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Introduction

Overexploitation and unsustainable practices in fisheries during the last decades have been well documented (World Bank 2009; Myers and Worm 2003; Pauly 2008). Due to the decline in marine resources, the focus of policy makers in the 1980s has shifted from development to management of fisheries (Symes 2006). This shift, however, did not prevent an even further decline, and the global fisheries crisis and conflicts within fisheries suggest that there are serious problems with current management practices, requiring new fisheries governance (Kooiman et al. 2005).

The hegemony of biological and economic approaches to fisheries management until the 1990s, and their continued dominance (Béné et al. 2010), has generally downplayed social relational insights (Coulthard et al. 2011). Yet the social sciences are criticized for using simplistic, reductionist models to base their analysis of decision making on (Symes 2006). While maritime anthropology and sociology are argued to be as old as conventional science-based management, what is new is the attempt to incorporate this knowledge into conventional fisheries management (Symes 2006).

Kooiman et al. (2005) and Bavinck et al. (2005) argue that new governance systems need to be sought to counter the degradation of marine resources, while simultaneously improving the lives of those who most depend on the resource. Development of fisheries governance as a tool to eradicate hunger and poverty, while simultaneously enhancing or at least not aggravating fisheries resources, is highly complex. This is not in the least because fisheries and coastal systems are considered to be intrinsically diverse, complex, and dynamic systems (Kooiman et al. 2005; Jentoft and Chuenpagdee 2009; Bavinck et al. 2005).

While the fact that fisheries are becoming increasingly overexploited is generally agreed upon, the reasons for this state of affairs and how to solve it is often cause for fierce debate. To solve the problem of overexploitation, while also improving the lives of those who depend on the resource, is even more difficult, as those involved in fisheries governance often have considerably different views, as problem perceptions and definitions are social constructs (Jentoft and Chuenpagdee 2009: 554). Scientists from different disciplines, policy and decision makers, NGOs, fish processors and traders, small-scale and industrial fishers, and others involved in the fisheries often possess different views of the causes of increasing marine overexploitation, the culprits, the victims, and the types of solutions.14

The differences often relate to the role of the state, market, and civil society in fisheries governance, and the interaction between these different sectors. These interactions can be expected to differ substantially across sectors, regions, and countries. The center of gravity between the state, market, and civil society will thus differ. I therefore expect the outcome of fisheries governance to differ across countries, and the aim of this thesis is to contribute to this debate by comparing different lobster fisheries governance styles in three

---

14 See Dryzek, 1997 “Politics of the Earth” for an excellent classification system of environmental discourses.
different countries, and examine the impact thereof on the lobster chain and the well-being of lobster fishers.

In this chapter I will discuss the three main theoretical concepts that underlie this thesis: fisheries governance, global value chain analysis, and well-being. This chapter explores the development and the application of these three main concepts. All three concepts stem from different theoretical discourses and backgrounds and are used in a variety of social sciences. In addition, this chapter will discuss the conceptual framework, the different research methods, choices of research, and the limitations of this research.

1.1 Fisheries governance

Governance has become a key concept in the academic debate over the past decades, and a catchword in the social sciences, as well as in the policy world (Peters and Pierre 2001; Marinetto 2003; Nuijten 2004; Kooiman and Bavinck 2005). The term stresses the importance of other actors besides the state in governing social and economic processes at the local, national, and international level (Peters and Pierre; Kooiman and Bavinck 2005: 14; Kooiman 2003). Governance therefore does not refer to either public or private actors, but to their shared efforts, and takes place at multiple levels (from local to supra-national). Governing activities are becoming diffused over various societal actors, whose relationships with each other are constantly changing (Kooiman 2003: 3). It refers to the interaction between market parties, public parties, and civil society. These new forms of governance can be: network-like arrangements of the public and private actors; coalitions between business organizations and NGOs; and public-private and civic-private partnerships (Van Leeuwen and Tatenhove 2010).

The concept of governance differs from management as it “is a more inclusive concept, which invites a more reflexive, deliberative, and value-rational methodology than the instrumental, means-end-oriented management concept” (Jentoft 2006: 672). According to Jentoft and Chuenpagdee (2009: 555) management is a technical issue, whereby a set of tools can be used to solve a concrete task, and where the goal is clear and the outcome measurable (Jentoft and Chuenpagdee, 2009: 555). Governance thus differs from management as it “is a more inclusive concept which invites a more reflexive, deliberative, and value-rational methodology than the instrumental, means-end-oriented management concept” (Jentoft 2006: 672). Fisheries management is thus a political issue “and must, accordingly, relate to conflicting interests, values, and world views” (Jentoft and McCay 1995: 227).

Governance is both an analytical as well as a normative concept that refers to how things are and should be (Kooiman 2005; Kraan 2009). In this research I follow the definition of Kooiman et al. (2005: 17) who define governance as “the whole of public as well as private interactions taken to solve societal problems and create societal opportunities, including the formulation and application of principles guiding those interactions and care for institutions that enable them.” In addition to this, I follow Peters and Pierre, and add that governance takes place at multiple levels: the international, national, and subnational (2004: 77). In the realm of fisheries governance the term refers to international-level governance (e.g., FAO, or regional bodies such as the WECAFC), national level governance (e.g., state, NGOs, and market parties), and local level governance (e.g., sea tenure systems by fishers).

Between the different schools of thought concerning the term governance, the differences usually revolve around the role of the state (Kooiman et al. 2005). The change
from government to governance stems from a shift in perspective of the policy-making process in the 1970s and 1980s, as during this period the perceived ability of the state to effectively manage policy came under question (Nuijten 2004). The shift involved a partial transfer of responsibility and authority for policy decisions from the central agencies of government to networks of public and private bodies at national, regional, and local levels, a process referred to sometimes as “hollowing out the state” (Symes 2006).

While power was partially transferred to lower levels, governments’ control over international and transnational affairs has also been curtailed by global interdependence (Krahmann 2003: 330). Global actors such as Regional Fisheries Bodies have gained importance in fisheries governance at the national level. Nevertheless, the extent to which the role of the state is decreasing remains disputed (e.g., Peters and Pierre 2001). Kooiman (2003: 3) states that the role of the government has become more that of a facilitator and cooperating partner, and it is therefore appropriate to speak of shifting rather than shrinking roles of the state. This doesn’t imply that the traditional role of the state is outdated, but rather implies a growing awareness of the limitations of traditional governance by the state on its own (Kooiman 2003: 3).

When we look at the role of the state, however, we need to acknowledge that states are very complex entities, and do not consist of a simple set of government agencies and functions that are clearly marked off from the rest of society (Sharma and Gupta 2006). The state itself is by no means harmonious, and states are internally complex and composed of many agents at different levels. The many politicians and bureaucrats in modern states are often at odds with one another. “The state apparatus is not a streamlined organization with clearly defined internal and external boundaries, mandates and standardized working procedures” (Jentoft et al. 2005: 175). Compared to the states of Europe and North America, the states of the South are sometimes unstable, and either have a deficiency or an overload of authority. In line with Jentoft et al. (2005: 175), I agree that states in developing countries are frequently perceived to be less “‘democratic,’ insufficiently transparent, and prone to an overdose of corruption” (ibid.). Hersoug (2004: 47) rightly states that the state apparatus in developing countries is often “weak, with little control over what is happening on the extreme periphery.”

Yet, the role of the state in a country will not just “happen,” it will typically vary in accordance with the prevailing situation in a particular country and a specific industry. For example, in countries that lack a strong class of traders, the state might take on important functions related to catching, processing, and marketing of fish, whereas in countries where the trader class is strong, this will be carried out without much state involvement (Hersoug 2004; Thorpe et al. 2005). Thorpe et al. (2005b: 214-215) rightly argue that “the extent to which the fisheries sector (or any sector) is nested in national development strategies, will depend upon the economic, socio-political, structural and cultural contexts relating to specific national environments.” What importance a state gives to the fishing sector in general, and what goal(s) of fisheries it supports, and the type of benefits it attempts to derive from the sector can thus differ substantially across nations. These different goals according to Bailey and Jentoft (1999), mainly are: food security, livelihood and employment, and generating foreign exchange and other tax income. These goals are, however, often difficult to match and may in fact conflict with each other (ibid).
Thorpe et al. (2005b) argue that the sector has a greater probability of inclusion in the national development strategies if the fisheries’ contribution to the overall economy is greater. One can state that “if fisheries are economically important, they get special treatment” (Jentoft et al. 2005: 175). Thorpe et al. (2005b) point out several factors that determine whether fisheries are mainstreamed into the national agendas. These items are also important in this research when looking at lobster fisheries governance in the Caribbean. They list: 1) distribution of fishing activity between industrial and small-scale—and the extent to which the control of fishing activity is concentrated in companies (or cooperatives) or diffused among individual fishers; 2) the extent to which said fishers and fishing companies are effectively organized into producer organizations or trade associations; 3) the interdependence between the fisheries sector and other industries (such as food processing and tourism), thereby permitting concentrated actions around common concerns; and 4) the degree and nature of external influence, manifested through international agreements, foreign ownership or co-ownership of fishing companies, etc., upon national development discourses.

Yet, the state cannot function without support from both the market and civil society. “In most coastal developing countries, the state has limited capacity to fulfill a comprehensive role in fisheries governance. Sharing the burden of management with markets and civil society may therefore be a way out” (Jentoft et al. 2005: 179). Besides the “sharing the burden” with other actors from civil society and market parties, states are also frequently subject to pressure from powerful private interests and lobby groups, making governance a highly political affair (Jentoft 2005: 150).

As Jentoft rightly argues, “in reality governments institutions are often ridden with internal conflicts, vested interests, and in some instances corruption. Frequently they are also under pressure from lobbyists, multi-nationals and other powerful economic interests that may distort the state’s ability to exert reasonable decisions from a collective perspective” (Jentoft 2004: 145). Van Hoof and Tatenhove (2009: 727) argue that power inequalities affect the mobilization and deployment of the available resources of different groups involved in governance, and also influence who determines policy outcomes and how. Power in this sense can therefore be contradictory; it can be used as a positive, constructive, and hence legitimate force, but can also be a negative and disruptive element, for instance, if captured by special interest groups. These power inequalities are difficult to investigate yet can profoundly influence the governance outcome.

The relations between state and market can be viewed from a Business Systems Approach (BSA). This was developed at the end of the 1990s by Whitley (1999), and was originally used at the national level to explain differences in economic achievements across Asian economies. The approach departed from the notion that each economic actor is anchored horizontally in a specific society or geographical setting (Andriesse et al. 2011). In order to analyze differences in economic performance, Whitley (1999) analyzed the nature of national economic institutions and economic coordination, notably (i) the nature of the state, (ii) the nature of state-business relationships, and (iii) the nature of the firm itself or way of doing business in a particular territory. Therefore, BSA combines a “relational view of firms (analyzing the networks linking them with other actors) with a political economy analysis of the societal context” (Andriesse et al. 2011). A main critique of BSA refers to its implicit assumption that coordination is fundamentally determined by national institutions (Andriesse
et al. 2011). Although originally Whitley was rather critical of the effects of globalization on national business systems, he later recognized the importance of examining interactions between global changes and national business systems (e.g., Whitley 2003). The next section on global value chains will further develop the role of the market in governance.

Civil society is also a complex term that means different things to different people. Definitions of civil society vary considerably based on differing conceptual paradigms, historical origins, and country context. In this research I follow the definition of Brown et al. (2000: 275) who define civil society as “an area of association and action independent of the state and the market in which citizens can organize to pursue purposes that are important to them, individually and collectively.” Civil society actors pursue political ends outside the traditional confines of the state apparatus (Teegen et al. 2004: 465).

There has been a dramatic expansion in the size, scope, and capacity of civil society around the globe since the 1990s, aided by the process of globalization (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu 2002). The civil society sector has emerged as a clear societal actor in many parts of the world. It is varied, however, in its nature and composition. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) can be, for instance, community organizations, NGOs, social movements, women’s movements, trade unions, and fisheries cooperatives. NGOs are organizational manifestations of civil society interests (Teegen et al. 2004: 466). NGOs involved in environmental governance are “highly diverse, including local, national, regional and international groups with various missions dedicated to environmental protection, sustainable development, poverty alleviation, animal welfare, and other issues” (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu 2002).

The trend towards a greater role for NGOs in decision making reflects a shift from more centralized institutions in favor of broader-based, more representative social organizations (Teegen et al. 2004: 467). NGOs can be involved in a variety of ways in environmental governance: expert advice and analysis; intellectual sparring partner for governments, as NGOs often have better analytical and technical skills than government officials; mobilization of public opinion; representation of the voiceless; service provision; and monitoring and assessment and legitimization of global-scale decision-making mechanisms (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu 2002: 7).

NGOs can serve as alternatives to weak or inadequate democratic institutions, as a route towards more inclusive dialogues, and as a way to disseminate knowledge on activities and issues within the international system (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu 2002: 9). It can thus also complement states in carrying out management tasks. The concept of civil society, however, has its limitations in what it can attain in fisheries governance (Jentoft et al. 2005: 192). In the seafood industry, NGOs like the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) aim to influence policy by informing consumers about sustainability issues, often through awareness campaigns, boycotts, certification schemes, and product guides. These are market-based tools that actually bypass the conventional political process in favor of directly influencing consumer behavior and the market (De Vos and Bush 2011). Neither markets nor civil society can fully compensate for the state’s governing capacity, because the state commands

15 Ibid.
resources such as information, expertise, legitimacy, financial resources, symbolic authority, and a considerable power apparatus that represent essential elements of good governance (Jentoft et al. 2005: 194). In this research the focus is on the interaction between NGOs and the state in relation to managing, monitoring, and enforcement of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs).

**Governance styles**

The overall result of the interaction between market parties, state, and civil society per country can be seen as a distinct governance style. Governance theory distinguishes modes of governance that differ according to their focus of research. In *Fish for Life*, Kooiman et al. (2005) distinguish three ideal types of governance styles of interaction: self-governing, co-governing, and hierarchical interaction. The authors argue that all societies demonstrate—and require—mixes of these three modes or styles.

**Self-governing** governance relates to a mode of governance where individuals, families, groups, and organizations—and even societal sectors—govern, outside the control of governmental intention or policy (Kooiman et al. 2005: 334). According to Pascual-Fernandez et al. (2005: 221) it is mainly civil society or the non-profit sector where such initiatives can be observed. Self-governing capacities can be incorporated into the governance frameworks of governments (Kooiman et al. 2005: 21).

The school of collective action has made the most systematic analysis of self-governance with regard to the exploitation of common pool natural resources, such as capture fisheries. Collective-action studies have investigated under which conditions actors join to construct rules and organizations for long-term resource use, and have identified conditions that facilitate or hinder collective action (see Ostrom, 1990; Dietz et al. 2003; Acheson 2003; Agrawal 2001; Gutiérrez et al. 2011). These self-governing institutions are argued to be a way to counter the “tragedy of the commons” (TOC) (Hardin, 1968). In Hardin’s view only state power or privatization would be able to counter the resource destruction that follows from the TOC. The numerous community-based collective action studies proved, however, that resource users have been able to cooperate and form enduring and robust institutions to manage their natural resources. Nobel Prize winner Ostrom (1990) has made a systematic analysis of the underlying reasons for resources users to join in collective action. There have been numerous research cases on community-based collective action institutions in fishing communities that document a variety of ways in which fishers act collectively in order to solve problems (see Pinkerton 1989; Durrenberger and King 2000; Acheson 1988, 2003, 2011). Self-governance can overlap with co-management as pure self-governing systems are rare at a larger scale and local institutions often work jointly with public parties.

**Co-governance** is a style where the different parties join hands with a common purpose in mind, and stake their identity and autonomy in the process. This style implies the use of organized forms of interaction whereby multiple actors govern at a horizontal level. It is about the restructuring of relationships and moving towards more equal power sharing among interested stakeholders (Jentoft 2007). Co-management is also a term than has been used frequently in the fisheries governance literature referring to a collaborative arrangement between governments and users (Wilson et al. 2006). Co-management can take many different forms, with different roles and interactions between the different user groups.
The role of user groups in the decision-making process will depend on their relative negotiating capabilities, knowledge and strengths vis-à-vis each other and with the governments. [...] The type of representation is often determined by the political culture of the country and whether participatory or representative democracy is encouraged or discouraged (Raakjaer Nielsen 1996: 407).

Sen and Raakjaer Nielsen (1996), for example, classify co-management according to the role of the government and users in five types with different types of relationships between state and other actors. Pomeroy et al. (2011) provide a list of conditions for successful co-management of fisheries in Asia, the Pacific, and the Wider Caribbean.

In this thesis I follow the line of Kooiman et al. (2005) and regard co-governance in principle as a neutral relationship between government and other users whereby no one actor overpowers the other. Kooiman et al. (2005) regard networks, public-private partnerships, and communicative governance schemes as prime examples of the co-governance style (Kooiman et al. 2005: 336).

Over the last decade, the use of co-management arrangements in fisheries and coastal resource management in the Caribbean region has increased (Pomeroy et al. 2004). At the same time, Pomeroy et al. (2004) note that in the Caribbean the organizational capacity to engage in co-management is weak. Involvement of fishers is commonly agreed to be a key factor for successful implementation of fisheries management regulations. The benefits commonly claimed include: a more open policy system; a broader basis for information and knowledge as user’s knowledge is included; a greater legitimization of the policy process and its outcomes; greater level of commitment and compliance; and lower transaction costs (Symes 2006: 114; Jentoft et al. 1998: 423). It has therefore been increasingly argued that fishers can and should participate in fisheries research and management (see Silver and Campbell 2005; Jentoft 2000). A co-management system therefore will, in all probability, lead to higher levels of well-being for fishers than more hierarchical systems would.

Hierarchical governance is the most classical form of governance. The style is top-down, with steering and control by the state, or market, as key concepts, and applying instruments such as laws and policies. In addition to laws and policies, in hierarchical governing financial means, such as taxes and subsidies, are important ways of interacting. According to Kooiman et al. (2005: 335), “ hierarchical modes of governance are the most formalized forms of governing interactions [...]” The hierarchical governance type is widespread in fisheries, particularly in the North (Kooiman 2005: 335). Although this type of governance is mostly associated with the state, it is also a common governing mode in the market sector. Where the state is retreating, following liberal-economic ideology, the markets often take over in the form of multinational companies. In that case hierarchical governance is not state-led, but rather market-led; these are two distinct types of hierarchical governance.

This thesis therefore aims to investigate and compare three lobster fisheries with distinct fisheries governance styles. I have started this research with these different styles in mind, based on secondary literature and my own Master’s research on the Nicaraguan lobster fishery. Which governance styles are present in each country and to what extent different

17 Sen and Raakjaer Nielsen (1996) give a classification on different co-management arrangements according to the role of government and users. See also Pomeroy and Berkes for a classification framework (1997).
fisheries governance styles are really present in the three countries, however, remains to be seen.

Based on the previous elaboration on the concept of governance and governance styles for this thesis, I investigate:

1. The development orientation of the state, by looking into:
   a. the orientation of the state at a more general level;
   b. dominant domestic groups present in the lobster fishery; and
   c. the orientation of the state towards the fishing sector; and
2. state institutions, laws and policies; and
3. stakeholder representation, by looking into Fishery Advisory Boards and fishing cooperatives; and
4. Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) involvement in the institution and enforcement of Marine Protected Areas (MPA).

Although the governance styles under investigation are not expected to fit exactly into one category or the other, as various governance styles often overlap, each country’s fisheries governance style is expected to be different and express characteristics that lean more towards one style than the other. The investigation framework of lobster fisheries governance styles in this research therefore results in the following list:

- Development orientation of the state
  - Development orientation of the state
  - Orientation towards the fishing sector
- Stakeholder representation
- State institutions, laws, and policies
- State-market relations
- NGO-state market relations in MPA management

1.2 Global Value Chain Approach

The previous section focused on governance from a state and civil society perspective. This section aims to further examine the role of market parties in lobster fisheries governance by means of the Global Value Chain approach (GVC). The lobster fishery in the Caribbean is a prime example of a value chain that starts with harvesters in the South and extends to consumers in the North. The Global Value Chain\(^\text{18}\) approach helps to address questions on the lack of correspondence between the geographical spread of economic activity and the spreading of gains from participating in global production markets (Kaplinsky 2000: 118).

\(^{18}\) Global Value Chain (GVC) analysis has been described in the last decades using other terms as well, such as Global Commodity Chains (GCC), and in French research *traditions filières*. Research on agricultural chains started in the 1960s in France using the term “*filières.*” The Global Commodity Chain concept was introduced by Gereffi in the 1990s. The GCC analysis has been developed mainly for industrial commodity chains and, in recent years, the GCC literature has abandoned the term “commodity chain” and has taken up that of “value chain,” as the latter is thought to better capture a wider variety of products, some of which lack “commodity” features (Kaplinsky and Morris, 2001: 25, and Gibbon and Ponte 2005). In this PhD I will refer to the global value chain, as it is considered to be a more neutral concept.
The GVC approach attempts to enhance our understanding of the dynamics of economic globalization, international trade, and the distribution of benefits throughout the chain across various regions. It describes the range of activities that are required to bring a product from its conception to its end use and beyond (Kaplinsky and Morris 2001: 80). The GVC approach stems from a world systems approach and it belongs to a school of thought which argues that developing countries located in the “periphery” are underdeveloped as a consequence of the development of core countries (Peet and Hartwick 2009).iv The GVC approach hypothesizes that the global economy can be usefully understood as a combination of discrete, product-specific “value chains” rather than as generic “markets” (Ponte 2007). The approach can play an important role both as a methodological as well as an analytical tool in order to determine the factors that drive the distribution of the gains from global production and exchange, explaining both why some parties have gained and others have lost, due to globalization (Kaplinsky 2004: 80). Moreover, it can be used to identify policy forces—relevant at the level of individuals, households, firms, regions, and countries—that may lead to a different and more favorable distributional outcome. The GVC approach analyzes the extent to which it is possible to identify a causal link between globalization and inequality, and what can be done to counter inequality-promoting tendencies of globalization, that is, its “unequalization” effect (Kaplinsky 2004); therefore the GVC approach is increasingly being used by NGOs (Vellema and Helmsing 2011).

The GVC approach has been used to investigate the value chains of different products by addressing questions on: the distribution of benefits from participating in global production markets; the extent to which it is possible to identify a causal link between globalization and inequality; and what can be done to improve the tendencies of globalization to widen the gap between the poor and richer members of society (Kaplinsky 2000: 118).

Many GVC analyses have been carried out on agricultural primary food products, such as cocoa, coffee, tea, and fruits (see e.g., for cocoa, Laven 2010; for coffee, Fitter and Kaplinksy 2001; for fruits, Gibbon 2003; and, for vegetables, Dolan and Humphrey 2010). Some studies, albeit in fewer numbers, have been undertaken in the field of fisheries (see e.g., Gibbon 1997; Nyeko 2004; Ponte 2007; Abott et al. 2007; Khiem et al. 2010; Bush and Oosterveer 2007; Thorpe and Bennett 2004; Henson and Mitullah 2004; Wilkinson 2006). These studies have mainly focused on one particular chain (e.g., the Nile perch from Lake Victoria Henson and Mitullah 2004; Thorpe and Bennett 2004), or focused on multiple fish chains stemming from one country (e.g., South Africa).

Gereffi identifies four dimensions with respect to which every value chain can be analyzed: (1) an input-output structure (the process of transforming raw materials into final products whereby value is added); (2) a territorial (or geographical) scope; (3) a governance structure (what actor or which type of firm plays the driving or leading role in the elaboration and management as well as performance of this role); and (4) the institutional framework through which national and international conditions and policies shape the globalization process at each stage in the chain (Gereffi 1994).

The focus of GVC studies have been mostly on the governance aspect of the chain (Henderson et al. 2002). In the GVC school of thought the concept of “governance” refers to “the inter-firm relationships and institutional mechanisms through which non-market coordination of activities in the chain takes place” (Humphrey and Schmitz 2002: 3). It thus
refers only to governance within the chain and does not apply to the interaction of market, state and civil society. I will refer to this type of governance as “market governance”. Governance in this interpretation is interpreted more narrowly, and focuses nearly exclusively on the relationships of chain actors.

The approach departs from the standpoint that markets and technology are the main drivers of the dynamics in the chain (Gerrefi et al. 2005). GVC scholars try to understand how lead agents build, coordinate, and control the linkages and flow of produce between raw material suppliers, processors, primary traders, wholesalers, and retailers (Raikes et al. 2000: 394). By focusing on the capacity of value-chain analysis to map input-output relationships, and by identifying governance structures and their inherent power asymmetries along the chain, it is possible to analyze the factors explaining inter-country distributional outcomes in a sector (Fitter and Kaplinksy 2001). Discussions have revolved around questions of power and the distribution of benefits along value chains, which entry barriers characterize value chains, and how unequal distribution of rewards can be challenged in favor of developing countries (Ponte 2007).

Chains may be driven by the producer, the buyer (Gerrefi 1994), the trader (Gibbon 2001), or by other types of inter-firm coordination (see Gereffi et al. 2005). In producer-driven chains, such as the automobile industry, the producers influence chains by means of their licensed dealership systems. In buyer-driven chains—often found in the field of agricultural commodities—supermarkets and retailers set the conditions under which the goods are produced and distributed. These “lead firms” act as strategic brokers that link producers and markets; their knowledge of strategic research, marketing, and financial services grants them a privileged position (Gibbon 2001; Gereffi 1999 in Laven 2010: 25). Lead firms therefore can create entry barriers to generate different kinds of rents (Kaplinsky and Morris, 2003). In addition, quality standards are becoming increasingly important in governance of the chain. Quality standards communicate information about the attributes of a product and are of great importance for developing countries’ firms because they determine whether and how the firms can participate in specific global value chains and shape market access to specific countries (Ponte and Gibbon 2005).

The dichotomy of buyer-driven and producer-driven chains posed by Gereffi has been challenged from various perspectives (Gereffi 2001; Sturgeon 2001 2002; Ponte and Gibbon 2005). Gibbons (2001: 351) adds a third category; the trader-driven chain. He argues that there are a number of primary commodities, such as cotton and fish, where international traders act to govern the chain (see e.g., Gibbon et al. 2008; Gibbon 2001). In this way, international trader companies are constantly able to secure specific volumes and quality mixes. Different market governance styles of the chain create a different set of advantages and limitations for participating actors (Gereffi et al. 2005).

One particular style of market governance may not, however, pervade throughout the entire chain, and a chain might be characterized by a variety of governance forms. Although lead firms in a chain might have the most power, there are intermediate roles and positions possible where firms may not be able to control all parts of the chain, but are capable of controlling certain parts of it (Smakman 2003). Market governance forms are not static and might change over time as well. The recent economic crisis can be expected to have an impact on the market governance of seafood value chains. As the world economy and consumer
confidence deteriorate, value chain actors’ terms of trade can be expected to change. Scholars have pointed out that within the GVC approach there has been disproportionate attention paid to lead firms, at the expense of the heterogeneity of suppliers or producers (Laven 2010; Bush and Oosterveer 2007). Regarding the differences among producers, generally a distinction is made between large and small primary commodity producers (Gibbon 2001; Kaplinksy 2004 in Laven 2010).

Another important critique of the GVC approach relates to the world systems theory from which it originates. The world systems theory is criticized for neglecting the different stages or levels of national development within what appears to be a unified global economy (Petras 1981). Although the approach recognizes that firms are inserted in value chains, which in turn are affected by the different local, regional, and national institutional frameworks in which they operate, the approach provides few tools to analyze this state of affairs. Focusing on international fish chains, Bush and Oosterveer argue that although the combination of vertical and horizontal features in commodity chains illustrates the multi-scalar global dynamics, “attention also needs to be given to the specific arrangements under which fishers and farmers operate in their local context, including access to land, technology, market information, finance and trade” (2007: 396).

Goverance in the GVC approach typically relates to governance within the chain and there is a tendency to ignore the importance of other governance structures, such as the role of the government and international regulations (my italics; Gibbon 2001; Humphrey and Schmitz 2000; Smakman 2003; Bush and Oosterveer 2007; Laven 2010). Market governance of chains is also usually considered to be predominantly top-down: either Northern buyers, or manufacturing firms or traders, have decisive influence on the position of producers in the South. This is, however, a rather narrow approach to understand local economic development, as little attention is paid to local and national conditions (Monnereau and Helmsing 2011).

In this research I will use the GVC approach to investigate, analyze, and compare the structure, governance, and dynamics of the lobster chain in the three countries involved. I will explore the following elements:

1. The structure of the chain, by looking into a) input-output structure, b) chain actor involvement, quality issues, and export rules and practices; and
2. Market governance within the chain by means of a) dependency relationships, and b) barriers to entry; and
3. the dynamics of the chain due to the economic crisis.

The economic crisis and consequent drop in price and demand has offered additional research opportunities: (i) to examine how the three lobster chains coped with the economic shocks;
(ii) to determine the mechanisms through which the effects spread throughout the chains; and (iii) to learn the extent to which differences in local embedding enabled actors, situated at different functional positions in the chain, to cope with the crisis. The Global Value chain in this research entails looking at:

- Structure
  - Input-output structures
  - Chain actors
  - Quality standards and practices
- Market governance
  - Dependency in the chain
  - Barriers to entry
  - Impacts of the economic crisis on chain governance

1.3 The pursuit of well-being

Well-being is a concept common to the social sciences (Smith and Clay 2010), and frequently used in policy debates about environmental sustainability (Coulthard et al. 2011) and development (McGregor 2009). In this thesis I follow the definition coined by McGregor (2009: 3) “Wellbeing is a state of being with others, which arises when human needs are met, where one can act meaningfully to pursue one’s goals, and where one can enjoy a satisfactory quality of life.” This definition suggests well-being is broader than economic or material circumstances alone. It includes both an objective assessment of conditions but also subjective elements that indicate how these conditions are perceived by participants (Smith and Clay 2010: 158; Gough et al. 2007; White and Allison 2006; Coulthard et al. 2007). It is therefore a concept that refers to the holistic nature of people’s poverty.

The concept acknowledges that poor people in a developing country cannot be defined by their poverty alone and that they strive to achieve well-being for themselves and their children (Gough et al. 2006). It’s an expansion in development thinking since the 1970s. Poverty was then seen increasingly as not only lacking in basic needs but also to include a lack of basic human rights. The development of this more holistic perception on poverty has its roots in various theoretical debates, ranging from the entitlement approach by Sen (1981), the vulnerability approach (Chambers 1983), and the livelihoods approach (see Carney 1998; Bebbington 1999). Amartya Sen’s (1981) development of an entitlement approach to poverty was presented for ESPA workshop 4th April 2009, Chennai, India. Entitled: Human Wellbeing in Fishing Communities.

And it’s exactly this subjective component that, among others things, differentiates the concept of well-being from that of the livelihood approach. The livelihood approach encompasses the assets (natural, physical, human, financial, and social capital), the activities, and the access to these mediated by institutions and social relations) which together determine the living gained by the individual or household (see Bebbington 1999). The concept of well-being attempts to go beyond this by including a subjective component. However, both approaches share the focus on a wider definition of poverty than the focus on material well-being alone.

There are discussions and debates on many different types of poverty; from consumption poverty and income poverty, to poverty defined in terms of the human development index or in terms of social exclusion, to poverty considered as being relative or absolute (Gough et al. 2007: 3). Gough et al. (2007) argue that “well-being” is a wider concept that can usefully encompass and connect these debates over different types of poverty.
understand famines in the early 1980s provided a very important stimulus for new thinking in the area of well-being and poverty (Gough et al. 2007). Sen argued that the absolute lack of resources is only one of the numbers of reasons why people lack access to the resources they need for sustaining their livelihoods and introduced the idea that power differences constrain people’s entitlements, or abilities to secure access to resources needed. Later he developed the capability approach, focusing more on the social structural factors that constrain entitlements and the developmental interventions that could counter them. Their lack of command over food and other necessary resources is thus governed by a range of social, economic, cultural, and political factors (Béné 2003). This type of approach thus shifted analysis beyond a narrow focus on income and the material resources people owned, towards the investigation of how they secured access to what they need (Gough et al. 2007). However, the approach has been criticized for its weakness in dealing with a more social perspective on the nature of human agency (Evans 2002; Robeyns 2005; Deneulin and McGregor 2010). The lack of command over food and other necessary resources is thus governed by a range of social, economic, cultural, and political factors (Béné 2003).

The well-being framework attempts to address this holistic approach and encourage an understanding of the differentiation that can be found among fishers and fishing communities. Heterogeneity is important for understanding how different fishers will respond to management and policy measures (Coulthard et al. 2011), as well as how fishers will be affected by them. Whereas policy measures might improve the well-being of some fishers, they can deteriorate those of others.

The study of well-being is understood to have three dimensions: material well-being, relational well-being, and subjective well-being (IDS 2009; Gough et al. 2007). These three dimensions connect to various theoretical discourses, which I explore below:

1) Material dimension: the resources a person is able to command, i.e., where human needs are met;
2) Relational dimension: what people are able to achieve with these resources, and in particular what needs and goals they are able to meet, and;
3) Subjective dimension: the quality of life a person is able to achieve and where one can enjoy a satisfactory quality of life.

Material dimension
The first dimension of well-being refers to the resources a person is able to command, and ideally to a situation where human needs are met. This dimension finds its origin in a range of theoretical approaches that have taken place in development thinking over the past 50 years and need not be summarized here (see Gough et al. 2007: 9; Peet and Hartwick 2009; Allison and Horemans 2006; Gasper 2007). The developments in poverty thinking from the 1970s shifted from a narrow focus on income and the material resources people owned, towards the

---

23 Martha Nussbaum (2000) has further developed this idea by embracing numerous non-economic aspects of life, such as the expression of imagination and emotions, affiliation, and play (Gough et al. 2007).
24 These include differences in: social status, social norms, values, and aspirations among fishers (Coulthard et al. 2011).
investigation of how the poor secured access to what they need. The roots of these developments lay in various theoretical debates, ranging from the entitlement approach of Sen (1981), the vulnerability approach (Chambers 1983), and the livelihoods approach (see Carney 1998; Bebbington 1999).

The material dimension refers to main material assets and attempts to define the absolute minimum resources necessary for long-term physical well-being. Whereas traditionally the list only included “basic needs,” such as food and water, shelter, and clothing, recent lists emphasize the inclusion of sanitation, education, and health care. The Human Development Index (HDI), for example, is composed from data on Life Expectancy, Education, and GDP per capita (at purchasing power parity). In addition to the usage in the HDI, in the last decade the basic needs approach has also reemerged through usage in the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (Gough et al. 2007; Peet and Hartwick 2009). The MDG has set targets and identified indicators for many basic needs, for instance survival, health, hunger, access to safe water, and education (Gough et al. 2007; Peet and Hartwick 2009). Building on the above, Coulthard et al. (2011) use the following for the material dimension of well-being in fisheries: monetary income, fish to eat, fishing assets.

Regarding the attainment of well-being, taking the large heterogeneity of fishers into account is of great importance. The heterogeneity of material circumstances among fishers has been well documented (Breton et al. 2006; Kooiman et al. 2005; Van Ginkel 2007; McGoodwin 1990; Coulthard et al. 2011). With regard to fisher’s heterogeneity, Van Ginkel states:

Fishing may be for subsistence, for the market or a combination; it may be open-access, communally managed or privatized; it may be subject to quota regulations, licensing or other measures; it may be small-scale, medium-scale or large-scale; it may be inshore, mid-water or offshore; it may be seasonal or year-round; it may be full-time or part-time; it may be owner-operated, done by crewmen who are hired by land-based ship-owners, or vertically integrated; it may be bases on share system of remuneration, a wage system or a combination (2007: 5).

In addition, one could add that fish can be caught for the export market, local market, or household consumption, or a combination of these. These types of characteristics show the large heterogeneity among fishers, which has a great influence on the material well-being of lobster fishers in the Caribbean. Lobster fishers in the Caribbean can, for instance, operate on a small scale or large scale (industrial), fish in inshore or offshore areas, or be part of a single-species fishery or of a multiple-species fishery. These differences will profoundly impact the ability of a fisher to achieve well-being. It will directly relate to such matters as his working conditions, safety, absence from home, and income. The heterogeneity between individual fishers can be seen by differences in age and position within a fishery, differences in fishing scales (small-scale vs. industrial fishers), and gear (trap fishers vs. divers).

Fishers work under different circumstances as a result of individual differences, differences in relation to the fishing métier (scale, type of gear), and of geographical factors. Safety is a crucial aspect of fishers’ material well-being, as it is still one of the most dangerous professions in the world (Pollnac et al. 2011). In addition, some fishers are full-time fishers, while others are part-time fishers and engage in other economic activities. These elements will also be of influence on the remuneration of fishers. Remuneration is often the
result of a share system, and therefore tied to the level of production of a particular fishing unit and fleet (Van Ginkel 2007: 20; Acheson 1981). In this research I will therefore examine the following factors for the material dimension of well-being: differences in working conditions; safety; remuneration; whether it’s a single species or multiple species fishery; and whether fishers are able to engage in economic alternatives across the different lobster fishing métiers. For the material dimension I will thus investigate:

- Working conditions
- Safety
- Remuneration
- Single-/multi-species fishery
- Economic alternatives

Relational dimension

The relational dimension in the well-being approach can be interpreted in multiple ways. In order to operationalize this dimension for the purpose of my research, I focus on fishers’ trade relations (related to fishers’ independence and dependency), and fishers’ ability to cooperate and to participate in decision making.

Doyal and Gough (1991 in Gough et al. 2007) claim “autonomy” is a basic human need, a universal precondition for any individual action in any culture. According to these authors autonomy refers to the ability of people to make informed choices regarding what should be done and how to go about doing it (Gough et al. 2007). Devine et al. (2006) make a nuance by claiming autonomy is a universal psychological need but that its expression is always contextual. In fisheries, autonomy is also regarded to be of great importance to fishers. McGoodwin states that the majority of fishers stress independence, self-reliance, freedom from regimentation, and challenge as important aspects of their occupation (1990: 23). Autonomy in fisheries refers to the ability to be your own boss, to own your own business, and to have an adventurous life, and is also widely acknowledged in the job satisfaction literature on fisheries (see Pollnac and Poggie 1998). Fishers’ autonomy, freedom, and pride in their profession are part of their “way of life.” Their autonomy and freedom are essential elements of their lifestyle, and an issue discussed in terms of being considered an integral part of the well-being of fishers in this thesis.

25 The link between freedom and fishing in the Caribbean can be traced back to the time of slavery. Price (1966) argues that during the colonial period skilled fishers acquired some measure of independence, which gave them a distinct social identity and made them relatively free from the oppressive slave-plantation system. He has stressed the high level of independence experienced by plantation fisher slaves in the Caribbean as far back as the 17th and 18th centuries. “From the first, fishing slaves—first Indians, then Negroes—received special treatment, and from the first they exercised potentially important economic skills that stressed independence.” Price argues that Caribbean fishermen—at first Indians and then Africans—were from the very beginning a privileged slave group within the plantation system. Besides the repressive character of the plantation system, it incidentally endowed fishing slaves with valuable economic skills as well as with considerable self-reliance and independence (Price 1966: 1364). Price also argued that their special socioeconomic role permitted a particularly smooth transformation to a life as free fishermen. Emancipation offered the opportunity for a new way of life to the enterprising freedman who had admired the success and prestige of his fishing colleagues during slavery (Price 1966: 1364).
The concept in this research also refers to the ability of fishers to enter the fishery: whether it is an open-access resource from a legal perspective, and whether there are other barriers to entry. Independence and self-employment are highly valued, particularly among small-scale inshore fishers who own their own boats and work alone, or with a small crew of kin. However, autonomy does not refer merely to “radical independence or individualism,” as autonomy also implies a degree of dependence on other actors and external environments (Devine et al. 2006).

Devine et al. claim autonomy is constituted relationally and contextually, and it must always be achieved in an institutional context, assuming interdependence (2006: 10-11). They argue “coherent accounts of autonomy must always recognize the interdependence of people in groups, and that autonomy can coexist with substantial relationships of dependence” (2006: 2). Autonomy and independence thus also relate to a fisher’s dependency relationships in his trade relationships. Fishers are often highly dependent on intermediaries, and other market and patron-client relationships between traders and fishers—but also between fishers—are often seen as intrinsic to fisheries (see Acheson 1981; Johnson 2010; Platteau 1989; Van Ginkel 2007). Although fishers often stress the importance of their independence, their autonomy is often highly curtailed by the patron-client relationships in which they are involved. Fishers are mostly “price-takers,” who have to adjust to fluctuating prices over which they have no control (Platteau 1989). Fishers often have very little withholding power, as fish tends to spoil swiftly, and have a weak bargaining position vis-à-vis traders and politicians (Van Ginkel 2007: 16).

Fishers have been—and still are often—dominated and sometimes exploited by fish traders and processors. Since fishermen are away from home for so much of the time, they are often underrepresented in the political arena, and are usually dependent on intermediaries who are often in a position to exploit them (Acheson 1988: 277). Fishers thus depend on the traders and processors to market their catch, and the latter can thus restrict a fisher’s independence, as relationships are often asymmetrical. Their indebtedness to intermediaries or processors for fuel, ice, bait, and loans for gear and boats, tends to decrease their autonomy. Fishers need intermediaries and processing plants for credit and supplies, as well as to serve as a market, but this dependency can suffer from a high level of “interlocking” relationships between fishers and patrons.

Patron-client relationships differ across fisheries and between countries. Certain patron-client relationships can, according to Johnson (2010: 265), “hamper fishers ability to organize and thereby their capacity to engage in collective action for resource allocation and stewardship.” However, patron-client relationships also provide many advantages and security, as they provide a guarantee of commitment from fishers to boat owners at times, in return for the promise of a basic subsistence provision when fishing is bad, and advances or periodic loans to cover irregular costs (Johnson 2010: 269).

According to Jacinto and Pomeroy (2011), fisheries are vulnerable to overexploitation in open-access situations. In this view, depletion of marine resources can be regarded as a collective action problem, and they argue that, as a result, increased levels of organization
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26 For the two terms patron and client I follow Johnson (2010: 270). Johnson uses the terms in a broad sense to refer to relative positions in the fishing chain. The individuals who are dependent on others for credit are clients; those who supply the credit are patrons.
among resource users and stakeholders in the chain could serve as a key solution. Fishers have often responded by establishing fishing cooperatives to help their position in trade networks, to gain leverage vis-à-vis fish traders and processing plants, and to circumvent as many intermediaries as possible (King 1999; Acheson 1981; Van Ginkel 2007: 16). Autonomy and dependency relationships are thus also linked to collective action. Cooperatives may enable fishers, as a unified body, to influence decision making more easily, and thus provide a way to participate in—or exercise influence over—management of the fishery.

Fishers often join cooperatives in order to face and reduce the many risks and uncertainties they face (Acheson 1981: 284). Marketing cooperatives are designed to provide many of the same services fish dealers do under ideal circumstances (i.e., a steady market for fish; fair prices for fish; credit; supplies; bait at reasonable prices; information about the market). “Cooperatives tend to be formed when fishermen have been or feel badly used by buyers, and join together to get fairer prices and steadier markets for their fish” (Acheson 1981: 284). They might also be formed when outside entrepreneurs begin to invest heavily in the fishing industry and fishers are afraid to lose control.

Cooperatives have received support from governments and international aid agencies, but they have a mixed history in realizing lasting benefits for rural constituents (Jentoft 1986; King 1997). Some cooperatives last for decades; others fail before participants see any returns on their investments in time and money. While some are organized and operated under supportive government regimes, others in fact might be frustrated by indifferent or unfavorable governments (King 1997). Results of fishing cooperatives are thus diverse. Van Ginkel (2007: 15) summarizes the reasons that can explain the phenomenon of organization failure among fishers. These include: 1) practical barriers caused by frequent absence of fishers; 2) uncooperative behavior as a result of capitalist modes of production (competition is a key element in this pattern of production, impeding cooperation); 3) fishers are argued by some to be competitors in open-access regimes, with competition as a consequence; 4) the independent and autonomous nature of fishers; 5) competition and economic and socio-cultural autonomy lead to the physiological character trait of a “need for independence,” and these traits do not support cooperation among fishers; 6) fishers are a very heterogeneous group at various levels with often very contrasting goals, ideologies, and behaviors. Jacinto and Pomeroy (2011) have also examined fishing cooperatives and analyzed the underlying factors for successful fishing cooperatives.

However, fishers do at times manage to cooperate. When cooperatives are successful and provide services to communities, they may, over time, attract new participants. Growth in membership, capital assets, and productive output are all signs of successful development, particularly when the economic benefits are reserved for cooperative members and their local communities (King 1999). Factors that help fishers manage cooperation successfully can be found in the literature of collective action (see Ostrom 1990; Agrawal 2001; Wade 1986; Baland and Platteau 1996). In many countries, fishers do indeed form strong movements, unions and cooperatives (Jentoft 2007: 432). The relational dimension in this research thus refers to a fisher’s trade relationship (focusing on autonomy and dependency), and his ability to participate in decision making. In this regard, I particularly focus on the presence of fishing cooperatives. For the relational dimension I will thus investigate:
Subjective dimension:

The third dimension of the well-being approach relates to how people feel about what they have and are able to do. This dimension goes by several labels, including quality of life, subjective well-being, life satisfaction, and happiness. Different disciplines and perspectives have contributed to this stream of research, but three have been of exceptional importance: subjective quality of life research by health psychologists and clinicians; the economics of happiness; and the psychology of affect balance and life satisfaction. Although these have originated in the developed world, they are increasingly gaining ground in developing countries (Gough et al. 2007). Critiques on the first stream relate to its primary focus on questions of health, the absence of a link with the issue of autonomy, and its design mainly by experts, rather than people’s own perceptions (ibid.: 28).

The economics of happiness approach reflects the move by some economists from the exclusive use of “revealed preferences” to self-reported accounts of satisfaction with life or happiness. It combines techniques used by economists and psychologists to assess well-being, and explores areas where revealed preferences provide limited information (e.g., the effect on well-being of inequality and unemployment). Researching happiness and subjective quality of life is problematic, however, in the context of developing countries (Gasper 2007; Gough et al. 2007: 30). People tend to adapt to changes in their life circumstances and to adjust their expectations to reality, while issues of cultural bias and preferences are often problematic (Gough et al. 2007: 28-31). At present, most research in this strand has been carried out in rich Northern countries, and the applicability of many of these findings to the “trapped and the exploited is, to say the least, unproven” (Gough et al. 2007: 33).

Psychologists have been mainly concerned with the third stream, and questions of life satisfaction and happiness (e.g., Maslow 1954). Initially work was carried out on life satisfaction on “life as a whole,” while later much of the research was carried out in terms of domain-specific satisfactions, such as satisfaction with work, family, housing, etc. Job satisfaction has been studied by a variety of disciplines from various angles, from organizational behavior studies, psychology, sociology, and—more recently—labor economics. In the 1930s and 1940s many studies were carried out to determine the correlations of high and low job satisfaction. Such studies related job satisfaction to seniority, age, sex, education, occupation, and income, among other things (Lawler and Porter 1967). It is a “subjective, individual-level feeling that reflects whether a person’s needs are or are not being met by a particular job” (Lambert et al. 1999). Job satisfaction theory has a strong foundation in industrial society; however, recently a few studies in the South have been carried out (see Smyth et al. 2009; Heywood et al. 2006).

Anthropological studies of fisheries that have measured subjective well-being often include objective measurements. For example, anthropologists have argued that job satisfaction is often more important than income to fishermen (Gatewood and McCay 1990). Sometimes, fishermen actually subsidize their desire to fish with other income and tend to
emphasize the benefits of fishing over the costs (Smith 1981; Daw et al. 2012). Even though fishing ranks among the most dangerous occupations and economic returns also vary greatly, fishers are generally very attached to their occupation (Pollnac and Poggie 2008; Daw et al. 2012). The view that fishing is more than “a way of life” is thus frequently expressed by fishers and has been well documented (Pollnac and Poggie 2008; Pollnac et al. 2001; Acheson 1981, 1988; Van Ginkel 2007). Results of a study on job satisfaction and income suggest that commercial fishers have higher than average perceptual well-being (Smith and Clay 2010).

Pollnac and Poggie (2006) have argued that levels of job satisfaction are associated with a number of socially significant variables, such as mental health and longevity, family relations, and job performance—all factors impacting and impacted by one’s level of happiness. Measuring fishers’ job satisfaction is thus one of various very important indicators for measuring people’s overall subjective well-being. Job satisfaction indicators allow for adaptation to specific work fields and is thus an attractive method as it facilitates comparing fishers’ satisfaction both within countries as well as between countries. In line with the trend in job satisfaction studies, job satisfaction studies in fisheries have been plentiful but mostly concerned with North America (see Pollnac and Poggie 1979, 1988; Smith 1981; Apostle et al. 1985; Gatewood and McCay 1990). Job satisfaction studies in the South have been gaining ground nevertheless (Monnereau et al. 2010; Pollnac et al. 2001, 2011; Bavinck et al. 2012; Monnereau and Pollnac 2012; Pollnac et al. 2012).

The job satisfaction studies that have been undertaken in fisheries have been largely based on Maslow’s (1954) hierarchy of needs (Bavinck and Monnereau 2007), distinguishing three basic categories: views on fulfillment of basic needs, social needs, and needs of self-actualization. Pollnac and Poggie (1988) authored one of the first publications focused on job satisfaction in fisheries, making use of a list of 22 items, with two additional questions on overall job satisfaction. The first asks whether a fisher would still go into fishing if he had his life to live over again; the second whether or not he would advise a young person to go into fishing. The results of this survey, tested among different fishing groups in New England, yielded significant results. The authors concluded there was more to fishing than pure money-making and that these non-monetary factors should be taken into account for effective and humane management programs (1988, 2008). Other scholars made small modifications to this original set of items, yet their analysis indicated that its overall structure was sound (Gatewood and McCay 1988, 1990; Binkley 1995).

Poggie and Pollnac have been engaged in the topic ever since (see e.g., Pollnac and Poggie 1998, 2006, 2008; Pollnac 2001, 2011, 2012). In this research I draw on this grand body of work, as I also make use of job satisfaction surveys.27 The job satisfaction surveys consist of 27 questions and three yes/no questions. The questions are divided into five categories: basic needs; social needs; self-actualization; management; and nature. The three yes/no questions investigate the perception of fishers on the future of the fishery and their position in it. The five categories show overlaps with the material and relational dimensions of well-being. The first categories of basic needs—with questions on the satisfaction with inter alia income, health, time to get to the fishing grounds—therefore relates to the material
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27 The job satisfaction surveys are also part of the work carried out by Maarten Bavinck and myself for the ECOST project. See 1.5 research methods for a broader explanation on the ECOST project.
well-being dimension. The social needs and self-actualization category—with questions on the satisfaction with inter alia the ability to be your own boss, level of autonomy, challenge of your job—relates to the relational dimension. The subjective dimension of well-being in this research thus relates to:

- Job satisfaction
- Willingness to change to another fishing type/occupation
- Whether a fisher would advise a young person to enter the fishery

1.4 Conceptual framework
The concepts of governance, global value chain analysis, and well-being as used in this research thus brings us to the following conceptual framework:

![Conceptual framework diagram]

Fig. 1.1: Conceptual framework.

The framework shows that governance of fisheries is comprised of the interaction between state, market, and civil society. Market parties are, however, also part of the lobster chain, which is why the market is located between governance and value chain. The governance style of a specific country impacts the structure and governance of the lobster chain directly. However, both governance and value chain are also influenced by the international level. Both the lobster chain and governance arrangements impact the well-being of fishers. Yet fishers and all others involved in the chain also possess agency, and exert influence over governance, as well as over chain structure and governance.
1.5 Research methods
This research departs from a comparative case-study approach, as I compare Belize, Jamaica, and Nicaragua. The comparative case-study approach is valuable for this type of research, as it is an excellent method to examine the relationship between contextual factors and a specific topic (Yin 2003). It embodies the logic of comparison in that it implies that we can understand social phenomena better when compared in relation to two or more meaningfully contrasting cases or situations (Bryman 2004: 53). A main argument in favor of multiple case studies is that it improves theory building (Bryman 2004: 55). Bryman argues that by comparing two or more cases, the researcher is in a better position to understand and determine the circumstances in which a theory will hold or not hold (2004: 55). Selecting cases that represent extreme types can be very valuable, and finding which factors are common to the cases can be just as interesting and important as those that differentiate them (Bryman 2004: 55).

Departing from this comparative case-study approach I had to streamline the research methods across the three countries. During my fieldwork in the three countries, I conducted informal interviews, unstructured and semi-structured in-depth interviews, administered questionnaires, carried out participant observation, and participated in state and non-state policy meetings. All of this thus had to be done across the three countries in the Caribbean, while I also conducted interviews with importers in the US and Europe.

I spent a total of seven months in the field: ten weeks in Belize, nine weeks in Jamaica, and twelve weeks in Nicaragua. Belize and Jamaica I visited twice, Nicaragua three times. All fieldwork was conducted between 2006 and 2009. In addition, I carried out interviews with importers in the US and EU. These interviews took place at the Boston Seafood Show (2008 and 2009) and in Brussels (2008 and 2009), as well as informally in New York City. I participated in the Fifth International Meeting on Spiny Lobster (*Panulirus argus*) Management (19-29 September 2006) of the WECAFC, organized by the FAO in Merida, Mexico. Here I conducted semi-structured interviews with all states representatives present (besides the three interviews with representatives from Belize, Jamaica and Nicaragua this amounted to an additional ten interviews) I also participated in the special one-day symposium on the responsible use of the spiny lobster resource in the Caribbean region at the GCFI conference in Punta Cana, Dominican Republic (5-9 November 2007). Here I presented my own research, participated in the meetings and held informal interviews with a variety of scientists, policy-makers, importers and exporters.

Choice of locations in each country
The choice of countries was carried out on the basis of their different governance styles. Within each of the selected countries, different fishing métiers were present, based on scale (small-scale and industrial) and gear (diving and trapping). The choice of research locations within each country thus had to reflect the ability to target the different fishing métiers in each country (see Fig. 1.2).
A) **Belize:** In this research I focused on fishers in the northern and central part of the country, as they are responsible for the largest share of the lobster production in Belize. I conducted interviews, surveys, and participated in fishing trips with fishers in Caye Caulker and Belize City. In Belize there are two types of lobster fishers: divers and trap fishers. Although there are two main lobster trap fishing villages in the north—San Pedro and Caye Caulker—I chose Caye Caulker, as many studies on the lobster fishery have already been carried out there (e.g., King 1997, 1999; Huitric 2004). All diving boats are stationed in the harbor of Belize City, so by conducting my fieldwork here I was able to target both types of fishers. The Fisheries Department and Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (which hosted me for six weeks during the period October-November 2006) are also located in Belize City.

B) **Jamaica:** The main fishing grounds for lobster are the Pedro Bank and several small fishing villages along the southern coast. The parish of Westmoreland on the south coast is one the largest producers of lobster in the country. I chose the village of Whitehouse, Westmoreland, as one of my two research villages. It hosted several different types of lobster fishers: day-fishers and fishers leaving for a week to fish the Pedro Bank, and both divers and trap fishers. In addition, a fishing cooperative with a long history was located in Whitehouse, as well as being home to an important fishing cooperative leader who served as a key informant. In addition, I investigated the fishing on the Pedro Bank (Middle Key). Pedro Bank is the most important fishing ground of Jamaica, and the Fisheries Department supported my stay on Middle Key on Pedro Bank during several days in 2007. I also spend two weeks in Kingston, where I spent time at the Fisheries Department.

C) **Nicaragua:** The three main lobster fishing centers on the Atlantic coast are: Bluefields, Corn Island, and Puerto Cabezas. In this research I have focused on Corn Island and Puerto Cabezas, as they represent 45 and 44 percent of the total spiny lobster production in the region, respectively. The best fishing grounds for fishers in Puerto Cabezas are located at the Miskito Keys. I therefore went out to the Miskito Keys to interview fishers there as well, but have grouped them under Puerto Cabezas. On Corn Island three different lobster fishing métiers are present: small-scale divers, small-scale trappers, and industrial trappers. Puerta Cabezas hosts the fourth fishing métier: industrial divers.

---

28 The cooperative in the south (Placencia) is only responsible for two to three percent of annual lobster production (average FD statistics 2007-2009).
Participant observation and fishing trips

Gaining access to fishers can often be complex and difficult. Fishers at times had little opportunity to spend time and converse with me, and often couldn’t fully understand why I wanted to know every little detail of what they were doing. At the same time many were very enthusiastic that someone coming from “so far” was taking the time to understand their livelihood. In order to gain a thorough understanding of the fishery, I conducted “participant observation” for hours on end, at docks, landing beaches, government offices, and fishing boats. Sometimes my presence would lead to a group conversation, or eventually an interview with a fisher; sometimes I could just sit and observe.

Being on board the different fishing vessels was the most informative and fun. At times the rapport I had built in a community or with a particular person would enable me to go out on a fishing boat, whereas my presence on board would stimulate even more rapport with the fishers. My presence as a (relatively) young white female from a different continent on the boats (up to five days at a time) never sparked moments, whereby “I blended in with the background.” Yet fishers would continue fishing as they were used to and allowed me into their world without much fuss. Although I am sure my presence caused some slight changes in their behavior, generally my presence would become less of a curiosity, and fishers would go about business as usual. Fishers would go to the “toilet” at the back of the small sailing boat in Belize, while I was still finishing my cup of coffee a meter away. On other occasions I would sleep on a thin mat tightly squeezed between two short fishers on folded-out cardboard
boxes in the hold of a diving boat. In the morning I would eat the undersized lobsters with tortillas just like the rest of the crew and start my day out snorkeling with the free-lung divers from small dugout canoes.

On an industrial boat in Nicaragua I slept with my mattress right between all the fishers in the kitchen (even though I was given the captain’s hut) because the storm scared me, and the presence of fishers sleeping or talking about regular things like soccer and sex soothed me. While out fishing I never attempted to actually participate in the fishing, as fishers always have a particular way of doing all their chores, and I was sure my attempts would mess up efficient fishing practices. I didn’t want to cause fishers any delays, and know I didn’t actually have the strength or know-how to do the things they were accustomed to doing. Nevertheless, sitting there, observing and asking many, many questions gave me a wealth of information. The time spent on board also enabled me to approach sensitive subjects like trade partners, drug finds, corruption, and illegal fishing. In total I spent 23 days at sea: three times for three days, and once for five consecutive days. The remaining days were day trips with fishers. On some occasions I would approach the fishers directly to ask if I could go to sea with them, when doing an interview, for example. For longer periods on board I either worked through my contacts at the Fisheries Departments who knew trustworthy fishers, or I used my contacts with the processing plant owners who employed the industrial boats. My ability to speak fluent Spanish and Creole (English used by the black inhabitants of Belize and Nicaragua), and a little bit of patois (Jamaica) helped in building up trust, making jokes, and “being treated like a princess” on board.

**Interviews**

I have conducted two different types of interviews: informal, unstructured in-depth interviews, and semi-structured in-depth interviews. The table below shows the unstructured and semi-structured in-depth interviews with a variety of actors conducted in the three countries. The way interviews were conducted differed substantially, ranging from a very formal to a very informal setting. Importers were, for example, interviewed at the Boston Seafood show at their booths, during dinner, in a causal restaurant in New York City, or even at the parking lot booth where one importer worked (and which he owned as well). In addition, I have interviewed several importers and exporters at the Brussels Seafood Show in 2009 and 2010.

With a number of importers and exporters I have also kept close contact by means of e-mail and telephone. Every now and again I would either check in with them or they with me. The e-mails and phone calls kept me up to date with current events in the lobster fishery, even when I wasn’t out in the field. I have approximately 50 e-mails from importers where we discuss lobster issues and which I have also used as data.

State representatives of the three countries were mostly interviewed in their respective offices, but also while on trips out to the field, restaurants, and during trips to processing plants. During the WECAFC meeting in 2006 I conducted structured interviews with each participating country (11 in total).

In Belize I spent six weeks at the CRFM, a building located next to the Fisheries Department. The office of the coast guard and the licensing department were all located in the CRFM building. I would therefore often meet government workers right out front, or inside
the building where I worked. As I got to know the various government officials better, I would frequently walk in and out of the Fisheries Department.

Intermediaries (also known as middlemen) were mostly visited in their “offices” if they were the more official type of intermediaries and indeed had offices. Other more informal intermediaries were interviewed on the beaches where fish and lobster were landed, at piers were boats docked, or randomly on the street or on their porches. Fishers were mostly targeted at landing beaches, while with intermediaries, at their homes, shops, and bars, or during fishing trips out at sea. Interviews with fishers could be conducted on beaches full of noisy fishers, and bottles of rum and beer, but also while they were cleaning fish and lobster at the landing site, or when they were just hanging out—basically any fisher that was willing to talk to me and had the time to do so. I also tried to convince fishers that were shy or reluctant, which sometimes worked well and at other times did not. At times I would start interviewing one fisher, but ended up in a group interview with multiple fishers all giving their opinion on the questions. This was usually very interesting and led to stimulating discussions. At times it would lead to nothing but chaos and the fishers would end up talking among themselves about completely different subjects. Or the person I was interviewing would just leave half-way through the interview, if he got bored, was short on time, or had other commitments.

After the initial round of fieldwork, I decided to print pictures of lobster fishing in the three countries. These pictures would entail the different fishing fleets (boats, gears, methods) and I would have pictures of the different types of lobster that exist throughout the world. These pictures, gathered in a book, would often evoke many stimulating conversations and discussions with fishers. Fishers were able to reflect on how different traps could be (size, material, whether bait was used or not), or, for instance, on ways of diving. This way fishers were able to reflect on their own fishery and, in so doing, provide me with interesting information; they mostly seemed to quite enjoy it.

If I needed more fishers from one specific métier, I would go to a place where these types of fishers could be found (e.g., a middleman working only with divers, or a middleman working only with trap fishers). I aimed to meet fishers at a variety of times during the day, in the morning when they would go out, or, for example, in the afternoon when they would return from sea. Visits to their homes and interviews in bars or during fishing obviously also occurred throughout the day. The sampling of fishers was thus one of convenience sampling, whereby fishers were interviewed simply because they were available (Bryman 2004). Of the fishers “simply available” where I was at the time, I had to find the ones who were willing to spend time with me for an interview. In addition, the only fishers that would be excluded from interviews were the ones that were completely drunk or stoned or both.

The same method was applied to the well-being questionnaires and job satisfaction surveys below. I only listed 23 qualitative interviews with fishers following a similar line of questioning. Yet, considering the number of hours I spent talking to fishers at the landing beaches, bars, on board boats, or hanging out at intermediaries, cooperatives, or other spots, I have in fact done many more interviews. These might have varied between ten minutes and a few hours, and I have not listed all these interviews separately here. The 23 interviews are therefore only a fraction of all the qualitative interviews or chats with fishers and others with knowledge in the fishery that have been carried out in this research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews per category (as used in thesis)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Importers in the US and EU</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Exporters</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: State representatives in Belize, Jamaica, and Nicaragua</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: State representatives of other countries in the Caribbean</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Interviews with fishers (besides the: informal interviews; surveys; fishing trips; and participant observation)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Cooperatives</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Intermediaries</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Scientists and NGOs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of interviews</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well-being questionnaires</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction questionnaires</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.3: List of interviews per actor group (see Appendix A for dates of interviews) as well as number of well-being and job satisfaction questionnaires.

**Surveys**

In addition to the qualitative interviews, 88 well-being questionnaires were completed and 84 job satisfaction surveys were conducted in total for this research in the three countries (see Fig. 1.3) (see Appendix B and C for both questionnaires). I developed the questionnaires to shed light on the material and relational dimension of well-being. The questions entailed more general questions on age, number of dependents, place of birth, and place of residence, as well as on: the location of fishing grounds; absence from home; multi-species/single-species fishery; economic alternatives; trade relations; conflicts; the role of the government; and illegal fishing. These questions were able to provide a general picture of the material and relational dimensions of well-being. Similar to how the interviews were conducted, the questionnaires were completed by fishers who were willing to do so and who had the time.

For information on subjective well-being, job satisfaction surveys were used. The research survey was administered to a sample of 83 lobster fishers from Belize, Jamaica, and Nicaragua. Thirty-one fishers were interviewed in Belize, 26 in Jamaica, and 26 in Nicaragua. Despite the fact that fishers are divided by gear type (trap fishers and divers), the majority of respondents are small-scale. Only four respondents in Nicaragua employ industrial type methods. The survey of job satisfaction used in the current research is based on the model developed by Pollnac and Poggie (1988), to which two categories of questions have been added. The survey therefore consists of five categories: basic needs, social needs, self-actualization, management, and the value of nature. The basic needs category relates to fishers’ health, earnings, and their ability to feed their families. The second category of social needs refers to fishers’ satisfaction with time at sea, being one’s own boss, and the time they spend away from their families. Self-actualization relates to the notion of fishing as a challenging, adventurous, and worthwhile occupation. Management is a new category, and considers views on conflict and conflict resolution, rules and regulations, performance of government officials, possibilities for participation, and overall management. The nature category refers to the satisfaction of fishers with their landing site, as well as with levels of fish stocks.
The Likert scale (Bryman 2004) was used to rank the responses to the 27 questions in the survey. The Likert scale is a multiple-indicator measure of a set of attitudes relating to a particular area, in this case their job. When responding to a Likert questionnaire item, fishers specify their level of agreement according to a five-point scale ranging from (1) very unsatisfied, (2) unsatisfied, (3) neutral, to (4) satisfied, and (5) very satisfied. In addition, three overall questions on job satisfaction were added, relating to whether a fisher would enter a job outside fishing, or move to another type of fishing, and whether he or she would advise a young adult to enter the fishery.

In Belize the job satisfaction surveys (31) were carried out by a research assistant (Iris de Hoog). In Jamaica fifteen job satisfaction surveys were carried out by Billy Honeghen, and in Nicaragua fifteen surveys were carried out by Eugene Dixon. These research assistants were trained by the author and all followed similar methods in carrying out the surveys. The well-being questionnaires and job satisfaction surveys were not necessarily carried out during the same period. The 88 and 83 fishers are therefore not the same fishers, but two different groups, although a number of them (approximately 35) were administered to the same group at the same time (in Belize).

Secondary data

A thorough literature search is vital to the success of any research project (Bernard 1988). I have therefore read a large number of documents for this thesis: official government documents; scientific articles; gray literature; white papers; PowerPoints; proceedings; and newspaper articles. In addition, I gained access to an American data supplier, Urner Barry, “a business publisher specializing in the accurate and unbiased reporting of market news and quotations” to clients in the poultry, egg, meat, seafood, and related segments of the food industry through a variety of print and non-print media.”

I needed access in order to track the historical price developments and volume of lobster imports into the US. The University of Amsterdam allowed me to purchase access to the Urner Barry database, containing current and historical records, as well as trade data. I used their data to map price developments of the different types of lobster throughout the past decades (see Chapter 1), and attempted to use the available trade data to learn which companies are the largest importers, from which countries they import, from which companies they buy the product, and how long the relationships are in general between importer and exporter (see Chapter 7). It turned out, however, that the Urner Barry data was a far cry from transparent, and roughly 40 percent of the lobster imports came into the US under the heading “order,” which means no company name is listed. This showed the high level of secrecy and competition that prevails in this sector (see Chapter 7 for more information).

1.6 Limitations of research

The sample size of the job satisfaction surveys is small. A larger sample size would have enabled me to use it for more statistical tests. Although the sample size of the material and relational surveys was also rather small (appr. 30 per country), these surveys did enable a thorough understanding of the three dimensions of well-being. A larger sample size would,

however, have enabled me to make more nuanced statistical comparisons between the three countries and widened the number of tests I could have carried out. In a future study I would like to carry out more surveys (both for the job satisfaction component as well as concerning the material and relational well-being). I did, however, also interview many fishers outside the confines of the questionnaires, in order to investigate the answers that came out of the surveys in more detail. In addition, I also participated in many (multi-day) fishing trips, which also enabled me to gather more in-depth information to back up the information found in the surveys.

Secondary literature from official sources at times was untrustworthy. The official catch statistics often suffer from the high levels of illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (known as IUU fishing) in the region. This was particularly the case in Jamaica and Nicaragua. In Nicaragua, however, nearly all the officially landed lobsters go through official processing plants, giving adequate data on the means, by which the lobster has been caught. In Jamaica, on the other hand, data on landings is very limited. Part of the catch goes through the processing plants and is exported, but precise data are unavailable. This limits this research in the sense that I was not able to adequately compare the different tracks the lobster travelled in Jamaica and the lobster chain, both nationally and internationally.

Some questions that highly interested me from the start—such as: how much illegal sized lobster do you catch; how much of this do you sell or consume; do you catch all the berried females that you catch; do you fish for lobster during the closed season; how much money do you make from narco-trafficking (or helping narco-traffickers refuel); how much cocaine have you found in total; and what did you do with this money (reinvest in fishery or invested in other causes)—I considered unfit to ask. So in order to come up with any sort of indication of IUU fishing, I asked fishers how many fishers out of ten would land a) undersized lobster, 2) berried females, or 3) engage in fishing during the closed season. The results of these questions are not very precise, but they do provide an indication of the levels of illegal activity in each country. With regard to fishers’ involvement in narco-trafficking, I only had them relate what they wanted to share. I never opened the topic, but once they started talking about it, I would ask more in-depth questions. The topic, however, requires much more thorough and systematic study and analysis in order to be able to make any major generalizations about the topic.

This research required access to a variety of circles, for instance: a variety of fishing groups; intermediaries; processing plants; importers in the US; national civil servants; NGOs; and so on. I needed to gain access to all of these different circles in each country, which required trust, rapport, and guts. Ultimately, I wasn’t able to gain access to everyone I needed to, and often one actor would refer me to the next important person to talk to. However, my talking to one person would in turn sometimes deter others from talking with me. This was especially notable at the Seafood conferences in Boston, where my interviewing an importer would not go unnoticed by anyone. Access at times was difficult, as some actors are more easily approachable than others. Gaining access to US importers and processing plants in the various countries proved especially difficult. I have developed various very good relationships with a number of US importers and processing plants, so rather than conducting a single interview with many importers, I ended up having many interviews and e-mail exchanges with just a few importers, and likewise regarding contacts at processing plants.
The last limitation of this study I would like to highlight is the time factor. The field research took place in the period 2006-2009. When I started carrying out the research and surveys, the sky was the limit when it came to lobster prices on the world market. By 2009, prices for lobster from the Caribbean had dropped 40 percent. Any surveys that would have been carried out during these times might have evoked different responses. This made assessment of the income of fishers (from data as supplied by them) much more difficult, as the surveys were carried out during different time periods in different countries. If I had known about the crisis beforehand, I would have scheduled to have all surveys done in all countries at the same time, and for any future study I will follow this strategy. This, however, proved impossible in this case, as the impacts of the crisis only slowly dawned on me. Given these limitations, arriving at precise estimates of the income of fishers proved impossible. Based on the interviews, surveys, participants’ observations, invoices from intermediaries, data files from intermediaries, and secondary literature I was able to compare the revenues of the different fishing groups.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has discussed the three main theoretical concepts that underlie this thesis, and the application of these three main concepts for this research. In addition, this chapter has shown the different research methods used, and the limitations of this study.

The three concepts used in this research—governance, global value chain analysis, and well-being—all stem from different theoretical discourses and backgrounds, and are used in a variety of social sciences. Governance is defined as the interaction between market parties, public parties, and civil society, at multiple levels. The interaction will differ between countries and sectors. The overall result of the interaction per country, between market parties, state, and civil society, can be seen as a distinct governance style. Kooiman et al. (2005) distinguish three ideal types of governance styles of interaction: self-governing, co-governing, and hierarchical. The authors argue that all societies demonstrate, and require, mixes of these three modes or styles. In this regard, I agree with these authors when they argue that, although these three types are idealized types, a fisheries governance style in a certain country can be argued to show more characteristics of one style than another. I follow the literature that suggests that different governance styles impact the final ability of fishers to achieve well-being in different ways. The literature suggests that certain governance styles, for instance co-management, are more beneficial for both the distribution of benefits throughout the chain, and for increased levels of individual well-being. The interaction between these three concepts will co-determine value-chain structure dynamics and therefore directly and indirectly the well-being of lobster fishers. To examine the different governance styles of the three countries I investigate the following: the development orientation of the state; the orientation towards the fishing sector; stakeholder representation; state institutions, laws, and policies; state-market relations; and NGO-state market relations in MPA management.

This chapter also explored the Global Value Chain approach. The GVC describes the range of activities that are required to bring a product from its conception to its end use and beyond. The Global Value Chain approach helps to address questions on the lack of correspondence between the geographical spread of economic activity and the spreading of
gains from participating in global production markets (Kaplinksy 2000: 118). The lobster fishery in the Caribbean is a prime example of a value chain that starts with harvesters in the South and extends to consumers in the North. In this thesis, I investigate the structure and governance of the value chain in each of the countries. A variety of market governance structures within the chain have been presented in this chapter. Governance within the chain refers to the distribution of benefits and dependency relationships throughout the chain. Different types of chain governance can impact the ability of fishers to achieve well-being differently. In this research I will focus on chain structure (input-output, chain actors, quality standards, and practices), as well as governance of the chain (dependency relations, barriers to entry, and the impacts of the economic crisis on chain governance).

The well-being of fishers is measured across three dimensions: material, relational, and subjective well-being. This chapter has shown the different schools of thought behind these three dimensions, although the origins of the different schools also partly overlap. The concept of well-being is one result of this development, and provides a holistic view on well-being of people, as it attempts to combine both objective as well as subjective measurements of well-being. The three dimensions try to encapsulate this holistic angle, as well as the ability to compare fishers’ well-being across different countries and métiers. Fishers can score differently across the three dimensions, both between fishing groups in one country and fishing groups in different countries. The three dimensions link back to different aspects of the characteristics of the governance arrangements and the lobster chain that a fisher belongs to. The conceptual framework thus shows the embedding of fishers in the governance arrangements and lobster chain, and the linkages between the different concepts. This chapter has thus hopefully convinced the reader that, in order to view the lobster fishery in the Caribbean as an integrated whole, and answer the research questions that underlie this study, we need to draw on fisheries governance, the Global Value Chain approach, and the well-being approach.