translation with explanations, symbolic cultural narratives, and made references to parallel examples taken from contexts and experiences of which Maria and Terisita were familiar.

Melissa and David, on the other hand, saw our interventions as a problem, and at times they described our use of concrete examples and our references to familiar contexts as "feeding them the answer." In their second meeting, Melissa explained, "we're just trying to avoid these huge tangents on everything else, and really make sure we're productive." As their metaphors of "spreading seeds," and not "babysitting one seed" indicated, Melissa and David saw their abstract and general questions as seeds or tools that could be picked up and "sown" independently and applied to diverse and multiple

contexts, *without* direct assistance. More pertinently, they saw misunderstandings as productive: a gap in understanding produced through differences in practice or world-view were to "open up" the kind of experiential and participatory learning space in which learners produced knowledge, through active engagement and dialogue. Melissa and David believed that because these abstract and open ended questions could be interpreted in many different ways and taken in various directions, they would give Maria and Terisita the space to practice and build new capacities (such as using their imagination to become new kinds of people, try on new ideas, or anticipate future business opportunities and challenges) while gaining confidence in their ability to solve problems on their own. In instances of "misunderstanding," they expected Maria and Terisita to ask qualifying questions and thus participate in the negotiation process as equals, responsible for their own learning and clarification process. But in cases in which Maria and Terisita did not understand the practice or purpose of a series of open-ended questions, they often turned to the translator for more explicit direction, thus turning to their own preferred understanding of the relationship and the practice of learning.

The use of translation as a strategy to negotiate the relationship between the Americans and Tanzanians was further complicated by the fact that Adam and I were also building our relationships with each side and each other. I needed to win the favor of Melissa and David, who initially had not wanted me to do research or observe their interactions, and only the value of our translation made our assistance necessary to them. Similarly, by providing translation for Maria and Terisita, I had something to contribute in exchange for allowing me to observe interactions and assistance with my research. Adam too had obligations to fulfill within the space of his role as translator: like Maria and Terisita, Adam was born and raised in a nearby village under similar material conditions to a family of subsistence farmers. Adam however had the chance to study for a few years in secondary school, spoke English, and throughout his life had several wage and contract jobs working for different *Wazungu*, western expatriates, putting him in a slightly higher position of power. Additionally he was male and a few years older than Maria and Terisita and as such would likely be perceived in a similar *walezi* framework, expected to care for and protect Maria and Terisita in moments of confusion, misunderstanding or contestation. As my research assistant, Adam likely understood his role as one of making sure that the conversation and meeting was "successful." A successful interaction was one in which all parties understood each other, not that Maria and Terisita would be given space to struggle to make their own meaning. He often was instrumental at pulling us over great impasses produced through the incompatibility of their relational expectations.

4.6.3 Placing partnership. The first meeting made the problem of space unavoidable, Maria and Terisita initially requested that we hold the meeting at the Elephant Bar, a small hotel in a nearby village in the hills overlooking Mlimani town and the same hotel that they led me to when I had offered to help them translate the constitution of their Women's Group. Melissa and David had never been to this hotel before, and since there weren't street signs to direct them, Adam and I had to meet Melissa and David to guide them there.

When we arrived, Maria and Terisita were waiting for us. They had arranged with the hotel manager for us to meet inside at a large table in a dark room at the back of the hotel. Although there were windows facing the front street, the windows were closed and

covered with dark red curtains. Since it was a hot day, and the room was stuffy, Melissa suggested that we sit at one of the several tables outside on the spacious shaded back patio, which were empty at the time. After translating, Maria started laughing and seemed a bit uncomfortable. Since they had purposefully led me to this same hotel, in circles, in hopes that other MEEP members would not see them with me, I assumed that they had intentionally prepared a room that was away from the main street and out of sight of those passing by, who would naturally wonder what kind of business and more likely opportunities the two Tanzanian women might have with three *Wazungu*, foreigners. Adam and I began searching for another place to sit that simultaneously met the needs of the Americans for fresh air and the Tanzanians for privacy. We moved two large tables outside into the tiny narrow space between the White House and the neighboring building furthest from the road and shimmied sideways one by one in order to take our seats. If it was a solution that met the minimal requirements for both positions, it was also not ideal for anyone: any choice of space was vexed by different intentions and goals.

We ordered a round of coca and *tangawizi*, ginger ale and began the meeting while waiting two hours to receive our chicken and chips.

4.7 Data

4.7.1 Starting the meeting. From the beginning of the meeting, there was disagreement about who would set the agenda. Because the Tanzanians constituted themselves as beneficiaries, they remained passive, waiting to follow the lead of their American “Walezi.” The Americans, on the other hand, refused to take the lead, since doing so would have immediately constituted them as experts, an acceptance of positions of power that they had hoped to relinquish through their discourse of partnership. And while they made every attempt to position the Tanzanians as the initiators of this meeting, the Tanzanians sought to avoid doing so. Without outside intervention from Adam and I, as translators, the meeting might never have started at all: as outsiders, we were not bound by the same incompatible metaphors or implicated in this particular relationship and thus were able to directly name the concerns and expectations that Maria and Terisita had raised.

Deciding who would start the meeting was further complicated by the ambiguity surrounding the invitation to this meeting: it was unclear who actually invited whom, and neither side wanted to clarify the issue. The initial arrangements were made rather spontaneously when Melissa and David first arrived in Mlimani and Maria and Terisita and I ran into each them on the path into town. In passing, the Americans and Tanzanians each expressed their interest in meeting each other, but the purpose of the meeting was not made explicit. On the Americans’ side, it was their practice to delay making intentions clear, since the purpose of meeting was to share and exchange information, not accomplish goals. Maria and Terisita had goals; they had told me prior to the meeting that they had wanted to get clarification about money they had received through one of Eco-Preneur’s partners -- and asked specifically that I translate in order to make such a meeting possible -- but they also believed that Melissa and David had reasons to meet with them, and referred to Melissa’s statement that they wanted to “*kukuona*” to see each other, as evidence. They expected that the intentions of Melissa and David would become clearer once the meeting began, and wished to let their partners take the first step.

This problem did not work itself out naturally. When we all finally found our seats around a long table, Maria and Terisita and Melissa attempted to exchange greetings with each other in simple Kiswahili and engaged as best as they could in un-translated small talk. Melissa introduced David, who didn't know Swahili and had just arrived for the first time to Tanzania. But even small talk soon became an object of struggle: Melissa and David believed that they had been invited to this meeting by Maria and Terisita and since they had no particular purpose other than to simply "kusalamiana" (exchange greetings) and "catch up," they did not direct the conversation further. In fact, by continuing to engage in small talk rather than shifting the frame to business, Melissa and David pro-actively avoided adopting the role expected of the international NGO practitioners to direct and lead, instead presenting themselves as equal partners who were determined to give space to Maria and Terisita to define the topic and direct the meeting, instead using small talk to fill the growing space while waiting for Maria and Terisita to initiate the meeting.

From the Tanzanians' perspective, this was obviously a business meeting; it would be very unlikely to meet at a restaurant -- rather than in one's own home -- simply to "catch up" and exchange greetings. And since, according to norms of interaction, the elite should initiate and direct the meeting by asking specific questions about the needs of the beneficiaries, Maria and Terisita began and remained reactive, responsive: even if they had something they wanted to discuss with Melissa and David, it would have been quite rude (by the standards of the conversation they understood themselves to be having) to begin the meeting by directly stating their intentions and purposes.

This delay was tangible. But while Melissa and David most likely understood Maria and Terisita's expectations that they should start and direct the meeting, they were unwilling to do, not wanting to occupy the roles of patrons which were associated with the act of starting the meeting. At the same time, while Melissa and David had little interest in meeting with Maria and Terisita other than to exchange greetings *unless* Maria and Terisita had specific business ideas to discuss, Maria and Terisita saw this meeting as a means to achieve their interests, and therefore needed the meeting to begin. In addition, they were on a tight schedule since they were expected to attend a MEEP meeting in several hours.

Maria and Terisita eventually found a way to get the meeting going, shifting the focus from small talk and greeting to the larger purpose of the meeting. But they couched this assertiveness in questions that positioned themselves not as empowered leaders taking control of the meeting but rather as interested beneficiaries ready to help supply the information that Melissa and David, their *walezi*, would likely want to know.

Excerpt 4-1

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
1	Terisita	Anapenda kujua tunaendelea	Does she want to know what
2		na nini? =	we are doing? =
3	Maria	= au tuna shida gani	Or we have what problems

Maria and Terisita's questions implied a relationship between *mlengwa* (beneficiary) and *mlezi* (patron) in which the *mlengwa* "does" or (practices) and has problems related to this practice, and the *mlezi* who wants to "know" (idea) about the "doing" (this practice). In meetings between rural villagers or the urban poor and foreign

NGO practitioners, it is common for practitioners or people of authority to ask “What have you been doing?” or “what problems do you have?” and because of their regularity, asking these particular questions would normally serve to constitute subject positions of *walengwa* and *walezi* and maintain relations of inequality. There is an implied economy here: in exchange for making oneself legible or known to the powerful (Scott, 1990), or helping the practitioner to accomplish the goals of their funded project, one expects compensation: advice and resources. These questions often set the agenda of the meeting and frame the ongoing interactions between those who have problems, and those who have the power, resources, ideas, knowledge to address those problems.

By positioning themselves as information providers by their willingness to answer these particular questions, Maria and Terisita constituted themselves as *walengwa* and Melissa and David as their *walezi*. They skillfully brought these questions to life indirectly by strategically making use of expected misunderstandings that would likely result in the gap between their different languages. Melissa and David of course had not asked these questions, and given their insistence on contesting relations of inequality and subject positions of experts or providers they would most likely not have assumed such a position.

Maria and Teresita also used the translator as an interlocutor from whom they could request clarification about these unsaid, yet predictable questions: by framing their questions as questions to the translator about what Melissa “would want to know” (line 1), they avoided asserting what they, Maria and Terisita, would like to tell. At the same time, by choosing questions that are tools for knowing, rather than tools for self-reflection, they emphasized the links and relationship with Melissa and David. If Melissa had really asked such questions, she likely would have formulated the questions in such a way to indicate her intention to prompt self-reflection on the part of Maria and Terisita, rather than to acquire details for her own use. But by asking the question of the translator, Maria and Terisita created the space and distance to say passively what would be too rude to say directly.

Translation can bring people together, but in this case, Adam and I were caught in the middle of incompatible expectations. Maria and Terisita repeatedly used misunderstanding as a tactic to passively employ the translator as a tool to achieve their interests. Adam and I were called on to do much more than simply translate English and Swahili words: we were also cultural brokers both uncovering and making comprehensible hidden contexts that had been implied and were also tools through which hidden tactics and preferred positions were being enacted. As such, we were both sounding boards and invisible interlocutors through which each side could try out and assess their next move.

Under normal circumstances, translation is practiced in a single space with all interlocutors oriented toward a unified shared activity, and even though only one side at a time can understand what is being said, the translator’s utterances are essentially spoken in a *shared* space, a space whose unity is created, in fact, by the work of the translator. The translator moves between each side translating, as all participants observe the process, waiting their turn to either receive or produce comprehensible utterances. But in this case, the translator was often pulled into a space “offstage,” (Goffman, 1974) a space that was linguistically constituted each time the other party engaged in separate conversations, rather than attending to the work of the translator or waiting for a response

from their interlocutors. Consequently, Adam and I were engaging in separate enclaves that were simultaneously protective and exclusive, and when returning to the shared space to translate, we often had to interrupt this separate activity in order to share what had been discussed offstage, making choices about where and how to intervene. And while Maria and Terisita often used this space to say indirectly what could not be said directly, expecting Adam and I to speak their concerns through translation, Melissa and David often used this space, to identify their concerns and plan their next steps, which they did not want shared with Maria and Terisita.

The meeting began in this context; Maria and Terisita pulled me off stage to ask me (rather than Melissa) for clarification about questions that had not and would not be asked. And as the two sides expected different kinds of translation assistance, I was caught in the middle: should I either translate the words that I heard literally (as Melissa and David would have expected of a translator), or respond directly to Maria and Terisita's request by offering my own suggestions about what I thought "she wanted to know?" To sidestep the problem, I stepped out of this conversation with Maria and Terisita and entered into a different side conversation with Melissa and David by telling them what Maria and Terisita "want to know" (line 4) about the questions that they had anticipated, but that actually Melissa and David had never asked. I did however add some explanation about the regularity of these questions in NGO-beneficiary interactions in order to give some context in which to understand the nature of Maria and Terisita's questions:

Excerpt 4-2

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
4	Liz	they, want to know (1) are you asking them how they're ↑doing
5		(1) or are you asking them what kind of problem (1) they have (2)
6		cause I think a lot of times (2) when people come (1) they ask (1)
7		what kind of problems you have (3) this I'm adding
8	Melissa	Oh
9	Liz	So she's wondering (1) whether or not you're asking how they're
10		↑doing in their ↑project (1) or are you coming to ask what kind of
11		problems they might have

Our position as translators remained ambiguous. On the one hand, we had to make the utterances (in this case request for clarification) comprehensible, while on the other, we had to maintain the linguistic *tactic* being undertaken, which was often purposely hidden within the articulation of an utterance (in this case to assert the topic of conversation, while not appearing to do so). Since the success of their "tactic" depended on its invisibility and incomprehensibility, the expectation that we would maintain the tactic not only conflicted with the expectations that as translators we would make utterances comprehensible but required us to "intervene" in order to maintain the meaning. Resolving these conflicts and negotiating the contradictions inherent in bringing these diverse stakeholders together required work on the part of the translators. Yet while this work was crucial, it, like the translators themselves were understood to be a non-presence, to be taken for granted by the interlocutors for whom we were translating, as no more than a necessary function of the work itself.

With their questions about what Melissa wanted to know about them (lines 1-3), Maria and Terisita strategically positioned themselves as beneficiaries, and as the

recipients of Melissa's unasked questions. In "translating," however, I was forced to frame these same questions in terms of what Maria and Terisita (as subjects) want to know, (line 4) or are wondering (line 9) and in doing positioned Maria and Terisita as subjects directly asserting their own request for clarification. In doing so, however, I had unintentionally erased their tactics to present their preferred positions as beneficiaries, and by emphasizing what *they* wanted (line 4), positioned them as assertive partners who have given the initial direction to the meeting. This positioning aligned more closely with the preferred subjectivities of Melissa and David as equal partners. At the same time, however, I referred four different times to the questions that Melissa was asking them (lines 4,5,9,10) naming the questions as if they had really been asked, while constituting Melissa (you) as the questioner and Maria and Terisita as those with problems for which the questions were intended to gather information.

In other words, it was impossible to translate the content in a way that would be simultaneously comprehensible to the addressee but still maintain the tactic of the one whose words I was attempting to translate and render comprehensible. And yet, as in this case, the content (these unasked questions) made little sense without at least partially understanding the context on which the tactic was enacted. In my attempt to share context for Melissa and David, I had to partially expose the tactic of Maria and Terisita and by failing to maintain their preferred representation of themselves, misrepresented their intentions by emphasizing rather than downplaying their agency in an effort to align with their interlocutor. Despite these shortcomings, and the reluctance of Maria and Terisita to take an assertive stand, at this point in the conversation, Maria and Terisita had effectively used the translator as a tool to indirectly put on the table the expected, yet unasked questions that they hope to have the opportunity to answer during the meeting. With their hidden tactics Maria and Terisita had also moved us beyond the small talk and started the meeting, without having to take responsibility for such assertive acts. Although clearly Melissa and David did not ask these particular questions, having these questions on the table presented new dilemmas for Melissa and David who had to be careful to engage with the questions in ways that didn't suggest that they had actually asked them, as doing so would once again position them as walezi. We see how that was done in the following few excerpts.

4.7.2 Questions about questions. When their unasked questions were suggested to them, Melissa and David were confused and pulled me offstage to ask for clarification. To make things more complicated, David and Melissa understood these unasked questions in significantly different ways even from each other, and as such required different kinds of "translation" from me. David simply wanted me to explain the difference between these two questions, but Melissa recognized the relational implications and expectations associated with these questions, and wanted assistance in knowing how best to respond to them, specifically, how to show respect for local expectations, without becoming too involved. As I began to translate David's utterance for Maria and Terisita (line 14), Melissa abruptly pulled me away in order to share her concerns "offstage."

Excerpt 4-3

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
12	David	How are they distinct? (2) can we start with one and move to the other?
13		
14	Liz	Vipi= [beginning to translate]
15	Melissa	Well wait! I don't know what is the appropriate thing-like don't-like
16		I don't think it's appropriate to be like (2) ↑so (1) what are your
17		problems (1) you know?
18	Liz	Yeah
19	Melissa	You know (.) it's not- it doesn't feel right (1) but (2) if-it's sort of like
20		what are their expectations (.) if that's what they're used to talking
21		about (.) and that's what they're interested to talk about (.) then
22		that's fine with me (.) but like (1) you know (.) I don't know what's
23		really going on (.) you know? (nervous laughter)

David wanted to know how the questions (but not relationships) were distinct (line 12), and wants to disembody them as tools or objects that he supposed could be addressed in a linear fashion, one after the other. Melissa in contrast, described her concerns in terms of people: the appropriateness (line 15) the feelings (line 19), the expectations (line 20), and the interests (line 21) of herself and Maria and Terisita that were associated with asking these questions, clearly illustrating her recognition of the potential of questions to build relationships. Relationships were a pitfall to be navigated carefully: as the spreading seeds metaphor indicated, Melissa needed to make sure that she built a relationship in which Maria and Terisita as “local” partners took the lead according to their interests and their direction, rather than Melissa and David. Asking these particular questions and indexing a relationship of inequality, however, positioned Melissa and David as *Walezi*, therefore undermining their efforts to engage as equal partners. Yet not asking these questions -- when they were appropriate and reflected the interest and expectations of their local partners -- would be equally problematic, and would be taken as emblematic of their refusal to attend to the interests and expectations of their local partners.

This contradiction created a dilemma, yet it was precisely Melissa's sensitivity to this aspect of the questions that created the dilemma: it was part of Melissa and David's strategy to frame questions in such a way as to maintain distance and contest relationships of inequality, so they asked questions that prompted self-reflection rather than for getting information. But in this case, in which they had not asked these questions, they had to instead pay closer attention to the potential of these questions to produce a the kind of relationship of closeness that they didn't want.

Melissa negotiated this dilemma by walking a fine line: while refusing to perform the role of *asking* the questions (which would constitute her as *mlezi*), she simultaneously expressed -- to me -- her willingness to *engage in conversation about* the topics which were prompted by these questions. As such she managed to position herself as the one who follows rather than accept the *mlezi* subject position, which would have otherwise accompanied the asking of these particular questions. By deferring to Maria and Terisita as the leaders in setting the topic of discussion, she made clear that these questions were the questions of Maria and Terisita, and not her own, even while allowing the conversation about them to begin.

Additionally, claiming that she “doesn’t know” (lines 15 and 22), and that “it’s fine” (line 22) to defer to the expectations and interests of Maria and Terisita, allowed her to constitute herself as less powerful. Yet by putting forth her own assessment that the questions “don’t seem appropriate” (line 16) and “don’t feel right” (line 19), she suggested that these were not the questions that she would have chosen to ask, further reminding us that she did not ask these questions. And although she fluently articulated her willingness to defer to the expectations of Maria and Terisita, she showed reluctance and hesitation each time she offered her own assessment. Her mis-starts and pauses (lines 15 and 19) and request for support (“you know”) and confirmation from me, her interlocutor (lines 17, 22, 23) also highlighted her reluctance to offer too much direction in the meeting.

She also put further distance between herself and the questions by using the pronoun “that” (lines 20 and 21) to refer to the questions. In referring to “that” she didn’t actually refer to questions as tools to gather information (which would put her in a position of asking), but rather “that” encompassed something much more. “That” referred to the ensuing dialogue and content that they “are used to” or “are interested in,” thus shifting the focus away from questions she and David most likely didn’t want to ask, to topics that were driven by Maria and Terisita.

When I translated Melissa’s response, I sought to emphasize her discomfort with such questions, as well as her willingness to talk about anything that they wanted and added some cultural context, suggesting that it was not common for Americans to ask such probing questions about problems at the beginning of a meeting. Maria and Terisita had only one simple response: “*sawa*,” a term of agreement or acceptance, which accorded with their positions as beneficiaries. But what did they agree to? They agreed only that Americans weren’t used to asking questions and that Melissa was still willing to discuss whatever they wanted. Nevertheless, they had no desire to launch into answering questions that they had just been told were not culturally appropriate for Americans.

Rather than just say “*sawa*,” or OK, I told Melissa that I had explained in general what she had told me and that “it wasn’t that she came specifically to ask of their problems.” This brought us back to where we had started: without a questioner to ask a question that could be answered, or a participant to bring up a topic that could be discussed, the meeting was at a standstill, with Maria and Terisita, the beneficiaries still waiting for direction from their walezi and Melissa and David waiting for their “local partners” to assert their interests and expectations.

4.7.3 Excerpt 3: Invitations. Perhaps to contest the expectation that Melissa and David would break the silence and start or direct the meeting, Melissa clarified her position even further. Unlike in previous contributions in which I was positioned as an interlocutor rather than a translator, Melissa asserted her position directly to Maria and Terisita this time, countering the assumption that Melissa and David should lead the meeting even more forcefully, though (ironically) doing so by forcefully asserting herself.

Excerpt 4-4

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
24	Melissa	we were invited ↑here= (laughing)	
25	Liz	Yeye anahisi kwamba ninyi	She feels that you (pl) invited
26		mlimkarabisha	her
27	Melissa	So I thought there was	
28		something you (.) wanted to talk	
29		about	
30	Liz	[yeye alifikiri kwamba]	[She thought that]
31	Melissa	[we just wanted to say] (1)	[We just wanted to say] (1) to
32		kusalamie	give greetings
33	Maria & Terisita	AAAAAh	(shows understanding)
34	Liz	yeye alifikiri kuna kitu ambacho	She thought there was
35		(1) ninyi mlitaka kumuliza	something you (plural) wanted
36			to ask her

In line 24 Melissa used a passive construction to assert that she and David were invited, implying but not explicitly stating that Maria and Terisita invited them. Since an invitation usually brings you to the place of the one who invites you, her reference to “here” was Maria and Terisita’s place, and not the place of Melissa and David. Although she articulated this assertion without hedging, in translating, I mitigated her directness by introducing her assertion in relation to what she feels (line 25), rather than stating her assertion as she had done, as fact. But I also reframed her passive construction by explicitly naming Maria and Terisita “*ninyi*,” (you-plural) as the subjects who had instigated the invitation and thus were responsible for their meeting “here.” My intervention might have exposed the meaning hidden by Melissa’s passive construction, but in the very next line, she herself was just as direct in articulating that she came here, (as opposed to staying there) because of something that “you” (line 28) wanted to talk about. In contesting her role as *mlezi* and emphasizing the contributions of Maria and Terisita, she was not trying to get clarity from me on the sidelines, nor was she hesitating with mis-starts or pauses, but rather spoke directly and quickly in a way that suggested confidence and certainty. By setting up a contrast between the “something” that “you” (Maria and Terisita) wanted to “talk about” (line 28) on the one hand and “just” (indicating the simplicity and lack of importance of) the greeting “kusalamie” that “we” wanted to say (lines 31-32) she emphasized the importance of Maria and Terisita’s contribution while deemphasizing her own. Consequently, this gave further evidence of her sense that Maria and Terisita’s invited them.

Melissa’s intentions were to demonstrate her emphatic desire to contest inequality and give space to Maria and Terisita to direct the meeting. But the practice of acknowledging invitation, a highly valued and important local practice required sensitivity, and indirectness was a requirement of politeness. In this case, her directness was a problem, both in speaking to “**you**” (rather than at the sidelines with the translator) and her explicit description and contrasting of intentions, which served to intensify the offensive accusation. There was a delay in response as I translated, but after several moments of awkward glances and tense laughter, Maria and Terisita mumbled to each other and Adam softly in Swahili in a way that marked and situated their discussion

offstage to which the Americans were excluded. In between bursts of nervous laughter, Maria and Terisita asked questions of themselves and each other as they engaged with Melissa’s assessment that they had invited Melissa and David to the meeting.

Excerpt 4-5

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
37	Terisita	mkarabisha? hapana	Invite her? no
38	Maria	Tulikuwa na kitu cha	Did we have something to tell
39		kuwaambia (.) kinachohusiano	them (.) something regarding
40		labda na-na nini?	maybe with- with what?
41	Terisita	Eh (.) kilichosababisha	Yeah (.) something that would
42		(laughing) tumkarabishe? hicho	make it necessary (laughing)
43		anachosema	we should invite her? this is
44			what she says

Terisita and Maria had to respond to the accusation that they were the ones who invited Melissa and David, but since this would be out of character for *walengwa*, they couldn’t say so directly. They treated the issue of invitation as a question or as a matter of misunderstanding, and responded to Melissa’s assessment with much laughter. The question of invitation stood out to Adam as well; later that day, he wrote in his field notes that “they [Melissa and David] had no reason to meet you, but all the while asking you questions that show you will soon have your needs met.” As Adam described it, there was a contradiction between the statement that that they had no reason to meet and the implications of their questions which were that they would have their needs met.³⁶

Laughter often indicates surprise, but it was unclear why exactly Maria, Terisita, and even Adam were surprised, and what they were “doing with words”(Austin, 1979) offstage. Were they really trying to understand what Melissa had just stated? Or might they have understood perfectly well what Melissa has stated, but did not want (according to their preferred understanding of the relationship) to take responsibility for this invitation? Were they surprised by Melissa’s assessment that Maria and Terisita had invited them to the meeting? Or were they surprised that Melissa would articulate her assessment explicitly and publicly? Maria and Terisita had explicitly asked me to arrange this meeting, and were with me when we ran into Melissa and David on the trail to town at which point I had translated their small talk in which each side stated that they would like to meet with each other. Was their sense that they hadn’t invited Melissa and David due to their expectation that Melissa and David said they wanted to see them, and interpreted this interest in meeting them as a request for an official meeting, especially given that they don’t normally hang out with Ameircan NGO practitioners? While it was impossible to know for sure what this interaction between Maria and Terisita indicated, it was clear that Maria and Terisita did not accept responsibility for inviting Melissa and David, and they did not use this opportunity to share with Melissa and David what they had shared previously with me: that they had questions about some money that they had received, and that they had wanted Melissa and David to clarify the conditions for using the money and to help them decide how to use the money most effectively in order to start a business. Why would they not state their expectations, even at this point in which

³⁶ Adam, like Maria and Terisita, likely also expected Melissa and David to ask questions about their conditions and needs, even if they never did ask these questions directly.

Melissa too had expected them to? They did not voice their expectations, even though they were now anticipated and expected by Melissa and David, because stating their expectations was not in line with their roles as *walengwa*.

At this point, the meeting was stuck. Neither party wanted to ask the opening question or assume responsibility for directing or defining the purpose of the meeting. Doing so would have constituted them in positions of power, which neither party wanted, albeit for different reasons. Given the relationship of *walezi* and *walengwa*, it was not polite for Maria and Terisita to lead the conversation; they therefore waited to receive direction from Melissa and David, or posed questions of clarification that anticipated the kinds of question they expected and hoped Melissa and David, as their *walezi*, would ask. Melissa and David also didn't want to ask this first question, as doing so would have positioned them as the more powerful patron, a role they were trying to contest in order to engage with their partners as equals. Each side's framing was contested by the other, which essentially resulted in a stalemate and kept the meeting from moving forward. How could Maria and Terisita respond to the *accusation* that they had been the ones who invited Melissa and David to the meeting, especially since accepting the accusation would have meant accepting the position of an equal or superior?

4.7.4. Excerpt 4: Breaking the stalemate. Adam effectively moved us beyond the stalemate by assuming the role expected by the Tanzanians of the Americans; by telling Maria and Terisita exactly what to do, he allowed the Tanzanians to meet the expectations of the Americans while not assuming the leadership role himself. Yet he could only assume this leadership role because he was an outsider and unlike Maria and Terisita, who had vested interest in the outcomes of the meeting, did not share Maria and Terisita's concerns about wanting not to direct. Not caring much about the participatory practices -- which required a more powerful person to hold back and not lead -- he did not share the same concerns as Melissa and David. Instead he oriented his actions towards moving the meeting forward, which in this case meant using his position and knowledge to direct Maria and Terisita to reengage, rather than maintaining a position of distance and neutrality, as Melissa and David would have likely expected of a translator. Adam's intervention made it possible to simply ignore the accusation of who invited whom, and get the meeting going again. Because Adam likely shared the expectations of Maria and Terisita for how a meeting with *wazungu* normally proceeds, Adam's directives fit with the same questions (see excerpt 1) that Maria and Terisita had raised indirectly at the start of the meeting, and thus effectively shifted the focus back to the preferred framing offered by Maria and Terisita.

Excerpt 4-6

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
45	Adam	Kwa nyie mngезungumza nao	For you (plural) should speak
46		tu (1) shughuli zote	with them only (1) about how all
47		zinaendeleaje=	the projects are progressing=
48	Terisita	= [ndiyo	=[yes]
49	Maria	[ndiyo hivyo]	[yes this]
50	Adam	Mlivoanza (.) mnavyoendelea	How you started (.) the way you
51			have continued

Adam's directives (lines 45-47, 50) gave Maria and Terisita a way out of having to address the question of invitation, and gave them the space to answer the questions that

neither Melissa or David nor Maria or Terisita had wanted to take responsibility for. With Adam’s assistance, Maria and Terisita could effectively move the meeting in a direction that they wanted without having to do so directly.

Terisita responded to Adam’s directions as if she was helping us to overcome a simple problem of misunderstanding, a misunderstanding that was no longer about invitation, but rather about the initial questions put on the table indirectly by Maria and Terisita about what Melissa and David wanted to know. In fact, it was the space which Adam’s presence could project (as an unknowing outsider needing clarification) provided that gave Maria and Terisita the opportunity in which to avoid the question of invitation entirely, while providing the appropriate frame in which they could assert themselves and their interests while not appearing to do so.

Excerpt 4-7

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
52	Terisita	Tulivyoanza (2) wanajua (.) kwa	How we started (2) they know
53		sababu tulikuwa pamoja (.)	(.) because we were together (.)
54		workshop Dar es Salaam(.)	at the workshop in Dar es
55		Wanafahamu jinsi tunavyoanza	Salaam (.) They know how we
56		(.) (all talking) Labda ki-yaani	started (.) maybe-if-I mean
57		labda kwa sasa hiivi (2) Tangu	maybe for now (2) since the
58		(.) tulitoka Dar es Salaam	time (.) we left Dar es Salaam
59		tulipokuja (.) tulipopata vile	(.) when we came (.) when we
60		pesa (.) kuendelea	got that money (.) to continue to
61		kukopeshana	make loans [with their savings
62			and credit group] ((Terisita is
63			pounding the table rhythmically
64			as she stresses each thing that
65			happened.))

Terisita’s contributions accomplished several different things. She was responding to Adam’s directives (lines 45-47, 50) and while suggesting to simply offer clarification to Adam about what Melissa and David already knew (lines 52-56), she simultaneously made clear the shared history that they have with Eco-Preneur. This reminder of shared history: the workshop in Dar (line 54), the starting of the group, and the reference to “that money” (line 60) allowed them to return to their preferred framework for thinking about their relationship as ongoing, as *walezi* and *walengwa*, directly contrasting Melissa’s earlier suggestion that they had no reason to meet, beyond simple greeting.

Moreover, by orienting her utterances toward Adam, as if to help him to figure out what Melissa would maybe want to know, she was able to bring up the topic of “that money,” without having to admit to doing so directly. Rather than take up a new line as an assertive participant and ask directly about the conditions for the money the Women’s group received, she embeded the topic of money within the same frame of offering clarification to Adam about what Melissa might want to know. And by raising the question of money within the context of her shared history and ongoing relationship with Eco-Preneur, Terisita illustrated the complex particular conditions and relations that were attached to this money. Asking directly about the conditions for the money’s use, would have likely shifted the focus to the abstract and general principals about the money, and not the particular relationships and obligations by which the money was exchanged. This

tactic allowed her to maintain her role as *mlengwa* (who does not direct the meeting but rather assists her walezi by resolving misunderstandings and providing information), emphasize her close relationship with Eco-Preneur, and effectively changed the topic to that of the money, which she had hoped and expected to discuss in this meeting, but refused to say so directly.

Although it appeared at this point, that Terisita had been successful in putting a topic on the table a topic to discuss -- having used the assistance of Adam to do so without asserting herself -- her tactic was enacted in Swahili and still had to be translated to English in order to be known by Melissa and David. And once again, the process of translation created problems, as the translator had to do two irreconcilably contradictory things: illuminate and assert the topic of money, while maintaining the tactic of indirectness through which the topic was raised.

After analyzing the data, I understand now that Terisita and Maria were using misunderstanding as a tactic to contest the question of invitation and to provide the space to assert their interests indirectly; as such, translating their exact utterances to Melissa and David could have been useful in carrying out their strategies. But at the time, I didn't realize the complexity of their tactic, understanding these side conversations as a place to bring sense to misunderstandings, (rather than where actual performances and negotiations were being enacted). Melissa and David helped to produce this exclusive "offstage" space, as they rarely attended or concerned themselves with the lively side conversations, instead using the time to talk freely amongst themselves. They often spoke of "being productive" and "avoiding tangents," and simply wanted to know the outcome of the discussion, rather than the particularities. Yet it was in the particularities that such hidden tactics were enacted.

Because of this, I often didn't translate everything that was said in the separate huddle formation and so Melissa and David never knew (nor asked about) (1) why Maria and Terisita were laughing (2) how Maria and Terisita responded to the accusation about the invitation (3) how Adam told Maria and Terisita exactly what to talk about (4) that Terisita felt that they didn't need to talk about how they began, because this was already known. Instead, I translated the resulting topic that Terisita had eventually raised after engaging with Maria and Adam in their separate huddle formation, the money. Although I did not translate all the details in which the tactic was enacted, I still introduced the topic of money on Terisita's behalf while maintaining the frame that she and Adam had constructed offstage by offering suggestions of what Terisita thought Melissa may want to hear, rather than a topic that Maria and Terisita assertively decided they wanted to discuss:

Excerpt 4-8

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
66	Liz	she was thinking (.) maybe since the time (1)- ↑They got money
67	Melissa	Right
68	Liz	And I think it had something to do with you guys
69	Melissa	Yeah
70	Liz	so she's also thinking that maybe you'd want (.) to know(.) what
71		they've done (.) since the time since they received the money.
72	Melissa	yeah of course=
73	Liz	I think they're even confused about why they got the money
74	Melissa	Oh

75 Liz maybe they think they need to explain to you something about this
76 money because (.) somehow (.) they get this money(.) nobody
77 told them what to do with this money(.) how to do with the money
78 (.) reports(.) anything (.) they didn't hear anything
79 Melissa are you serious?

In sharing with Melissa what was discussed on the sidelines, I moved between two different translation roles (as translator and advocate), guided by the different expectations of Melissa and David to receive simple comprehensible information and Maria and Terisita to maintain a tactic that would position them as passive. I alternated back and forth between sharing Terisita's thoughts and hedges, (66, 70, and 75) attempting to maintain her strategy to passively offer suggestions of a topic for discussion without appearing too assertive, and sharing my own thoughts (lines 68 and 73) and in doing so intervened more assertively to offer my own assessment and interpretation of Terisita's suggestions. I knew that Maria and Terisita had specific questions about this money, and after all the work that had gone into putting the topic of money on the table, I was honestly quite ready myself for the meeting to begin. Nevertheless, I was torn on the one hand between being faithful to the tactics of Maria and Terisita (and the researcher's imperative not to intervene), and on the other, a personal desire (and responsibility) to state explicitly what had been told to me offstage and therefore presented only between the lines at this meeting.

Melissa enthusiastically affirmed Terisita's "thoughts," (line 72) of what might be considered an appropriate topic or interest. This validation most likely was understood by Melissa and David as showing mutual interest in the topics of their partners (participatory ideology), but such validation also fit within a frame of hierarchical walezi-walengwa relations in which the mlezi gives permission and accepts the contribution of the mlangwa who is merely trying to offer possible suggestions of what Melissa and David might want to hear, rather than what they would like to talk about. Although still not articulated explicitly, the two different representations of the relationship were still working in opposition. In lines 66-78, while maintaining the frame of solving a misunderstanding about the initial unasked questions, and thus carrying forward the hidden tactic of Maria and Terisita to assert their questions and interests indirectly, I presented the concerns that Maria and Terisita had explained to me. With this act, I had exposed the concerns and topics, which in this meeting had only been articulated offstage and indirectly through hidden tactics by Maria and Terisita.

At this point in the meeting, Terisita, with the assistance of Adam's direction, and my translation, put the topic of money on the table and in doing so moved us beyond the stalemate. Finally there was a topic to discuss that concerned both Eco-Preneur and Saccos. What the Americans received though this translation, however, was simply the final outcome of intense and complex negotiations which took place out of their view. Much of the work required to bring the two parties together, first physically, and then in relation to a shared topic, was carried out by the invisible tactics of Maria and Terisita and the efforts of the translators to negotiate such incompatible expectations of the diverse stakeholders. The work of bringing such diverse stakeholders together could only have been done by a third party who had no allegiance to either side. And yet in order to do the work at all, the translator had to become an insider.

In other words, precisely because and to the extent that the translator did not translate him/herself, nor the hidden tactics, which were played within their space of translation, the translator became the necessary facilitator. Assumed to be an outsider, even if really a particular kind of insider, it was the translators who brought multiple and diverse stakeholders together. And while discourses of partnership so common in Millennial Development would have us believe that such an event would be natural and simply a matter of removing extrinsic obstacles, the work that needed to be done by the translation helped reveal the intrinsic and sometimes irreconcilable conflicts of interests at stake.

This chapter has simply focused on what it took just to get them *to* the meeting and finding a topic to discuss. But the difficulty that both sides had in finding a shared space to practice “partnership” also reflected the centrality of space, as a site through which the meaning(s) of “partnership” was negotiated. Their expectations for what interaction and dialogue would afford, could only be understood by illuminating their respective material conditions which shaped the different networks through which they travelled and facilitated (in the case of Melissa and David) and restricted (in the case of Maria and Terisita), the access they had to hierarchical global, local, and national scales through which knowledge and practice flowed. But despite these structural differences, each side worked hard to make sense of the new conditions brought by the other, using the translator and their lack of shared language strategically, and actively pushing back against the strategies of the other.

In the next chapters, we will see what happens when they actually have a topic, to discuss.

Chapter 5: What's in a Metaphor? "No Strings Attached"

5.1 Introduction

In the last chapter we saw how difficult it was simply to bring the practitioners of Eco-Preneur and the women of the SACCOS women's savings and credit group together to the same table. Despite a shared interest in developing environmental businesses, it was quite impossible to consider the question of how the entrepreneur is made as they found they could not even communicate: they seemed to be facing opposite directions and their talk went nowhere as they struggled over even something as apparently simple as who would start the meeting. However in this chapter, and even more so, in the next, we will see what happens when they are not only sitting at the same table, but when they actually do find ways to communicate. Their communication, however, was still not without difficulty, as each of their words were often directed at contesting, rather than building on the viewpoints and understandings of the other. It was within these interactions that Melissa and David modeled and described entrepreneurial behavior, and that Maria and Terisita learned the value of defining and defending their business practices in entrepreneurial terms as they made claims on their walezi.

The topic that brought them together was money, a sum of money that was given to Saccos by an American Funder, the Lobelia Foundation. Although Eco-Preneur did not give Saccos the money, knowing the history of this particular sum of money, implicated them in the exchange. Money, and the relationships implied through its exchange, brought Saccos and Eco-Preneur together. Yet precisely because money can potentially express relationship, actually discussing that money created new problems as they struggled to manage and negotiate their relationship with each other through that money. This chapter will explore how they did this, how money created relationships, and how they negotiated these relationships through their discussions of money. And as they used money to negotiate their relationships, their reactions, responses, and misunderstandings show us in practice what was at stake in making the entrepreneur and particularly what happens when philosophies of money conflict and dialogue about money takes place between unequal partners.

Although proponents of entrepreneurial practice suggest that becoming an entrepreneur is for the most part a matter of *thinking*, and that by acquiring a "new mindset," anyone regardless of status, gender, or class can be an entrepreneur, this chapter demonstrates otherwise. Through Maria and Terisita's perspectives and material claims, a discussion of money illuminates many of the political, cultural, and economic interests and contradictions, which are otherwise hidden behind positive discourses of partnership, independence, and empowerment. By illuminating the work, relationships and interventions that are required to create and maintain independence and "disembedded" capital (resources which are so fundamental to an entrepreneur), this chapter pushes our thinking of globalization forward by demonstrating through language that global entrepreneurial discourses and practices do not flow freely, (as proponents of entrepreneurial projects suggest), but must overcome numerous obstacles and contradictions (J. Ferguson, 2006; Harvey, 2006; Tsing, 2005). Nevertheless, as funding is tied to the demonstration of one's competency of entrepreneurial discourses and practices, these discourses become the valued commodities (Blommaert, 2010) which one

most possess to experiment within a development regime. Using a Foucauldian lens, this chapter therefore offers an example of how linguistic analysis can help us to examine a heterogeneous *dispositif*: While linguistic analysis allows me to show how entrepreneurial discourses as valued commodities discipline actors through interaction, but also illuminates the contradictions within entrepreneurial discourses which actors exploit.

Since Maria and Terisita desired a closer relationship with Eco-Preneur, discussing money was an opportunity to illuminate and emphasize the inequalities between them, thereby interpellating Eco-Preneur as a benefactor or patron. For Melissa and David, on the other hand, a discussion of money presented a problem for exactly this reason. Since it exposed their involvement in local affairs and the inequalities that structured their relationship, they sought to avoid intervention by downplaying their power, keeping their distance, and interacting as equals. While Eco-Preneur *did* hold a position of social power in the global network that sent money from the Lobelia Foundation in the United States to Maria and Terisita in Mlimani, acknowledging their own role and power within this network would force them to admit their power with respect to Maria and Terisita (and vice versa). Holding positions of privilege, Melissa and David were able to use the bonds of obligation that structured their relationship with Maria and Terisita to insist that bonds of obligation didn't exist.

Each side constructed a particular narrative of how money constituted their relationship as a creative response to the dilemmas presented by a discussion of money. While Maria and Terisita depicted the money they received from an American Foundation as evidence of their connection to and ongoing dependency on Eco-preneur, Melissa and David contested this sense of connection and obligation by asserting that the money didn't come from them and that, in any case, it came with "no strings attached."

The notion of "no strings attached" made little sense to Maria and Terisita, however. The money had come to them in the first place through an extensive web of local and global connections, a web composed of the very "strings" of whose existence Eco-Preneur was denying. After all, the money only arrived in their hands as a result of a variety of social relationships on which they were dependent: Eco-Preneur directed the Lobelia Foundation to MEEP and had initially encouraged MEEP to include Maria and Terisita as members in the first place. And even when the Lobelia Foundation arrived in Mlimani, Maria and Terisita had depended on the other MEEP members to translate for them in order to become known and thus supported by the Foundation.

What Maria and Teresita could see was, in a sense, precisely what we cannot see through Melissa and David's eyes (and metaphors). I will therefore use Maria and Terisita's perspective to illuminate the complicated strings of connection and webs of obligation through which money travels (and is negotiated) but which the concept of "no strings attached" very strategically rendered invisible. Although Melissa and David only intended to say that the donor would neither impose obligations nor maintain an ongoing relationship, the metaphor of "no strings attached," helps bring into focus the attachments, relationships, lifelines, and obligations through which the money traveled before arriving in Mlimani and reaching Maria and Terisita. Not only did Melissa and David define their relationship with Maria and Terisita in the narrowest possible terms -- excluding their role in the variety of interactions that resulted in Lobelia's donation to the Women's group -- but this broader focus gives us insights into larger consequences of

Melissa and David's actions and interventions which seemed to be invisible to them, giving us a nuanced picture of how relationships are negotiated through money.

In the next chapter, I will show how Eco-Preneur and Saccos actually learned from each other in the process of developing an environmental business. The relationships and obligations that money implies continue to structure their interactions, but as the focus of discussion shifted from money in the concrete to business in general, the links between Eco-Preneur and Saccos became even more difficult to trace, yet no less consequential. This chapter therefore lays the groundwork for these more general discussions of business development and entrepreneurial learning by first highlighting the key narratives, terms, and metaphors through which Maria and Terisita made claims on their walezi, and by which Melissa and David contested them.

This chapter is divided into three sections. After giving a brief description of Eco-Preneur's and Saccos' respective philosophies of money, the first section demonstrates how they used their discussion of money as an opportunity to emphasize either a relationship of closeness and dependency (in the case of Saccos) or distance and independence (in the case of entrepreneur). Section two discusses the Mlimani Environmental Enterprise Partnership (MEEP), in which Eco-Preneur and Saccos were each members, to give necessary context to their conversations and thus make visible the relationships through which money actually travels, which their utterances strategically index or avoid. Finally, in section three, I demonstrate their different philosophies of money in practice, first analyzing how Melissa managed the contradictions inherent in her suggestion that the money came with "no strings attached" and then showing through Maria, Terisita, and Adam's response an alternative socially embedded philosophy of money and exchange.

5.1.1 Philosophies of money. Each side strategically employed different philosophies of money, and in this sense, while the subject of money brought them together, their different expectations of the kinds of relationships that money implied kept them apart. It is important to think of these differences not simply as cultural, however, for they were also a function of the strategies by which each side advanced their own interests. Melissa and David understood money as a detached object, which *grows and reproduces* as a result of individual good sense, through market research, and reinvestment, as a way of emphasizing their relationship as one of equals sharing only information and knowledge. In contrast, Maria and Terisita were seeking to make claims on Eco-Preneur by emphasizing the numerous relationships to which the money was attached, and the enormous needs to which the little money they had must be *used*.

Discussing money as a detached object allowed the Americans to disassociate themselves from a financial relationship. And saying the Lobelia Foundation's money had "no strings attached" also complemented their metaphor of "spreading seeds," by understanding money as an object which could grow and produce on its own, independently. Downplaying or ignoring attachments through which the money traveled allowed Melissa and David to discuss money as simply a tool for capital growth and reproduction and *not* as structuring the terms of their relationship with Maria and Terisita. It was not, to them, the gift of the money that enabled Maria and Terisita to become partners (since that would have made them dependent on a donor) but rather their knowledge of how to *use* the money.

In contrast, Maria and Terisita consistently emphasized the attachments and relationships in which money was exchanged and the needs of the people (their families, the women in their group, the orphans in their community) to which the money could be put. Talking about money as self-generating or their group as self-sufficient would have undermined their strategy to make claims on Eco-preneur, so they both reminded Melissa and David of their shared history in helping them access money and resources and also highlighted their own needs, emphasizing the material inequalities between themselves and their American patrons. Maria and Terisita believed that money and material resources, rather than good sound business ideas were the main obstacles to starting a new business, and so they emphasized how Eco-Preneur had assisted them in the past to encourage them to do so again.

5.2 Linguistic Strategies for Discussing Money

Ironically, both sides had, in common, the same kind of dilemma, the problem of needing to advance their particular interests while avoiding the appearance of doing so. As I showed in the last chapter, each side had to avoid acting assertively, as doing so would undermine their efforts to maintain a relationship of equality (for the Americans) or hierarchy (for the Tanzanians). On the other hand, each side had specific goals which could only be accomplished by intervening in the conversation. The linguistic tactics they employed reflect the particular ways they each managed this contradiction.

5.2.1 Maria and Terisita’s philosophy of money and linguistic strategies. This first excerpt begins at the moment when Terisita and Maria had successfully put a topic on the table that both parties were willing to discuss: the money the Lobelia Foundation had given to Maria and Terisita’s Savings and Credit Group (SACCOS). Whereas in the last chapter I analyzed the following excerpt to show how difficult it was to put a topic of conversation on the table, at this point, I use the same excerpt to show how talk of money afforded them new opportunities to emphasize their relationship with Melissa and David.

Excerpt 5-1

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
1	Terisita	tulivyoanza (1) wanajua (.) kwa	How we started (1) they know
2		sababu tulikuwa pamoja (.)	(.) because we were together (.)
3		workshop dare s salaam(.)	at the workshop in Dar es
4		Wanafhamu jinsi tulivyoanza	Salaam (.) They know how we
5		(.) (all talking) Labda ki-yaani	started (.) if maybe for now(2)
6		labda kwa sasa hivi (2) Tangu,	since we left Dar es Salaam (.)
7		tulitoka dar es salaam	when we came we received that
8		tulipokuja (.) tulipopata vile	money to continue to make
9		pesa (.) kiendelea kukopeshana	loans (with their savings and
10			credit group)

Since Maria and Terisita were not sure why they received the money from this American foundation (or what conditions there were for using it), they had practical questions (which they had told me privately in a previous meeting) for bringing up “this” topic in particular: What are the conditions for using the money? Do they have to write reports? Do they have to return the money? At the same time, since they were quite sure (and quite correct) that Eco-Preneur had something to do with it, they likely hoped that a

discussion of money would do more than simply clarify the conditions under which the money had received. And their questions were also strategic: they raised the topic of money as a way of implicating Eco-preneur in the exchange of money from the Lobelia Foundation. By narrating their shared history, they sought to emphasize the very real connections between SACCOS and Eco-Preneur, interpellating Melissa and David as their benefactors, even constituting the money from Lobelia as evidence of attachment and relationship by highlighting their shared knowledge of the money.

Terisita first raised the topic of money indirectly (“maybe for now...”lines 5-10), suggesting that it was a topic Melissa and David might be interested in discussing. Being indirect allowed Maria and Terisita to get their questions answered without appearing assertive, and by referring only vaguely to “that money,” Terisita implied that Melissa and David lack of need for further explanation demonstrated their shared history and insider knowledge (line 7-8).

As translator, I also had to communicate the nuances of Terisita’s dilemma without compromising her strategy of non-assertiveness.

Excerpt 5-2

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
11	Liz	Maybe they think they need to explain to you something about this
12		money because somehow they get this money (1) nobody told
13		them what to do with this money (.) reports (.) anything (.) they
14		didn't hear anything
15	Melissa	are you ↑serious?
16	Liz	all of a sudden they get money (.) they don't know where or why
17		(1) so I think they were thinking this was a chance for them to tell
18		you like (.) this is what we've done (.) because they've got no
19		follow up in terms of what this money is (.) and where it came
20		from.
21	David	this is The Lobelia Foundation?
22	Melissa	yeah [this is] The Lobelia Foundation, siyo Eco-Preneur (laughing)
23		The Lobelia Foundation, not Eco-Preneur

Because money expresses relations of dependence between people, it would be counterintuitive to receive money from an American Foundation without explanation or obligations; on this assumption, Maria and Teresita were left wondering why they received it and what the obligations for reporting on its use were. I raised these questions as Maria and Terisita had shared them with me, as a series of problems: they don't know how or why they got the money (12), nobody told them (12, 13) what to do with the money, the reports do they need them? (13); they didn't hear anything (lines 13-14), there has been no follow up in terms of what this money is or where it came from (18-19). In presenting these questions as problems, I sought to maintain their strategy of presenting themselves as *walengwa* (beneficiaries), and of interpellating Melissa and David as *Walezi* (patrons) who would likely come to their aid: the kinds of information that they were expecting would show their relation to be one of inequality since beneficiaries are told what to do, they are required to write reports to provide evidence for how they have used the money, and donors come to follow up on their progress.

5.2.2 Eco-Preneur’s philosophy of money and linguistic strategies. For Melissa and David, a discussion of money posed a problem, however. They wanted to demonstrate their willingness to engage in the discussion, but they also wanted to avoid the implications of their knowledge of the exchange of money. To avoid being seen as *walezi*, or patrons, they tried to be responsive to the questions while still maintaining a sense of detached equality.

When Melissa first expressed her surprise at the problems I raised in line 5, she showed sympathy with Maria and Terisita’s concerns. Yet she emphasized that while she wanted to help them with their questions, she did so as a party outside the arrangement in question, asserting firmly that the money came from Lobelia and NOT from Eco-Preneur. By neglecting the role played by Eco-Preneur in facilitating the connection between Lobelia and MEEP, she thereby presented each of them as independent actors who entered into partnership freely, simply because they each had something beneficial to offer the other.

Excerpt 5-3

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
24	Melissa	Ok (.) When um (.) The Lobelia Foundation became interested in
25		the MEEP (.) Um (.) They- the way that the MEEP works is a very
26		new way of looking at- working together- in trying to make change
27		in one’s own community
28	Liz	(....)
29	Melissa	They wanted to fund MEEP. And they wanted to be able to give.
30		Eco-Preneur said, if you want to give us money, no strings
31		attached, no line items. No budget.

An American foundation doesn’t just *find* and then become “interested” (line 24) in a women’s savings and credit: Maria and Terisita had to be connected for a foundation like Lobelia to be able to find them. Maria and Terisita were, in this sense, dependent on Eco-Preneur: Eco-preneur initiated the MEEP partnership, and while MEEP received recognition for its unique way of doing development in Tanzania, it was through Eco-Preneur’s promotion of MEEP on funding proposals, web-sites, and in conference presentations that MEEP became known throughout the world and to funders like the Lobelia Foundation. Admitting Eco-preneur’s role, however, would have made visible the strings of attachment and implicated Eco-Preneur in the extended process and politics surrounding the money, thereby conflicting with Eco-Preneur’s efforts to avoid acquiring dependents and also contradicting their larger mission to support local independence. Melissa’s passive construction hid the process by which Lobelia “became interested” (line 24) in the MEEP partnership.

Furthermore, Maria and Terisita’s participation in the MEEP partnership dovetailed with the strategy of the MEEP members to appeal to funders, and particularly Eco-preneur by showing that their partnership included diverse stakeholders, such as Maria and Terisita. These women were likely chosen because they had participated in a training given by Eco-Preneur and with their guidance established a successful Women’s savings and credit group, a self-help project that is highly valued in development circles. As Maria and Terisita saw it, if it were not for the care of a former Eco-Preneur employee, they never would have been selected as MEEP members.

However, rather than positioning MEEP and The Lobelia Foundation in a hierarchical relationship in which the needs of MEEP became the object of The Lobelia Foundation's concern and the reason for funding, Melissa used Maria and Terisita's questions as an opportunity to model win-win partnerships in which independent actors come together because they have something mutually beneficial to offer the other. She positioned MEEP and Lobelia as active subjects that actually *do things*: "work together to make change in their own community" (lines 26-27), and *have desires* "want to fund and want to give" (line 29 in the case of The Lobelia Foundation). Her mistart in line 26 illustrates her attempt to choose more active verbs in describing MEEP's unique way of working, since merely looking at something (development or problems) would not demonstrate the self-initiated action she was trying to convey.

Depicting Lobelia and MEEP as independent agents allowed her to contest Maria and Terisita's expectation that donors like Eco-Preneur were responding to the needs of their dependent beneficiaries (namely Maria and Terisita). Instead, Melissa positioned The Lobelia Foundation as the one with needs: saying that they "wanted to give" (line 29) and wanted to fund MEEP (line 29). And MEEP's independence and efforts to work in its "own" community (which she emphasized in line 27 as opposed to being told what to do by a funder) were what met the desires and interests of The Lobelia Foundation, making them an appropriate investment.

Although the links between MEEP's actions and Lobelia's interests could be logically inferred, in describing the exchange of money, Melissa worked to avoid making the relationship any more explicit. Beginning her statement about Lobelia with the subject "they" (line 25 referring to Lobelia) she likely intended to describe more clearly Lobelia's interest and funding of MEEP, but perhaps in order to downplay Lobelia's powerful leadership role and highlight MEEP as an empowered partner, she carefully changed the subject of her statement to MEEP (line 25 mistart) and instead emphasized the active and attractive nature of MEEP. Furthermore, by using discrete statements and pausing for translation between describing the actions of the Lobelia Foundation and the interests of MEEP (rather than completing an entire thought as she had done in other circumstances), Melissa further emphasized the independence of these two entities.

After describing the interests of Lobelia and the attractiveness of MEEP, Melissa brought the ideologies of Eco-Preneur to life as she staged Eco-Preneur as an assertive member of MEEP, setting the conditions by which they would be willing to accept the funding. In ventriloquizing what Eco-Preneur said, she used the conditional tense (if you want to give us money Line 30) followed by a series of demands (no strings attached, no line item, no budget, lines 30 and 31) which modeled assertive behavior of an empowered partner, rather than a passive beneficiary, who willingly accepts the conditions set by the donor. In other words, she positioned the recipients of the money (MEEP) as active in contrast to Maria and Terisita's portrayal of their own passive role in which they suddenly received money, but didn't even know why, and were dependent on MEEP members to tell them.

5.2.3 Solidarity: A third strategy to manage inequality and maintain distance. Who exactly was this empowered partner who was able to make demands on the Lobelia Foundation? Initially, when Melissa first told us that The Lobelia Foundation wanted to fund MEEP, she characterized Eco-Preneur as having set conditions for Lobelia, rather than describe how MEEP made demands on Lobelia. However, portraying

an American organization as the empowered actor presented a contradiction, as Eco-Preneur could be seen as acting as *mlezi* (patron), using its privilege to secure money for the dependent MEEP. To resolve this contradiction, Melissa interpellated Eco-Preneur as simply another member of MEEP by referring to the conditions Eco-Preneur set for The Lobelia Foundation as being made for “us” (line 30).

Positioning herself as part of the collective “us” allowed Melissa to hide both the demands she made on Lobelia and the privileged status that made such an intervention possible. To contest Maria and Terisita’s sense that the money was exchanged within relationships of patronage, Melissa had to deny the power of Eco-Preneur in facilitating the terms of this exchange. Only by constituting herself as an equal member within MEEP therefore could Melissa describe the origins of the money as the result of a partnership between independent agents who asserted their interests and engaged in exchange because they each had something beneficial to offer the other. Solidarity, like the metaphor “no-strings attached,” and the use of passive tense to make invisible relations of inequality was another linguistic strategy to manage inequality and maintain a relationships of equality and distance.

As the weakest members of the MEEP partnership, however Maria and Terisita’s perspective illuminated these contradictions, which Melissa’s strategy had sought to resolve. Although Melissa hoped that Maria and Terisita would emulate the assertive behavior and embrace the ideology of independence she modeled, Maria and Terisita lacked the social position for this to be an effective strategy. Being assertive and giving American Foundations conditions for how they should spend their money required more than just (as implied) the appropriate words or assertive behavior. It also required having a particular privileged social position, which would not only give you access to funding connections but also make sure that your voice was taken seriously. (see Blommaert 2005 p.68-69)

As a white, educated, and middle class American, Melissa had the privilege to move freely between positions of power, in which she had the authority to set conditions for the Lobelia Foundation, and positions of solidarity, in which she aligned herself with members of a Tanzanian partnership. For Melissa, solidarity with the Tanzanian community partnership was a solution to her dilemma of having social power and material access, but wanting to engage with the community as an equal. But for Maria and Terisita, solidarity enabled them to overcome the opposite dilemma: they wanted but did not have the social status (such as English, education, authority) to access resources and make demands on their own. Only through their attachment to the MEEP partnership did Maria and Terisita access and benefit from the privileges shared by the elite members and their international partners, Melissa and David. This access however did not come without “strings attached,” and in exchange for the benefits they received through the partnership, Maria and Terisita were obligated to those elite members who had spoken on their behalf.

5.3 The MEEP Community Partnership as a Site of Mediation

For Maria and Teresita, Melisa and David offered the possibility of sidestepping the strings attached to assistance from MEEP; since MEEP’s intervention would come with strings attached. In other words, they valued relations with Melissa and David

particularly because doing so would help them sidestep MEEP. According to David, “this money was given essentially, so that they could self-determine,” implying that they shouldn’t need Melissa and David, but with the money, take care of themselves.

However, for Melissa, considering herself as a member of MEEP (“us”) (line 19) was a way to resolve her immediate dilemma of how to engage in a discussion of money while contesting Maria and Terisita’s understanding of the hierarchical relationships implied by its exchange. But claiming to speak from the voice of a collective “us” was more than just an immediate strategic convenience; doing so reflected Eco-preneur’s broader solution to an ongoing dilemma of collaborating with the community of Mlimani as “equals” without intervening or privileging their roles as outsiders. In fact the MEEP partnership was initially constructed for precisely that purpose as a site of mediation, which would allow Eco-Preneur to intervene practically while remaining neutral in a theoretical sense.

The MEEP partnership, however, also became a site of mediation for a variety of Tanzanian actors to negotiate relations of power: the elite of Mlimani, NGO practitioners, government officials, and representatives of the youth and female urban poor, (such as Maria and Terisita), employed the MEEP to pursue their intersecting material and symbolic interests. MEEP became a site from which to access funding and engage with global practices, since it was by forming (performing) a community partnership of “diverse” stakeholders that they were able to attract the international development community, which currently prefers to support inclusive, self-initiating, democratic and collaborative projects. While the poor needed the elite, who had skills to negotiate with the international funders, the elite needed the poor to show themselves to be participatory and inclusive. Government officials added political support and legitimacy, while also negotiating their own personal interests in accessing the funds and knowledge that were expected to pass through the partnership.

For this reason, while the MEEP partnership can help us better understand Eco-Preneur’s intentions for building and engaging with a community partnership of empowered and equal individuals, the perspective of the least empowered members of this MEEP partnership, Maria and Terisita, allow us to look behind these good intentions and see the conflicts produced *in practice* by this philosophy of equality and partnership.

5.3.1 MEEP: A partnership of empowered individuals. Eco-Preneur originally set up the MEEP partnership as an alternative to their previous efforts to teach environmental enterprise courses directly, an effort to work with the community on locally initiated projects, rather than to impose practices and knowledge from the outside. After realizing that they were bringing environmental and business practices from the U.S., that were available, yet not necessarily shared within the Mlimani Community, Eco-Preneur initiated the MEEP partnership as an informal learning space to bring together seemingly isolated stakeholders, each with different, yet equally valuable strengths, knowledge, and experience together to learn from each other and collaborate in their common efforts of developing environmental business and a green economy. By valuing the diversity of local knowledge found in Mlimani, Eco-Preneur hoped that within the MEEP partnership they could be simply one member among many, a move that might also encourage the elite to similarly recognize and find value in the knowledge and experiences of diverse stakeholders.

Since the idea was that every member organization brought something different to the partnership, Eco-Preneur believed they could contribute (as equals) by sharing, but not privileging or imposing the knowledge and practices which they had access to through their global networks. Putting the Lobelia Foundation in touch with the MEEP partnership exemplified their efforts to collaborate; rather than intervene into local efforts as outsiders, they were to be just one member organization among others³⁷, “spreading seeds” (in this case information and funding opportunities), but not necessarily determining which seeds to nurture nor getting involved in their care. Melissa realized that once spread, the seeds would take a life of their own: “Maybe this one grows crooked but it still survives, maybe this one grows straight, but it kinda wilts. Maybe this one is robust, and has a lot of pretty flowers, and this one is doing it’s thing--more power to him.” Nevertheless, she asserted, “I wasn’t planning on changing that or impacting that in any way,” and worked hard to live by this philosophy.

As Eco-Preneur saw it, MEEP’s success as an informal learning space strongly depended on the willingness of all MEEP members to share knowledge and practices freely, rather than hoarding knowledge within traditional hierarchies. As David explained, “anyone- regardless of gender, class, or age, has the ability to develop a good, profitable business idea; therefore questions of power and networks of control just get in the way and ultimately impede good business.” With greater participation of diverse stakeholders, the partnership could therefore choose the “best ideas” and work according to the collaborative goals of the larger community, rather than according to interests of strongest members.

David saw things from a perspective of privilege, the ability to regularly access the knowledge and social position that would allow him to freely express his idea and expect them to be heard. However, seeing MEEP from bottom of a hierarchy gives us a very different perspective of how MEEP works and the meaning of partnership between “diverse stakeholders.” As the two weakest members of the MEEP partnership, Maria and Terisita were the first to see and say that ideas and experiences were not equally valued, and that knowledge and practices were not exchanged freely. For them, it was clear that the coming together as equal individuals and freely sharing valued knowledge conflicted with local social arrangements and especially the interests of the elite MEEP members.

5.3.2 MEEP from the perspective of Maria and Terisita: Access and obligation. In practice it was quite difficult to translate the concept of “no strings attached,” not only because the phrase did not exist in Swahili, but also as I have already noted, because for Maria and Terisita their access to development projects and benefits were often contingent on relations of patronage and obligation. And what they failed to understand in a linguistic sense, they could be forgiven for not recognizing in a social sense. After all, even if Eco-Preneur insisted that the Lobelia Foundation money should have “no strings attached,” (in terms of donor’s claims and attachment to the money) when it arrived in Mlimani, Maria and Terisita saw clearly that the money was embedded in a web of relationships, the lifelines they used to access money, but which, in turn, constrained how they were able to use it. But because their access to money came

³⁷ Eco-Preneur’s position was often a point of conflict and negotiation and never consistently set in stone for either side. Their position fluctuated between one of “member organization” with international status to one as an outside international organization that was working with the MEEP partnership.

through hierarchical, (not flattened) networks this access could not be divorced from their obligations on which: the MEEP members continued to pull, the women of the women’s group made claims, the orphans who they claimed to support had ongoing needs, their dependents depended, the government required reports and registration fees. Maria and Terisita’s understanding of the inseparability of obligation and access not only shows us a different perspective on the MEEP partnership, but in doing so also illuminates the less visible contradictions in Eco-Preneur’s discourse of partnership, which they had hoped the MEEP partnership could overcome.

5.3.3 Different Expectations: Needing and Doing Maria and Terisita’s interjections—especially when they did not match our intended translation--offered insights into their expectations about the nature of relationship, which the money of exchange implied. While Melissa emphasized the active and independent role of the beneficiaries in terms of what they were *doing*, Maria and Terisita consistently interjected with descriptions of *need*, putting forward their expectations that an exchange of money implied a relationship between donor and beneficiary.

Excerpt 5-4

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
32	Adam	ukitoa pesa	if you give money
33	Maria	ummm	yes
34	Adam	hawatauliza kwamba=	they won’t ask=
35	Terisita	wanahitaji	what they need
36	Adam	=unafanyia nini	=What you are doing
37	Maria & Terisita	aaahhhhh	ooooohhh
38	Adam	bujet ↑gani, hawatauliza	which budget? they won’t ask
39	Terisita	mbona tunasumbuliwa tu	so we are just being bothered
40	Maria	Kumbe tunasumbuliwa tu	It turns out, we are just being
41			bothered

Because Maria and Terisita recognized the Lobelia Foundation as a patron, they expected their relationship with Lobelia to be structured by their needs and by the ability of the foundation to serve those needs. For this reason, although Adam intended to say that the Lobelia Foundation would not ask “*unafanyia nini*, ”what you are doing” (line 36) with the money, Maria interjected by saying that The Lobelia Foundation would not ask “*hawahitaji*” what they “need” (line 35), an understanding which conflicted with Melissa’s portrayal of Lobelia as an investor desiring to fund an organization with the capacity to use the money productively and capitalize on it, rather than an organization understood as being in need.

It was not clear that Maria and Terisita understood Melissa’s narrative or her preference for a relationship of equality and independence, and since there is no comparable Swahili metaphor, it was unlikely that they understood the particularities of a partnership or relationship constituted by the concept of “no strings attached.” But they clearly understood when Adam explained that Lobelia would not ask what they do with their money, that “*tunasumbuliwa tu*,”(lines 39-40) “we were just being bothered” (by MEEP members) who could be safely ignored when they insisted that Maria and Terisita must spend and document the use of their money.

By “being bothered” Maria and Terisita indexed what they had explained to me previously-- that MEEP members had been pressuring them to spend their money from Lobelia to conduct an entrepreneurship training. Such a training would have employed a MEEP member as a facilitator, as well as offered an invitation for all the other MEEP members, who would not only learn more about the values of entrepreneurship, but would have been paid a “sitting fee³⁸” for their participation. And while in theory, Maria and Terisita were free to do as they pleased, in practice they had no choice but to take seriously the suggestions of the other MEEP members, both because they did not know the conditions for the use of the money, and did not have the ability to communicate with either the Lobelia Foundation or with Eco-Preneur directly (because of their lack of English, lack of phone, and lack of email).

At the same time, however, cutting strings would not necessarily make Maria and Terisita freer. While their dependence on MEEP limited their choices, it was also through the elite members that they accessed the money in the first place. If it were not for their membership in MEEP and Eco-Preneur’s role in directing The Lobelia Foundation to MEEP, (and perhaps more specifically to the Women’s Savings and Credit group), it would be unlikely that The Lobelia Foundation would have found, much less funded Maria and Terisita.

After all, because Maria and Terisita did not speak English, it was the other MEEP members who introduced the Lobelia Foundation representative to the Women’s Savings and Credit group and it was only by translating a meeting between them that the Lobelia Foundation came to know enough about the Women’s Group to be inspired to offer funding. Then, once they had decided to fund the Women’s Group, Lobelia had to go through other MEEP members in order to facilitate the transfer of money from the foundation’s account in the U.S. to the Women’s’ Group in Mlimani. If the money didn’t pass directly through the general MEEP account before being distributed to Maria and Terisita, it was at least necessary for the coordination of MEEP members, who had email and phone access, to communicate with Lobelia to direct the money to the account of the Women’s Group.

In other words, this money did not (and could not) fall from the sky without strings attached; rather it moved along these very strings in order to arrive in the hands of Maria and Terisita. But being dependent on the elite members for access to funding, training, and information, came with its own set of obligations and expectations, like the expectation that the women’s group would hold a training from which the other members could benefit.

³⁸ It is common in Tanzania that participants are paid to attend trainings. Through interviews with development practitioners in Mlimani and professors at the University of Dar es Salaam, I was told that the British introduced the practice of paying participants in order to attract participants to their projects and trainings who might not attend voluntarily. Then during the period of Ujamaa, the government paid villagers to participate in trainings and work projects to compensate for missed wages and missed time on the farm. In the entrepreneurship trainings, which I attended beneficiaries described how their presence assisted the facilitator or project manager, who *needed* the participants. Much time was spent documenting the names of participants and the collection of their payments. In the briquette training therefore, beneficiaries were very disappointed that they would not receive payment for their time in training. Although the training facilitator explained that in the age of globalization, an entrepreneur must seek out education and take advantage of learning opportunities, beneficiaries that I spoke believed that project managers were pocketing the “sitting fees,” for themselves.

The politics of the MEEP partnership were somewhat and perhaps purposefully murky. According to the members of MEEP, there was an unwritten policy that, in exchange for bringing one's ideas to the MEEP (and receiving feedback, access to community resources, help in writing proposals, and the use of the partnership name) a project received that received funding had to invite all MEEP members to affiliated activities or training and to give 5% of their funding to the MEEP coordinating committee. And while in theory this money was to be used for the good of the entire partnership (in service to the needs of the larger Mlimani community), there were allegations that the money was being misappropriated by a few. All three members of this committee were from a tribe from a distant region in Tanzania and members from the Mlimani region complained that they only represented the interests others from their tribe and used this 5% "to fill their own pockets." And while Maria and Terisita were among those that complained about the improper use of money, other members claimed that they received a significant stipend (twenty thousand shillings) for their positions as signatories- approving withdrawals to pay the coordinating committee.

Others described how the coordinating committee used this money to compensate themselves for their efforts in accessing opportunities, which benefited the entire MEEP partnership. As an elite group, well connected with officials of local and national governments as well as numerous well funded and influential international development organizations, the coordinating committee had the means through which to influence government plans and secure funds from potential donors on behalf of the MEEP partnership. They claimed to follow up on the proposed activities of member organizations to make sure that the funding obtained in the name of uplifting the community was not wasted or squandered by the organization itself. The success or failure of individual member organizations reflected on the community partnership. The coordinating committee also claimed to assist in proposal writing and training of the weakest organizations. It was by building the capacity of new and inexperienced organizations, such as Saccos, that the MEEP could show itself to be "participatory" and "inclusive" of marginalized communities. Finally, the coordinating committee with its access and affiliations with government officials worked to scale up small projects implemented by a single organization by incorporating project design into district plans in order to reach a larger sector of the community.

At first glance, the MEEP partnership might seem to be an example of the very kind of corrupt patronage network for which Africa is notorious, and which the concept of "no strings attached" and accompanying entrepreneurial practices were meant to resolve and address. Yet these same powerful elite were the lifelines through which women like Maria and Terisita, gained access to training, funding, and global networks from which they were otherwise excluded. From the perspective of Maria and Terisita, who saw their dependence on the reputation, status, resources, and skills of the elite for access very clearly, "corruption" could also be called patronage.

Because they envisioned a partnership in which members were empowered individuals, speaking for themselves, and acting out of individual interests, Melissa and David claimed that "they were not interested in questions of power," which just got in the way of creating innovative business ideas. For Maria and Terisita, however questions of power could not be separated from how they received the money in the first place. They had access to the money precisely through their relationships with the elite who in turn

needed them because of the value that their status at the bottom of the MEEP hierarchy brought to the partnership.

Maria and Terisita were not, as such, opposed to the idea that money was detached and could be used according to the interests of the personal business rather than according to hierarchical social, familial, and political obligations. In fact, they were excited, if surprised to learn that there weren't conditions for the use of the Lobelia money: this knowledge could potentially give them additional leverage in their interactions with MEEP. Yet even with this knowledge, Maria and Terisita faced real difficulties in emulating the assertive behavior modeled by Melissa: if they were to set new terms of engagement, they might also lose the many privileges that they accessed through their attachments to MEEP.³⁹ They were trapped: in order to look good in the eyes of Eco-Preneur and other American funders, and to access the resources that come through partnerships with international non-governmental agencies and foundations, Maria and Terisita had to show themselves to be independent and productive in their "own" activities. But in order to even have access to these partnerships and funding opportunities, they were obligated to the MEEP partnership, and especially to the elite members who had been instrumental in offering them a seat at the table and using their status to speak on their behalf.

In other words, by insisting that there were "no strings attached", Melissa was not just failing to understand, but she was insisting that Maria and Terisita also believe in her misunderstanding, an insistence that her own prominence imbued with the force of a directive. Maria and Terisita therefore had to strategically represent themselves two contradictory ways: to MEEP as loyal members, and then to Melissa and David as competent and empowered individuals who were tired of having to put up with the obligations of the MEEP. They lived and worked in the contradictions produced within development discourse and practice.

5.4 Living Within Contradictions

In the last sections I demonstrated how Saccos and Eco-Preneur struggled to manage and negotiate their relationships with each other through their discussion of money. In this section, my focus will now shift from describing how *relationships are structured by money* to describing how the abstract properties of *money* come to be, in turn, *structured by relationships*.

5.4.1 The implications of "no strings attached" for the flexible entrepreneur.

To demonstrate the philosophy behind Eco-Preneur's demand that Lobelia send the money with "no strings attached," Melissa painted a rosy picture in which unfettered actors could engage with their world and invest money in sites of growth and productivity rather than simply in places where money is needed. In contrast to donors who see

³⁹ Although Maria and Terisita didn't have the social power to stand on their own, without losing the access gained through the MEEP partnership, other MEEP members did have this social power and found the language and vision of Eco-Preneur useful for their own interests. To take advantage of this ideology however, presumes a level of status, which Maria and Terisita did not have. One educated MEEP member, with the support of Eco-preneur, (who promised to write his proposals and find donors for him), had the means to break away and start a new community partnership based on the principals of "good governance." This new partnership claimed to operate on the principals of transparency and equality, electing a coordinating committee that was gender, tribal, and class balanced.

problems as static and place clear restrictions on the use of money, Melissa described the benefits of having the freedom and flexibility to modify investments according to constantly changing circumstances. And as Melissa explained, it was precisely because Saccos had demonstrated their independence and their capacity for productivity, that the Lobelia Foundation recognized their ability to “benefit” from additional money, and selected them as one of three MEEP organizations to receive a two hundred dollar grant.

Excerpt 5-5

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
42	Melissa	and the reason (1) [for no strings attached] is that today (1) we
43		might see something happening and want to do something about
44		it (1) (...) and then (1) two months later (.) au [or] three months
45		later (.) the problem has changed (.) Maybe it's because it's
46		something you're doing that things are evolving (.) that things are
47		growing (.) You do not want to be limited by having to follow what
48		the funder says.

In order to emphasize that money should be used as part of a dynamic process, Melissa used adverbs (today, in two or three months lines 30, 32) and the continuous verb tense to show action and movement over time: *today* (line 30) “something is **happening**” (line 43), *in two or three months*, the “problem has **changed**” (45) something you’re **doing** (46) “things are **evolving**” (46), things are **growing** (47). Using static verbs and verbs that connote restriction: to be limited (line 47), having to follow (47); instead of donors giving money for a specific static situation, and through rules and limitations, limiting the ability of beneficiaries to respond to the specificity of a changing environment she argued that entrepreneurs need to be able to respond to a constantly changing environment without restrictions.

According to Melissa, Saccos had received the Lobelia money with this in mind: rather than choosing the organization with greatest need, Lobelia “came to look at the different organizations within MEEP, to see who was *doing* what, and to figure out which organizations could best *benefit* from the money.” The Lobelia Foundation had chosen Saccos to receive the two hundred dollar grant because they were already *doing* and *being productive*. They had shown success in generating collective savings and profits from their individual businesses and demonstrated their productivity by generating profits through the interest earned from loaning out their own money. Just as Lobelia invested in Saccos as a site of productivity (rather than need), it was expected, that the Saccos would continue to invest this money productively.

5.4.2 Melissa’s dilemma and intervention to keep Lobelia money unattached.

Although it was Saccos’s success in generating savings *independently* from within their own personal savings and credit group and using these savings productively that led to their group being chosen to receive the Lobelia money, the expectation of “free” use that came with the money conflicted with the group discipline that had allowed them to produce the original savings in the first place. Since Eco-preneur’s philosophy of savings and credit groups stressed the importance of autonomy,⁴⁰ bringing in money from an

⁴⁰ In contrast to numerous micro-credit organizations, which loan money to women to start or expand small businesses, Eco-Preneur used a methodology popularized by Care International to train the women to generate their own collective savings from the profits of their individual small businesses. After the first

American Foundation such as Lobelia ran counter to Eco-Preneur’s intention to foster self-initiative and the resulting empowerment developed through one’s realization of their own capacity to generate money independently. Melissa faced yet another dilemma therefore when she realized that the money from Lobelia, which she had worked hard to constitute as an “investment,” with “no strings attached” would be brought into their savings and credit group. We see in the following excerpt how she managed this dilemma: by interpellating the money from Lobelia as “outside” money (in contrast to their self-generated inside money), and intervening to suggest that “this” (unattached/outside) money should not be used for a women’s savings and credit group. Melissa could simultaneously protect the independence and principals of the Women’s Savings and Credit group :

Excerpt 5-6

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
49	Melissa	she [the visiting lobelia representative] chose Saccos as one of
50		the- (2) Saccos (.) MHTS (.) and um- global youth center ⁴¹
51	Maria & Terisita	um hmmm
52	Melissa	And (3) you guys- (2) you know that (2) its not- (1)// for a savings
53		and credit group (2) you do not want to bring in (1) outside funds
54		(3) because it, <I don't know how best to say it> (1) but it disturbs
55		(1) the-the cycle.

Although Melissa had just finished explaining the importance of having the flexibility to use money according to one’s knowledge of the immediate situation and inferred that the Saccos was chosen to receive the money because they had this capacity to benefit from the money, she now contradicted herself by telling Maria and Terisita that the money was *not* for use in Savings and Credit groups. Yet she also chose her words and tactics carefully so as to intervene without admitting or even recognizing her own intervention: by speaking of the properties of money in the abstract (excerpt 1), and savings and credit groups in general (lines 52, 53), Melissa attempted to mitigate the contradiction between her description of the Lobelia money as not “limited” by donors, (lines 47) implying Maria and Terisita’s freedom to use the money as they pleased; and the realization that women’s savings and credit groups on principal operate through strict rules and principals, which not unlike donors, protect the money and the project by limiting the women’s flexibility to use the money as they desire.

Her hesitations in lines 52-54 marked her engagement with the contradiction she was seeking to elide: while she believed in a philosophy of independence, she had to intervene to ensure that Maria and Terisita follow this same philosophy. Melissa hesitated with a three second pause and two misstarts (line 52) as she shifted from a position of distant narrator (recounting the process by which Lobelia selected the Womens Savings and Credit group) to an involved participant (authoritatively setting limitations on the use of the money.)

few facilitated introductory trainings, women’s groups were to operate completely independent of banks and NGO organizations.

⁴¹ Melissa is naming the other two organizations (Mlimani Tourism Society and Global Youth Center) that also received funding from Lobelia.

Melissa never asked Maria and Terisita how they had chosen to use the money, or if from their experiences, they had discovered that outside money would disturb their self-generating savings practice. Asking these questions would have positioned her as having concern and interest in their use of the money and the decisions, which she believed they were free to make independently. Not asking therefore became the solution to her problem: she could tell them *about* the money without engaging in a relationship, which structured the use of the money.

Using colloquial expressions to address them directly: “you guys” and “you know” (line 52) Melissa could downplay her authoritative position as she told them what they can’t do with the money. But this vacillation of perspective proved to be unsustainable, so after two misstarts, she began again, shifting her focus from Maria and Terisita (“you guys”) *specifically*, to Savings and Credit Groups *in general*, thereby allowing her to intervene more discretely, precisely by restaging her intervention as simply the passing on of a universal truth, rather than the assertion of personal opinion (or situated knowledge). Telling them “its not for a savings and credit group,” (lines 52- line 53) and “it disturbs the cycle” (lines 54-55), allowed her to couch her assertions in what “you know,” (line 52) and what “you don’t want to do” (line 53), as if to suggest that she is simply rephrasing what they already know, and would obviously want, rather than intervening and telling them what to do.

Melissa’s sudden realization and hesitation reflects the contradiction between a discourse of independence and disembedded money, and the reality that this independence and “free” money requires intense forms of governance, legal contracts, webs of obligation, and interdependent relationships, which Melissa’s initial narrative had ignored (or excluded). The group’s savings and credit practices produced their independence. In fact, by locking their money up, using strict rules and peer pressure they protected their money, not only from the individual interests of each members, but also from the interests and obligations of extended family and social networks, whose claims on the money were now out of reach.

In other words, a variety of structures were in place to ensure that the money was used in accordance with the principals of the group. The women decided the terms for membership participation, the rate of interest on a given loan, the period for loan repayment, penalties for arriving late or missing meetings, and the date on which collective savings were divided (usually before a holiday or just before planting season). And although collective decisions were described by practitioners of Savings and Credit groups in terms of ensuring buy in and ownership of the project, the decision making practices also constructed interdependency required for self-governance and discipline, which certainly created real restrictions on how the money could be used.

Protecting their “independence” and “autonomy,” then required a series of legible routines in which every woman had a role to play. The women met each week to purchase between one and three “shares,” each share priced at 1000 TSh (.75-2.25 cents) which they saved collectively in a single bank account. Each transaction required the presence of three signatories to ensure that the money would not be misappropriated. During each meeting, the women recited their collective rules and watched as the elected accountants counted the collective savings. As each woman was called by their number to the “bank” (the front table) to deposit their shares, the other members watched as her passbook was stamped with the appropriate number of ink-blots, reflecting the number of

shares purchased. Once they had collectively saved enough money, the women took turns borrowing money (no more than three times their total contributions) in order to expand their small businesses, which they returned with interest, thus increasing the groups' collective savings. In other words, it was through interdependent and transparent relationships and obligations, that the women not only protected their self-generated savings, but increased their savings through the interest levied on each other.

As I have already discussed, the concept of “no strings attached,” could hide the lifelines of obligation through which Maria and Terisita accessed money. Here we see something similar: the discourse of the independence and autonomy of the savings and credit group, renders invisible the actual practices, conditions, rules and interdependence that keep the money available and productive, thus allowing for the independence of the women's group and individual members. Clearly, the governance practices of the women's savings and credit group are not invisible.

5.4.3 Maria and Terisita's strategic responses to Melissa's intervention.

Although Melissa would not have intended for her words to have been taken as a specific directive, lacking perspective on the privileged position from which she spoke, she could not predict the consequences her words would have: since Maria and Terisita had in fact mixed the Lobelia money with their own self-generated savings, they suddenly felt the need to prove that they had used the money “properly.”

Maria and Terisita, in other words, read Melissa's words in the context of the privilege and power, which Melissa ignored. After all, showing that your organization's practices are productive could potentially lead to future funding, so it was of great importance to show that their savings and credit practices were in line with Eco-Preneur's expectations. Additionally, it became clear later in the meeting that Maria and Terisita were still uncertain about the real meaning of “no strings attached,” and believed that the money could possibly be taken away, either because of assumed misuse (they did bring in the “outside” money into their self generated savings cycle) or because the money was given as a loan rather than a grant, and therefore had to be repaid, making their defense even more important.

However, because they were now tasked with the burden of responding to Melissa's implied accusation that “mixing” the Lobelia money would undermine their independence, Maria and Terisita could no longer continue to position themselves as dependent or needing direction from their Walezi: doing so would only have confirmed Melissa's concern that they had acted inappropriately by bring “outside money” into their savings and credit group and perhaps would have indicated that, because they were not using it freely, they should not have received it in the first place.

As the following three excerpts illustrate, their solution was to read Melissa's intervention as evidence of her unfamiliarity with the principals of savings and credit groups, to take the position of knowledgeable and experienced entrepreneurs and to educate Melissa, a strategy that both defused Melissa's challenges and demonstrated their competence in handling new investments.

According to Maria and Terisita, their decision to bring outside money into their self-generating savings account made perfect sense in terms of their practical situation. In addition, their decision could be understood in terms of helping them to remain independent. First of all, they had no other safe place to put the money, except for the collective account of the women's group (Putting the money in the collective account of

the women's group, also protected it from the claims made on them by the other MEEP members who had wanted them to provide entrepreneurship training). And secondly, with an additional two hundred dollars, the Women's group could make loans to more members during a single rotation, giving each member more frequent access to credit and building their profits more quickly. The members of Saccos did in fact incorporate the Lobelia money into their savings and credit practices, but assuming that there were special conditions for the use of this money, and intending eventually to start a small business, rather than mix it with their independent savings, (which would have been divided among the group members at the end of the year), they accounted for and treated this "outside" money separately.

Excerpt 5-7

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
56	Terisita	hii pesa ambayo tunapata	this money that we got,
57		(pounding on table) ina maana	(pounding on table) it is like, it is
58		kwamba inakuwa kama mbegu	like a seed [seed capital
59	Maria	Ehhhh	affirming
60	Liz	seed money, capital	
61	Melissa	I see	
62	Terisita	kama mtaji (.) zile Tunazo	Like capital (.) the money we
63		↑changa (1) ↓wenywewe (2)	have(1) we↑ contribute
64		mwisho ya mwaka (.) kila hisa=	↓ourselves (2) at the end of the
65			year (.) each share=
66	Maria	=tunagawana. ehhhh (1) zile	=we divide. yeah (1) those [the
67		hatujazigusa kabisa kugawana	lobelia money] we haven't
68		kwa sababu yaani (1) ili zile	touched at all to divide (.)
69		tuwezeshe	because that [money] must
70			build our capacity
71	Terisita	ile faida (.) tunagawana	That profit (.) we divide with
72			each other
73	Maria	Faida, tunagawana	Profit, we divide with each other
74	Terisita	ehhh	(yes) agreement
75	Maria	unajua faida?	Do you know faida?
76	Liz	umhmm	
77	Adam	profit	
78	Liz	then they get profit, when each	You divide the profit, not=
79		person returns. (turning to	
80		Maria and Terisita) So	
81		Unagawana faida, siyo=	
82	Terisita	[mbegu]	[The seed capital]
83	Maria	[mbegu] hapana	[The seed capital] no
84	Adam	Shamba bado lipo	The farm is still there

Because Melissa did not make explicit why she believed bringing outside money into the Savings and Credit Group would disturb their savings and credit cycle, Maria and Terisita had to anticipate the problems that they were inferring from Melissa's position. They oriented their defense towards common critiques of development projects, which they assumed⁴² her words implied: misappropriation of money, unsustainability of

⁴² After this meeting, it was in the context of discussing whether or not the money had to be returned (as if it were a loan) that they told me of their concern that they felt that they needed to prove that they had used the money properly for these reasons.

resources, and lack of transparency. They used the very discourses taught by Eco-Preneur and other NGO practitioners to highlight the consistency between the interests, values, and understandings that Melissa had just modeled and those of their own.

Defining her practice in capitalist terms allowed Terisita to demonstrate her alignment with Melissa's capitalist orientation and philosophy of money. First Terisita used the metaphor, "*mbegu*" or seed (line 58) to describe the money in terms that demonstrate her knowledge of capitalist principals and orientation to the money as an object of productivity. While the idea of seed capital is commonly used in English, few Tanzanians have heard of or use the term *mbegu*, which perhaps explains why Terisita offers even greater specificity by defining the term *mbegu* as *mtaji*, (line 62) the more commonly used term, meaning capital.

Next, to respond to Melissa's concern that you don't want to bring in "outside money," Terisita demonstrated the groups' independence and self-sufficiency, explaining that, "*tunazochanga wenyewe*" or we contribute ourselves (lines 62-63). She described how the group applied democratic principles to a capitalist practice of dividing their own money according to the proportions of shares that they each contributed individually. In this way she demonstrated how the money was exchanged with "no strings attached"-exchanged between individuals, and not constrained by webs obligations. The money was not divided equally, nor was the money divided according to need, but rather according to the "hisa" or shares (lines 64-66) that they each individual was able to contribute each week. The women used an accounting system by which they kept track of how many shares each women contributed weekly so that at the end of the year, each woman would receive payment according to her individual productivity shown by the objective records, and not according to their particular circumstances or status. Record keeping and dividing money by the number of shares purchased was not only fundamental to capitalist business practices, but also to the fundamental principals of women's groups are self-governed according to democratic and transparent procedures.

Moreover, in response to fears she assumed Melissa was invoking about misappropriation or unsustainable *use* of donor money (dividing the money as they did their collective savings, as opposed to simply *capitalizing* on it), Maria was emphatic in explaining that *hatujazigusa kabisa*, "we haven't touched that money at all." (line 67) She demonstrated her knowledge that this money must be protected, because it was the money that "*tuwezeshe*,"⁴³ enables us or builds capacity (line 69). In other words, Maria and Terisita demonstrated their understanding that the money was a source of ongoing productivity, which according to Melissa was one of the main criterion for the Foundation's decision to choose the women's group in the first place.

By constituting the money as seed capital, which could be distinguished from their independently generated savings, Maria and Terisita resolved the contradictory concerns which they assumed Melissa had: to maintain the disciplined principals which

⁴³ In development contexts the concept of *kuwezesha* refers both to 1) providing material resources which enable change 2) the American concept of empowerment, which emphasizes personal change, such as independence and assertiveness, that doesn't necessarily imply material resources. It is likely that Melissa would have heard empowerment as personal change and keeping them independent, while Maria and Terisita were intending to explain how with the money they could generate money to feed themselves. Maria and Terisita were likely not concerned that the "outside money" from Lobelia would have made them less independent; rather they saw the possibilities to use this money. This sense of *kuwezesha* as feeding themselves fits with their use of seed within a farming context which I will describe in excerpt 5-9.

would encourage on-going group savings and thus continued independence, while remaining supportive of entrepreneurial mindsets of their MEEP partners (Maria and Terisita), by encouraging new innovative and productive environmental business ventures.

5.4.4 Do you know profit? Teaching us about their credit business—a second strategy. After having responded to Melissa’s initial concern that bringing outside money would undermine their self-generated savings practices, in this next excerpt Maria and Terisita shifted their focus to the question of profit. By discussing profit, they could show alignment with Melissa and David’s entrepreneurial interests and respond to their other concern, that the money be used productively.

Excerpt 5-8

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
85	Terisita	ile faida (.) tunagawana	That profit (.) we divide with each other
86			each other
87	Maria	Faida, tunagawana	Profit, we divide with each other
88	Terisita	ehhh	(yes) agreement
89	Maria	unajua faida?	Do you know faida?
90	Liz	umhmm	
91	Adam	profit	
92	Liz	then they get profit, when each person returns. (turning to Maria and Terisita) So	
93		Unagawana faida, siyo=	You divide the profit, not=
94			
95			
96	Terisita	[mbegu]	[The seed capital]
97	Maria	[mbegu] hapana	[The seed capital] no
98	Adam	Shamba bado lipo	The farm remains

When Maria stopped the flow of explanation to ask if I know “*faida*” (profit) (line 89), she strategically framed the problem as one of misunderstanding, suggesting that it was not that Maria and Terisita had used the money improperly, but rather that the rest of us didn’t fully understand the terms under which the Savings and Credit group operated. Her question was also practical, as in this case it was critical that I knew the concepts, since as translator with Adam, I was ultimately responsible for making sure that Melissa and David understood their savings and credit practices. Without “knowing *faida*,” I could have mistakenly explained that they divided the Lobelia money instead of the *faida*, which would have proven that they had not used the money “properly”: neither productively, nor sustainably, and thus unsuccessfully defended their practice to Melissa and David.

I did know “*faida*” but I responded passively (um hm line 90), rather than as Maria and Terisita would have expected, by actively contributing to the collaborative practice to show not only that I know, but that I am present and engaged. Adam therefore jumped in and responded for me, both to translate in case I didn’t know, and to participate in the interaction, which Maria and Terisita had constructed for us.

I had a second chance to redeem myself as an active and engaged participant, but in participating according to the expectations of Maria and Terisita, I intervened in ways that likely would not have been appropriate for Melissa and David. While beginning to translate, in line 95, I interrupted myself to check (and demonstrate) my understanding; but in the process of asking for clarification, I further specified and juxtaposed the

concept of dividing the profit in opposition to **NOT** (line 81) dividing the money from Lobelia.

In effect my clarification contributed to, rather than simply translated Maria and Terisita’s efforts to address the concerns that Melissa’s words implied. Maria and Terisita completed my utterance (lines 96-97), showing not only affirmation of my personal understanding as an individual speaker and translator, but rather engaging in a collaborative linguistic practice in which multiple actors co-produce arguments and explanations. With their contribution to our joint effort to explain that they don’t divide the Lobelia money, they interpellated the money as *mbegu*, or seed, to show themselves not only as transparent and just, who knew better than to divide the Lobelia money, but also as sustainable and conscientious entrepreneurs who know that this money was not simply money, but rather an ongoing source of productivity and benefit.

Taking an interactive pedagogical approach, Maria and Terisita modeled and also demanded from us active participation in their efforts to describe how the group divides the profit (interest) that they earn from using the Lobelia money to give credit. Checking our understanding of key terms such as *faida* (line 89), or profit allowed Maria to simultaneously position herself as knowledgeable and experienced in entrepreneurial practices (deserving and capable of receiving investments), while contesting any question regarding their proper use of the money from Lobelia.

Maria and Terisita’s discourse style may have been strategically pedagogical, but also reflected a common Swahili discourse practice, in that the participation of interlocutors, was required to validate and expound on the speaker’s words (by interjecting, repeating key phrases, and finishing each other’s utterances) thereby showing understanding and interest. Adam and I were therefore drawn into their efforts. This interactive, participatory, and collaborative style contrasted sharply with that of Melissa and David who were for some moments left out of the conversation as Adam and I worked with Maria and Terisita to make sense of their practices before translating. Yet placing us translators in a position of actively learning and collaborating on behalf of Melissa and David also meant that Melissa and David did not engage with the difficult process of linguistic negotiation and allowed them to avoid getting too involved.

5.4.5 Re-embedding *mbegu* (seed) within a farming context—a final strategy. Responding to my request for clarification (line 95), Adam also contributed to Maria and Terisita’s efforts to explain how they had not lost or misappropriated the money. Having not yet attended an entrepreneurship training, however, Adam was likely unfamiliar with the metaphor of *mbegu* (seed) to connote capital. Instead he offered a subtly different metaphor, one more common in Mlimani exclaiming, “*shamba bado lipo*,” or “the farm is still there” (line 98). By interpellating the Lobelia money as a farm, he used more common representations of capital to explain in new terms that the money from Lobelia was still there (had had not been divided among the members) and could still be used productively. Adam’s farm metaphor to connote capital, became yet another resource for Maria and Terisita to demonstrate how they had used the money properly.

Excerpt 5-9

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
99	Adam	shamba bado lipo	the farm is still there
100	Terisita	[shamba bado lipo na biashara	[the farm is still there and our
101		yetu ndiyo hiyo ya kopeshana=]	business is in fact this one of

102			giving credit to each other=.
103	Maria	[shamba lipo (2) na wakulimo	[the farm is there (2) and the
104		bado wapo (.) ile mbegu ipo]	farmers are still there (.) that
105			seed is still there (referring to
106			the seed of seed capital)
107	Terisita	ile na maana mnakula mtaji=	its such that if you eat the
108			capital
109	Maria	ehhh yes	
110	Terisita	huwezi kuendelea tena	you can't continue again
111	Liz	Its not like they sell the farm	
112		each and every time	
113	Melissa	(soft laugher)	
114	Liz	or they divide the farm (2) what	
115		they're dividing (.) is the interest	
116		that they've received and the	
117		profits that they've received	
118		from that interest.	
119	Melissa	Ok	
120	Adam	yeah. They have to keep their	
121		seed (pounding)(.) and the farm	
122		(pounding)(.) and the farmers	
123		(pounding)(.) are there (2) so	
124		what they share, is what they	
125		have from the farm(.) But the	
126		seeds will be -there (.) and the	
127		farmers are -there (.) and the	
128		shamba [farm] should be there	

While Maria and Terisita simultaneously repeated Adam's assertion that "*shamba bado ipo*," the farm is still there, (lines 100-104) they each used the farm metaphor to represent different philosophies of productivity.

5.4.5.1 Terisita's narrative: Equating farm capital with seed capital. Terisita used the farming metaphor just as Adam had initially introduced it: as an abstract representation for capital, *shamba* (farm) was simply synonymous with the idea of seed capital. Adam's metaphor therefore provided Terisita with another way to construct the same argument she had made earlier with "*mbegu*" (excerpt 5-7): that they neither divided (used) nor lost the Lobelia money, since it remained protected as seed capital. Like Adam, she was seeking to demonstrate her knowledge of capitalist principals (using seed or farm interchangeably) in order to defend their decision to bring the money from Lobelia into their savings and credit group.

For one thing, using the farm as another synonymous representation of capital in the abstract allowed Terisita to demonstrate alignment with Melissa and David by sharing their philosophy of detachment and independence through reference to seed capital. Repeating Adam's assertion, she used the farm (as capital), which "is still there," (line 100) to make a comparison with their business of giving credit, thus also showing alignment and engagement with Adam and Maria. With her comparison she implied that just as a farmer must hold onto and protect the farm in order to continue his/her livelihood, so too must the women protect their capital (the Lobelia money) to continue their business (line 110). Referencing the relationship between eating the capital and the continuation of the business (line 107), Terisita painted a picture not unlike that of

Melissa in which capital must be “free” from use and hungry predators or parasites, in order to provide the entrepreneur the flexibility to direct the business productively.

At the same time, Terisita’s reference to not “eating” the capital also countered any implication that the women’s group had acted inappropriately by bringing outside money into their collective bank account. The metaphor of “eating” is common in Swahili and used in African politics to reference exploitation and misappropriation of the collective resources. The metaphor has referred to the capitalist or colonist who got fat (fed) by stealing from the worker, the shop keeper working during the period of Ujamaa socialism who selfishly consumed the collective resources of the people, and currently refers to the greedy politicians and powerful elite who misappropriate state funds and international aid for personal interests. By emphasizing that the farm was still there, she illustrated that the seed capital had not been “eaten.”

Terisita’s reference to “eating the capital” (line 107) also reflected what she had likely learned from entrepreneurship trainers, who like Melissa emphasized the importance of a “no strings attached” philosophy for a true entrepreneur. Often citing the “poorly run” and “undisciplined” socialist stores as examples, students were taught in entrepreneurial trainings that one of the most common causes of business failure and overall poor development in Tanzania has been the practice of “eating the capital.” Using familiar narratives to demonstrate the problem, the trainer described business owners who give away their products as “gifts” to friends, who “visit” their stores. As students laugh, perhaps from recognition, the trainer gives a name to the *wabangaizaji*, “survivors” who perhaps not unlike the training participants use the money collected from the sale of the products to address immediate personal needs. The trainer then juxtaposes these narratives of “failure” to those of the *wajasiramali* or entrepreneurs who invest in their future by using the money from sales to purchase more products so that the business can not only continue, but also grow.

To counter the “poor” behavior exemplified by the first two narratives, students were taught that “you are not your business,” meaning that the money earned from the sale of products is not your money, but rather the money of the business. Although the trainers used a different metaphor when they taught the students, “you are not your business,” they stressed the same physical and metaphorical separation between people and capital as the metaphor of the seed. This separation between business capital and the one who capitalizes parallels the work of Melissa in insisting that exchange of money does not imply relationship and offers yet another demonstration of the meaning of “no strings attached.”

With this in mind, her assertion that the capital had not been “eaten” made perfect sense: if “eaten,” the lack of capital would have prevented their credit business from continuing.

But her choice in metaphor, made little sense when juxtaposed in relation to Maria’s narrative, which positioned the *mbegu* of seed capital in the context of subsistence farming in which eating is precisely the point of the entire enterprise. The juxtaposition of “not eating,” (line 107) raised by Terisita, and Adam’s emphasis on “sharing what they have from the farm,” (line 124-125) points to the incongruence between the disembedded *mbegu* (seed capital) that is unattached and risks being eaten or lost and *mbegu* that is embedded within a subsistence farming system, which is cared for and grown by the farmer who must eat.

What Terisita neglected to point out at this stage, however, was that while she interpellated the money as *mbegu* (seed capital) and described how the women had protected the “investment,” this money did not actually grow, as the concept of disembodied seed capital might imply. Instead, rather than reinvest the profits earned by using the money productively (the interest earned by lending out money to each of the group members), at the end of the year, the women divided the profit, in the same way a farmer would divide “what they had from the farm.” And by talking about seed capital in the abstract, (as something that one should not eat), Terisita was able to show alignment with Melissa and David’s philosophies of disembodied capital, while simultaneously avoiding the particular details and issues of reinvestment or use.

5.4.5.2 Maria’s narrative: Embedding seed capital on a farm. More than Terisita, Maria’s use of the farming metaphor went beyond merely showing alignment with Melissa and David, engaging with the very details and relationships, which Terisita had strategically elided, and which Melissa had sought to render invisible when describing the Lobelia money as “unattached.” By emphasizing not only the presence of the farm (“*shamba lipo*”) (line 103), but also the presence of the farmers (“*wakulima bado wapo*”) (line 104) and the seed (*mbegu ipo*) (line 104) and pausing between each object and using repetition to show that each is “there,” Maria constructed a narrative emphasizing the presence (and importance) of each component. While capitalist narratives emphasize disembodied growth, in other words, Maria emphasized both the necessity of making the capital grow and the social context, which that capitalist production is to feed.

By referring specifically to *ile mbegu* or “that” seed (line 104), Maria linked the farm metaphor back to their initial use of *mbegu*, or seed capital (excerpt 5-7 line 56-58) when they had first interpellated the Lobelia money as “seed capital” to show that they had not divided the money. It was “that seed,” and the implications implied (that because it’s seed capital, the women wouldn’t divide the money) that prompted Adam to assert (using more common terms) that like the seed capital or the Lobelia money, “the farm is still there.” But by placing “that seed” on this farm, Maria recontextualized the single word, embedding the word into a narrative, and a story in which the seed (a single word) was embedded within a larger more complicated social context. In doing so, Maria not only changed the meaning of the seed from disembodied capital to embedded capital, but also implied different relationships attached to it as well as different conditions and expectations for its use.

While Melissa and David characterized seeds as self-sufficient, self-contained, movable, and disconnected from the one who spreads them, Maria placed “that seed” on the farm, as a way of taking emphasis away from the seed and dispersing its importance to the farmer and the farm. In contrast to *mbegu* (disembodied seed capital), *mbegu* (the seed on the farm) is neither self-sufficient nor disconnected but rather embedded within a complex process of production which *requires* relationships: Unlike Eco-Preneur, farmers do not just spread seeds and hope that they will take care of themselves; the relationship between the farmers (people) and land (and other material resources-tools) are integral to the farmers’ and the farm’s productivity. Similarly, a farmer can’t continue to spread and care for seeds, without being fed by the produce of the seeds; farmers must eat in order to have the strength to continue farming to produce the harvests of their labor.

5.4.5.3 Liz's translation of Terisita's narrative. Translating this lively interactive conversation proved difficult since Maria and Terisita were talking at the same time and using similar metaphors to construct significantly different arguments. And if I translated the metaphors literally from Swahili to English, it was unlikely that Melissa and David would have understood the particular nuanced meanings implied by each metaphor and the social and political contexts to which the metaphors referred. Finally, although I was familiar with the meaning of the metaphors in general, my limited knowledge of subsistence farming prevented me from fully understanding, and thus translating, the social and political implications, which the metaphors implied.

In the moment I failed to capture the nuances of Maria's narrative: her assertion that "the farm is there, the farmers are there, and that seed is there," (lines 103-104) simply seemed like a list of "things," a repetition with emphasis of what I assumed Adam had intended, the offering of new terms to say what Terisita and Maria had been saying all along: that the Lobelia money was like seed capital, and had not been lost when mixed with the savings of the women's group. In my translation, therefore I sought to convey the argument and purpose I assumed captured Adam's initial use of the metaphor. I focused my translation on the words of Terisita, whose argument addressed most clearly Melissa's intervention.

While Terisita used the metaphor "eating the capital," (line 107) to convey that the money was still there, I translated only the assertion that the money had been used properly (there had been no misuse or corruption), the metaphor's idiomatic usage, and failed to translate Maria's narrative, which indexed the embeddedness of capital within social relationships. Rather than literally translate Terisita's metaphor—which explained that they didn't "eat the capital," or in this case, the farm-- I treated the farm as synonymous with disembodied seed capital and suggested that they didn't sell or divide the farm. In this sense, while my translation was literally accurate, I actually altered the meaning by failing to consider the manner in which Tanzanian land ownership is inescapably embedded in social, political, and familial relationships. Land can only be leased for ninety-nine years by the village government, (which still owns the land collectively) and the extended family of a farmer has claims to the use of this leased land. Not only are these sales of land *use*—since land itself is not sold—but doing so requires the approval of numerous parties who are connected to that land through both official and familial histories.

In other words, not only is the seed embedded on the farm, but also the farm itself is embedded in numerous familial and social relationships. There are strings attached. By neglecting to consider the social implications implied by Maria's narrative (which indexed the embeddedness of farm capital), I treated seed capital and farm capital synonymously, and in doing so paved over, rather than illuminated the differences and places of contestation implied through narratives describing disembodied and embedded capital.

It was only after further analysis (using a lens of "no strings attached") that I realized the importance of Maria's narrative and recognized her repetition of farm components as asserting the existence and importance of subsistence farming, rather than its demise. However, Adam recovered the social relationships and hidden strings, which my translation had removed: Pounding on the table, just like Maria, he emphatically

described both the protection and existence of not only the seed, but also the farm and the farmers.

5.4.5.4 Adam's narrative. Although Adam argued (as Terisita and I had) that the women's group had not lost the Lobelia money, he described their protection of the money not in terms *withholding* from the people (i.e. not touching (excerpt 3 line 67-68), not eating (line 107), not selling the farm (line 111), but emphasized instead the role of the people who share "what they have from the farm" (line 124-125). And he shows us that it is precisely because the farm is there, the seed is there, and the farmer is there that the farming continues. And the sense that sharing with those who contribute to the productivity of the farm does not prevent the farming from continuing, stands in stark contrast to Terisita's narrative in which eating the capital would prevent you from continuing or Melissa's narrative that attachments will hold impede on your flexibility.

In this reality, after all, it would not be feasible to continue to protect the money, without somehow benefiting from its protection and by putting the seed back into its social, political, and economic context, Adam and Maria constructed a significant critique of the concept of no strings attached, bringing back to the table the very strings that Melissa and David's metaphors (no strings attached, spreading seeds, seed capital) made invisible. And by responding indirectly to Melissa's intervention, Maria, Adam, and Terisita illuminated two different philosophies of capital productivity as they demonstrated their knowledge and experience of protecting the money from Lobelia for productive use.

5.4.6 Getting back to business: Melissa's return to the place where she had left off. Despite Maria and Terisita's defense of their savings and credit practices, their demonstration of their knowledge of entrepreneurial discourse and practice, and their creative use of metaphors to offer new understandings and perspectives on the money from Lobelia, Melissa and David were unable to fulfill Maria and Terisita's expectations for a two-way engaged interaction,⁴⁴ and instead, said very little. Their lack of engagement with Maria and Terisita's defense, made sense given the constraints structured by their discourse of partnership which allowed them only to engage in relationships of equality and independence between partners. She therefore kept her distance, and responded with only short non-descript answers, silently listening to Maria and Terisita's explanations, but offering little judgment. Doing so would have positioned her as the *mlezi* [patron], since she would have become the person to whom Maria and Terisita believed they had to defend their use of the money from Lobelia.

Her silence, in this sense, may have reflected her inability to understand the nuances of their narratives and the particular context indexed through their metaphors, but her decision to not ask for further clarification and her general lack of verbal participation also established that Maria and Terisita's explanations of their savings and credit practices did not interest or concern her, a passive intervention. In fact, she seemed anxious to get back to the explanation of the origins of the Lobelia money, where she had left off. Acknowledging, but not engaging with Adam's translation or the particularities

⁴⁴ During interviews with Maria and Terisita, one of their most common complaints was that Melissa and David did not engage with them. They asked questions, but would not answer when Maria and Terisita asked a question, and often did not acknowledge what they were saying. Excerpt 4 illustrates a more common discourse style of engagement and participation. When I failed to actively show understanding, Adam jumped in on my behalf.

of Maria and Terisita’s narratives, Melissa steered the conversation back to her own narrative:

Excerpt 5-10

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
129	Melissa	ahhhhh sawa (2) [ok] Well (1) Um (.) so after that happened (.) we
130		did not really (3) well (sigh) um (2) one (1) we did not want to tell
131		you what to do with your money... ⁴⁵ Because you know better
132		than we do, what you should- your needs are

Melissa’s use of the Swahili word “sawa” (line 129) might have been a gesture to mutual understanding, but that single word response, *sawa*, was also out of place as it did little to show understanding or connection with the lively explanations and interactive engagement of Maria, Terisita, Adam⁴⁶. In this case, this simple phrase punctuated their “turn,” and allowed her to shift the focus back to her narrative, where she had left off, simply providing information until Maria and Terisita began to defend themselves.

In this sense, while it was unclear how much Melissa understood the narratives or the extent to which her assessment that the money should not be used for a Women’s Group prompted Maria and Terisita’s explanations, her position also allowed her no rhetorical space to engage with what they were suggesting. Because she was insistent that she and her ideas were equal with those of Maria and Terisita, and was certain that this money had no strings attached, Melissa could only articulate her understandings about the general purposes of the money. Melissa certainly did not mean to challenge Maria and Terisita to defend their use of the money, as Maria and Terisita understood, but was simply sharing her ideas, which they could take or leave.

It is also possible that their explanations showed her that she had acted inappropriately by making such a strong assessment, and so she wanted to bring the interaction back to one of “equilibrium,” in which Maria and Terisita did not feel the need to prove themselves. Yet it ultimately didn’t matter: either way, in seeking to avoid taking up the position of *mlezi*, Melissa resisted relationship and in her distance consequently could only ignore their description of their lives, their knowledge, and their creative solutions to bringing the Lobelia money into their savings and credit practices.

Instead by treating her assertion that the money would disturb their independent loaning cycle as simply an aside to her larger narrative, as a general comment, and not a specific condition that required Maria and Terisita’s response, she attempted to regain her position as simply an information provider about the conditions of Lobelia, rather than an *mlezi* who would likely show concern for the proper use of the money. Using a marker of time, “after that happened,” Melissa made a seemingly natural and seamless return to the place in her narrative where she had previously left off. (she had just explained that the women’s group was chosen to receive a grant from Lobelia p. 15 Excerpt 5-6 line 49).

After returning back to the point in her narrative in which Lobelia chose to give money to Saccos, Melissa essentially rewrote the history, this time avoiding her intervention in which she told Maria and Terisita what they had to do with their money, and instead, said the very opposite: ‘we [Eco-preneur] didn’t want to tell you what to do with your money,’ (130-131) asserting her position as non-intervener: “Because you

⁴⁵ simple translation

⁴⁶ see excerpt 5-7 for this demonstration.

know better than we do, what your needs are” (line 132). Her mis-start in line 132, switching from *you should* to *your needs* may also be indicative of her attempt to avoid language symbolic of authority.

Reminding Maria and Terisita that ‘we [Eco-preneur] didn’t want to tell you what to do with your money,’ after they had just spent four minutes defending their practice with the belief that Melissa and David could possibly take back their money, illustrated the internal contradictions inherent in Melissa’s idea of “no strings attached:” For Maria and Terisita, the money certainly wasn’t without attachments as their access through their relationship with Eco-Preneur demonstrated. And yet, in order to look favorably in the eyes of Eco-Preneur, Maria and Terisita had to show that they not only agreed with this impossibility, but also conducted their savings and credit group accordingly.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter examined a discussion between Saccos and Eco-Preneur about a *specific* sum of money given to Saccos by an American Foundation to illustrate 1) the linguistic work necessary to constitute money as *free*, poor women as *empowered individuals* rather than *beneficiaries*, and relationships between international funders and Tanzanian recipients as *mutually beneficial partnerships* 2) make visible the lifelines of access and strings of obligation which are otherwise hidden behind discourses of disembodied capital and 3) demonstrate how a relationship between two independent individuals which has been characterized by a metaphor of “no strings attached,” has become a new “string” or condition for “partnering with” international development organizations which promote entrepreneurial practices.

It’s important to point out that by showing Melissa and David’s inability and resistance to engaging with Maria and Terisita’s narratives, questions, and expectations, I don’t mean to suggest that the problem lies with either Melissa or David or Maria and Terisita as individuals. Rather, in this chapter, I intended to show what happens when contradictory discourses meet in practice. As representatives of this way of “doing development,” Melissa and David were constrained by the discourses and ideologies of “partnership” and “entrepreneurship” in which they were enmeshed- discourses that ultimately did not allow for the very kinds of interactions and attachments which Maria and Terisita expected.

Through Maria and Terisita’s perspective, we saw strings and attachments, which *do* exist- strings which shape not only their understanding of how money operates (embedded), but also shape their understanding and expectations of relationship in which they are embedded with Melissa and David (who as walezi who have the power and resources to share with them). Maria and Terisita sought to challenge Melissa and David’s understanding as part of their strategy to win their favor and build a strong relationship. In sharp contrast however, Melissa and David had no interest in building a relationship. They weren’t dismissing or challenging Maria and Terisita’s reality, as doing so would have conflicted with their discourse of independence, trapping them in a relationship and a position of authority, which they absolutely sought to avoid. Eco-Preneur did not come to Tanzania to destroy local practices or challenge their everyday theories. What Maria and Teristia decided to do with their money, how they understand productivity, or which problems they have was their own business and not the concern of Melissa and David.

Their respective metaphors of seeds and strings, which were the subject of their conversation, can help us to understand the conversation itself. Maria and Adam's narratives were based on a negotiation between the farmer and the land and seed. The farmer plants the seeds, and the seeds give something back in return. As they demonstrated through their engaging and interactive moves, Maria and Terisita had much at stake in their conversation with Melissa and David. They embedded themselves within the conversation and carefully attended to the interests they assumed from Melissa and David's position, with the expectation that they would receive something, as a harvest in return.

Melissa and David's seeds however were unattached and didn't require negotiation. They brought seeds from America, and although many have been previously tested throughout the Global South, they were uncertain if the seeds would be useful in the Mlimani context. The more seeds they threw, the more likely the seeds would reach somebody who would have use for them, or who would know how to innovate and tend to the seeds in ways that made sense for the local context. When they saw this kind of success, as we will see in the next chapter they were excited and willing to offer more seeds. But when a seed failed to grow or the terms, which Melissa provided did not make sense, they didn't try to fix it or understand why it was not growing; their commitment to not intervening required them, as we just saw, to just move on. They didn't require or even expect that the seeds would give something back in return; that which the seed produces was for somebody else to eat. When the Tanzanians, to whom they offer seeds, question the terms in which they seeds are given, they have no way to respond. This was not the way their seeds work.

I realize in showing the tensions between their discourses and their strategies to maintain their appropriate positions within their respective discourses, I have only shown a small part of this conversation- a part in which Melissa and David could not fully respond or engage with the knowledge and practices of Maria and Terisita. The conversation however did not end at this point; and once Melissa was able to regain her footing (Goffman, 1981) and return to her position as facilitator (rather than *mlezi*) she could reengage with much enthusiasm. In fact in the minutes which followed, Maria and Terisita said nothing new, rather they explained once again how they protected the money from being lost by their members and how were using the money productively. However, this time Melissa responded with interest and even follow up questions to understand more. She begged for translation and became frustrated when Adam and I spent too long negotiating meaning in Swahili, demanding to know what was going on every step of the way.

Responding to her assertion that "you know best what to do with your money," Maria affirmed Melissa's reframe of their interaction, explaining that "that is why we decided to bring the money into the savings and credit group." On these new terms, in which Maria and Terisita described "what they new best," rather than defending their practices to their *Walezi*, Melissa and David could engage. They engaged with them by selectively asking questions, which fit with their positions as independent information providers and their interest in encouraging the growth of seed capital: had the *Lobelia* money grown? Were they satisfied with the returns on their investment? or would they prefer to do something more productive with the money? What would be the benefits of

continuing to loan out the money? What would be the benefits of taking the money out and using it for a small business?

Although in this chapter Melissa and David's engagement was limited by the dangerous terms implied by a discussion of money, we will see in the next chapter how Melissa and David could engage when the terms of their interaction change. To the extent that Maria and Terisita's practices and concerns become legible and fit with the discourse system in which Melissa and David operate (Ferguson, 1994), they engaged enthusiastically. They would never agree to terms of a relationship, which fit with the expectations and desires of Maria and Terisita, but they would engage with Maria and Terisita enough to teach them or show them how to pick up and modify their seeds independently. This then is the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter 6: Knowing the Market: A Conversation of Struggle

Eco-Preneur's methodology and our focus is a scarce resource. To apply a scarce resource you need to make sure that it's best applied to someone who has entrepreneurial characteristics or is able to internalize them sooner, than later, because those are going to be the ones that make the ripples... Do they have the capacity as entrepreneurs? Or do they have the capacity to become entrepreneurial? With our scarce resources, are they the best people to invest time and resources in? (Interview with David)

6.1 Introduction

As we saw in the last chapter, Melissa and David were willing to work with Maria and Terisita only to the extent that they had the capacity to “do things” and work with them in partnership toward common goals. Eco-Preneur had come to Mlimani to support entrepreneurs who had the capacity and enthusiasm to spread environmental entrepreneurship because, as David explained, social or green entrepreneurs “create ripples,” inspiring other entrepreneurs to further develop their product, thereby transforming the market in favor of green alternatives. Melissa and David believed they could more adequately address environmental conservation and alleviate poverty by creating learning spaces in which local entrepreneurs and diverse community stakeholders (government officials, NGO practitioners, representatives of youth and women's groups) could share knowledge, experience, and diverse perspectives about community needs, available resources, consumer practices, and market patterns as a mechanism through which to inspire new innovative community responsive environmental business solutions.

This chapter explores one such learning space and examines what happens when Melissa and David “apply their scarce resource,” within a two hour meeting with Maria and Terisita. Following questions raised in the literature review, this chapter explores the potential for these informal learning spaces to facilitate Maria and Terisita's access to entrepreneurial discourse and practices, while considering the ways in which such practices conduct their conduct in the service of global capital. Specifically I ask: How did they each understand their meetings in general and learning in particular? How did they negotiate their differences? To what extent did Melissa and David's methodology and focus engage with or challenge the “local” knowledge, orientations, and practices brought by Maria and Terisita?

Given the difficulties of their first meeting, Maria and Terisita did not at first appear to be likely partners for Eco-Preneur's efforts to “create ripples” and spread green technologies, Yet their first meeting was followed by six more. The reason why becomes clearer if we heed the advice of Blommaert and foreground the context in which Maria and Terisita became attractive partners for Melissa and David and their interactions became possible (Blommaert, 2005, p. 65).⁴⁷ Following a description of the particular

⁴⁷ Blommaert argues that the context in which conversations are analyzed is critical to because the

circumstances which gave rise to their meetings, I describe Eco-Preneur's assumptions about learning and partnership, which informed their interactions with Maria and Terisita and contrast these with Maria and Terisita's own expectations of learning and Melissa and David as teachers. Using critical discourse analysis, I analyze four excerpts, which illustrate Melissa and David's learning methodology and their techniques for "opening up a learning space."

Melissa and David's methodology drew from socio-cultural theories of learning, and particularly communities of practice. By engaging in "dialogue" and *participating in* entrepreneurial activities rather than *being taught* entrepreneurial skills, Melissa and David hoped Maria and Terisita could "learn through experience," acquiring and "internalizing entrepreneurial characteristics," through exposure and practice, rather than explicit teaching. Specifically, Melissa and David sought to provide the space for Maria and Terisita to participate in the entrepreneurial practice of assessing the viability of an alternative fuel business, by reflecting and reconsidering their everyday fuel practices and living needs in relation to the market. Although the discourses Melissa and David used to describe their engagement with Maria and Terisita ("dialogue," "conversation," and "opening a space for reflection") suggest that the meeting's direction was flexible and open to the interests and concerns of Maria and Terisita, as I show in four different excerpts, Melissa and David used conversation and dialogue to strongly *direct* Maria and Terisita towards their particular understanding of environment, business, and economy.

Following the work of Margaret Perrow (2000), I demonstrate how Maria and Terisita and their world were "repositioned" through Melissa and David's informal educational and communicative practices in relation to their world. It was through these seemingly neutral and locally attentive practices that Maria and Terisita were disciplined and their conduct was conducted. Despite the use of disciplinary practices however, Maria and Terisita, attuned to a manufacturing economy, strategically negotiated and contested the activity frames, knowledge, calculations, and learning practices assumed within the methodologies of Eco-Preneur.

Ultimately, I will suggest that Eco-Preneur's learning methodologies do not privilege local practice or knowledge as they suggest, but serve primarily to hide the ways in which they were intervening. Framing the engagement as one of partnership and conversation obscured -- and thus reinforced -- the very relations of inequality, which Melissa and David hoped to mitigate, if not overcome. These relations of inequality, however, were crucial: because Maria and David did not have legitimate positions within the learning activities which were "made available" by Melissa and David, they were ultimately unable to access, much less internalize the orientations, values, ways of thinking, practices Melissa and David had hoped they could acquire. But by oversimplifying the process of learning in self-interested ways, Melissa and David rendered invisible the ways these practices remained out of reach for their partners.

6.1.1 How Maria and Terisita became attractive partners. Maria and Terisita's interest in starting an alternative fuel briquette business developed out of a larger community wide "partnership" between Eco-Preneur and MEEP. Alternative fuel briquettes exemplified the kind of green business Eco-Preneur considered potentially transformative, and would therefore be willing to "invest their time and resources in."

contexts shapes the "things that can be said" [or not said], and therefore "the things that can be researched."

First, the idea came from the MEEP members themselves, an organic function of their own knowledge of available resources and community needs.⁴⁸ Second, as these particular briquettes could be produced without electricity and with minimal input costs, even those living in rural areas could make use of agricultural residuals and other “waste” products to create new and potentially more efficient fuels. Finally, alternative briquettes had the potential to replace or at least challenge the charcoal market, thus fundamentally transforming the fuel economy. Eco-Preneur willingly contributed their skills and services to the community partnership by drafting a funding proposal and using their access to global funding and environmental business networks to locate both a funder and an experienced briquette training organization.

The American funder, however, conceived of the project as more than just teaching how to make briquettes in Mlimani. In deciding on the terms of the project, the foundation not only negotiated with Eco-Preneur, (who were acting on behalf of their Mlimani partners), but also in relation to American “experts,” of briquette production (who were well known in the field of alternative fuel development), a local women’s organization in Uganda (seeking briquette training), and the United Nations Development Project (UNDP), which had received a similar proposal for briquette training for village groups in Mlimani (from one MEEP member organization) and wanted to make sure they were not duplicating services.

As a result of these negotiations, the final project expanded to include a training in Uganda, a training for the village groups in Mlimini, and cross learning opportunities between training participants in Tanzania, Uganda, and Kenya (where the American briquette experts had already provided training and briquettes were being sold). The expansion of the project consequently gave additional responsibilities and leadership positions to Eco-Preneur, who were to coordinate the trainings in both countries, organize the travel and payment of the American experts, and facilitate “learning journeys” in which participants in each of the projects would have the “opportunity” to learn from each other by sharing market and production strategies with producers and business managers in other East African countries. Eco-Preneur believed that by bringing together “people on the ground” (those who were actually making and selling briquettes), participants would gain new ideas and inspire innovation, thereby improving the briquette technology and developing the alternative fuel market.⁴⁹

Sharing across borders would first require research on production processes and market demands in each of the respective locations. Upon returning to Tanzania, Eco-Preneur had expected to collaborate with the members of the MEEP partnership to do this “participatory” market research. Yet while the MEEP members recognized the importance of research on the production process and market potential for deciding which alternative fuel briquette would be most beneficial to the particular Mlimani context, several complained that they had little interest in “wasting” the project budget to build virtual communities or travel to Uganda and Kenya to “dialogue” with other briquette producers or business people. Furthermore, they were quite upset to learn that while Eco-Preneur had accepted funding conditions (to use expensive American Trainers and to set

⁴⁸ According to MEEP, a fuel briquette could make productive use of the saw dust left behind as “waste” when lumber mills shut down operations by simultaneously addressing the problem of vermin (attracted to saw dust) while providing an alternative to the more environmentally destructive charcoal briquette.

up learning exchanges) on their behalf, the project budget was non-negotiable, which meant MEEP members would not have a say in how the money would be distributed. After several contentious meetings between Eco-Preneur and MEEP⁵⁰, few members were willing or interested to collaborate with Eco-Preneur to carry out “participatory” research, especially without payment. With limited Swahili, little knowledge of the local fuel market, and a commitment to local participation, Melissa and David were unable to carry out the research on which this funded project depended.

This problem made Maria and Terisita much more attractive partners to them. Other MEEP members had well-paying jobs or contracts and had no interest in actually making briquettes or participating in a voluntary research project, but Maria and Terisita were not only precisely the kind of small scale entrepreneurs that this project envisioned, but they had something concrete to offer the Americans in exchange: their knowledge of the current fuel market and eagerness to start an environmental business. As consumers of both firewood and charcoal, Maria and Terisita could potentially provide not only invaluable information about the current fuel market, but with their experiential knowledge of fuel use, Maria and Terisita were uniquely positioned to conduct market research. They also had the potential to become the kind of entrepreneurs who Melissa and David wanted to work with, those who could create “ripples” and inspire change in the current fuel economy.

6.1.2 Expectations for win-win partnerships. Melissa and David described their coming together as a “win-win partnership” in which each side had something beneficial to learn from the other. Melissa and David were oriented towards a knowledge economy: they needed to understand local fuel markets, which Maria and Terisita knew a great deal from their personal experiences. Melissa and David assumed Maria and Terisita would also need to learn about these same markets as part of a process to decide if in fact the briquette business would be profitable. While asking and learning about local fuel markets, Melissa and David expected that their critical questions would model the process of researching markets, and in doing so would give Maria and Terisita the space and experiential practice to learn this fundamental entrepreneurial process.

Maria and Terisita also saw the potential for their meetings to be mutually beneficial, but described their potential “win-win partnership” differently: Because of their previous relationship with Eco-Preneur and their participation in their environmental entrepreneurship training,⁵¹ they understood the kind of resources, access, and expertise which Melissa and David could provide. They expected that Melissa and David would assist them in acquiring a press machine needed to produce briquettes along with the skills and direction they needed to build a profitable business. In exchange they believed that their “participation” in Melissa and David’s project, (and especially their eventual success in business) would reflect favorably on the “facilitating” organization, Eco-Preneur, which had “empowered” them. By orienting towards a more industrial economic sense of their needs, they arrived at their meetings with very different understandings of what they would learn and receive.

While Maria and Terisita continued to position Melissa and David as “walezi,” therefore, Melissa and David saw their role quite differently. While they did have

⁵⁰ For a detailed analysis of MEEP and Eco-Preneur’s dispute over funding see Kramsch and Boner 2010

⁵¹ They had already participated in one of Eco-Preneurs' earlier trainings in which they were taught the principals of recycle and reuse, savings and credit, and learned to make batik, candles, and juice.

resources and business expertise, they were unfamiliar with local conditions and could not be expected to give clear directions about how to create a successful environmental business in Mlimani. Moreover, while they could have purchased a briquette press for Maria and Terisita, it was unclear if there would be a market for briquettes, and they did not want to make the mistake of investing in projects which ultimately could not be maintained, which had little value to the local populations, or which had no market. Eco-Preneur therefore sought to facilitate a learning process through which local communities would assess a new idea in relation to the needs of the community before deciding to adopt it.

Since Eco-Preneur could not be experts in this learning and assessment process Melissa and David avoided terms like “education” or “teaching” to describe their practices. They used a participatory methodology, which began with the premise that all participants came to the learning space with knowledge and experience to share. They explained how in a knowledge economy, teachers could no longer be expected to transfer static knowledge to their students; instead students must learn how to read and respond to changing conditions themselves. Melissa and David therefore saw themselves as participants, not teachers, in this learning process, which they often referred to as a “dialogue” or “conversation.” They expected to exchange information with each of their local partners and were quite open and adamant that they had neither the answers nor material resources that Maria and Terisita had expected that they would provide.

This difference illuminates a contradiction in Melissa and David’s interest in Maria and Terisita. On the one hand, it was because Maria and Terisita were operating in an industrial economy, as poor women, that they had access to market knowledge about the purchasing habits of typical fuel consumers. But their material and social positions also meant they did not have access to the orientations, practices, and knowledge required by a knowledge economy to make productive *use* of market based knowledge.

Melissa and David hoped to overcome this contradiction by engaging Maria and Terisita’s entrepreneurial focus. As David explained they were willing to invest their time with Maria and Terisita because:

“We felt like that capacity to learn how to be entrepreneurs was there. The desire is obviously there, and if we can work on translating the [entrepreneurial learning] process enough, they might very well be the ones that we want them to be.”

In other words, Maria and Terisita seemed to have the capacity and desire to learn to become the kind of entrepreneurs that Melissa and David “wanted them to be,” as part of their efforts to transform the fuel market. The entrepreneurial learning process was to be the missing ingredient in this equation, which Melissa and David would introduce to Maria and Terisita in their meetings.

Unlike the teacher-centered model typical of schools with which Maria and Terisita were experienced, the kind of education necessary for a knowledge economy presumed that, because knowledge is constantly changing, teachers can no longer be responsible for knowing and transferring knowledge to their students. Instead, as David’s quote indicated, learning involves translating *processes*.

Eco-Preneur described their training methodology on their website as follows:

“Eco-Preneur uses an integrated, participative, experiential and youth-friendly training and curriculum, which allows young people and members of the community to actively engage in sustainable development issues... Learning occurs through participating in a process that allows individuals to formulate questions, start experiencing solutions, reflect on lessons learned, and apply such lessons.”

Although David and Melissa had never heard of Paulo Freire, their description of a “participatory” learning methodology employed many of the same concepts and vocabulary as his sense of participatory education: words like “dialogue,” “active engagement,” “participation,” “experience,” “formulating questions,” “transformation,” “action,” “reflection,” and “application.” Like Freire, they reject what Freire called the “banking method” of education, which positions the teacher as knowledgeable expert and the student, as an empty vessel waiting to be filled. Instead, Freire proposes his “pedagogy of the oppressed” as a means of transforming oppressive relationships: by beginning with the assumption that students have already acquired knowledge by living in the world, they are to learn to better read the world in which they live as a way of coming to know the world that must be transformed. Freedom, Freire argues, is not a gift to be given, but can be the result of praxis, informed action that brings together theory (reflecting on the world and action) and practice (engaging in the world based on theory) (Freire, 1986, 1987).

I will use this similarity, however as my point of departure to show the dramatic difference between the participatory practices of Freire and the entrepreneurial learning practices of “dialogue and action” which Eco-Preneur directed towards a different kind of transformation: one that oriented Maria and Terisita to read their world according to changing market conditions for the purpose of increasing their participation in, rather than critiquing the consequences of, a capitalist system and knowledge economy.

As it turned out, Melissa and David’s efforts to redirect the focus of Maria and Terisita by “translating the [entrepreneurial learning and market research] process” and “applying their learning methodology” were met with much resistance and struggle. Each of the following four excerpts illustrates a problem of “translation” between their different orientations to education, economy, and communication and shows how each side made sense of and strategically negotiated the problem according to their specific interests and understandings. They were asked to consider the potential viability of the business by focusing on the market, rather than in terms of the usefulness of the product (excerpt 1); to calculate their daily fuel consumption and report their results in abstract figures which could not capture the complexity fuel consumption practices and strategies (excerpt 2); to use questions as tools for self- reflection and prompts to generate new innovative ideas, rather than a linguistic tool to build relationship while accessing information and advice from an interlocutor (excerpt 3); to consider the costs of a business in terms of one’s *individual* labor and time, rather than in terms of the minimal input costs (excerpt 4).

Maria and Terisita were often unable to understand or share the purpose of Melissa and David’s open-ended reflective questions, and answered in ways that directed Melissa and David’s focus back to their world, their concerns, and their issues, each of

which Melissa and David had considered off topic, and otherwise sought to avoid. The process of re-considering the viability of the briquette business required not only a new focus (situating the business in terms of the market, rather than meaningful practices), but also required new learning practices (ways of knowing), new tools (ways of using questions) for learning, and new identities and corresponding ways of relating (as equal partners rather than beneficiaries and *walezi*). Through entrepreneurial learning practices and dialogue, Maria and Terisita were being exposed to, if not disciplined into an unfamiliar discourse system, one expected of people like Melissa and David who are attuned to a knowledge economy.

6.2 Data

6.2.1 “Knowing the market:” A directed “conversation.” This first excerpt examines the opening of the second meeting between Saccos and Eco-Preneur, in which they each frame their differing understandings of the purpose of the meeting. Because Melissa and David operate within a knowledge economy, the success of a business happens in the mind: businesses trade in ideas and knowledge. They therefore hoped to learn more about the *current fuel market*, both in order to assess the potential of a briquette business and to develop new market strategies. On the other hand, Maria and Terisita understood their problem in terms of an industrial economic logic, framing the issue in strictly material terms. Instead of the market, they emphasized production: how to *get a press* so to start producing briquettes.

After initial greetings and ordering tea, Melissa began:

Excerpt 6-1

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
1	Melissa	how a business would work with this(.) is (.) knowing about the
2		mkaa [charcoal] market (.) and how kuni [firewood] (.) and mkaa
3		[charcoal] (.) are used in the ↑home (.) And so I was hoping to ask
4		them about that (.) just for general knowledge, but (.) it would be
5		really important for them to know (1) specifically for their business
6		[...] So I think its-I'm really glad we're having this conversation (.)
7		and I'd kind of like to talk about that

While Melissa and David did not wish to be regarded as teachers, David's opening quote illustrates how Eco-Preneur's objectives framed and defined how the conversation would proceed. For example, by explaining, “*how* a business would work with this,” (line 1), Melissa authoritatively defined both the properties of business and the purpose of the meeting: linking “how a business would work” with “knowing about the charcoal market” with the particular verb used -- *a form of be* -- effectively defined the relationship between business and market as unproblematic and imposed a set of normative expectations about how a business should work. At the same time, setting the focus on “knowing the market” (lines 1-2) excluded other possible formulations, like the way Maria and Terisita focused on the briquette as a product, emphasizing its particular use value and ease in production and briquette production as a development “project.” Such an orientation did not reflect the particular entrepreneurial focus that Melissa and David were working to translate, and by “clarifying” their objectives and focus from the beginning effectively excluded it from discussion.

However, because she was caught between limiting their discussion to a particular focus and avoiding directing the discussion, Melissa vacillated between framing their relationships as hierarchical and as equal. Although she had just designated the focus of the meeting and the importance of this knowledge for Maria and Terisita's business (lines 5-6), Melissa then characterized their interaction as just a "conversation" (line 6). Framing her interests through uncertainty -- "I'd *kind of* like to talk about that" (line 7) also allowed her to position herself as simply an interested learner, "hoping to ask" (line 3), rather than a knowledgeable expert who directs the conversation by explaining how businesses work (lines 1-3). And to avoid suggesting that her questions reflected personal or selfish interest, she explained that her questions were "just for general knowledge," (line 4) which she contrasted with the "specific" needs of Maria and Terisita's business (line 5).

Melissa and David, however, did have motivations: they needed to "know the market" as part of their efforts to spread alternative fuel technologies. Melissa and David told me before the meeting that they were considering hiring Maria and Terisita to do market research for them. But Melissa did not articulate this interest explicitly; instead, she emphasized the importance of "knowing the market" for Maria and Terisita's business and referred to Eco-Preneur's needs only in terms of shared interests with Maria and Terisita. By presenting their interests as the same, Melissa effectively hid any potential *conflicts* of interest.

Adam's initial misunderstanding of David's first question illustrates the potential of this conflict of interest. While David and Melissa focused on the "why" of the business, Maria, Terisita, and Adam focused on the "what."

Excerpt 6-2

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
8	David	just to start them off (....) if they can explain why it is- what their
9		thoughts are
10	Adam	explain to them what is briquettes?
11	Melissa	no why, why, why
12	Adam	why
13	David	why is it going to be a good business?

Although Melissa referred to their interaction as a "conversation," her and David's practices construed their relationship by reference to authority: rather than *asking* Maria and Terisita about their thoughts, David's phrase, "just to start them off" (line 8) claims a position of authority in *directing* Maria and Terisita to the questions he expected them to answer. In accordance with Eco-Preneur's experiential learning methodology, David asked his question not simply for the purpose of accessing information -- as the word "conversation" implies to Maria and Terisita -- but rather used the question as a tool to prompt the start of a learning process. And by "starting *them* off," David placed himself and Melissa as directing a process in which only Maria and Terisita were the learners. Moreover, by embedding his directive, "explain what their thoughts are," (lines 8-9) within the structure "if they can," (line 8) David strengthened his authoritative position: his questions not only directed but also *tested* Maria and Terisita's capacity.

Adam did not mishear David's directive, nor was this example an isolated incident. Instead, it indexes a consistent and fundamental difference of perspective between industrial and knowledge economies. Adam's focus on the *briquette* itself --

“What is briquettes?” (line 10) -- reflected the industrial orientation Adam shared with Maria and Terisita: they described the briquette’s beneficial environmental characteristics, its use value, its ease of production, and the minimal input costs. Instead, directing them to share their *thoughts* about business – and focusing on abstract *thoughts* and *knowledge* about the market – David directed their questions towards a different economic logic. And David and Melissa’s response to Adam’s misunderstanding clarifies both this distinction and Melissa and David’s efforts to manage the meeting’s focus away from Maria and Terisita’s original focus: without hesitation, Melissa contradicted Adam’s mis-formulation of David’s directive (“no” line 11) and *corrected* him, (“why, why, why,” 11) even adding emphasis through repetition to the distinction between Adam’s “what of briquettes” and their “why of business.” Even after Adam translated David’s question “correctly,” Maria and Terisita’s response once again demonstrated a discrepancy in their respective frames of reference.

Excerpt 6-3

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
14	Maria	We like this project (.) and we are a group (2) as they were able to
15		help the group=
16	Adam	Of the village
17	Maria	Of the village (.) but the machine (.) we have been thinking (.)
18		what will we do (.) but already we have seen that the thing to do is
19		to make briquettes (1) therefore (.) this maybe (.) should we say
20		the relationship between this means here (referring to Melissa and
21		David, laughing) and how can we get-get the machine
22	Terisita	what can we do
23	Maria	what can we do
24	Adam	so they were thinking because you have been able (2) able to buy
25		(1) five presses (.) for those people of the village (1) and these
26		they have decided themselves (.) that they could do briquetting (1)
27		So they are (1) just thinking (.) if they can discuss with you (.) on
28		how they can have that press machine.

Because David framed his question in terms of thoughts, Maria and Terisita also framed their answer in terms of thoughts. But the open-ended nature of the questions allowed Maria and Terisita to re-package their response with their own concerns and objectives, expressing their thoughts in terms of their concrete activities and material needs: “what [project] we will do,” (line 18), and “how we can get the machine” (line 21). Adam’s translation therefore walked a fine line: framing his translation of Maria and Terisita’s response in terms of what they “have been thinking” (line 24 and 27) allowed him to express their request for a machine while mitigating its directness by framing it in terms of David’s question about their thoughts.

Another point of contention was that while Melissa and David framed the briquette as a *profit* making enterprise – an imperative which made “knowing the market” of central importance -- Maria and Terisita framed the briquette as a “*mradi*,” or development project (Line 14) which, as such, required a machine for more pragmatic reasons and implicated Eco-Preneur as the donor who would provide that machine. Rather than describing SACCOS as a “business,” as Melissa had (excerpt 1, line 6), Maria described SACCOS as a group, (line 15), which she compared (in lines 14-17) to the village groups who were given briquette presses by Eco-Preneur. With this

comparison, Maria interpellated SACCOS as a beneficiary of a development project and Melissa and David, (the ones who gave briquette presses) as the donors.

This relationship contrasted sharply with Melissa and David’s sense of partnership: instead of meeting to have a “conversation,” about shared interests in “knowing the market,” and although Melissa and David hoped Maria and Terisita would come to a new awareness and understanding about themselves as entrepreneurs and briquette production as an innovative business, framing the production of briquettes as a *development project* meant that SACCOS and Eco-Preneur were *not* engaging in the same activity and did not share the same goals. Unlike a capitalist business, whose value is determined by the market and measured by the customer’s purchases, the success of a development project is measured by the extent of beneficiary participation and the beneficiaries’ interest in the project’s process, products, and services.

Since one of the common critiques of development organizations has been that that they bring projects and ideas which reflect donor interests over shareholder interests Maria and Terisita sought to give “local” approval of the project with their positive assessment, “we like this project” (line 14). Later, by sharing their more specific descriptions of the ease of the production process and use value of the briquettes, Maria and Terisita addressed the concerns which they believed they shared with Melissa and David. And by emphasizing that “they *themselves* decided that they could do briquetting,” (line 26) Adam further assisted Maria and Terisita in proactively responding to the concern that donors impose their own development ideas. Since Melissa and David would need “participants” to adopt and spread the briquette technology, Maria and Terisita articulated their interest to show themselves to be important beneficiaries in whom Melissa and David should invest. Yet by shifting the frame from “why it’s going to be a good business,” to a “discussion of how they can get that press machine” (line 21), Maria and Terisita not only contested Melissa and David’s focus on the market, but also re-positioned Melissa and David as donors or facilitators of a project.

Unwilling to engage with Maria and Terisita’s development project frame, Melissa shifted the discussion back to a focus on the business by asking about choice rather than need:

Excerpt 6-4

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
29	Melissa	but beyond the machine, I'm	
30		wondering like, like why would	
31		you choose to use a briquette	
32		versus mkaa [charcoal] or kuni	
33		[firewood]	
34	Adam	kwa nini mtachagua briquette	why would you chose briquette
35		badala ya mkaa ama kuni	instead of charcoal or firewood
36	Maria & Terisita	ahhh	ohh
37	Maria:	briquette tunaipenda kwa	the briquette we like it because,
38		sababu. Kwanza tumejifunza	first we learned that it can clean
39		kwamba (.) inaweza-itasafisha	up our environment, and we,
40		mazingira yetu (.) na sisi (.)	our group=
41		kikundi chetu=	
42	Terisita	itasaidia hifadhi ya mazingira	it will help to conserve the
43			environment
44	Maria	itasaidia hifadhi ya mazingira	it will help to conserve the

45			environment
46	Adam	they are saying the briquetting	
47		will help to conserve the	
48		environment.	
49	Maria	mulize hivi. Kwamba kikundi	Explain this (1) that our group
50		chetu sisi sasa hivi tumekisajili	(.) we are now (.) we have
51		kwa mpango huo wa mazingira,	registered with that purpose of
52		yaani	environment
53	Adam	and their group is now	
54		registered in environmental	
55		conservation	
56	Melissa:	yeah, but if you don't care	
57		about the environment	
58	David	No (1) It's about pricing. Ask	
59		them how much they think	
60		briquettes are going to be sold	
61		for and who will buy them.	
62	Adam:	Translation [difficult to hear]	
63	Terisita	hajazaliwa bado.	It hasn't been born yet

Once again, Melissa directed the conversation while actively masking her dominance: without directly rejecting Maria and Terisita's request to discuss the press, moving the discussion "beyond the machine" (line 29) to their "choice" (line 31) to use the briquette shifted the discussion away from a development frame to a business frame and the problem of "knowing the market." Her conversational style mitigated her dominance, ("I'm wondering like" line 29-30), but Maria and Terisita still needed to answer the questions she asked, competently in order to earn Melissa and David's favor and support.

Despite Melissa and David's dominance, Maria and Terisita had tactics to maneuver and actively respond. They maintained what was important to them by creatively using *some* of Eco-Preneur's rhetoric while subtly altering other parts. For example, by comparing the *characteristics* of the fuel products in terms of their use value and social benefits, Maria and Terisita could avoid talking about the briquette in strictly *business and market terms* and instead emphasize the briquettes' environmental values ("it will conserve our environment" lines 42-45 or "it will clean up our environment" lines 38-39), thereby emphasizing the social need the briquettes would fill. Highlighting that their organization has been "registered (with the government) in environmental issues" (lines 50-51) Maria and Terisita used their official status to mark their environmental concerns as legitimate. While such status is significant within the hierarchical bureaucratic system to which they were orienting, it would have little value in the eyes of the market.

As social and environmental entrepreneurs, Eco-Preneur saw business as central to their efforts to build environmentally sustainable communities but would be unwilling, as Maria and Terisita subtly suggested, to favor one (the environment) without considering the other (the economic opportunities). By attending to the "triple bottom line" (assessing their projects by economic, social, and environmental criteria) Eco-Preneur sought to avoid the mistakes of previous development agencies, who either encouraged conservation practices at the cost of people's livelihoods, or encouraged economic development while disregarding environmental and social costs. Because they

emphasized non-market based criteria, Maria and Terisita's assessment of the briquette's environmental value proved unsatisfactory: after (barely) accepting their contribution, ("yeah" line 56) Melissa imposed a new condition and a new question ("but what if you don't care about the environment?" lines 56-57). David was even more direct, diagnosing the problem with no uncertain terms: "No. it's about pricing" (line 58) and asking more questions ("how much the briquette would be sold for" and "who would buy them," lines 59-61) to firmly shift the frame back to knowing the market.

6.2.2 Treatment #1: Re-calculating household costs. Melissa and David's initial line of questioning in the previous excerpt proved unsatisfactory: their opened ended questions were too vague, allowing Maria and Terisita to discuss all sorts of things, but failing to lead them to a concrete discussion about the market. Moreover, when Terisita suggested that they couldn't discuss pricing because the business "has not yet been born," (line 63) and Maria explained that SACCOS liked the briquette business because "there are no expenses at all," Melissa and David realized Maria and Terisita were not assessing the business according to the same market principals. For Melissa and David, the sense that the briquette business had no expenses meant that Maria and Terisita were not properly accounting for the time needed to collect the "free" materials, the cost of the machine, and the price of their labor. Diagnosing the problem as one of understanding "pricing," David provided the treatment: calculations to assess the market and determine if the business could earn a profit, and provide Maria and Terisita with enough money to live on.

Melissa and David therefore took up a new strategy by facilitating Maria and Terisita in an exercise, which David called, "playing with the price-line." By asking concrete and focused questions about the price of a briquette and the frequency of use, they intended to use Maria and Terisita's current knowledge of household economies to show them how to anticipate the price of the briquette, even though, as Maria and Terisita explained, "the business has not yet been born." As David explained, they started with something that Maria and Terisita already knew because:

"It was rather imperative that we didn't make the market calculations alone but bring them in as participants in our thought process so they could learn it and use it again to make better decisions about whether to buy a second machine or the next time other NGO's tried to set them up with a different income-generating strategy."

In other words, as is characteristic of socio-cultural pedagogical practices, they weren't just giving a treatment to address their current business problem, but providing the tools for Maria and Terisita to treat other pricing issues in the future. As such Melissa and David's questions were not simply oriented to accessing information provided by Maria and Terisita's answers (as Maria and Terisita would have expected), but rather their questions became the very tools to prompt Maria and Terisita's thinking and learning process.

This excerpt follows the previous excerpt. Maria and Terisita have just explained that they like the briquettes because the production of briquettes required no expenses. As we saw in previous examples, Melissa and David did not *directly* contest Maria and Terisita's assessment; rather they shifted the meeting's focus to a discussion of the fuel market by asking new questions about fuel costs and average fuel expenditures.

Excerpt 6-5

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
64	David	just something about what mkaa [charcoal] costs, and what is
65		spent on fuel
66	Melissa	yeah if you didn't care about the environment, how much would
67		you be willing to spend on a briquette?
68	Adam	how much?
69	Melissa	how much would you be willing to pay for a briquette? If you didn't
70		care about the environment
71	David	yeah. You have to cook right? They have to cook right?
72	Adam	um hm
73	David	and what do they use now?
74	Melissa	yeah what do you use in your kitchen and stuff

By casually introducing a new focus on fuel costs with the phrase “just something about” (line 64) David suggested that his questions would be simple and straightforward, and therefore likely assumed Adam could *naturally* facilitate the “something” (line 64) he wanted to talk about. This was not the case; although Melissa and David recognized and affirmed each other’s questions “yeah” (lines 66, 71, and 74), as logical and related, the questions themselves were based on assumptions, which Maria, Terisita, and Adam did not share. It therefore took several turns before they could even understand the first question.

The problem was three-fold. First, Melissa and David’s questions implied a kind of flexible choice with respect to purchasing needs which Maria and Teresita would have little familiarity with. With their questions (“*what* do they spend?,” (line 67) and “*how much* are you willing to spend?” (line 69), Melissa and David assumed they could capture the complexity of Maria and Teristia’s fuel practices with single numerical figures. Yet as Adam explained in an interview following this meeting, because poor women do not have consistent income, they do not calculate how much they *spend*; rather they purchase basic needs such as fuel and maize, inconsistently, according to what they can *afford* at the time.

Moreover, in reducing their fuel need to a cash amount, Melissa and David’s presumed that Maria and Terisita got fuel exclusively by cash purchases. This assumption, too, poorly reflected a more complex situation: while Maria and Terisita earned cash through their clothing business, it was not uncommon for them to find themselves without cash, and they would then also collect firewood by hand, barter, and rely on friends and family. Regardless of how they got the fuel, their calculations were on how to make the fuel last longer, not on calculating how much they spent. They had multiple techniques to maximize their fuel resources: they had methods of putting out fires so as to preserve charcoal for re-use the next day, ways of mixing different fuel sources to increase and decrease heat intensity, and they also collected other freely available fuel sources (in an unpredictable way) in the course of their day.

Maria and Terisita’s fuel practices, in other words, developed out of transactions with necessity, according to unpredictable material conditions. Yet by asking “how much they would be *willing* to spend,” rather than what they could *afford* to spend, Melissa’s discourse suggested that their fuel expenses reflected only personal choices. And as common as these practices may be for individuals attuned to the knowledge economy, such calculations have limited relevance in the context of scarcity and material need.

Moreover, thinking about the environment as a *choice*, implied that Maria and Terisita were working with her to hypothetically “play” with the price line, that by removing the “added value” of the environmental benefits, they were together working to get down to (or at least close to) the bare economics or price of the briquettes. Yet while Maria and Terisita likely shared this perspective in the abstract, protecting the environment was more than a luxury to them in the sense that Eco-Preneur’s (and Millenium Development in general) expressed interest in the environment necessitated Maria and Terisita’s tactics in the first place. The briquettes had value (especially in a development funding market) precisely because Eco-Preneur taught Saccos that environmental conservation *is* an “added value” that can be commodified and sold as part of the briquette product, and they sought to take it into consideration in their calculations. Getting rid of the value implied by the briquettes environmental properties also meant getting rid the resources and support which Maria and Terisita assumed were tied to the briquette’s environmental qualities.

Another problem was that Melissa and David were using questions in a way that was unfamiliar and unexpected by Maria, Adam, and Terisita, making translation even more difficult. They used questions as a *tool of instruction*, rather than a *tool to access information*. And because Melissa and David had not explicitly articulated the intentions to “guide” Maria and Terisita with their questions (to determine the price of a briquette and thus the viability of the briquette business), Adam, Maria, and Terisita still thought they were asking questions, “just out of curiosity” (excerpt 6-1 line 4) or perhaps had an interest in their lives at home and how they cook.

As if trying to show Adam the obviousness of his questions, David responded to Adam’s confusion, (“how much” line 68) by reminding Adam “you have to cook right?” (line 71) and though he constructed his words as a question, he used the question to *show* Adam what he meant, rather than to ask about Adam’s cooking, or in this case about Maria and Terisita’s cooking. Yet this contextual clue was not sufficient; Adam could not facilitate Melissa and David’s exercise to “play with the price line” because he did not share an understanding of their learning methodology or their purpose for asking questions. Therefore, Adam could only *literally* translate the parts of Melissa and David’s question which he understood, simply asking questions, but not making comprehensible the underlying framework of “playing with the price-line” through which the asking of questions were made meaningful. As a result, the relationship between market pricing and one’s average fuel expenditures remained obscure.

Seeking to provide a “personal basis” for Maria and Terisita to engage in the exercise of reading the market, David explained to me in a reflective⁵² interview that he purposely asked questions related to cooking, which he assumed Maria and Terisita knew a great deal. By starting in the “kitchen,” rather than in the more abstract “market” David thought he could translate market principals and make calculations more accessible.

Excerpt 6-6

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
75	David	how much do they pay per day?	
76	Adam	mnalipa shin gapi?	how much do you pay?
77	Maria	eh?	Huh

⁵² I interviewed David a few days after this meeting to ask about his purpose in asking these specific questions.

78	Adam	mnalipa shilingi ngapi kwa	How much do you pay for
79		mkaa ama kuni	charcoal or firewood
80	Maria	debe ya mkaa sasa hivi ni elfu	a tin of charcoal today is 1500
81		moja na mia tano	[shillings approx 1\$]
82	Adam	kwa mwezi moja debe ngapi?	For one month you can use
83		Unaweza kutumia debe ngapi?	how many tins?
84	Maria	kwa wiki moja debe moja	for one week (.) one tin (.) it
85		inategamea=	depends
86	Terisita	=inategamea matumizi	It depends on the uses
87	Maria	kwa mimi kwa sababu, sina	for me, because I don't have a
88		familia. Kwa wiki debe moja.	family(.) But For my comrade=
89		Lakini kwa mwenzangu=	
90	Terisita	debe mbili, hata debe mbili na	two debes, even two and a half,
91		nusu, inategamea unapikia kitu	it depends what you are
92		gani	cooking
93	Adam	so the cost of the charcoal	
94		depends on how big is your	
95		family. Like Maria, she can just	
96		use one tin for one thousand	
97		five hundred a week. But	
98		Terisita, can use up to two and	
99		a half tins of charcoal	
		[discussion of how many people in family]	
100	Melissa	But do you pay for ↑kuni too?	
101	Adam	unalipa kuni pia?	do you pay for firewood too?
102	Terisita	kuni pia, tunauziwa...kama	kuni also is sold to us, with
103		maka tunaweza kutumia debe	mkaa we can use one debe
104		moja	
105	Adam	if he uses only charcoal, he can	
106		use those two tins and a half.	
107		But if he mixes, charcoal and	
108		kuni, he can have like one tin of	
109		charcoal for Terisita.	
110	Melissa	oooh in a week	
111	Adam	Yeah	
112	David	how many use that? (...)	
113	Melissa	but if its only charcoal- ni mkaa	But if it's only charcoal- it's
114		tu. Lakini kama ukutumia mkaa	charcoal only (.) but if if you use
115		pamoja na ↑kuni, ni debe=	charcoal together with
116			↑firewood (1) its debe [small tin
117			worth]
118	Adam	Na kuni kiasi gani?	and firewood what amount?
119	Terisita	Kuni?	Firewood?
120	Melissa	Um hm	
121	Adam	unanunua tu	You just buy it
122	Terisita	kama mgeni anakuja, tunatumia	If a guest arrives, we use
123		kuni yaani	firewood in other words
124	Maria	Kuni tunazitumia sana	Firewood is used a lot
125	Terisita	halafu jiko	And then the stove
126		she said that, he has not yet	
127		estimating for the kuni↑ and	
128		also it depends on the kind of	
129		cooker he uses	
130	Melissa	but her personally	
131	Liz	she hasn't measured it	
132	Melissa	But you don't pay for wood?	

Adam's difficulties in translating David and Melissa's questions into Swahili and Maria and Terisita's responses (which failed to provide the information Melissa and David were seeking), again show us the incongruence between their different orientations to fuel costs. While Melissa and David sought to *quantify and calculate* Maria and Terisita's fuel expenditures, Maria and Terisita, answered their questions according to their concrete experiences, describing the many *contingencies* on which their fuel use and such calculations depended.

Again, Melissa and David asked questions about *amount spent* ("how much do they pay per day" line 75) *quantities* ("how many people in your family" "how many use that?" line 112), and if something is *paid* for as a commodity, rather than part of the "surrounding environment" ("do you pay for kuni?" (line 100) don't you pay for wood?" (line 132). Again, rather than respond with the abstract numbers, Maria and Terisita tried to explain that "*inategamea*," it depends. Maria and Terisita gave some figures, but in each case struggled to emphasize the many contingencies on which they made their choices. How much they spend on fuel depends on: "*matumizi*" their fuel needs (line 86), the size of their family (*sina famalia lakini mwenzangu*, I don't have family, but my friend here [has 6] lines 87-89), what you are cooking (*unapika kitu gani*, line 91-92), if there are guests (*mgeni anakuja* line 122), and finally, the kind of stove you are using (line 125).

The gap created because of their different understandings and orientations to costs also affected how they experienced and approached learning "together." For Melissa and David, learning happened through struggle and a gap in knowledge or a problem in understanding presented an opportunity to develop more useful and complex solutions.⁵³ For this reason, they were not concerned that Maria and Terisita should have the "correct" answer, but rather that their questions, (as problems) would engage them in a learning process and eventually prompt new ways of thinking and potentially more useful solutions. For Maria and Terisita however, not having "the answer" meant that they lacked knowledge and experience and reinforced their sense of inadequacy and ignorance. And for Adam, asking a question that he knew Maria and Terisita could not answer would appear disrespectful- an intentional act to shame them in front of their walezi. So while the Americans expected Maria and Terisita to learn new concepts through their struggle with confusion – though never making this clear -- Adam very carefully changed their questions to prevent confusion from happening in the first place, while Maria and Terisita sought to show that they understood as an effort to impress with their competence.

For example, rather than translating David's question exactly as he asked it -- "how much do they pay per day" (line 75) -- Adam sought to get the same information by breaking David's question into two questions which Maria and Terisita could more easily understand and answer. First, as Maria and Terisita usually pay for *something*, rather than assess how much *they pay* in general or per day, Adam specified the actual product ("you

⁵³ As David explained in an interview, and Kato explained in his entrepreneurship training, entrepreneurs love challenges, barriers, and obstacles, because they force one to come up with a better solution, one that is likely more innovative. Eco-Preneur's director explained how she intentionally raises doubts about an entrepreneurs business plan so that in offering a viable response, the entrepreneur will be forced to think even more carefully and critically about their project.

pay how much for *charcoal or firewood?*” line 78-79), when his first question, “unalipa shilingi ngapi,” [you pay how much? Line 76] was not understood. But rather than tell us how much *she spends* on either of these products (which would have reflected the intentions of David’s question), with her response, (“a tin of charcoal right now is 1500 Tsh” line 80-81), Maria emphasized the price of the *object*, answering the question with costs and calculations which were useful to her. Because David had not asked for the cost of the *mkaa*, Adam asked a second question, “You can use how many *debe* or tins of *mkaa*,” (line 83) seeking to assist Maria and Terisita to answer David’s question, by focusing, as Maria and Terisita would, on what they *use* (and in doing so, changing the meaning of the question).

Even after describing the many contingencies on which their *mkaa* use depended, Melissa and David still could not understand the inappropriateness of their questions and continued to ask Maria and Terisita to represent the complexities of their fuel use in a single numerical figure. And despite her use of Swahili (line 113-115), by asking them to also consider payment of firewood in their calculations, Melissa only added further complexity (and contingencies) to an already over-complicated equation.

Rather than considering Melissa’s question as a tool for learning and allowing Terisita the space to struggle, reflect, and creatively arrive at new ways of thinking about fuel use, Adam answered for Terisita what he knew from his own personal experience, “*unanunua tu*” (“you just buy it” [firewood] line 121), implying that she doesn’t calculate her fuel use, or at least does not calculate using the figures which Melissa and David were looking for. His intervention therefore protected her from the uncomfortable space of being shown to misunderstand. Yet although his response validated Maria and Terisita, he neither translated their shared practice of “just buying” firewood nor translated their response (“if a guest comes we use firewood” “we use firewood a lot,”) which while representing their fuel practices, would have failed to give Melissa the figures she expected. Instead, speaking on behalf of Maria and Terisita, Adam used the language of calculations to engage with Melissa and David using their terms to explain why Maria and Terisita did not have an answer: “he had not yet *estimating* for kuni.” (126-127)

As Adam attempted to protect Maria and Terisita from the questions they could not answer, Melissa asked another. And her question, (“but don’t they pay for firewood?” line 132) could not help but be interpreted as suggesting that because they buy firewood, they *should* know how to calculate their firewood expenses (when they clearly did not), a calculation that would seem to expose their ignorance. But by asking a question of their own, Maria and Terisita deflected Melissa and David’s questions and shifted the focus away from the exercise of calculating costs to the personal realm of their everyday practices in the home. How they did this and the implications of this shift will be explored in the next excerpt.

6.2.3 Questions as tools: Learning, relationship building, and control. For the first fourteen minutes of what Melissa and David framed as a “conversation,” Maria and Terisita exclusively answered Melissa and David’s questions: how much *mkaa* and *kuni* is sold for (by *debe*, bag, or by piece), how much it costs, how much they spend, and how much is used per person. Not realizing that Melissa and David were asking their questions as part of a process to facilitate *their* learning, Maria and Terisita answered the questions as if Melissa and David really wanted to know more about their lives and particularly their cooking practices. According to Maria and Terisita, by answering

Melissa and David’s questions, they were providing valuable information, which Melissa and David obviously needed; but according to David, he was only asking these questions as a part of an experiential learning process, “modeling the kinds of questions that any entrepreneur should ask themselves” before investing in a new business. He hoped through this process, Maria and Terisita could eventually understand the importance of “knowing the market,” which he assumed could be ‘known’ by assessing the potential cost of the briquette in relation to Maria and Terisita’s individual economic needs and their average expenditures for fuel. “Playing with the price line” in other words, was the treatment to counteract Maria and Teirista’s belief that the briquette, (because it could be made out of readily available materials) was “free.”

During a pause in the conversation, however (as Melissa, David, and I discussed, in English, which burns hotter- charcoal or firewood), Maria suddenly asked a question that shifted the conversation back to Maria and Terisita’s concerns and reframed the interaction as one between beneficiaries and *walezi* rather than business partners. By taking the floor, and asking her question in the middle of David’s treatment (to “play with the price line,”) Maria showed that she had either not understood or wished to move on from the many questions which made up David’s “treatment.” The abruptness of her interruption particularly illuminated the one-sidedness of the conversation up until that point.

Excerpt 6-7

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
133	Maria	Melissa kipindi kile tuliporudi	Melissa, the time when we
134		Dar ulimuuliza Christina	returned from Dar, you asked
135		kwamba, mnataka Eco-preneur	Christina, you (plural) want Eco-
136		iwasaidie ninyi, alikujibu?	preneur to help you with what,
137			did she answer you?

As Melissa tried to shift gears to a discussion they had had six months earlier, Maria and Terisita explained to Adam and I that they had been together in a workshop in Dar es Salaam (sponsored by Eco-Preneur) when Melissa had gone to each of the organizations of MEEP and asked how Eco-Preneur could help them. At the time when Melissa offered to help, Christina was the chairman of Saccos. Ignoring Maria’s reminder of Eco-Preneur’s willingness to help, Melissa answered:

Excerpt 6-8

Line#	Speaker	Utterance
138	Melissa	she was mostly talking about the group itself, and the last time I
139		spoke with her, Saccos had not started. And she was talking a
140		little bit about batiks, but nothing specific (...) she had been saying
141		like, “yeah, we’re thinking of doing composting,” and oh (.) she
142		said you got some land from one of the members (.) and Bwana
143		Mushi was going to teach composting (1) so what happened with
144		that anyways?

Maria used her question as a tool to emphasize their relationship with Eco-Preneur, to establish both the history they shared and the expectation that Eco-Preneur would serve as helper or *mlezi* which she took that history to indicate. Asking how Christina answered Melissa’s question (line 136) allowed Maria to indirectly remind

Melissa about the help she had previously offered (which had not yet been fulfilled), without asking for help directly. And tying her immediate question to a previous question within a previous shared context was a strategic tactic, to emphasize relationship, which I have shown in previous chapters. By answering Maria's current question about how Christina answered, Maria attempted to force Melissa to acknowledge that she asked the question (about how eco-preneur could help) in the first place.

But the indirectness of Maria's question also allowed Melissa to focus on Christina's response while avoiding the question of whether and how Eco-Preneur was *still* willing to help. Shifting the focus away from Eco-Preneur, Melissa described (as she remembered Christina had) "the group itself:" "Saccos had not started," (line 139) she said; they had been "talking a bit about batiks" (line 140) *thinking* about doing composting (line 141), and that they had even been offered land and compost training (line 142-143). Since, as Melissa described in the last chapter, donors generally invest in organizations which are "doing things" (rather than talking and thinking about activities), the fact that they had many general ideas and engaged only superficially in multiple activities did not reflect favorably on Saccos.⁵⁴ And listing these activities as *ideas* demonstrated that Saccos hadn't yet done anything "specific (line 140)." Finally by asking another question, "what happened with that [composting, training, and land] anyways?" (line 143-144) Melissa put Maria and Terisita in a position of reporting on their *own* (lack of) progress ("the land was far and we weren't able to do the training because of the distance"). Her questions about Saccos activities, therefore, strategically moved the discussion even further away from the question of how Eco-Preneur could help.

While Melissa had emphasized the *lack* of specific action, Terisita next described *more specifically* their decision to produce briquettes, as a way of bringing Eco-preneur back into their preferred framing of the conversation:

Excerpt 6-9

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
145	Terisita	Tulikuwa tunafikiri kitu gani	We were thinking (.) what thing
146		tutafanya kinahusiana na	we will do that is related to the
147		mazingira hasa kama biashara	environment especially as a
148		ni maana tukaamua briquete.	business. this is how we chose
149			briquetting
150	Adam	So they were thinking for a long	
151		time. Which kind of thing they	
152		can do. Like businesses which	
153		is related to environmental	
154		conservation. so that's why	
155		they're thinking of the	
156		briquetting now.	
157	Melissa.	(5) and um (3) and (.) That's	
158		wo:n-der↑ful (laughing). I'm	
159		really ↑glad, and I'm glad that- I	
160		don't know what to say	

⁵⁴ The director of Eco-Preneur shared with me her concern that Maria and Terisita have regularly attended trainings batik, composting, environmental enterprise, but don't actually follow through with any one activity.

161	Adam	Amefurahi wala atasema nini.	She is happy, however what will
162		(laughing)	she say
163	Terisita	Au nyinyi mnashauri nini?	Or you (plural) advise what?
164		mmapata mawazo yetu sasa	you got our ideas, now we will
165		tutapenda ya kwenu	like yours
166	Adam	So she has given you their	
167		ideas.	
168	Melissa	ahaa	
169	Adam	so what are your ideas	
170	Melissa	My ideas? Ohh (.) ya	My ideas (.) ohh (.) of
171		↑biashara? [of business]	↑business
172	Terisita	nd↑iyo	↑yes
173	Maria	hata wewe	even you

By demonstrating that they did, in fact (now) have a specific project, Terisita's account of how they decided to do briquettes managed to respond to Melissa's previous inquiry (what Saccos had decided) and while providing a link to the question of how Eco-Preneur could help. Stating their decision to produce briquettes, within the context of Melissa's previous offer to help, Terisita constituted their relationship as one of institutional patronage and their interaction as a conventional practice of "asking for advice."⁵⁵ According to this convention, after hearing the ideas and decisions of the group Melissa, positioned as *mlezi*, would have been expected to offer advice, direction, and even resources.

Melissa did not know how to respond, either because she was unfamiliar with this convention or uncomfortable with the expectations implied; her enthusiastic tone only partially masked her hesitations (pausing for five seconds before saying um and then again for 3 seconds), and mis-starts. Her exclamation, "that's wonderful," positively acknowledged the decision, which Saccos made independently, but remained (somewhat awkwardly) detached from Terisita's implication of ongoing responsibility and engagement.

Because Melissa did not respond appropriately to the common convention for giving advice, Terisita had to articulate her expectations even more directly: explicitly asking for Melissa and David's advice (*mnashauri nini* #90), as they had already "received our [Maria and Terisita's] ideas" (*mmapata mawazo yetu* #90) But by "ideas," Terisita included the "idea" she had just given in line #87 within the many "ideas" she and Maria had given in response to Melissa and David's fifteen minutes of continuous questions, thereby re-framing the conversation they had been having as a one-way debriefing of valuable information, rather than as Melissa and David had understood- a

⁵⁵ As Adam explained, it is common practice in Tanzania to ask advice of a person of privilege, status, and/or knowledge. You don't just ask directly that which you are looking for, but rather describe your situation, your ideas, and how you have gone about making decisions. The other person will offer their "advice" on what they see and what they would suggest given the situation that you have described. The advice might be given in a story or a common proverb, but importantly, something comprehensible is given in return. The person to whom you are asking advice, might ask you a question in order to better understand the situation, to which his/her advice will be directed, but other than that, this is not intended to be a back and forth dialogue or an exercise in joint problem solving.

learner centered process in which questions prompted self-reflective thinking. And by invoking a framework of equality, Maria and Terisita implied that the inequality of their interactions up until that point would now be rectified as “**even** [Melissa and David]” should give their ideas.

Melissa responded to Terisita’s request with the following “thoughts:”

Excerpt 6-10

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
174	Melissa	mimi nafikiri (2) well (.)	I think (2) well (.) yourselves
175		wenyewe nafikiri briquetting ni	[you think on your own] think
176		biashara bora ↑lakini (1) ni	briquetting is a better business
177		muhimu kujua ya=	but it’s important to know=
178	Maria	soko	
179	Melissa:	soko (.) ndiyo (.) kabla kuanza.	The market (.) yes (.) before
180			starting

Ignoring the explicit request for “their advice” (*mnashauri nini?* Line 163), Melissa limited her response to what Maria and Terisita think. Although she began her response, “I think,” (line 174) her two second pause and interjection, “well” (line 174) allowed her to up a new, less agentive, line. And by using the emphatic reflexive pronoun “*wenyewe*,” [yourselves], rather than just the subject pronoun “*wewe*” you, Melissa constructed a grammatically incorrect sentence⁵⁶ to further emphasize that the thoughts were not her thoughts, but were the thoughts, which Maria and Terisita developed on their *own*. By repeating Maria and Terisita’s thoughts, rather than simply giving her advice, Melissa contested both the convention (for giving and receiving advice) and the hierarchical positions (of expert and beneficiary) instantiated through the practice.

Moreover, Melissa presented her own thoughts on the market not as her own, but as a simple, obvious truth (“it is important to know the market”), a mantra so often taught in entrepreneurship trainings, discussed in newspapers and radio shows, and repeated again and again by Melissa and David, that Maria, an attentive student could finish Melissa’s utterance for her (line 178). Deferring to the market, as the guiding source and arbiter of Maria and Terisita’s decision to start a briquette business, shifts the responsibility for “helping” or advising away from Eco-Preneur. Melissa and David didn’t have the answers, she emphasized; the market had the answers, which further justified Melissa and David’s numerous questions as their efforts to help Maria and Terisita to “know the market.” Melissa therefore answered Maria and Terisita’s request for her ideas with even more questions, thereby strategically shifting the frame away from their relationship and Maria and Terisita’s request for advice and back to their previous discussion of “knowing the market.”

Using Maria and Terisita’s clothing business as a concrete example, Melissa constructed a scenario, in which she intended for Maria and Terisita to discover from their own responses that they already had significant knowledge of the market because (“you know the market of clothes”).

Excerpt 6-11

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
181	Melissa:	kwa sababu what do you sell?	because what do you sell?
182		What do you- Una- una-	What do you-you-you-you do-
183		unafanya unafanya nini kwa biashara.	you do what for business
184		Tunauuza mitumba	we sell used clothes
185	Melissa	ok	
186	Adam	Mjomba (laughing)	uncle [slang: the clothes of one's dead uncle]
187			
188	Melissa	So do you, when you buy used clothes, do you buy like a huge	
189		↑amount and then sell them? or	
190		do you buy them, and sell them	
191		along the ↑way?	
192			
193	Adam	Na mnapo kwenda kununua	and when you go to buy, do you
194		mnanunua. nyingi kwa pamoja	(pl) buy many all at once, or do
195		au mnanunua kidogo kidogo na	you buy a little and sell little by
196		kuuza kidogo kidogo.	little. What do you do.
197		Mnafanyaje.	
198	Maria	Kidogo kidogo.	little by little
199	Adam	Mnanunua kidogo sio kama beli	you(pl) buy a little, not like a full
200		zima.	bail
201	Maria	Halafu tunawauzia watu mmoja	then we sell to people one by
202		mmoja mitaani.	one in the street
203	Adam	They are buying in small	
204		quantities and they are selling	
205		them one pieces to peoples.	
206	Melissa	Why	
207	Adam	Kwa nini mnafanya hivyo.	And why do you do this
208	Terisita	Hatujapata mahali pa kuuzia	we haven't yet gotten a place to
209		kama banda.	sell, like a small hut
210	Melissa	And (.) if you were going to (.)	
211		grow your business say, into a	
212		bigger hut, what would you do?	
213	Adam	Mtakapofikia swala ya biashara	
214		yenu imekuwa mtafanyaje.	
215	Maria	Tutanunua kwa wingi na	we will buy in large quantities
216		kuwauzia watu watakaouza	and will sell to people who will
217		kwa rejareja.	sell wholesale
218	Adam	When it will come that time.	
219		They will buy in large quantities.	
220		And they will sell to people who	
221		are going sell. Retailers.	
222	Melissa	And why?	
223	Adam	Kwa nini. (4)	why (4)
224	All	(laughing)	
225	Maria	Au yeye anauliza kwa jili ya	or is she asking for the purpose
226		kama tutakapo kuwa na	of if we will have a business,
227		biashara tutafanyaje hiyo	what will we do or she has what
228		tutafanyaje au ana maana gani.	purpose
229	Adam	Biashara yenu(.) Hiyo biashara	your business. this business if it
230		ikishakua mmesema mtaweka,	grows, you already said you will
231		mtanunua labda, marobota	buy a full bundle and will put it
232		mazima na kuweka humo ndani	inside a banda and you will sell
233		ya kibanda halafu mtawauzia	to people, like whole sale. Then

234		watu kama whole sale. Halafu	they ask, why do you think this
235		hawa wanauliza, Kwa nini	
236		mnafikiria hivyo.	
237		Kwa sababu watu waliokuwa	because people who travel to
238		wakisafiri kwenda Dar es	dar to buy, will buy here and it
239		salaam kununua watanunulia	will be cheaper for them.
240		hapa na kuwa rahisi kwao.	
241		its because if they are going to	[Maria and Terisita are laughing
242		have such a shop, of the whole	hard while Adam explains]
243		sale of used clothes, those	
244		people who are running to dar,	
245		for the same clothes, if they can	
246		get it here, it will be easier for	
247		them to buy from them.	
248		So, unajua soko ya nguo.	so you know the market of
249			clothes
250		Ndiyo	Yes
251	Melissa	ina mahali tofauti kufanya.	there are different places to do
252		Ee kwa mfano ukiwa na huo	yes for example, if you have big
253		mtaji mkubwa unaweza	capital, you can take it to
254		ukapeleka labda Soni,	maybe Soni, you can take it to
255		ukapeleka Bumbuli, ukapeleka	Soni, you can take it to
256		Mlalo, kuna masoko mengi=	Bumbuli, you can take it to
257			Mlalo, there are many markets
258	Melissa	Ahaa.	
259		Do you understand? Like	
260		they're going to have like a big	
261		shop. And they're going to sell	
262		wholesale. To other people. So	
263		they'll be able to even take	
264		them, those. Clothes to various	
265		places, like soni, bambuli, the	
266		other markets, like lukozi.	
267		Where they can just go there	
268		and sell their clothes. Now they	
269		cannot because there is no=	
270	Melissa	In the same way, there are	
271		different ways of running a	
272		briquetting business.	
273	Terisita	Ndiyo maana yake.	so this was her purpose

By thinking about how they currently ran their business (buying clothes little by little and selling in the street (lines 198, 201) and imagining how else they could have run their business (they could “buy full bails” of clothes, “sell to retailers,” (line 215) have a “small shop from which to sell the clothes” lines 208-209) Melissa used their *own* answers (those in quotes) to show them that they already knew “there are many different ways and “places” of “running a business” (lines 270-273)

By asking Maria and Terisita *why* they did the business the way that they did, or *why* they imagined that they would do their business differently in the future, Melissa encouraged them to *think* about the *reasons* for different business practices, suggesting once again that the differences implied knowledge of the market, rather than as Maria and Terisita’s also suggested, access to material resources. Such an implication allowed Melissa to demonstrate why she could not give them her “ideas,” (because she did not

have the knowledge as they did) while justifying the thinking exercise (playing with the price line) that preceded and would follow Maria's interruption.

Although repeatedly responding to Maria and Terisita's description of their clothing business with the question "why," (lines 206,222) Melissa had only intended to show that they *knew* the market and the different places where business could be done, Maria and Terisita gave reasons that indicated that their problem was not a lack of knowing the market or understanding possibility, but rather a lack of material resources. The fact that they still didn't have the shop or the capital to purchase the large quantity of used clothes, however was not a part of the exercise, so it was not acknowledged or taken up in their "conversation."

For Maria and Terisita it should have been completely obvious why they sold clothes in the street, why they didn't have a banda, and why they sold clothes little by little rather than purchase full bails directly from the ships arriving from America. For Maria and Terisita, these details did not index different (innovative) ways of *doing business* which result from *knowing the market*; rather they demonstrated their material positions which limited their business flexibility. So when Melissa responded to their response with "why," for the third time, Maria and Terisita assumed that there must be something wrong and began to doubt their own understanding of her questions (lines 225-228). Were they not answering the question properly, and therefore prompting Melissa to ask again? Was she not understanding their responses, and wanted to know more? Unfamiliar with the purpose and practice of learning scenarios in which a facilitator asks questions to prompt thinking and self reflection, Maria and Terisita had assumed that Melissa had asked her questions because she genuinely wanted to know why they bought clothes little by little and sold them in the street; rather than as Melissa had intended- to show them how much they already knew about the market (which could be applied to their knowing the fuel market) by using their knowledge of the many different ways to run a clothing business. Only once she had given the punch line, "so you know the business of selling clothes, there are many different ways or running the business," did Maria and Terisita have any idea why Melissa had been asking so many questions, instead of answering their own.

6.2.4 Treatment #2: Re-calculating living costs. When Melissa and David once again had the floor, they returned to a discussion of the market by asking Maria and Terisita to consider their business' potential both in competition with other briquette businesses and with charcoal and firewood sellers. After describing again the benefits of the briquette and their skills in selling, Terisita said with confidence, "*nina uhakika briquette itananuliwa tu*," (I am sure the briquette will be sold; it can't be any other way.)

But David was unconvinced that the briquettes would sell or that Maria and Terisita had actually thought about the market before deciding. As David's boss explained in an interview:

"I'm just scared that if they're going to do briquettes, they've really thought about the market. Even if it's [the market] not there, its ok. But if they're doing it just because they were at a training, then that's scary."

In other words, Eco-Preneur was happy to bring and share new ideas but they absolutely did not want Maria and Terisita to accept their ideas just because *they* brought

them. Instead they expected Maria and Terisita to make their business decisions based on their own market assessments.

Using a practice commonly used by entrepreneurs to push their thinking and strengthen their innovation by playing devil’s advocate. David challenged Maria and Terisita to imagine how they would capture the market if their briquette cost more than *mkaa* or *kuni*. For him, this was an effort to create a “learning space” in which Maria and Terisita could consider the market, but Maria and Terisita did not realize that this was only a *changamoto* or challenge, and that Melissa and David were purposely creating barriers as part of a learning process to help them anticipate and develop strategies to overcome potential risks. Since they saw no reason for the briquettes to cost more than *mkaa*, they were surprised and confused by the suggestion that it would.

Even after David reminded them that they would have to buy a press and take the time to collect the materials, Maria and Terisita could not be convinced that the briquette could cost more. Comparing themselves to the charcoal makers, they explained that the game’s ground rules were wrong: “according to our experience, after purchasing only the press, there are no other expenses, but those who make charcoal have to continually purchase trees. But for us, the expense is only one [the machine].⁵⁷” They emphasized the minimal capital costs because, as any businesswoman with limited and inconsistent income would understand, that was the primary obstacle they faced.

David, however, sought to determine whether the business was sustainable and worth their efforts by thinking about the price of the briquette in terms of their labor, their time, and cost of living. To make these “other costs” visible and relevant to the lives and interests of Maria and Terisita, therefore, David created another scenario, which started with a question about their own daily living requirements. By knowing how much they needed to live on, and the average number of briquettes a group could typically produce in a day, David intended to show them how much they would need to sell each briquette, in order to earn at least enough to meet their daily living needs. With this exercise, he hoped to bring new meaning to the concept of “price,” which went beyond a simple calculation of input costs but rather considered the price in relation to their own personal material needs.

Excerpt 6-12

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
274	David	How much money do they	
275		need to make a day to live?	
276	Adam	ni kiasi gani cha pesa ambacho	what amount of money would
277		mnatakiwa mpate kwa siku ili	you need to get per day in order
278		kuishi? Natengeneza siku ile	to live?
279		kuishi	
280	Maria	kutengeneza maisha?	to make a (better) living
281	Adam	ehhh (1) yaani maisha ya	yeah, that is the ordinary life
282		kawaida	
283	Maria	Kwa siku ↓ Kwa ↑si:ku (.)	Maria: per day (.) per ↑day a
284		kwamba mtu (2) labda tusaidie	person (2) maybe help us here
285		hapo kwamba kwa siku mtu	that for a day a person would
286		unatakiwa utummie shilingi	be required to use how many
287		ngapi.	shillings

288	Adam	Aa ni kila mmoja, ni kila mmoja	oh, it's each person, that is=
289		yaani hii (.)=	
290	Terisita	anamatumizi	he has his expenses
291	Adam:	eh ana- unatoa wewe sasa (.)	Adam: yeah. He has- you take
292		kwa sababu unaweza kuangalia	you now (.) because you can
293		kama- kuassess kama wewe	see, for example- to assess if
294		unatumia shilingi kadhaa (1)	you use various amounts of
295		itakuwa hivi hivi hivi (.) maana	shillings (1) it will be this, this,
296		kama ukimuliza huyu huyu	this (.) which means that if you
297		anamatumizi tofauti., ↑Melissa	ask her, she has different
298		(.) anamatumizi tofauti (.) ↑mimi	expenses. Melissa has different
299		tofauti, ↑ David tofauti na wewe	expenses, me different, David
300		tofauti.	different, and you different
301	Maria	Lakini tunazumugumza	Maria: but we are talking that
302		karabiwa watanzania kama sina	nearly all the Tanzanians who
303		hela (.) matumizi yetu	don't have money (.) our
304		hayatapishana sana.	expenditures don't pass each
305			other much.
306	Adam:	Yata ↑pishana (2) mimi labda	they pass each other (2) me
307		nina watoto wengi (.) na wewe	maybe I have many children (.)
308		una watoto kidogo=	and you have few children
309	Maria	Aaha.	ohh
310	Adam	= yaani ni tofauti kwa hiyo	Adam: it's that it is different for
311		unaangalia unapo zungumzia	this you see when you talk
312		kwa siku (1) unazungumzia	about per day (.) you talk about
313		wewe kwa moja, yaani kuliza	yourself as one, which means,
314		nyumbani ↑kwako (.) na kiasi	to ask about your house (.) and
315		gani (.) unaweza kutumia kwa	what amount you can use per
316		siku.	day
317	Maria	Yaani kwa sababu sisi (1)	it's that because we (1) we use
318		tunatumia matumizi ya kawaida	ordinary expenses that (1), it's
319		ambayo (2) yaani- siyo kwamba	that- it's not that we don't need
320		hatuhitaji ya hela.	money.

Like his previous questions about Maria and Terisita's fuel spending habits, David's first question "how much money do they need to make to live on," (line 274) implied several assumptions about the way Maria and Terisita address their daily living needs. For while Maria and Terisita actively go out every morning "*kutengeneza maisha*," [to make their lives] (line 280), they often do not earn money for their efforts. When calculating "how much money they need to make a day to live," what counts as living? What counts as need? And according to whose standard of living should they make their calculations? Should they only account for the little money they "live on" presently? Their difficulties in first understanding the question and then their responses to David and Melissa illuminated the complexity and assumptions, which a simple answer in the form of a numerical figure failed to capture.

Although Adam clarified that they were talking about the life which Maria was familiar, "*maisha ya kawaida*," (line 281-282) the average life, Maria was still uncertain how to make the calculations. Assuming that Adam, a farmer from a nearby village lived a similar "average" life and therefore would have similar expenses, she turned to Adam for help: "*tusaidie hapo kwamba kwa siku mtu unatumie shilingi ngapi?*" [help us here, for one day, a person uses how many shillings?] (lines 284-287)

Maria's question did not simply indicate her need for Adam's help, but also indexed her membership among the majority of rural and urban people who express their material situation not in terms of its individual particularities, but according to their collective experience of "*maisha kawaida*," a "normal or common" life (lines 281-282). Membership in this collective experience finds expression through both linguistic and cultural practices, which have become particularly important sites of struggle. While indexing one's membership in the collective had particular value during the period of Tanzania's socialist project, *Ujamaa*, today in entrepreneurship trainings, these very same linguistic practices are contested, precisely because they emphasize the collective experience at the expense of making visible the "choices" and particularities of the individual.

In one training, for example, in response to his question, "why do you get up in the morning," the Tanzanian facilitator stopped participants mid-sentence every time they referred to the collective "we." When a participant responded with a common [socialist] phrase, "we get up in the morning, in order to make a better life," the facilitator exclaimed, "This is politics!" reminding participants that they were no longer living under the period of *Ujamaa* and that it was "time to change the mindset." Instead, the facilitator insisted that they reformulate and repeat their responses by replacing the collective "we" with an individual "I," in order to rid of what was commonly referred to in Tanzania as "*siasa*" or politics. For him phrases such as "*kutengeneza maisha*" (making a better life) or "*maisha bora*" or "good life," were empty slogans, recited by politicians to win the favor of their constituents during an election, but too vague to achieve or demand accountability. To counteract their collective responses, the facilitator taught students how to articulate concrete and measurable *individual* goals as a first step in realizing their *own* and unique "good life." He offered a formula, which participants could easily follow: "*ninaamka asabuhi kumudu gharama*" [I (*not we*) get up in the morning to be able to have **sufficient money**] to buy healthy food. As each student offered their own goal, participants repeated the formula in unison adding the newest contribution at the appropriate moment: "I get up in the morning *kumudu gharama* to: own a house, to pay school fees, to pay for medical treatments, to own machines, cars, bicycles, and to put away savings (many of which would have been considered basic needs under *Ujamaa*). It was within the contradictions between learning to speak one's own voice and assert individuality through personal goal setting on the one hand, and learning such mantras of individuality and neo-liberal practices through formulaic, collective, and rhythmic chanting on the other, that Tanzanians like Maria and Terisita were unlearning *Ujamaa*'s principles and learning to see themselves anew, not as part of *watu wa kawaida*, but rather as individuals who had a unique purpose when they got up each morning and clear action plan to make their goals reality.

Although Adam indexed a collective experience when he referred to their *maisha ya kawaida*, (lines 281-2) like the example above he instructed Maria "*kuassess*" [to assess] (293) her living expenses individually. Using English to signify the practice (*kuassess*) by which one would distinguish or assess his or herself further indexed the foreignness of the assessment practice. By pointing to each of us, Adam interpellated us as individuals as he explained, "if you asked her, she has different expenses, Melissa has different expenses, David has different expenses, and I have different expenses" (lines 295-300).

But while the comparison between each of our expenses, showed that we were in fact *different* from each other, Adam’s explanation offered little assistance to the predicament Maria faced in how to make the calculation so that it expressed the *meaning* of her own expenses. For how could she calculate, “how much money do you need to live on” when as she explained, “almost all Tanzanians *don’t have money* and our expenses don’t pass [don’t differ from] each other much?” And even though Adam explained that their expenses do pass (differ from) each other, “because maybe I have many children, and you have few children,” (lines 306-308) his explanation again constituted their individual subjectivities and differences, but did little to express the needs that remained after calculating one’s individual expenses. For as Maria explained, “we have *matumizi ya kawaida*,⁵⁸ or basic expenses, but its not that we don’t need money” (lines 318-320).

Terisita responded to David’s question differently. First she answered David’s question with a numerical value as David expected, saying that she “uses” five thousand shillings. However, she didn’t allow the number to speak for itself; rather she made visible the consequences and meaning of five thousand shillings for her life. First she itemized what she *can* buy with that money: *nimepata chakula* [I have gotten my food]; “*nunua mkaa*” [I buy charcoal]; “*chai asabuhi*” [morning tea (breakfast)] *na chakula cha mchana* [lunch]. And then continuing, explained what she *can’t* buy, naming precisely the very items, which she and Maria find Melissa, David and I using when we run into each other in town.

Excerpt 6-13

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
321	Terisita	Hapo hujasema naende	Terisita: here you don’t say I
322		kunywa juisi (.) mahali.	must go drink juice somewhere.
323	Adam	Hapo(.) hamna juisi.	Here [in this situation] (.) [there
324			is] no juice
325	Terisita	Uh uh	
326	Adam	No juice (.) no coka cola	

Without acknowledging what seemed to me like obvious references to our [Melissa, David, and my] luxurious drinking habits, Melissa shifted the focus back to the calculations by asking:

Excerpt 6-14

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
327	Melissa	kwa mtu moja?	for one person?
328	Maria	Kwa familia.	For the family
329	Adam	For the family	
330	David	That’s too high, that’s too high	
331	Adam	For the family she has	
332	Melissa	So is that for one person	
333	Adam	No it’s for six	

⁵⁸ In this case, by referring to her expenses as *kawaida* Maria indexes not only shared membership with the “common” Tanzanian, but also a status of basic sufficiency

As these figures would become the basis for calculating the cost of the briquette and the number of briquettes needed to produce and sell in a day, it was important for Melissa and David that the numbers realistically represented the daily living needs of an individual or family (or at least close approximations). Their questions were indicative of this objective. Maria and Terisita, in contrast, seeking to make claims on their *walezi*, used the questions as an opportunity to articulate the meaning and consequences of their limited income.

While Terisita showed us that with her 5000 shillings she could not afford to buy the luxury drinks so common to our American diet, prompted by Terisita's direction, Maria described her daily living costs in terms her struggles to meet basic needs:

Excerpt 6-15

Line#	Speaker	Utterance	Translation
334	Maria	Tuseme pale kwangu ni kama=	Let's say there at my place, it's
335			like
336	Terisita	=Elfu mbili na miatano.	Two thousand and five hundred
337	Maria	Elfu mbili na miatano	2500
338	Terisita	Ukinunua na mkaa?	and if you buy with charcoal?
339	Maria	Yaani kwa matumizi ya kawaida	It means [enough to pay for] the
340		kabisa.	the absolute basic needs
341	Adam	Yaani kawaida kabisa (1) moja.	Completely basic (1) is one
342			thousand shillings
343			[approximately eighty cents]
344	Melissa	elfu moja kwa wewe, siyo?	1000 for you [Maria], isn't it?
345	Maria	Lakini kwamba maana	but that's in a way in which
346		maahitaji sana haya matumizi	there are many [unsatisfied]
347		ya elfu moja=	needs, those expenses of 1000
	Adam,	Laughing	
	Maria,		
	Terisita		
348	Maria	ni kwa shida (2) Sio kwamba-	its with problems, yeah, its not
349		yaani nataka hela	that- it means I want money
350	Adam	Yaani ni kwasababu ↑hakuna	it's that it's because there isn't
351			any
352		Kwa sababu biashara yangu ni	Its because my business is
353		ndogo yaani tuna biashara	small, it means we have a
354		inayoniingizia chakula hela	business with small inputs. The
355		kubwa hiyo siwezi kutumia hela	cost of food is a lot of money (.)
356		kubwa wakati maingizo ni	I can't use a lot of money when
357		madogo, kwa hiyo nala hivyo	income is small, therefore I eat
358		kwa shida.	this way with problems (.) [I
359			have a hard time getting food.]
360	Adam	Analazimika (1) hakuna jinsi	She is forced [by her situation]
361			there isn't another way
362	Terisita	Bado haitoshi, nimejinyima	Still it's not enough (.) I deny
363			myself
364	Adam	She's using five thousand so if	
365		you just divide that by six	
366		people, its like 800 a day. For	
367		the family. For one people. Its	
368		not like she like that way, but	
369		only the circumstance.	
370	David	How many briquettes would you	

Although Adam just explained that each individual had unique living expenses and must make their calculating independently, by providing Maria a concrete figure (*elfu mbili mia tano* 2500 shillings) and prompting her with follow up questions (line 338), Terisita responded to Maria's request for help, giving her the opportunity to talk about her financial situation and avoid the potential shame that she may have experienced if she couldn't come up with the "right answer" independently. Terisita's intervention, exemplified the kinds of collective thinking and responding, which as I showed in the previous examples above, the entrepreneurial trainer and Adam tried to disrupt.

Also, Terisita could respond on Maria's behalf, because they did share similar material conditions. Considering that Maria lived alone with her daughter (unlike Terisita who had a family of six), Maria agreed with Terisita's suggestion that she used 2500 shillings a day. By asking, "if you buy with Mkaa [charcoal]?" (line 338) Terisita prompted Maria to give meaning to this number particularly *in relation* to David and Melissa's previous questions about how much they were willing to spend on fuel. With her response "by 2500 I mean the absolute basic needs," (lines 339-340) Maria not only told us that she couldn't afford *mkaa* but also began to illuminate the qualitative meaning, which would have otherwise been erased by a simple figure.

Focusing on answering Melissa and David's questions correctly, however, Adam contested Maria's numerical representation of basic needs reminding them that actually "absolute basic [needs] was 1000 [shillings]" (line 341). And as this amount sounded more accurate to Melissa, she turned to Maria to confirm: "one thousand for you no?"⁵⁹ (line 344) While Maria did likely *live* on one thousand shillings a day, this simple number, although accurate, failed to capture its meaning and consequences, and would hardly account for the dreams and hopes they set out with each day as they got up in the morning "*kutengeneza maisha*" [make a life]. As Maria explained, living with the expenses of one thousand shillings meant that she also had to live with many of her needs unsatisfied: For Maria, getting food was a problem, *ni kwa shida* (lines 357-9) and for Terisita she also "*jinyima*" (denies herself line 362). But they lived this way because "these are their circumstances" and "*hakuna jinsi*," there is no other way (line 369), explanations which contrasted sharply with the "choice" implied by David and Melissa's earlier question, "how much are you willing to spend."

Unwilling to engage with the *meaning and consequences* of living on one thousand or five thousand shillings a day, David took only the figure of five thousand from Adam's translation. He ignored, however, the parts of Adam's translation, which were not necessary for the next step of the calculation, namely Maria and Terisita's concerns ("it's not like she like that way, but only the circumstance") and continued.

⁵⁹ Melissa's words do more than just *confirm* the calculation. 1 thousand shillings, the rough equivalent to a dollar a day, carries meaning beyond the *individual* and *unique* calculations, which Melissa and David were seeking. As I described in the literature review, "Living on/under a dollar a day," indexes a category of poverty and people, "the bottom billion," that have been constituted through new poverty measurements and visibility characteristic of the global campaign to "Make Poverty History" (J. Sachs, 2005). Not unlike Maria and Terisita, who describe themselves as *watu wa kawaida*, this figure indexes their membership, rather than their individuality as part of the "bottom billion," or "those living on less than a dollar a day."

Using our six tea-cups to represent bags of briquettes, David asked Maria and Terisita to figure out how much they would need to sell the “bags of briquettes” in order to earn at least 5000 shillings. Without difficulty, Terisita responded that they would need to sell the bags for 2000 shillings, notably 500 shillings more than the cost of charcoal, thereby “making real” the possibility of David’s initial challenge (“what if the briquettes cost more than mkaa or kuni?”) With these “learner centered” calculations derived from the real life experiences of Maria and Terisita, David and Melissa move on- steering the conversation to a discussion of their customers and the particular characteristics of those who might be willing to pay more for these environmentally friendly, clean briquettes.

6.3 Discussion

This chapter explored Melissa and David’s efforts to “translate their [environmental entrepreneurial] focus,” and “apply their methodology” to create the conditions in which Maria and Terisita could assess the potential viability of a new briquette business. How did they each understand the purpose of their meetings in general and the meaning of learning in particular? How did they negotiate their differences? To what extent were Melissa and David’s methodology and focus able to engage with the “local” knowledge, orientations, and practices which Maria and Terisita brought to the table? And what kind of space of governmentality does a focus on the “local” create?

Since the participants used very different interpretive frameworks to make sense of what the others were saying, no one analytic framework will be sufficient to analyze the complexity of their interaction (a problem as germane for the participants as it was for me). By looking at this interaction through several different interpretive frameworks, therefore, a more complete and complex picture becomes possible.

On the one hand, an activity theory framework allows us to see how orienting towards two very different activities -- even within the same meeting -- would cause them to “misunderstand” each other: to the extent that their objectives presume different modes of knowledge and learning, they would constitute themselves according to the particular kinds of identities required by these objectives.

On the other hand, stepping back to focus on the *activity and places of engagement* they shared shows us that they were not simply misunderstanding each other, nor were they participating in separate and isolated activities. Instead, precisely *because* of their differing understandings of their practices, they *struggled with each other*, reacting to and intervening in the other’s practice.

In section one, I use activity theory as an analytical framework to explore the constitutive relationship between persons acting and the contexts with which they act. In section two, I will ask what the relationships are *between* particular practices that can contextualize the ways people act together. In section three, I will bring these perspectives together, not into synthesis but parallax. As Jean Lave usefully puts it, the problem is asking both

“How it is that people live in *history*,” and “how it is that people *live* in history”: Activity theory reflects the former, and with it the importance of the partially given character of an objectively structure world. Phenomenological views emphasize the latter

and with it the partially cogenerated character of a meaningful world” (Lave, 2011).

By using Paulo Freire’s “pedagogy of the oppressed,” I demonstrate the inaccuracy of describing Melissa and David’s interaction with Maria and Terisita as a “conversation.” Contrasting their conversation with a Friirian pedagogy allows me to show the extent to which Melissa and David were not really *listening*. Although they encouraged student-centered learning and emphasized local knowledge and practice, they also actively redirected Maria and Terisita’s contributions (especially those which emphasized their material conditions and inequalities) towards their own market-oriented objectives and visions of reality.

Yet Maria and Terisita were not directed in any simple way. They took advantage of opportunities to redirect the conversation towards their own objectives, and following James Ferguson’s interpretation of Foucauldian power, I demonstrate how each side “experimented with power” and negotiated with each other’s practices in pursuit of their respective objectives. Melissa and David used conversation as a technique to direct their interaction -- while downplaying their privilege to do so -- while Maria and Terisita used the spaces created by Melissa and David’s participatory techniques to shield their critiques and assert their agency.

6.3.1 Conflicting activity systems. Although each side came together for a “meeting,” and shared an interest in developing briquette businesses, they came to the meeting with different expectations, objectives, understandings of how to start a business, and understandings of the roles they would each play. These objectives were shaped by (and shaped) how they were situated in the contexts and economies in which they were each embedded; as activity theory emphasizes, the *agent*, *activity*, and *the world* are all mutually constitutive (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 33). In this sense, because Melissa and David were oriented towards a “knowledge economy,” they sought to “know the market” and to model for Maria and Terisita the process of using reflective questions to access market knowledge. By contrast, Maria and Terisita were oriented towards the imperatives of an industrial economy, and as they sought to make briquettes, they desired Melissa and David’s direction and material support in doing so.

As Gee puts it, “the business world...now sees knowledge as its primary value.”⁶⁰ And certainly Melissa and David considered knowledge to be the starting point for developing a profitable business. By “knowing the market” through reflecting on their own lives, they believed Maria and Terisita would be in a better position to create a business that would be sustainable long after Melissa and David left Tanzania. They assumed that if there was a market for briquettes, Maria and Terisita could invest their two hundred dollars from the Lobelia Foundation to find a way to run the business independently. And *without* a market, they reasoned, it made little sense to purchase a press or spend time and energy actually making briquettes. Emphasizing the market was

⁶⁰ “Contemporary globally competitive businesses don’t any longer really compete on the basis of their products or services per se. They compete rather on the basis of how much learning and knowledge they can use as leverage in order to expeditiously invent, produce, distribute, and market their goods and services as well as to innovatively vary and customize them.” (Gee, et al., 1996)

also a way to avoid providing resources and industrial knowledge to make products with no local market or sustainable infrastructure, a common failing among NGO's.⁶¹

Moreover, Melissa and David believed that the entrepreneur would find ways to mobilize the resources of others to achieve their entrepreneurial objectives.⁶² Obtaining material resources was therefore of secondary concern, and they avoided discussions of material needs. They believed that Maria and Terisita would be in a good position to attract investors if they knew the market, and that by “knowing” the investor and knowing how to represent themselves,⁶³ Maria and Terisita would be able to mobilize the material resources which *they* lacked, but which others could provide.

For these reasons, Melissa and David directed their questions towards knowing *why* and *how* briquettes could compete in the current market. They asked: “Why is it going to be a good business (excerpt 6-2); why would you choose to use the briquette rather than charcoal or firewood (excerpt 6-4); how much will the briquette sell for, and who will buy them? They actively redirected questions away from a focus on the production process or the qualities of the briquettes themselves, insisting on looking “beyond the machine, if you didn't care about the environment?” (Excerpt 6-4 line 29) to focus on what they considered the real concern, “pricing: Who will buy the briquettes and how much will they pay?” (excerpt 6-4, lines 58-61)

By contrast, Maria and Terisita thought the first step in starting a business was to find a useful commodity to sell and the resources to produce it. In their discussions, they emphasized the *use value* rather than the *market value* of briquettes (saying, for example, that “it can clean up our environment,” “it will conserve our environment” (excerpt 6-4, line 39-45) and directed their questions towards “how” to get the capital to make the briquettes (“how can we get the machine?” excerpt 3, line 21). They regarded the briquette production as part of an *mradi* (or project) aimed at creating socially useful commodities (rather than a competitive business), and they sought to gain profit by producing better commodities than their competitors, the firewood and mkaa sellers.

For Maria and Terisita, material concerns had to come first because, as they saw it, the market couldn't exist until the project was “born.” Since people in Mlimani had never even seen these briquettes, Maria and Terisita were uncertain whether or not they would be a useful alternative. Maria and Terisita also understood the “value” which the briquettes had in several important non-market terms. For one thing, since briquettes could be produced from agricultural residuals, paper, and other readily available “free” materials, growing forest restrictions and the potential for fuel scarcity gave the project a

⁶¹ In one NGO that I visited for example, I observed young women who had been trained and given materials to sew red sweaters. Yet while the shelves, stacked high with every size, displayed their accomplishments, the director complained that they had recently run out of red thread and were concerned that the NGO could not continue without additional donor support.

⁶² Howard Stevenson, a leading theorist of entrepreneurship at Harvard University demonstrated how entrepreneurs need not be limited by their current resources, by contrasting the resourcefulness of entrepreneurs with “administrators,” who allow their existing resources and job descriptions to constrain their visions and actions (J. G. Dees, 2001).

⁶³ Melissa and David often spoke of Kiva, an organization which uses the internet to facilitate “partnerships,” between entrepreneurs and investors. Kiva facilitates transactions between investors who provide loans to small scale entrepreneurs who improve their credit rating after successfully returning the loan. If in fact there was a market for briquettes, Melissa and David believed that Maria and Terisita could have accessed funds for start up capital through this project.

particular relevance. Second, starting a business affiliated with two different American environmental organizations (the briquette trainers and Eco-Preneur), an American foundation interested in empowering women (Lobelia), and the UNDP, represented a significant but unquantifiable kind of social capital. Maria and Terisita therefore came to the meeting seeking resources and direction to produce briquettes, precisely because these briquettes would be “good for the environment” and thus good for environmentally conscious donors.

6.3.1.1 Implications of different objectives: Learning, identities, and language.

These differences in focus and objectives had deep implications for how each side approached their interactions with each other, and how they approached and defined the problem of “learning through partnership.” Since Melissa and David regarded market knowledge as situated, constantly changing, and free-flowing, they believed that every partner had knowledge to share that would be useful in mastering the particular market in which they were situated. They therefore approached their conversation as an opportunity to learn from the unique perspectives gained from each participant’s diverse situated position, using linguistic tools to facilitate sharing knowledge and to prompt a process of critical and reflective thinking through which they could co-produce new knowledge.

For Maria and Terisita, however, knowledge was not free flowing, but was locked in the minds of the few who had the material resources (schooling, connections) to access it. They assumed Melissa and David were *wataluum*, or specialists, a kind of knowledge that structured their relationship as hierarchical. They assumed that since Melissa and David had come from America to help them, they would transfer knowledge to them on how to start a business and would provide them with the material resources to do so. They approached their conversation as *walengwa* (beneficiaries), seeking to following the direction and answering the questions of their *walezi* (beneficiaries).

Melissa and David’s beliefs about knowledge and learning. “Knowing the market” required careful thinking and reflection about current conditions and customer interests, and Melissa and David knew little about the local fuel market or the daily fuel consumption practices and needs of potential customers. As a result, they did not know (and could not know independently) the knowledge they sought to steer Maria and Teresita towards learning: if briquettes would sell in Mlimani, and if so, how best to market them. They saw Maria and Terisita -- as familiar with local fuel consumption practices and fuel markets -- as in the best position to figure out what these briquettes had to offer their potential customers that would pull them away from the familiar alternatives.

In this sense, Maria and Terisita were to be *equal partners* in the quest for market knowledge. Through critical dialogue an entrepreneur could strengthen their business plan by hearing new and diverse ideas and responding to the critical questions and feedback of others. And while Melissa and David had this learning *methodology* to offer, they believed that Maria and Teresita would have to be the ones to put it into practice: because of their experiences in Mlimani, Maria and Terisita could provide the provocative questions and ideas through which to further interrogate and strengthen their own business plan.

Reflection was at the core of their methodology, so Melissa and David’s questions focused on *thoughts*. Melissa and David used questions to prompt reflection and deeper critical thinking, the real goal of the learning process: in asking about Maria and

Terisita's fuel consumption, daily expenses, or living needs, Melissa and David were trying to show them how they could make use of their calculations as resources to *think* with. They posed hypothetical problems and scenarios in which Maria and Terisita could use current information and ideas to consider future possibilities. When David asked what would happen if the briquettes cost more than charcoal or firewood, for example, he was not asking about a real situation, nor did he need the answer for his own use; creating hypothetical barriers was to force them to think through their plan more carefully.

Maria and Terisita's beliefs about knowledge and learning. Maria and Terisita, on the other hand, expected more direct help from development practitioners like Melissa and David. They weren't sure why they had been invited to the meeting or what Melissa and David would provide, but as they received direction and support in the past, they arrived ready to show themselves to be worthy of more support. By comparing themselves to village groups who had been given a briquette press,⁶⁴ Maria and Terisita sought to remind Melissa of her previous offer to "help."

For this reason, they did *not* see Melissa and David as equal partners, but as *wataalum*, whose knowledge gets its value from its exclusivity. They did not see knowledge as constantly changing, but saw the knowledge of an *mtaalum* as a static commodity shared, inconsistently, only with those who acquired valuable access. And so they expected that Melissa and David would (and could) give them this -- materially understood -- expertise to help them start a business and that they had been invited to this meeting for that purpose.

Different objectives, different strategic tools. Each side used language as a tool to achieve their respective objectives. Although Melissa and David used questions to prompt thinking and reflection, Maria and Terisita assumed that Melissa and David genuinely wanted to know the answers. Maria and Terisita read Melissa and David's questions in the context of the very development interaction which Melissa and David used their questions to avoid. Since practitioners typically ask *walengwa* questions about local conditions in order to know best who and how to help, Maria and Terisita answered Melissa and David by illuminating their hardships and inferring ways that Melissa and David could help.

Maria and Terisita did not understand the practice of using questions to prompt deeper and more critical thinking. They did not understand that because Melissa and David were not seeking "correct" answers, they regarded moments of "not knowing" and "struggle" as productive and necessary to ultimately achieve better solutions. And because Maria and Terisita were trying to answer Melissa and David's questions correctly -- to show themselves as worthy of support -- they experienced "not knowing" negatively, as a failure. Especially with the Ujamaa's legacy and emphasis on equality, Melissa and David's problem-positing questions could seem to force an uneducated person to show their educational inadequacies. Anticipating this problem, therefore, Adam worked hard to rearrange Melissa and David's questions so that Maria and Terisita would not be put in this compromised position.

⁶⁴ Although Eco-Preneur's funding did not pay for the briquette presses given to the village groups, (this was paid for by UNDP), Maria and Terisita were right in perceiving that the presses had been given to the villagers by another international development organization.

At the same time, Maria and Terisita read Melissa and David's refusal to answer their own questions as a disinclination to share knowledge-resources. After two additional meetings in which Melissa and David evaded Maria and Terisita's questions (not unlike excerpt 3), Maria and Terisita gave up and explained to me that they saw this as "*tabia mbaya*" (rude behavior) and "*ucoloni*" (colonial ways), characteristics of the class of "business people" who had, during Ujamaa, been the subjects of great moral censure:

"they only want our ideas, but if you ask them a question, they don't answer. We have seen that we should not follow them about our idea about whether we should buy a machine and make briquettes. Because if we wait for them to give their answer, when they came to do their own research- as she explained the other day, she wants to do her own business.⁶⁵ So they came for their own purposes.... We are helping her with her work and therefore now, she doesn't help us....they are business people. In each thing, they plan for their own benefit. They came here to benefit themselves."

Continuing to probe, I asked, "How do they benefit? And Maria and Terisita responded by stating what they considered obvious, "ideas!"

Melissa and David regarded themselves as (social) entrepreneurs and wished only to conduct meetings with individuals who could engage with them in mutually beneficial partnership. They needed some of the information that Maria and Terisita were providing, but they certainly had no interest in using Maria and Terisita's information selfishly. They hoped their questions would help Maria and Terisita in the immediate situation as well as provide tools which could be applied in new contexts and future situations. Yet because Maria and Terisita didn't know what to do with the questions, it appeared to David and Melissa as if they couldn't or didn't want to be self-reliant, that they were dependent and couldn't think for themselves.

In short, because they were situated within different kinds of material economies, they had different objectives, engaged in different practices to achieve those objectives, identified themselves and each other as "different kinds of people" (Gee, 2002, 2005), and used language differently to manage these differences.

6.3.2 Different activity systems in struggle.

6.3.2.1 Participatory practices as techniques of control. While it may seem as if each side was simply misunderstanding each other, they were still engaged with each other, and still in dialogue. Even if it was with someone they didn't understand, they *were* still in a kind of conversation. So how can we describe how they were engaged?

⁶⁵ At the end of the following meeting, Melissa thanked them for sharing, and told them that she had learned so much from them. She was not planning to do a briquette business, but rather likely wanted to emphasize her recognition of their contributions. Nevertheless Maria and Terisita took this to mean that she too was starting a briquette business or some other comparable business for which she would need the information they provided her.

Melissa for example, described their interaction as a conversation:

“we can't provide answers to people, only ideas, and it needs to be a two-way street with ideas, particularly when you have those strange relationships...So I guess for me the meetings are a way to get that exchange of ideas going. I will never fully understand what situation people here are in, so I can't provide answers, only ideas. If I try to provide answers without a full understanding, I am contributing to creating an unsustainable business, especially because it is not my business to continue working with.

Although they had never heard of Paulo Freire, Eco-Preneur's methodology shared some of the same vocabulary and constructivist learning practices as those associated with Freirian pedagogy: it sought to overcome “strange relationships” (by which Melissa means relationships of inequality and histories of colonialism) and used dialogue to arrive at new understandings of the world. But the differences are more important. Placing Melissa and David's “conversation” within a Freirian framework demonstrates how -- despite framing their interactions as a “conversation” and specifically articulating an interest in listening to and learning from Maria and Terisita -- Melissa and David did *not* engage with Maria and Terisita's concerns and interpretations.

In a Freirian pedagogy, the facilitator encourages the expression of local narratives for the purpose of examining the material world [problem posing] more deeply. In contrast, Melissa and David often ignored Maria and Terisita's narratives, considering them off point and tangential to the “real” work they believe they shared. Instead of encouraging Maria and Terisita to describe and engage in the world they knew, Melissa and David defined that world for them, repositioning them and their practices towards *their* knowledge based economy and market-based reality. When they asked questions about Maria and Terisita's everyday practices, they sought only decontextualized bits of information which could be re-applied as data to *their* own activities-- “knowing the market” and “playing with the price line.” They had little interest in the fuller context from which Maria and Terisita were pulling their information. And rather than providing problem-posing questions which would encourage Maria and Terisita to “read their world” in terms which reflected their own experiences, Melissa and David re-presented their world as the kind of knowledge economy they sought to bring into being.

In excerpt one, Melissa introduced the meeting as a “conversation, but did not imply that both sides could negotiate that conversation's focus, directing the meeting towards “knowing about the fuel market” and “how different fuels were used in the home.” She never said explicitly that Maria and Terisita couldn't bring up their own topics of interest, but it became clear that only responses and questions which fit that focus could be entertained. Explicit discipline was rarely necessary, since implicit direction produced precisely the framework they were expecting to find, and did. When Maria and Terisita strayed from Melissa and David's intentions (“we like these briquettes because they protect our environment”), Melissa and David asked new questions to redirect the conversation and repositioning their relationship to the world (“if you don't care about the environment, how much would people be willing to pay, and who is going to buy them?”).

In excerpt 6, Melissa and David sought to treat the problem, which they saw to be Maria and Terisita's misunderstanding, their inappropriate responses to the open-ended questions. While a Freirian approach would explore Maria and Terisita's responses -- so as to understand the conditions which gave shape and meaning to their orientation, Melissa and David asked "how much do you spend on fuel?" which implied assumptions about budgeting which Maria and Terisita did not share (but were expected to). This question directed Maria and Terisita to consider their fuel consumption practices in new ways: while Maria and Terisita were familiar with creative ways of making fuel last longer and of any number of structuring contingencies (stove type, weather, number of guests, type of cooking), Melissa and David's calculations required these practices to be translated into the kind of market data that could inform business choices.

While Freire argued that one must read the world -- know the conditions and relationships out of which lives are constructed -- in order to then *transform* that world, Melissa sought in excerpt 11 to redirect Maria and Terisita away from their specific situation to a more "general" scenario, one in which she could show them that they already had everything they needed. By asking Maria and Terisita questions about *why* they sell clothes in the street, she intended to create a problem-posing scenario in which Maria and Terisita could realize that their material conditions were actually opportunities to capture a different market, re-orienting their relation to their business as determined by *choices* rather than material necessities. She encouraged them to *think* and *imagine* possibilities in the future, but rather than discuss the impossible (because they did not at this time have the resources for such possibility) in his translation, Adam had to bring the possibility and *choice* into the realm of time, "when the time arrives that you have the material resources, what will you do with them?" For Maria and Terisita, the purpose of such dreaming was not clear, nor did it derive from the kind of increased understanding of present conditions (reading the world) which Freire argued was necessary for transformation and eventually liberation.

In excerpt 12, Melissa and David asked Maria and Terisita to calculate "how much they need to live on," to represent in a single number all of their experience as individuals with individual circumstances and differences (such as how many children they each had). For Maria and Terisita, however, such a question could not be answered with a single number, and so they described their current conditions in terms which highlighted 1) their *collective* experience (in relation to "the majority of Tanzanians who don't have money") 2) the *implications* of having so little money ("no juice or coca cola" "my needs are unsatisfied needs, it's with problems", "I eat with problems," "it's not enough. I deny myself" and 3) *the reasons for their limited living expenses* (it's because there isn't any [money], it's because my business is small and the cost of food is a lot of money, she is forced, there isn't another way).

A Freirian pedagogy would have encouraged exactly such a response, and would use Maria and Terisita's description of their material conditions as generative themes for a problem-posing curriculum. Their reference to coca cola and juice, for example (drinks which only the rich could afford), could have ignited discussions about inequality, while their articulation of *collective* poverty might have suggested collective strategies for social transformation.

Melissa and David asked Maria and Terisita to read their world for different purposes. To conduct a cost benefit analysis would require them to understand their own

living expenses in relation to the fuel market. They were not concerned and would not engage with Maria and Terisita's description of poverty or inequality, experiential realities which a single number representing "living expenses" made invisible.

At the heart of this difference was the problem of power. Both Paulo Freire and Julius Nyerere understood education as a process of understanding the world's relations of power as a way of changing them. They therefore emphasized systems of oppression and inequality, using local examples as a means of dialoguing about what people *already* know about their material conditions. Local examples were the texts through which taken for granted assumptions about the world (its inequalities, and one's position within it) could be defamiliarized and made visible. Only by exposing and "reflecting" on material conditions and power relations, they argued, would it be possible to know how to change these relations.

In many ways, Melissa and David shared this approach; they were working to spur reflection on local conditions so that individuals could change their mindsets. But rather transform the system; they sought to adapt their partners *to* this system. And in doing so, they sought to de-emphasize *power* and *hierarchy* as a problem to be overcome, beginning with an assertion of equality to effectively foreclose the question before it began. As David explained, the knowledge economy was less interested in status and power: successful entrepreneurs depend on their minds and creativity to develop new ideas and mobilize missing capital and knowledge. This meant, he asserted, that anybody, regardless of age, class, or gender could be an entrepreneur. And as Tanzania's development visions also made clear, poverty and inequality has been articulated as a consequence of inappropriate skills and mindsets therefore articulating a vision of transforming (disciplining) the individual (rather than unequal conditions), so that they can successfully compete, (rather than transform) a market-based economy. Melissa and David's participatory questions and learning communities were intended to give *access* to the new skills, values, knowledge and mindsets, considered necessary to compete in a global knowledge economy.

The obstacle, as they saw it, was the way that individuals perceived themselves (they needed to feel empowered and recognize in order to capitalize on their strengths) and the way they were thinking and reading the market. Change was thereby located inside the Tanzanians who were to be changed by new ways of knowing and seeing, not the global and national policies which privileged the market. If only the individuals were competent in reading the market, they could make different choices, and expect that the market will work. The point was not to change the material conditions, which created the unequal relationships, but to create new individuals who could remake themselves in relation to the market.

By making the condition of participation an orientation to the market, participants were necessarily de-politicized, as James Ferguson has argued. "[R]eposing political questions" in technical terms is an intervention with far reaching effects, an exclusion (of certain political questions) that both limits and shapes what improvement becomes or could be (Ferguson, 1994). Assumptions based on a particular understanding of knowledge and learning prevented them from seeing Maria and Terisita, their world, or that Maria and Terisita weren't sharing their frame. The bottom line was that they wanted to work with those who are in their world, not those who are not.

6.3.2.2: *Experimenting with power.* Although reposing political questions in technical terms is an intervention of power as Li reminds us, it is nevertheless true that political questions do not just go away: misrepresentations inspire new forms of political agency which, in turn, require new tactics to contain (Li, 2007). While Melissa and David's entrepreneurial discourses and participatory practices worked to direct the meeting and encourage Maria and Terisita to read the world in a particular new way, they ultimately failed to discipline Maria and Terisita. What are we to make of this fact?

For one thing, Melissa and David might have controlled the meeting, but it is important to also see how each side was experimenting with the challenges (and opportunities) presented by the other. Melissa and David did genuinely want to have a conversation and while they worked to make that happen, they were likely unaware of many of the ways in which they were directing Maria and Terisita. And their use of participatory practices to control conversation should be understood, in part, as a response to Maria and Terisita's refusal to accept Melissa and David's terms.

At the same time, while Maria and Terisita continued to constitute Melissa and David as powerful experts, they also worked to employ the partnership spaces which were "opened up" by Melissa and David. In response to an open-ended question, "what are you thinking about the business?" for example, Maria and Terisita packaged their response about their thoughts with concerns about how to get a machine. Maria and Terisita's questions about material concerns posed challenges to Melissa and David, for whom asking further questions could then become a strategy to avoid these political questions.

While Melissa and David tended to render poverty invisible, Maria and Terisita's refusal to think "abstractly" was not simply their limitation to their material worlds, but an effort to subvert these exercises and re-represent the realities of poverty which determined their minimal living expenses. And by describing their living conditions in terms of the drinks which they could not afford -- but saw Melissa and David drinking -- they not only illuminated their conditions of poverty, but also re-narrated the relations of inequality which Melissa and David sought to use abstractions to render invisible.

In this sense, Maria and Terisita did experiment with power and contested the practices of Melissa and David. Unfortunately they were unsuccessful in changing Melissa and David any more than Melissa and David were changed by them. They were unable to develop a new practice in which they could engage towards shared objectives. Maria and Terisita's agency and display of creativity in working within and subverting new forms of control, in fact, directly resulted in Melissa and David realizing that they were not entrepreneurial and therefore not the right partners to invest their time. Maria and Terisita also decided they should not waste their time following Melissa and David when they had nothing to share with them. At this point, they also believed that Melissa and David were actually business people who were asking them so many questions because they intended to steal their ideas.

How should we read this coming together to build capacity of the "right kind of people," and leaving behind those who just don't get it? This is the subject of the following conclusion chapter.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Returning to the Research Problematic and Questions

My study of entrepreneurial capacity building through education as a solution to poverty and global marginalization among poor Tanzanians was framed by debates in international development. On the one hand, some perspectives in development and business see entrepreneurial approaches to economic and social development as empowering, providing the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to successfully compete in the global marketplace (Prahalad, 2006; Tanzania, 1997; United Republic of Tanzania, 2005a; World Bank, 2004). In place of patronage systems and top-down development schemes, teaching a new “entrepreneurial mindset” allowed subjects to draw on their particular knowledge of local resources and needs, partner with others to provide missing capital, information, and technology, and to be uniquely well-positioned to realize untapped business opportunities (Prahalad, 2006) and to develop innovative approaches to their own social problems (Bornstein & Davis, 2010b; G. Dees, 2003; J. G. Dees, 2001). In sharp contrast, other scholars have argued that entrepreneurial approaches to development represent a new form of imperialism. Rather than empowering the poor, they argue that education aimed at building entrepreneurial capacities only imposes capitalist ideologies and practices, aiming thereby to produce entrepreneurial subjects who will serve, rather than contest, new forms of global neo-liberal governance (Fernando, 2006; Rankin, 2001; Tikly, 2004; Weber, 2006b)

Since both approaches tend to frame power as monolithic, I follow the work of Foucauldian scholars like Briggs and Ferguson in finding it more useful to examine how these efforts actually play out in practice. By considering efforts to build entrepreneurial capacity a *dispositif* of power -- an ensemble made up of *heterogeneous* and even contradictory elements that acts on and emerges through the actions of a *multitude* of subjects -- I leave open the possibility that elements of the discourses and practices associated with building entrepreneurial practice could be negotiated and redirected towards new ends (Brigg, 2006, p. 68). By examining how real actors *made use of* the discourses and practices of partnership and entrepreneurial learning -- rather than passively being subject to them -- I sought to consider the ways in which neo-liberal power could potentially be improved upon, experimented with, and redeployed towards more liberatory ends (J. Ferguson, 2008).

Eco-Preneur offered a promising case study, since their objectives and practices seemed to adhere to Ferguson’s notion that power should be experimented with rather than simply rejected. They hoped to use the market to circumvent traditional hierarchies and government bureaucracies, thereby providing more innovative, efficient, cost-effective, and locally responsive solutions to environmental and social problems. Building partnerships between local community members with mutual interests and shared goals, they believed such “win-win” partnership had the potential to involve new kinds of people (particularly women, youth, non-elite actors) who not only represented different constituents, but also brought new and valuable ideas. Finally, they recognized the importance of learning and personal growth as a way of encouraging collaboration among diverse community members rather than privileging those of a few.

In practice, however, this study demonstrated ways in which Eco-Preneur were not as effective at experimenting with neo-liberal power as they may have intended; by failing to recognize and address as such the existence of power disparities and hierarchies (in which they were often complexly enmeshed), Eco-Preneur was, in some cases, unintentionally working in its service. On the other hand, each of the MEEP members -- in their own particular ways -- *did* experiment with neo-liberal forms of power, using entrepreneurial discourses and practices, the spaces of partnership, and the informal learning practices, which were brought by Melissa and David. Yet they often did so *not* in the ways that Eco-Preneur initially intended: instead of building their environmental and social entrepreneurial capacity, they sought to make claims on Melissa and David, who belonged to a powerful development interest with direct potential to provide the resources they needed to start a new business.

As I will describe, my data seems to at least qualify Ferguson's optimism that experimenting with neo-liberal power could produce alternate outcomes. Still, the possibility remains that MEEP partners will make use of their seeds in new ways. Eco-Preneur's practices did present significant challenges to local hierarchies, and while they required -- and in some cases, helped establish -- new forms of control to maintain the status quo, the openings they created for members to form new kinds of solidarities with each other is impossible to summarize or foreclose.⁶⁶ I observed only the initial seed "planting"; how the seed grows, who picks it up and uses it for what purpose, requires further research. More importantly, by exploring some of the ways an experiment with power *failed* to produce the kinds of results Ferguson champions, I seek to explore the kinds of power logics that such an optimistic program would need to account for.

At the start, it was not clear why the collaboration would fail. As I described in chapter four, Eco-Preneur and Maria and Terisita saw the potential for collaboration with each other as a "win-win partnership": Eco-Preneur sought to work in partnership with diverse stakeholders and Maria and Terisita shared an interest in developing new environmental businesses. Despite their many socio-cultural, historical, and linguistic differences, and their initial difficulties in getting to and starting their first meeting, they had a topic that brought them together: money which was given by Lobelia. And after receiving briquette training together, their shared interest in alternative fuel briquettes seemed to put them on the same team, with different kinds of knowledge and experiences to offer each other. Nevertheless, after four long meetings, and a directive from their boss, Melisa and David put aside their hopefulness in Maria and Terisita and left in search of better partners: by working with *real* entrepreneurs, they said, they would have a chance of "flipping" the market so that green businesses could hire people like Maria and Terisita. A vibrant green economy, they believed, would provide better economic opportunities (and environmental solutions) for both Maria and Terisita and for the vast majority of Mlimani residents.

⁶⁶ Just as I was leaving the research site, one MEEP member began organizing a new community partnership in response to critiques that MEEP was not run transparently and had been dominated by a coordinating committee, which used the MEEP to serve their own interests. This new community partnership would require people to pay membership dues, rather than pay people to participate in MEEP organized activities. Several MEEP members, particularly those who benefited least from the MEEP partnership, left MEEP to join this new partnership. Eco-Preneur was excited about these efforts, and offered to continue writing grant proposals on behalf of this new leader.

Maria and Terisita left these meetings dissatisfied. They felt they had wasted their time and were insulted that while Melissa and David wanted to meet with them, they would never answer their questions. In the end, they decided that Melissa and David had no intentions of helping them, and described them as “business people” and “*wacoloni*” who were “stealing their knowledge about local experiences in order to develop their own green businesses.”

Neither interpretation is correct. Melissa and David *did* want Maria and Terisita to succeed in business and did not intend to use Maria and Terisita’s answers to serve their own purposes: they saw their questions as tools to help Maria and Terisita assess the potential of the briquette business. And while Maria and Terisita may not have been the right people to spread green technologies, Melissa and David’s care in avoiding explicit authority over the meeting – along with a reluctance to learn from and respect Maria and Terisita’s contributions – meant that they failed to communicate their intentions or perceive Maria and Terisita’s complaints. Furthermore, because Eco-Preneur prioritized widespread and scalable impact, they were reluctant to dialogue with Maria and Terisita about their immediate material conditions, which effectively shut off avenues through which they may have been able to arrive at common understandings from which to begin experimenting with power, and the Mlimani fuel market in particular together.

Their failure to find mutually beneficial ways of collaborating is more complicated than either side understood, but also much more revealing: in many ways, failure demonstrates the implied problems more completely than a success – in which problems were overcome or did not obtain – ever could.

This study began with three interrelated questions:

1. How do Tanzanian and American “partners” representing different social and economic classes understand, make sense of, and negotiate differing conceptions of partnership?
 - a. For what purpose do they employ and or contest a discourse of partnership?
 - b. How are discourses of partnerships expressed and contested linguistically?
2. How do Tanzanian and American “partners” representing different social and economic classes understand, make sense of, and negotiate entrepreneurial discourses?
3. How do poor Tanzanian women and middle class American development practitioners understand, make sense of, and negotiate entrepreneurial learning spaces and participatory practices?
 - a. What are entrepreneurial learning spaces and how are they constructed discursively?
 - b. How and for what purpose are participatory educational practices used and manipulated? How do participatory learning practices facilitate access or create barriers to entrepreneurial behaviors, attitudes, practices?

7.1.1 How do Tanzanian and American “partners” make sense of and negotiate their different conceptions of partnership? As I explained in the literature review, “working in partnership,” with “local” and marginalized communities” has become one of the most popular discourses within Millennial Development. On the one

hand, “partnership” is a global discourse: corporations like Benetton use it to define themselves as “global citizens” through their relationships with African entrepreneurs and international development organizations and practitioners such as Melissa and David use it to characterize a shift in thinking and practice from earlier development initiatives. But a discourse of partnership has also been employed by the Tanzanians themselves, drafted into national development vision statements, and used as the measure of accountability by which new development projects are designed and assessed. In Mlimani, local development practitioners described their own work in interviews and written proposals in terms of the “partnerships” they were forging with local schools, local village government leaders, unemployed youth, and women’s groups, emphasizing the different yet no less valuable knowledge and skills each group brings to the problem solving equation, and as I describe in the introduction, participants in entrepreneurial trainings were directed to call each other and the facilitator “mapatna.”

Although the discourse of partnership was commonly accepted and had positive connotations among all practitioners, in practice, it presented new challenges to the status quo and became a site of struggle. In chapter four, I brought into focus the structural relations and material inequalities between the Americans and Tanzanians (and even between the Tanzanians themselves) to make visible the ways the discourse of partnership became a tool to actively negotiate and contest relationships (see also (Kramsch & Boner, 2010).

By initiating a community-wide environmental enterprise partnership (MEEP), Eco-Preneur had initially hoped that they could work collaboratively with diverse stakeholders representing different sectors of the Mlimani community. For an entrepreneur, they argued, working in partnership has the potential to increase access to knowledge, resources, and networks, and Eco-Preneur believed that by bringing different stakeholders from the Mliamani community together would put them in a better position to develop innovative green business products and solutions that would be responsive to complex community problems. Although MEEP members also spoke enthusiastically about working in partnership -- describing their “novel development arrangement,” which included partners as varied as “international partners” like Eco-Preneur and “vulnerable populations” like Maria and Terisita – the partnership simply could not overcome the latent power structures which popular entrepreneurial discourses tended, rather, to render invisible.

According to current developmental funding priorities, collaboration among diverse stakeholders and efforts to increase the participation of marginalized groups are important objectives. Global development experts, local communities, and Tanzanians have little choice but to take this discourse and practice seriously. In other words, the discourse of partnership is a “valued commodity” itself (Blommaert, 2010; Heller, 2010), and is used as a resource to attract investment within a well-funded development marketplace. Yet while organizing as a “partnership” may function as a means of raising funds, it may not necessarily mean that they have consented to new forms of neo-liberal power. As this case showed, in fact, elite partners “experimented” with neo-liberal power themselves, using discourses of partnership to represent themselves in advantageous ways even while maintaining their status and authority within the partnership.

As I explained in Chapter five, Maria and Terisita’s position in the partnership illuminated several contradictions hidden behind a discourse of partnership. On the one

hand, their presence -- as representatives of “vulnerable populations” -- contributed to the partnership’s legitimacy. Yet their participation was limited by the very factors that made them “vulnerable.” They were given critical roles as signatories, and were paid generously for signing checks, but unlike other MEEP members, they were never given the chance to represent the partnership by traveling to workshops or visiting environmental projects in other towns. Because they didn’t speak English or have access to phone or email, they were dependent on MEEP members to translate and share information with them, which was often inconsistent and questionable.

While traditional hierarchies continued to operate within the MEEP partnership, however, a discourse of partnership did give them access to a seat at the table, affording Maria and Terisita opportunities that they otherwise would have been excluded from. These opportunities are not inconsiderable. They attended MEEP meetings and trainings, which gave them access to learning opportunities and valued development discourses and practices; they had the opportunity to meet visiting American donors, such as Lobelia, which provided their Women’s group a two hundred dollar grant; and as “partners,” they had more legitimate access to Eco-Preneur, who would likely not have made time for meeting with former beneficiaries.

More importantly, the situation was not a given: Maria and Terisita worked to exploit the contradictions within the systems of power that were created by the discourse of partnership. First, when I came to interview them about the partnership, they asked me to set up and translate a meeting for them with Melissa and David, since – as their “partners” – Melissa and David had to take them seriously. Second, speaking through an outsider allowed them to speak more freely than they could have if they had needed to depend on another MEEP member for translation. Because Maria and Terisita suddenly had the means to expose the inequitable practices of MEEP to Melissa and David, several MEEP members became concerned and asked to be interviewed so that they could tell their side of the story. But even though Maria and Terisita’s alliance with Melissa and David did seem to make some MEEP members uncomfortable, Maria and Terisita still needed MEEP and showed their allegiance to MEEP, by negotiating conflicts on their behalf with Melissa and David.

Partnership was not given in practice. Although Maria and Terisita made use of a discourse of partnership to gain access to a relationship and with Melissa and David, they also contested the principals of equality and independence, which Melissa and David’s use of “partnership” implied. By describing how Eco-Preneur “gave birth” to their women’s group and reminding Melissa and David about Eco-Preneur’s previous offers to help them, they worked to re-construe the beneficial aspects of a hierarchical relationship, contrasting sharply with Melissa and David’s metaphor “spreading seeds” which sought to place the responsibility for growth on the one who chooses to pick up the seed, rather than the one who delivers the seed. While Eco-Preneur searched for “partners” who could pick up their seeds and make innovative changes independently according to their own needs and desires, Maria and Terisita picked up the seed of “partnership” and made innovative changes in its meaning according to their own desires for assistance.

At the core of this dispute, then, was the question of connection, responsibility, and inequality (J. Ferguson, 2006), and this dispute was negotiated linguistically. Maria and Terisita highlighted inequality in ways that placed a parental responsibility on the Americans to address this inequality. They built a connection with Melissa and David by

showing affiliation with their goals, reminding them of their shared history, answering questions in ways that demonstrated their needs and worthiness. Their communicative practices also indexed their *walengwa* status in refusing to explicitly assert themselves, yet they also employed the translator to raise the kinds of questions they hoped and expected to be asked (but could not ask directly). In response, Melissa and David sought to avoid questions of inequality by placing the responsibility on Maria and Terisita to find solutions to material needs through careful entrepreneurial thinking and personal choices. Their use of entrepreneurial discourses and informal learning practices assisted them in contesting the version of “partnership” which Maria and Terisita preferred.

If “partnership” is a discourse of governance, it also implies and reveals the counter-tactics which contested that order of governmentality. Even as Melissa and David sought to impose one definition of “partnership” on their partners, that interpellation as partners gave Maria and Terisita the speaking position from which to contest and re-negotiate a new definition of the relationship. Moreover, since Melissa and David lost legitimacy every time they showed their power, they were constrained in how they could respond.

Just as language was the means of re-negotiating the meaning the “partnership” for Maria and Terisita, however, it was also the means used by Melissa and David to re-establish order. As critical development theorists show, governing in a way that seems “natural” allows many schemes to appear not as an external imposition but as the natural expression of everyday interactions of individuals or groups (Brigg, 2006; Escobar, 1995; Li, 2007). Through their use of entrepreneurial discourses and participatory learning practices, Melissa and David continued to challenge Maria and Terisita’s claims and reestablish an entrepreneurial order.

7.1.2 Money and entrepreneurial discourse. The entrepreneurial discourse used by Melissa and David to talk about money also served to obscure the power relations which money indexed. At the same time, talking about money – and contesting the terms of that conversation – were a way for Maria and Terisita to re-assert those very relationships.

In chapter five, I showed how each side used money to manage their relationship. For Maria and Terisita, a discussion of the specific money given by Lobelia to Saccos allowed them to emphasize their concrete ties to Eco-Preneur, making visible Eco-Preneur’s role in directing Lobelia to Saccos in the first place. Precisely because the exchange of money between Lobelia and Saccos expressed a relationship in which Eco-Preneur was implicated, a discussion of concrete money challenged Melissa and David’s efforts to remain distant and independent.

By reconstituting money, which embodied histories and connections, as money that came with “no strings attached,” however, Melissa was able to engage responsively to their partners’ legitimate question about the origin and conditions for using the money while erasing Eco-Preneur from the “strings” through which money actually traveled. Explaining the general and technical meaning of “no-strings attached” allowed Melissa to move the discussion to more general properties of disembedded money and demonstrate the entrepreneurial practices and philosophies of disembedded money. But because in her “general” discussion of disembedded capital, Melissa made clear that “outside money” should not be brought into their independently generated savings, Maria and Terisita (having done exactly that) needed to use “abstract” entrepreneurial discourses to

demonstrate their “appropriate” (entrepreneurial) use of the money, and shift away from the concrete details of where they did actually put the money.

Each side continued to strategically shift back and forth between concrete details and abstract discourses in an effort to manage their relationship, emphasizing and hiding particular conditions. In chapter six, while I show how they have moved beyond the question of the particular money, their philosophies of money and the relationships implied in chapter five, continued as the invisible context for later interactions.

In chapter six, David used concrete and relevant examples -- their lives, their kitchen, their everyday fuel practices -- as a tool to “hook” Maria and Terisita’s attention and to scaffold their learning process towards more abstract entrepreneurial principles such as cost-benefit analysis, market research, product comparison, and playing with the price-line. Yet because it was in the concrete that Maria and Terisita actually live -- and in which their poverty and inequalities are starkly visible – David had to be careful that he did not get hooked in the process. So while questions like “how much fuel do they spend,” and “how much money do you need to live on?” indexed lives of security, Maria and Terisita answered every question by teaching David and Melissa the details of their insecure personal lives, their creativity and expertise in surviving under difficult and inconsistent conditions, and the material inequalities that structured the conversation.

By turning a discussion of everyday fuel practices and daily living needs into an exercise of calculation, David rendered poverty and inequality merely technical: his question, “how much do you need to live on?” demanded a numerical value which he could then plug into his exercise of “playing with the price line.” And he had good intentions: his questions and calculations were helping them to assess the viability of a briquette business, which required them to make price comparisons. He wanted to make sure that when Maria and Terisita anticipated the price of the briquette, they had factored in their own time (labor) and living expenses. Entrepreneurship trainings often describe the common problem of entrepreneurs who sell products at costs that fail to cover their own living expenses, therefore requiring them to take from the business capital in an emergency.

Maria and Terisita, however, had no idea where his questions were leading them, but strategically used this question to illustrate the concrete consequences of living with so little (“my needs are unsatisfied,” “I live with problems,” “I deny myself”) and by describing what they couldn’t buy with (the juice and coca-cola that we Americans drink) to highlight the stark inequality between us. Because David’s goal at that moment was limited to helping them price a briquette he extracted only the abstract number from their detailed narrative, and ignoring the concrete implications of their limited income, moved on to show them how to use this number to calculate the price of the briquette and finally to assess the potential sustainability of the briquette business. With his calculations, David erased the question of poverty and inequality, and shifted the problem of concern back to knowing the market.

7.1.3 How Eco-Preneur and Saccos make sense of and negotiate entrepreneurial learning spaces and participatory practices. As I described in chapter six, Melissa and David intended for their entrepreneurial learning methodology to “open up a space” for participatory dialogue, in which Maria and Terisita could practice being entrepreneurs by participating in entrepreneurial practices. Yet while opening up space for “participation” might as Freire argued potentially create the possibility for

collaborative re-definition of the terms of that partnership, true collaboration proved elusive in practice. Paradoxically, participatory practices allowed them to obscure the fact that they were actually directing the meeting. Yet in their efforts to *not* direct the meeting, they also failed to make explicit the agenda and real intentions that they did have, therefore compromising Maria and Terisita's access to entrepreneurial knowledge and practices.

Originally, the idea of "participatory educational practices" was made popular by progressive educators as an alternative to teacher-centered approaches. By privileging student voices, and providing opportunities to share, construct, and reshape knowledge, such practices have been considered "empowering," and thus continue to be associated with social justice agendas. But as scholars influenced by Foucault have warned, because neo-liberalism works by retooling and co-opting critique, a shift to a student-centered learning may also suggest a response to a crisis of legitimacy that finds new ways to conduct student conduct (Cruikshank, 1999; Giroux, 2008; Tikly, 2004).

In practice, Melissa and David's use of participatory practices seemed to discipline rather than empower. They considered their meetings to be the basis for a "win-win partnership" -- assuming that Maria and Terisita would benefit from the entrepreneurial tools they could offer, while Maria and Terisita could provide detailed information about the local fuel market -- Maria and Terisita expected something quite different. They *did* hope to learn more about "modern" entrepreneurial practices from Melissa and David, but they expected that Melissa and David would *share* their expert knowledge with them.

This conflict was not resolved directly. Although Melissa and David defined the meeting as a conversation and genuinely hoped it could be one, they were unwilling to engage with the kinds of material issues and concerns that Maria and Terisita brought up. But they could not directly impose their agenda on the meeting; not imposing was part of Melissa and David's strategy to maintain a relationship of distance.

This contradiction required new tactics: They used informal conversational language, but framed the discussion in pedagogical ways, such as narrowly defining the topic, asking most of the questions, and managing the conversation to limit what could be discussed. They didn't tell Maria and Terisita what to say directly, but by asking all the questions, they predetermined what kinds of answers could be given. They always *acknowledged* Maria and Terisita's answers, but never took them up unless they fit with their entrepreneurial logic. When Maria and Terisita went outside of the authorized discussion topic (knowing the market), they were not told so directly, but rather redirected with an even more specific question.

Their tactics were intended to discipline, but Maria and Terisita continued to find ways to raise the issues and concerns, which Melissa and David worked to avoid. Each side used *questions* for different purposes, and while questions were the foundation of Eco-Preneur's methodology, it was also through questions that Maria and Terisita pressed their claims.

Table 7-1: The Purpose of Questions

Maria and Terisita	Melissa and David
To build a relationship	To avoid imposing Western solutions
	To maintain distance
To share information and exchanging ideas	To direct the conversation indirectly
Specific and Concrete	To encourage local solutions and self-reflection
Illuminate poverty	Abstract and general
Contest inequality	Highlight equality
	Avoid inequality

For Melissa and David, in theory, asking questions was simply “spreading seeds” and they asked general questions as abstract tools that would de-center their positions as experts and thereby encourage local solutions. Rather than “giving a man a fish, so that he could eat for a day,” they believed they were helping Maria and Terisita even more, by giving questions that they could use not only to assess the fuel market today, but to assess future businesses and any other aspect of their lives.

However, in practice, the repetition of questions, without answering questions in return, was a routine that solidified the power structure. While they believed themselves to be posing questions to prompt self-reflection and dialogue, remaining distant and disinterested allowed them to remain aloof from the manner in which Maria and Terisita’s responses illustrated narratives and descriptions about their personal challenges and poor material conditions. And while they did not reject Maria and Terisita’s responses -- which would have been inconsistent with their effort to privilege local knowledge -- they simply responded by posing yet another question, effectively managing the conversation by changing the subject to another general field of inquiry.

Maria and Terisita on the other hand, saw questions not as tools for self-reflection, but as tools to elicit information that would have concrete value, and pushed this interpretation. This was hardly surprising: while Melissa and David could access a great deal of information through their use of numerous media and information technologies – and for them, in this sense, information was freely available -- knowledge in Mlimani was often a scarce and personalized resource. One acquired knowledge by asking a person who possessed it and then, when allowed to do so, by watching and emulating their practice. But such specialized information and knowledge was usually not freely available, instead being held by an *mtaalum*, an expert, whose position was earned because of the scarcity of their knowledge, a scarcity which they could then convert into value.

When the Melissa and David asked questions about their living conditions, therefore, Maria and Terisita assumed that they needed or wanted to know something about their living conditions. In their mind, they were being treated as *wataalum*, “experts” of their own living conditions. But when they provided this information, they sought to do so by strategically constituting themselves as beneficiaries responding to the direction and requests of their *walezi*, “patron.” Sometimes they answered questions with examples chosen as demonstrations of their lack of resources, thereby strongly hinting at the responsibility of their patron. Other times they answered questions in ways that showed their alignment with Eco-Preneur’s vision, articulating an interest in conserving

the environment or demonstrating their knowledge of seed capital, to suggest that they were in fact viable partners and worthy beneficiaries.

Maria and Terisita were not simply controlled by Melissa and David's disciplining questions. But the structure of the discursive frame made their answers irrelevant: by putting all the emphasis on the act of asking questions itself (and away from the answers), Melissa and David took away their ability to re-shape the conversation's thrust.

7.1.4 What do we make of these findings? Maria and Terisita were not passive victims of the spread of entrepreneurial discourses and practices, nor were they simply made into entrepreneurs and socialized into new entrepreneurial mindsets and behaviors. Melissa and David did set the frame of their "conversations," and used open-ended questions as tools of discipline, managing and controlling what could be said and how. But rather than accept these terms and practices, Maria and Terisita actively experimented within them--retooling Melissa and David's open-ended questions and entrepreneurial discourses to package their own claims and critiques. But despite their innovative use of discourse, their tactics were unsuccessful and they were unable to access either the resources or knowledge they had expected. In fact, the more actively and directly they negotiated and expressed the particularity of their interest, the more Melissa and David refused to engage: Maria and Terisita's focus on their immediate concerns and orientation to the world in which they actually lived, rather than the world Melissa and David had hoped their methodology could prepare them for, was precisely the thing that suggested to Melissa and David that Maria and Terisita were not entrepreneurial and therefore not the appropriate partners in their efforts to develop a green economy.

What kind of outcome was this? For Melissa and David, flipping the market began with finding the right partners: since they had already run into problems with the elite members of MEEP, they considered working with Maria and Terisita instead. And in realizing that Maria and Terisita were not the "right partners," they decided to cut their losses, take what they had learned, and continue searching for better partners. Each failure was a step towards finding the right configuration of partners, and, as they said from the beginning, they didn't have resources or time to babysit one "seed." Instead, they needed to work with those who wanted to pick up their seeds independently and had the ability to do so. Because they realized that the elite MEEP members wanted to use the partnership to secure donor funds and exert their power in the community, and that Maria and Terisita expected resources and direction, they decided that neither party was interested in the kinds of seeds that Melissa and David provided, and decided to move on.

Further study is required to understand who may have become their "right partners," and the implications of choosing such people, but Melissa and David's assessment that Maria and Terisita were not the right partners, and that experimenting with neo-liberal power would require different kinds of people raises important questions and concerns.

To truly harness neo-liberal power towards more socially and environmentally responsive outcomes would require Melissa and David to first acknowledge and understand the forms of power in which they work. But because they were enmeshed in their own crisis of legitimacy—needing both to manipulate local power structures in order to facilitate their social and environmental goals and yet also not wanting to appear as if they were intervening – they resisted discussing power in any form. Assuming that

we are all equal under the market allowed them to disregard the social and political relations in which that market and the environment was embedded (Polanyi, 1944). But their mistake was in assuming that they were experimenting in an ideal world outside of the structures of power.

Although they physically lived in Mlimani, because they had access to global mobility, unlike Maria and Terisita they could operate at higher scales (Blommaert, 2010), seeing the world from the perspective of a global knowledge economy, which obviously affected Maria and Terisita, but which Maria and Teirsita did not have legitimate positions to even access, much less participate as subjects. Melissa and David's practices and discourses therefore oriented to a very different world of theory and *ideal* partnership. Because they didn't want to occupy positions of power or foster relations of dependency, they avoided Maria and Terisita's responses which indexed or explicitly articulated relations of power, because these responses contradicted their idealization of what partnership should be. And because their theory of partnership took precedence over engaging with Maria and Terisita and the world in which they saw themselves as living in, Melissa and David couldn't learn from them or hear them. Any practical knowledge that didn't fit their technical efforts to "know the market" was not admitted for discussion. This meant that Maria and Terisita's world was effectively off the table, thereby preventing the kind of conversation through which Melissa and David and Maria and Terisita might really have learned from each other from happening.

What Melissa and David failed to understand, however was that "non-intervention" and "non-engagement" with Maria and Terisita's concerns was actually an intervention and even a form of discipline. By simply making their entrepreneurial seeds "available," Melissa and David suggested that Maria and Terisita had choice. But while Melissa and David did not force Maria and Terisita to take on their entrepreneurial orientations and practices, their decision *not* to do so became the grounds to decide that they were not the right partners, and more importantly, had the end result of leaving Maria and Terisita unprepared to compete in a knowledge economy. Assuming that the problem was one of Maria and Terisita's poor choices allowed Melissa and David to overlook the ways their lack of engagement prevented Maria and Terisita from gaining access to the entrepreneurial discourses and practices which they were trying to master, thereby reinforcing and re-obscuring the latent power structure.

In short, by insisting that Maria and Terisita did not make the right choices, or aren't the right kind of entrepreneurial partners, Melissa and David misrepresent the problem, thereby legitimizing and working in the service of the power structures that Maria and Terisita were struggling to overcome. Their decision to find the "right partners" left Maria and Terisita at the mercy of the partners they *did* choose (the educated elite) or left them out altogether.

Learning for both sides would have required that they began in the world in which they were meeting, the world in which Maria and Terisita lived, and in which the market Melissa and David hoped to transform, actually operated. Only by beginning in concrete practice, and examining rather than avoiding the issues and concerns which Maria and Terisita raised, would Melissa and David and Maria and Terisita arrive at a mutual understanding from which to then examine and explore how best to make use of entrepreneurial discourses and practices to harness market power towards more collective, social, and environmental good.

7.2 Significance and Suggestions for Future research

7.2.1 Significance to Critical Development Studies. First of all, by examining language or discourse in interaction, my study applies Foucauldian theories of discourse and knowledge to *actual practice*. In response to critiques that studies of development discourse have failed to capture the complexity and contradictions within discourse, my study contributes to the growing body of critical development scholarship which examines how real actors engage with, negotiate, reshape, and contest development discourse (Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Li, 2007; Mosse, 2005). However, very few scholars have paid attention to how, as my study demonstrated, language is used to socialize and discipline subjects into new practices and relations, even as -- through language -- discourses are subverted, reshaped, and redeployed to new ends. Adding a linguistic analysis allowed me to illuminate the subtle nuances that may be overlooked in a social practice or ethnographic analysis.

At the same time, a Foucauldian lens allowed me to examine the intersection of discourse at the local, national, and global scales, thereby providing an analysis which does not privilege either local practice or global governance, but demonstrates how structure and agency are mutually constituted in practice. Paying attention to how actors negotiate discourse in interaction therefore allowed me to illuminate the contradictions within discourse, reminding us that development is not simply monolithic. This approach may be particularly useful for researchers of participation and participatory practices, who take seriously the critiques of discourses and practices of participation, but still recognize the transformative potential of participatory education if strategically situated in relation to political struggles beyond the educational site.

Second, by focusing on subjects who are normally considered the beneficiaries of entrepreneurial projects -- and who would not normally be included in as “partners” in global-local entrepreneurial and development partnerships -- my study helps us understand the process and effects of *exclusion* from neo-liberal development and the importance of examining development discourse from multiple perspectives. Because neoliberal development privileges “winners,” studies of neoliberal development only sees successful partnerships and subjects who successfully take up entrepreneurial practices, thereby preventing us from seeing the process and consequences of exclusion by which people like Maria and Terisita are often allowed into the conversation only as the *objects* of discussion. By inadvertently intervening as a translator, my presence enabled discussions and participation that might otherwise not have been possible, and while this raises important methodological research questions, the result of these meetings were that Melissa and David were forced to confront the contradictions normally obscured by the discourse of “partnership. By having the vehicle (translation) to engage with Maria and Terisita -- who they discursively constructed as “diverse community partners” -- they came to understand the limitations of Maria and Terisita’s participation, and then (after realizing that they were not the “right kind of partners”) had to articulate why they would have to be excluded, thus revealing the latent power structures that often go unseen.

By focusing on the diversity of partners within a community partnership and using linguistics analysis to examine the particular ways in which different actors employed discourses of entrepreneurship and partnership, my study demonstrates not only that development discourse does not impose representations uniformly -- different

actors use these discourses in fundamentally different and creative ways -- but also that development discourses *cannot* be exploited by all actors equally. While I offer empirical evidence that we must examine educational efforts to build entrepreneurial mindsets, rather than assume that they are either tyrannical or empowering, the findings from this study also suggest avenues for further research that pays close attention to how structural inequalities constrain and enable access to discourses and practices of the knowledge economy, and how inequalities may be reproduced through entrepreneurial and experiential learning spaces.

Finally, this work also contributes to efforts in applied linguistics to use language as a lens through which to ask new kinds of questions about the spread of English and the politics of language within development contexts (Bartlett, 2004; Higgins, 2009a; Higgins & Norton, 2010). Much of what happens in development relationships takes place at the level of language, but language is often taken for granted within development practices as a site of struggle. My work uses language to show how relations of power are reproduced (despite good intentions) in ways that are not so clear to those involved. Although the particulars of my research findings are unique to these individual at this particular context, the interactions, which I analyzed will likely seem familiar to development practitioners in general and could inform critical discussions and trainings for development practitioners.

7.2.2 Significance to Critical Language and Literacy Studies. Increasing the “participation” of “marginalized groups” has long been an important goal of educational practice. Yet what might we overlook when we let these kinds of discursive frameworks define both the problem and its solution? Rather than presume “participation” as the necessary focus of efforts to address marginalization through education, my study suggests that educators consider “participation,” “partnership,” and “marginalization” to be discourses that shape our understanding of the global context in which educational interventions occur.

I suggest that because neo-liberal systems of governance gain consent through discourse -- containing and incorporating critiques and disciplining indirectly -- it has become even more difficult to see the complex ways in which power operates through education, which suggests new avenues for critical research. By paying attention to how discourses operate through multiple scales, it is possible to illuminate how discourses of participation and participatory practices -- which were once characterized by their association with liberation struggles -- now work to articulate local and international actors together as “partners” working within a reinforced neoliberal system. In this way, I challenge the presumption that global is always a positive goal and illuminate common pitfalls of participatory practice which are too often hidden behind it.

My research suggests that critical educators should pay greater attention to how neo-liberalism operates through education, disciplining educators and students, even without awareness or explicit consent. Research is needed both in Tanzania and in the United States to specifically examine how “participatory” practices may actually work in service of new forms of neo-liberal governance. Such research would not only examine how discourses and practices operate as techniques and sites of resistance within local sites, but also how education is, in a more general sense, implicated within larger struggles over governance and social change. Such research would not only inform the particular practices and theories of critical educators, but would have implications for

teacher practice and teacher training more generally by inquiring into how and why educational approaches and perspectives become technologies, prioritizing quantifiable standards and principles outside of the teaching/learning practice, thereby effectively undermining and shutting down engaged and responsive teaching and student learning.

By expanding our picture beyond the site of learning itself, I bring into focus the connections between the multiple scales which participatory practices articulate together: the social and political processes through which popular (global) discourses are first developed, how these discourses shape educational interventions, how educators make sense of and operationalize the discourses within their local practice, and how students understand and negotiate these discourses in relation to their everyday social practices. By interrogating this connectivity, my approach gives us a more nuanced understanding of the hidden power that brings partners together and shapes educational practices in ways that often go unnoticed.

For one thing, while macro-level perspectives tend to suggest that participatory and entrepreneurial practices are either empowering or tyrannical, my research demonstrated how Melissa and David used these participatory practices to control the participation, while at the same time, doing so also gave Maria and Terisita the means to push back and to refuse to be simply controlled. For another thing, a focus only on the local level would prevent us from going beyond one of two limiting interpretations of the situation: either that Maria and Terisita demonstrated agency by using entrepreneurial discourses to make claims on Melissa and David, or they were, as Melissa and David concluded, simply not interested in the seeds that were being made available. By articulating different levels together, my research demonstrates how discourses of participation and participatory practices have been reshaped in ways that are consistent with neo-liberal governance, how Melissa and David, despite their good intentions, used participatory practices in ways that effectively disciplined Maria and Terisita into a capitalist market rather than transforming the conditions in which they lived. And rather than rejoice in Maria and Terisita's agency, my study illuminated how their rejection of Melissa and David's entrepreneurial discourses and practices functioned as the occasion and justification for their exclusion.

My project also argues that we need to understand "marginality" in more complicated ways: I suggest that discourses of independence can potentially become barriers to student's access to the knowledge and practices needed to make use of the "independence" which they are expected to display. As practical techniques, progressive principles of participation and partnership actually prevented Melissa and David from being able to listen to Maria and Terisita in ways that might have allowed them to bring their partnership to a more satisfactory conclusion (for both sides).

7.2.3 Significance to sociolinguistics of globalization and CDA. By bringing together theoretical and methodological approaches from critical development studies and sociolinguistics, my research offers a unique sociolinguistic account of international development, a context which has been noticeably absent in the sociolinguistic literature.

First, while discourse analysis allows us to interrogate the processes and actors through which "globalization" flows, my study uses discourse analysis to highlight the ways the global does not flow: because poverty is not separate from, but in many ways constituted as the "shadows" of global flows (J. Ferguson, 2006), a study of development discourse is also a study of globalization's discontents. And although global development

has not been well studied in the field of critical discourse analysis, I illustrate how a project to end poverty is a global project, bringing together multiple and diverse actors at multiple hierarchical scales, as a way of showing how development practice raises many of the critical questions of language, globalization, and inequality which should be of critical concern to applied linguistics. By emphasizing the implications of material inequalities and the inconsistencies of global flows, this project demonstrates the importance of and calls for more research on situating globalization in relation not only to particular local sites, but also in relation to the various actors within that site, who may never have met “global” development, may have never seen “global” products, may lack TV’s to view the global flow of images, and who may not have access to the discourses and practices of the “global.”

Second, while my account of development interaction at a local site provides an interesting example of “cross-talk,” the more significant contribution is in its attention to an expanded notion of context. By showing how relations between interlocutors were constituted at scales beyond and previous to local meetings and interactions, I was able to make visible the complicated relations of power and inequality through which the American and Tanzanian interlocutors shaped their utterances, an attention, which would not have been part of a conventional conversational analysis. And while issues of power are central to critical discourse analysis, that discipline too often fails to pay attention to how these inequalities are negotiated, contested, and reproduced in practice. In my study, therefore, I show how relations of power operating at multiple scales not only structured the interactions between Eco-preneur and Saccos, but also became the resources they used to exploit their relationship. In this sense, I showed that Melissa and David and Maria and Terisita were not simply “stuck in culture” and engaging in “cross talk,” (J. J. Gumperz, Jupp, & Roberts, 1979) as studies of interactional sociolinguistics might suggest. By highlighting their material interests, and situating their relations beyond the site of interaction, I could show how they were not simply orienting towards different activity frames, but actively pushing against each other in pursuit of their own material interests.

Third, a greater attention to ethnographic details provided insights into the ways in which each side managed to manage the expectations of their present interlocutors alongside those of others who were absent. For example, the American development practitioners were orienting both to global discourses about “local participation” and also to the demands of their boss, who insisted that they didn’t get “too involved.” The Tanzanian women needed to present themselves using discourses that show themselves to be entrepreneurial and independent in order to look favorably in the eyes of the Americans, but they also worked to raise concerns about their lack of material resources, which their women’s group expected them to secure on their behalf. In each case, language was the site of the problem’s resolution.

As these findings suggest, an analysis of intercultural communication within “zones of awkward engagement”⁶⁷ requires us to move beyond simple notions of culture

⁶⁷ Rather than situate this example of intercultural communication within the context of a poorly defined and abstract discourse of “globalization,” I find it more useful to consider the particularities which make possible global/local interactions between American development workers, funders, policy makers and Tanzanian practitioners, government officials, training participants as Anna Tsing does, within transient “zones of awkward engagement,” where “aspirations for global engagement come together in friction, the

or simple dichotomies between global and local to consider interlocutors, who may be physically absent, but none the less, have become meaningful “shadows” to which actors must orient their utterances (Kramsch & Boner, 2010) as well as to consider “the layers of historical simultaneity (Blommaert, 2005), the heteroglossia present in everyday utterances (Bakhtin, 1981), the different timescales on which participants position themselves (Blommaert, 2005; Lemke, 2000), and the socially constructed categories on which they draw (Hacking, 1999)” (Kramsch & Boner, 2010). Furthermore, following Anna Tsing’s approach to global ethnography, these findings suggest the importance of research, which pays greater attention to how divergent linguistic practices don’t simply cause misunderstanding, but rather how actors use linguistic practices of their interlocutor to creatively and actively negotiate relationships and points of “friction⁶⁸,” to achieve their respective material interests despite, and in some cases *because of* their differences and lack of shared understanding (Tsing, 2005). Taking misunderstanding as productive and part of a strategy to achieve social purposes, rather than a problem to be overcome, opens up new avenues of research, especially research that considers the potentially complex and contradictory role of a translator.

Fourth, by examining the complexities and contradictions of global flows my study builds on the work of Blommaert (2005, 2010) to offer another example of a sociolinguistics of mobility. Applying Blommaert’s work to hierarchical scales and the histories in which these interactions took place, I show that the contexts to which Melissa and David and Maria and Terisita were orienting were not just (culturally) different, shaping how they would interact with each other, but they were relationally unequal. This had implications for their access to different discourse practices and knowledge, which shaped how they could exploit their immediate interactions with each other and how ultimately they would assess each other. For example, while Melissa and David’s questions about fuel spending practices and living expenses implied consistent cash flow, their communicative language practices implied access to knowledge flow, each of which limited Maria and Terisita’s ability to participate. When Maria and Terisita failed to answer Melissa and David’s questions using practices appropriate to a knowledge-based economy, Melissa and David concluded that they were not appropriate partners. And while Maria and Terisita also judged Melissa and David according to local norms of interaction, their privilege and mobility meant that Melissa and David not have to take these judgments seriously. These findings suggest the need for further research on how communicative practices characteristic of a knowledge economy may structure and reproduce inequalities, despite informal educational spaces set up to provide access and practice.

Fifth, by employing Foucauldian theories of governmentality through discourse, my study responds to the critique that critical discourse analysis relies on a simplistic notion of power, reducible to simple domination and resistance (Luke, 2002; Pennycook, 2001). Rather than assuming that efforts to promote entrepreneurial discourse are inherently tyrannical, I follow Ferguson in leaving open the possibility that actors could experiment with new forms of neo-liberal power, offering nuance to claims that such

grip of worldly encounter (Tsing, 2005, p. 1)” and “words mean something different even as people agree to speak”

global discourses are simply imposed. The Tanzanians I observed were not simply socialized into new practices and ideologies implied by development discourse, but rather considered development discourses as “valued commodities” (Blommaert, 2010), and strategically and creatively negotiated, resignified (Butler, 1997), contested, performed (Bakhtin, 1981; Butler, 1997; Yurchak, 2006) and reappropriated (Pennycook, 2006) entrepreneurial discourses for their own purposes. While stylization and ventriloquation have been studied in local contexts (Hanks, 1996; Rampton, 1999; Reyes, 2005) and in global cultural contexts (Alim, Ibrahim, & Pennycook, 2009; Higgins, 2009b; Pennycook, 2006), it has not yet been studied in the context of global economic development (Kramsch & Boner, 2010, p. 515).

Finally, while I showed how even Maria and Terisita creatively contested and manipulated discourses of entrepreneurship in ways that challenged Melissa and David’s control, we are only able to assess the effect of Maria and Terisita’s display of creativity and agency by placing the consequences of these contestations in relation to the global knowledge economy. While Maria and Terisita could not fully access the knowledge and practices which are required of a knowledge economy -- and therefore could not fully participate in the practices Melissa and David “made available” -- Melissa and David assessed them according to the very standards which Maria and Terisita were being denied access to. Nevertheless, as free trade agreements do structure the world they have to survive in, Maria and Terisita are disciplined at this higher scale. While these findings do not discount the possibility for meaningful experimentation and subversion of discourse, they do highlight the importance of research that pays close attention to scale and socio-political status especially as neo-liberal power finds ways to work with rather than to destroy local practices and disciplines through inspiring individual agency rather than control.

7.3 Limitations of Study

While a fine grained linguistic and year long ethnographic study allowed me to illuminate the subtle linguistic practices and tactics which often go unnoticed in more extensive studies, my study was limited by design to observations of organizations within one community wide partnership and to a large extent focused specifically on the interactions between two American development practitioners and two Tanzanian representatives of a local women’s savings and credit group. There are countless projects in Tanzania aimed at developing entrepreneurial mindsets and practices; this study should not be considered representative.

Building entrepreneurial mindsets and practices takes time. A second limitation was that my study documented a single year of observations and therefore must be understood within a particular moment in time. I conducted field work in 2007 a year when entrepreneurship trainings in Tanzania were just becoming popular and when Eco-Preneur decided to shift their practices from working with individual organizations and their individual beneficiaries to working with a community wide environmental entrepreneurship partnership made up of diverse stakeholders of the Mlimani community. As I reported in this study, the practice of partnership introduced by Eco-Preneur was filled with challenges and contradictions. Nevertheless, we can’t assume from this study that partnerships between diverse stakeholders are inherently problematic or that efforts to build entrepreneurial mindsets and practices are likely to fail. Further research is

needed to understand what partners took, if anything from their experiences as members of the Mlimani community partnership, how Maria and Terisita understood their interactions with Melissa and David several years later, and how Eco-Preneur may have adjusted their practices and choose new partners following their difficult interactions during the year of my field study.

As my research demonstrated, it was not possible to separate educational efforts to build entrepreneurial capacity from the development regime in which it is embedded. This interdependency became a limitation: It was difficult to distinguish between one's alignment with entrepreneurial discourses and practices, and one's use of entrepreneurial discourses and practices as a means of representation to look favorably in the eyes of development interlocutors. While I made productive use of this limitation by focusing on how development actors make use of entrepreneurial discourses and practices to serve other purposes, if in fact Tanzanians are acquiring new entrepreneurial mindsets and practices in ways that go beyond performance and stylization, (which I still assume is the case), I was unable to locate and spend enough time documenting successful educational and socialization efforts.

Although in my study, I did not find many examples in which to suggest that Tanzanians were becoming new kinds of people, in one entrepreneurial training that I observed, a student responded enthusiastically to the new entrepreneurial practices and ideas he was learning stating, that "it is here that we are being born again." Similarly, another student claimed that, "it is hear that they are making goal on us," suggesting that they have failed to compete with South African fruit sellers because they have not acquired the same entrepreneurial practices. Unfortunately, although I interviewed these participants after the training, to understand the meaning of "rebirth" would require extensive ethnographic study, and at the time, I did not have the appropriate access. Further research is still needed to understand more about how Tanzanians make sense of entrepreneurial practices, what they find attractive in entrepreneurial ideologies and practices, and if they take these new ideas and practices out of the training, how they appropriate them in relation to their everyday lives. Ideally, for such research, I would recommend observing Tanzanian facilitators, who are recognized nationally for proven success.

Finally, not all participants were available to examine and give their comments on all of the transcripts. Although Adam assisted in transcription and analyzed the transcripts with me, I still may have missed culturally relevant material or misunderstood some of the language data due to my outsider and second language status. Also because I was unable to share my own analysis and drafts with participants, without compromising the confidentiality of their interlocutors, my analysis may not be complete. I should add however, that in subsequent academic presentations and discussions of my work with other Tanzanian researchers, my research assistant, and American development workers, my analysis have not been negated and have allowed me to consider multiple interpretations.

Bibliography

- Alim, H. S., Ibrahim, A., & Pennycook, A. (2009). *Global linguistic flows : hip hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of language* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (2001). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. In J. X. Inda & R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *The Anthropology of Globalization*: Blackwell.
- Apple, M. (2006). Understanding and Interrupting Neoliberalism and Neoconservatism in Education. *Pedagogies: an International Journal*, 1(1), 21-26.
- Atkinson, J. M. a. H., John. (1984). Jefferson's Transcript Notation. In A. a. C. Jaworski, N. (Ed.), *Discourse Analysis*: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bartlett. (2004). Genres of the third space: The communities strike back *Language and Intercultural Communication* 4(3).
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse : a critical introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to change the world* (Updated ed.). Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010a). *Social entrepreneurship : what everyone needs to know*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bornstein, D., & Davis, S. (2010b). *Social entrepreneurship : what everyone needs to know*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Thompson, J. B. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brigg, M. (2006). Disciplining the developmental subject: Neoliberal power and governance through microcredit. In J. Fernando (Ed.), *Microfinance: Perils and Prospects* (pp. 64-88). New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). Linguistic vulnerability *Excitable speech. A politics of the performative* (pp. 1-41): Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*: Oaxford University Press.
- Chaiklin, S., & Lave, J. (1993). *Understanding practice : perspectives on activity and context*. Cambridge ; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, M., & Levitin, K. (2000). A Cultural-Historical View of Human Nature. In N. Roughley (Ed.), *Being humans: Anthropological universality and particularity in transdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 64-80). New York: deGruyter.
- Cooper, F. (2001). What is the Concept of Globalization good For? An African Historian's Perspective. *African Affairs*, 100, 189-213.

- Cooper, F. (2005). *Colonialism in question : theory, knowledge, history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cornwall, A. (2004). Spaces for transformation? reflections on issues of power and difference in participation in development. In S. Hickey & G. Mohan (Eds.), *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?* (pp. 75-91).
- Crewe, E., & Harrison, E. (1998). *Whose development?: an ethnography of aid*. London Zed Books
- Cruikshank, B. (1999). *The will to empower : democratic citizens and other subjects*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Dees, G. (2003). Social Entrepreneurship is About Innovation and Impact, Not Income. Retrieved July 2010, from Skoll Foundation: <http://www.caseatduke.org/articles/1004/corner.htm>
- Dees, J. G. (2001). The meaning of "social entrepreneurship.". Retrieved July 14, 2010: http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees_SE.pdf
- Delpit, L. (2001). The politics of teaching literate discourse. In E. Cushman, E. Kintgen, B. Kroll & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A Critical Sourcebook*. Boston: St. Martin's Press.
- Drayton, B. (2006). Everyone a change maker. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*(Winter).
- Easterly, W. (2006). *The white man's burden : why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Engestrom, Y. (1999). Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Y. Engestrom, R. Miettinen & R.-L. Punamäki (Eds.), *Perspectives on Activity Theory* (pp. 19-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Engestrom, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Towards an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of education and work*, 14(1), 133-157.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development : the making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK ; Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power* (2 ed.). London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N., & Chouliaraki, L. (1999). *Discourses of Modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Femia, J. (1987). *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process*: Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ferguson. (1994). *The Anti-Politics Machine "Development,: Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ferguson, J. (2006). *Global shadows : Africa in the neoliberal world order*. Durham [N.C.]: Duke University Press.
- Ferguson, J. (2008). "Toward a Left Art of Government: From 'Foucauldian Critique' to Foucauldian Politics". Paper presented at the Foucault Across the Disciplines, UC Santa Cruz.
- Fernando, J. (2006). Introduction: Microcredit and empowerment of women: blurring the boundary between development and capitalism. In J. Fernando (Ed.), *Microfinance: Perils and Prospects* (pp. 1-42). NY: Routledge.

- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (R. Huxley, Trans.). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1980). The Confession of the Flesh. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault*. New York Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Francis, D., & Hester, S. (2004). Social Interaction, Language, and Society. In D. Francis & S. Hester (Eds.), *An Invitation to Ethnomethodology: Language, Society, and Interaction*: Sage.
- Freire, P. (1986). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1987). *Reading the Word and the World*: South Hadley, Mass. : Bergin & Garvey.
- Gaynair, G. (2010). Exxon Mobil Explands Support for Technologies that Help Women in Developing Countries. Retrieved July 2010, from <http://www.icrw.org/taxonomy/term/24>
- Gee, J. P. (2002). Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction and What is Literacy? In E. Cushman, E. Kintgen, B. Kroll & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 525-544). Boston: Bedford.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis : theory and method* (2nd ed.). London ; New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2010). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method* (3rd ed.). Milton Park, Abingdon ; New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P., Hull, G. A., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order : behind the language of the new capitalism*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- The GEF Small Grants Programme. Retrieved June 28th, 2010, 2010, from <http://sgp.undp.org/index.cfm?module=ActiveWeb&page=WebPage&s=HowdoesSGPwork>
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory : action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1993). Literacy and the politics of difference. In C. Lankshear & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical Literacy: politics, praxis, and the postmodern* (pp. 367-378). New York: State University of New York off.
- Giroux, H. A. (2008). *Against the terror of neoliberalism : politics beyond the age of greed*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1989). *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. In Jaworski & Coupland (Eds.), *The Discourse Reader* (pp. 306-320). London: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Footing In Forms of Talk*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

- Gould, J. (2005). Timing, Scale and Style: Capacity as governmentality in Tanzania. In D. Mosse & D. Lewis (Eds.), *The Aid Effect* (pp. 61-84). Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.
- Gramsci, A., & Forgacs, D. (2000). *The Gramsci reader : selected writings, 1916-1935*. New York: New York University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1992). Contextualization and Understanding. In D. a. Goodwin (Ed.), *Rethinking Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J., Jupp, T., & Roberts, C. (1979). *Cross Talk*. Southhall: National Centre for Industrial Language Training.
- Hacking, I. (1999). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hanks, W. F. (1996). *Language & communicative practices*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Harvey, D. (2006). *Spaces of global capitalism*. London ; New York, NY: Verso.
- Heller, M. (2010). Language as a Resource in the Globalized New Economy. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell
- Hickey, S., & Mohan, G. (2004). Towards participation as transformation: critical themes and challenges. In S. a. G. M. Hickey (Ed.), *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?* New York: Zed Books.
- Higgins, C. (2009a). *English as a local language : post-colonial identities and multilingual practices*. Bristol, UK ; Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Higgins, C. (2009b). From Da Bomb to *Bomba*: Global Hip Hop Language in Tanzania. In H. S. Alim, A. Ibrahim & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Global linguistic flows : hip hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Higgins, C., & Norton, B. (2010). *Language and HIV/Aids*. Bristol, UK ; uffalo N.Y. : Multilingual Matters.
- Holland, D., & Lave, J. (2009). Social Practice Theory and the Historical Production of Persons. *Action: An International Journal of Human ACTivity Theory*, 2, 1-15.
- Igoe, J., & Kelsall, T. (2005). *Between a Rock and a Hard Place*. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.
- Inda, J. X., & Rosaldo, R. (2002). Introduction *The anthropology of globalization : a reader* (pp. xii, 498 p.). Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Isserles, R. (2003). The Rhetoric of Empowerment, the Reality of "Development As Usual". *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 3 and 4, 36-55.
- Kramsch, C., & Boner, E. (2010). Shadows of discourse: Intercultural communication in global contexts. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *Handbook of Language and Globalization*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kramsch, C., & Boner, E. (forthcoming). Shadows of discourse: Intercultural communication in global contexts. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *Handbook of Language and Globalization*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews : learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 3(3), 149-164.
- Lave, J. (2011). Social Practice Theory *Changing Practice*: Unpublished Manuscript.

- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning : legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge England ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lemke, J. L. (2000). Across the scales of time: artifacts, activities, and meanings in ecosocial systems. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 7(4), 273-290.
- Li, T. (2007). *The will to improve : governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Luke, A. (1996). Genres of power? Literacy education and the production of capital. In H. Ruqaiya & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in Society* (pp. 308-338): Longman.
- Luke, A. (2002). Beyond science and ideology critique: developments in critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 96-110.
- McLaren, P. (2005). *Capitalists and conquerors : a critical pedagogy against empire*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism : a critical pedagogy*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. L. (1993). Critical Literacy and the Postmodern turn. In C. Lankshear & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical Literacy: politics, praxis, and the postmodern* (pp. p. 379-420). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis : an expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Mohan, G., & Stokke, K. (2000). Participatory development and empowerment: the dangers of localism. *Third World Quarterly*, 21(2), 247-268.
- Mosse, D. (2005). *Cultivating development : an ethnography of aid policy and practice*. London ; Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.
- Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid : why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa* (1st American ed.). New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429.
- Nyerere, J. (1962). Ujamaa-The Basis of African Socialism. In J. Nyerere (Ed.), *Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism* (pp. 1-12). Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
- Nyerere, J. (1967). Education for Self-Reliance. In J. Nyerere (Ed.), *Essays on Socialism*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
- Nyoni, T. (2006). *The role and scope of industrialization in enhancing the impact on poverty reduction in Tanzania*. Paper presented at the The Second National Dialogue on Trade, Development and Poverty in Tanzania.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing Gender. In Duranti & Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 335-358). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogden, T. (2010). U.S. lagging not leading social entrepreneurship. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2010/06/us_lagging_not_leading_social.html
- Peet, R., & Watts, M. (1993). Introduction: Development Theory and Environment in the Age of Market Triumphalism. *Economic Geography*, 69(3), 227-253.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics : a critical introduction*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Pennycook, A. (2006). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. New York: Routledge.

- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice* (1st ed.). Milton Park, Abingdon ; New York: Routledge.
- Perrow, M. (2000). Learning in transition: youth development in post-apartheid South Africa Unpublished Dissertation. UC Berkeley.
- Polanyi. (1944). *The Great Transformation* (2001 ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Prahalad, C. K. (2005). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Publishing.
- Prahalad, C. K. (2006). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Wharton School Pub.
- Rahnema, M., & Bawtree, V. (1997). *The post-development reader*. London Zed Books
- Rampton, B. (1999). Styling the Other. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3(4), 421-427.
- Rankin, K. (2001). Governing development: neoliberalism, microcredit, and rational economic woman. *Economy and Society*, 30(1), 18-37.
- Reyes, A. (2005). Appropriation of African American slang by Asian American Youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(4), 509-532.
- Rist, G. (2002). *The history of development : from western origins to global faith* (New ed.). London ; New York: Zed Books.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking : cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rose. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* (Third ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roy, A. (2010). *Poverty Capital*. New York: Routledge.
- Sachs, J. (2005). *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*: Penguin Books.
- Sachs, W. (1992). *The Development Dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*. London: Zed Books.
- Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of the weak : everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance : hidden transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shivji, I. (1991). The Politics of Liberalisation in Tanzania: Notes on the Crisis of Ideological Hegemony *The IMF and Tanzania* (pp. 67-85). Harare,; South Africa Political Economy Series.
- Smith, D. E. (2005). *Institutional ethnography : a sociology for people*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Swidler, A., & Cotts Watkins, S. (in press). "Teach a Man to Fish": The Sustainability Doctrine and Its Social Consequences. *World Development*.
- Tanzania, U. R. o. (1997). *The Tanzania Vision 2025*.
- Tikly, L. (2004). Education and the New Imperialism. *Comparative Education*, 40(2), 173-198.
- Tripp, A. M. (1997). *Changing the Rules The Politics of Liberalization and the Urban Informal Economy in Tanzania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- United Republic of Tanzania. *The Tanzania Development Vision 2025*. Retrieved from <http://www.tanzania.go.tz/vision.htm>.

- United Republic of Tanzania. (2005a). *Mkukuta (National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty)*. Retrieved from <http://www.povertymonitoring.go.tz/aboutus.asp>.
- United Republic of Tanzania. (2005b). *National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP)*.
- Vavrus, F. (2003). *Desire and Decline: Schooling Amid Crisis in Tanzania*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Vygotsky, L. S., Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., & Scribner, S. (1978). *Mind in society : the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Weber, H. (2006a). The Global Political Economy of Microfinance and Poverty Reduction. In J. Fernando (Ed.), *Microfinance: Perils and Prospects* (pp. 43-63). New York: Routledge.
- Weber, H. (2006b). The global political economy of microfinance and poverty reduction: Locating local 'livelihoods' in political analysis. In F. Jude (Ed.), *Microfinance: Perils and Prospects* (pp. 43-63). New York: Routeledge.
- Werstch, J. (2007). Mediation. In H. Daniels, M. Cole & J. Werstch (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Vygotsky*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- World Bank. (2004). *Tanzania and the Knowledge Economy: Preliminary Assessment*: World Bank Institute.
- Wortham, S. E. F. (2001). *Narratives in action : a strategy for research and analysis*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Yurchak, A. (2006). *Everything was forever, until it was no more : the last Soviet generation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

[Simultaneous talk overlapping with another speaker
=	Contiguous utterance
(1.)	One second pause
(.)	Micropause
-	Abrupt cut-off
<u>text</u>	Emphasis (underlining)
te:xt	sound stretch
(text)	uncertain transcription
?	Rising intonation
.	Falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
°text°	low volume
CAPS	loud volume
↑	sudden rise in pitch