Kenya: Establishing the Nature and Rate of Resilience (Recovery) Among the Displaced Population in Nakuru County

Eric ISRAEL-OKERE

Abstract: Although internal displacement of persons has been witnessed in Kenya over the years, the 2007/08 episode was the most severe. This study was conducted to examine the socio-economic characteristics of the internally displaced population (IDPs) and to assess the nature of the initial resettlement among the displaced population at the Nakuru Pipeline Complex, Nakuru County, Kenya. The study used a survey design and sampled 260 households from the resettlement register. Questionnaires which included the household displacement deprivation scale and key informant guide were used. Indicators that were rated worst (i.e., severely or rarely available or accessible) at the time of the initial settlement in 2008 included loss of self-esteem (82%), loss of income (82%), loss of employment (78%), lack of shelter (81%) and loss of property (71%). By 2018, there were considerable improvements (recovery) that included housing (72.0%), food access (63.0%), water (57.0%), and clothing (54.0%) compared to the initial crisis periods. Given the occurrence of processes that induce disasters and displacement, social development efforts should be directed to the reduction of vulnerabilities, including socio-ecological vulnerabilities. Such measures will ensure that when disasters and displacements occur, it will be possible for the people, and citizens, to recover, adapt to new environments, and continue with their livelihoods. Reduction of severity in magnitude and duration will need to be an integral part of the social development planning.

Keywords: *Resilience, internally displaced population, displacement, Nakuru Pipeline, deprivation*.

Eric ISRAEL-OKERE
Department of Sociology, Gender and Development Studies, Kenyatta University
Email: ericisraelokere@gmail.com

Conflict Studies Quarterly
Issue 46, January 2024, pp. 39–54

DOI: 10.24193/csq.46.3
Published First Online: January 05 / 2024

Background

Forced displacement refers to occurrences (or incidences) of households (persons) obliged to leave or flee their habitual

residence as a result of natural disasters, conflicts, development initiatives, and/or violation of human rights (UN, 1951). Although forced displacement has been witnessed at various times in history, it became one of the major challenges from the 2nd half of the 1900s particularly in developing countries; characterized by the two inter-related components; namely refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—UNHCR, 2009, UN 1951). Refugees were defined in 1951 as persons displaced across an international border, and IDPs were defined in 1998 as persons displaced but remained within the county/state of their original habitual residence. The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) (2012) emphasized that displacement in itself was a driver of future disaster risks, and it placed people at a higher risk of impoverishment.

By 2018, 70.8 million people were displaced globally; of which 29.5 million were refugees, and 41.3 million were IDPs (UNHCR 2015, 2016, 2018). By 2018, 23.8 million people were displaced in Sub Sahara Africa (SSA), reflecting a dramatic increase from 14.1 million in 2016 to 18.4 million in 2017 (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs—OCHA, 2017). Out of the entire displaced people in SSA in 2018, 7.3 million were refugees and 16.5 million were internally displaced (UNHCR, 2015, 2016, 2018; Getanda *et al*., 2015). By 2016, SSA had overtaken the Middle East in both the conflicts and displacements with nearly one million new displacements as a result of resource-based conflicts.

The displaced population in East and Horn of Africa (EHOA) stood at 13.02 million at the end of 2018, of which 4.02 million were refugees and asylum-seekers and 9.0 million were IDSs largely by environmental conditions, conflicts, and socio-economic deprivation (UNHCR-IOM-UNOPS-MoDM-KRG, 2007; UNHCR 2018, OCHA 2017, Samuel Hall, 2016). Although internal displacement has been witnessed in Kenya since the early 1960s, the 2007/08 Post-Election Violence (PEV) was the most severe with estimated 660,000 IDPs, out of which 53% (360,000) went to displaced camps and 300,000 (47%) were designated as integrated IDPs, i.e., displaced persons living outside the camps, staying primarily with host families, relatives, friends, etc. (Getanda *et al*., 2015, Kamungi 2013).

While the causes of displacement have continued to increase globally and in various regions, an even greater challenge has been the issue of protracted displacement. UNHCR (2009) defined Protracted Refugee Situations (PRS) as circumstances where 25,000 refugees or more have been in exile 'for about 5 years or more after their initial displacement, without immediate prospects for durable solutions'. Similarly, an expert seminar on Protracted Internal Displacement (2007) organized by UNHCR and the Brookings-Bern Project agreed that protracted internal displacement situations (PIDS) will be those situations in which 'the process for discovering long-term solutions has been delayed and stalled for about 5 years or more after their initial displacement,

remained marginalized or lacked the protection of human rights, including economic, social and cultural rights.

In this case, resilience has been adopted and used in conflict-induced displacement as a concept and also as a theory to reverse the effects of the underlying processes, address related vulnerabilities, and develop /reinstate self-reliance and capacity to participate in durable solutions. Displacement by definition limits people from owning or accessing their previous livelihoods and forces them to adapt to new circumstances. Resilience therefore is referred to as the capacity of human units (individuals, homes, societies, nations, and structures) to mitigate, adapt to, and recuperate from hazard shocks in ways that reduce the severity of the impact (loss of lives, damages, destructions or disruptions); including depletion of socio-economic capacity, sliding to chronic poverty, poverty vulnerability; and re-activating rapid self-reliance and ability to participate in durable solutions (Wisner & Fordham, Department for International Development—DFID, 2011).

Recovery is measured by how long it takes to return to the prior state after a disruption (Folke, 2006). Majidi and Hennion (2014) examined the resilience of displaced women in Afghanistan, gender dimensions, and vulnerabilities of internal displacement. These authors observed that women were "the vulnerable within the vulnerable" and struggled to re-establish sustainable livelihoods with their families or on their own. Families and households tended to delay the decision of whether or not to go back to their places of habitual residence or start a new life elsewhere. However, limited attention has been given to resilience towards recovery and self-reliance, measures to enhance livelihoods, adaptation to urban livelihoods, labor market, and integration to socio-economic production therefore this study was determined to establish the nature and rate of resilience (recovery) among displaced population in Nakuru county Kenya.

Methodology

Study site

This study was carried out at the Nakuru Pipeline Displaced Complex (NPDC) which hosted the 2007/08 segment of the IDPs. The study site was appropriate to examine displacement vulnerability, resilience, recovery after more than 10 years in the temporary-transit displacement camp, and re-settlement in the urban environment since 810 households were settled in the NPDC. The initial pipeline Camp was located 15 km from the Nakuru Municipality of Nakuru County and 155 km from Nairobi.

Target population

The target population of the study therefore was the entire displaced households at the Nakuru Pipeline Displaced Complex (NPDC) and resulting resettlements at Subukia and Njoro, most of whom had remained in the same complex since the 2007/08 displacement episode.

Sample and sample size determination

We used the formula for small and finite populations, 95% probability of confidence, and the corresponding 5% probability of error were used to obtain a sample of 260. The same sample size was also verified with the use of the Krejcie and Morgan table (1970) which indicates required sample sizes for different levels of population sizes at a 95% level of confidence (or inversely 05% probability of error).

Data collection

Data collection was carried out using three principal approaches, namely key informants, focus group discussion (FGD), and the survey questionnaire. The key informant approach involved interviews of persons knowledgeable on the 2007/08 post-election violence in Kenya, Nakuru, displacement, and resettlement. In total, we had 15 key informants that included an assistant sub-county commissioner, the head of the catholic relief secretariat, a representative of the Norwegian Relief Council, the chief, assistant chief, a priest, and coordinators of the Nakuru pipeline Camp, Njoro and Subukia. Other key informants included the Nakuru County Education Coordinator and the principal of the Nakuru Pipeline Primary School. We adopted three (3) key dimensions of social resilience, namely: (a) displacement deprivation; i.e., key aspects that households experienced the greatest deprivation; (b) recovery or the ability for timely response to overcome adversity (or disruption); and (c) the ability to adjust to new environments, occupations and livelihoods. Key aspects (indicators) of resilience that were examined included the rate of response to key dimensions at the displaced Camp, the rate of recovery after 12 months in key areas, reduced vulnerability from displacement deprivations, reduced dependency particularly from humanitarian agencies and donations, recovery to adequate levels of sustainability and adjustment to new occupations, careers, and environment.

Data analysis

Data were tabulated, edited, recorded, and classified in quantifiable terms. Data were presented using frequencies, bar charts, pie charts, and percentages. Qualitative data were analyzed using descriptive content analysis. The typological analysis was used to classify patterns, themes, and recurrences. The logical analysis was used to outline generalized causation. The research findings came directly from the results of the analyzed data.

Ethical considerations

The study sought ethical approval from Kenyatta University and the National Commission of Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI/P/18/47050/25833). Before data collection, all participants were consented and informed that participation in the study was voluntary and that they would withdraw from the study without any indictment.

Results

Household displacement deprivation scale

For this study, a deprivation scale was adopted to assess the reduction in vulnerability, recovery to adequate levels of sustainability, and adjustment to new occupations, careers, and environment.

A scale that ranged from 1 to 5 representing progression from severe lack of availability/access to adequately available/accessible goods and services to support livelihood, notably: (1) severe lack of availability/access of goods and services; (2) rarely (minimal) availability/accessibility; (3) available through aid agencies and not sustainable; (4) regular availability/accessibility of goods and services; and (5) adequately available/accessibility of goods, services (Ergin, 2017; EU 2017).

Indicators that were rated worst (i.e., severely or rarely available or accessible) at the time of the initial settlement included loss of self-esteem (82%), loss of income (82%), loss of employment (78%), lack of shelter (81%) and loss of property (71%) as summarized in Table 3.1 below:

Table 3.1: Percent deprivation one year at displacement camp 2008/2009

Key components	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1 Severe food shortage	55	30	6	5	4	100 (257)
2 Lack of shelter/housing	81	7	6	3	3	100 (258)
3 Loss of employment	78	9	6	4	3	100 (258)
4 Shortage of water	52	21	15	9	4	100 (258)
5 Loss of property	71	13	4	7	4	100 (260)
6 Limited access to clothing	16	56	13	11	4	100 (260)
7 Loss of income	82	8	4	3	3	100 (260)
8 Congestion	70	12	9	6	3	100 (260)
9 Insecurity	47	31	7	8	7	100 (257)
10 Loss of dignity/self-esteem	82	8	4	3	3	100 (257)
11 Family cohesion and integrity	55	21	11	9	4	100 (257)
12 Lack of sanitation	53	21	13	9	4	100 (260)
13 Sickness/lack of medical services	42	31	17	5	5	100 (257)
14 Accessibility of education facilities	57	23	9	7	4	100 (260)

Key 1= severe lack of availability/access, 2=rarely/minimally, 3=made available through aid agencies, 4= regularly available/accessible, and =adequately available/accessible.

Key challenges to the households during the initial six months of settlement at Nakuru Pipeline Displaced Camp were listed in the order of the deprivation as access to food

(33%), access to shelter (30%), need for clothing (20%), and the need for employment (17%) as shown in Table 3.2 below:

Table 3. 2: Order of Key deprivations; One year of displacement

Key Deprivations	Frequency	Percent
Limited Access to Food	84	33
Limited Availability of Shelter	78	30
Limited Access to Clothing	53	20
Limited opportunities for employment	45	17
Total	**260**	**100**

Source: Fieldwork, 2018

Recovery (Resilience); 3 years of displacement

Household heads indicated their experience of recovery three (3) years after displacement (adversity, disruptions, or discontinuity); on a scale of 1 to 5 for faster (or timely) recovery on key aspects that included employment, self-employment, trade (business), average income, education for children, continued education for household head and spiritual growth. Areas that reflected a reasonable rate of recovery included spiritual growth (53.6%), self-employment (42%), trade (41.6%), and education for children (38.6%). This is summarized in Table 3.3 below.

Table 3.3: Rate of recovery: Three years of displacement

Specific Aspects	Rate of Recovery in Some Dimensions					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Employment	73.2	11.5	7.2	6.2	1.9	100 (257)
Self-employment	20.4	22.6	42.0	15.0	0	100 (242)
Trade (business)	23.5	18.7	41.6	7.6	8.6	100 (197)
Average Income	71.9	11.9	11.8	4.4	0	100 (257)
Education for children	15.2	18.5	38.6	27.7	0	100 (257)
Continued Education for the household head	75.2	9.5	7.2	6.2	1.9	100 (255)
Spiritual growth	19.9	24.5	53.6	0	0	100 (258)

We also assessed recovery during the three (3) year period with access to basic needs. Out of the six (6) indicators, access to religious services, and access to basic needs (43.5%) reflected reasonable recovery during the three (3) years of displacement. The result is presented in Table 3.4 below:

Table 3.4: Rate of recovery; Three years of displacement

	Specific Aspects	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	Access to basic needs (Shelter, food, water, sanitation)	13.4	15.3	27.8	43.5	0	100 (253)
2	Access to livelihoods (Farm produce, trade, employment, and/or income)	31.1	26.2	24.6	18.0	0	100 (257)
3	Access to welfare support	52.7	18.1	14.7	14.5	0	100 (257)
4	Access to religious services	22.3	9.4	8.5	8.1	51.7	100 (257)
5	Access to opportunities to improve household wellbeing	58.0	27.0	15.0	0	0	100 (255)
6	Adjusting to living at the Camp	57.9	18.3	10.2	9.4	4.2	100 (255)

Vulnerability reduction and recovery (resilience)

Given the challenges at the initial settlement, household heads were requested to respond to the same deprivation rating scale (where one was equal to severe lack of availability/access, to 5 for adequate availability/accessibility of key components (food, shelter, sanitation, etc.) from their present (2018) experience at the Nakuru Pipeline Displaced Complex.

In principle, most of the indicators reflected a scale of 4; i.e., regular availability/accessibility of goods and services; which reflected a considerable reduction of vulnerability and therefore recovery. Responses are summarized in table 3.5 below:

Table 3.5: Percent deprivation 10 years at displacement complex 2018

	Key components	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	Severe food shortages	5	15	5	63	12	100 (257)
2	Lack of shelter/housing	4	7	9	72	8	100 (258)
3	Loss/recovery of employment	14	30	11	38	07	100 (258)
4	Lack/shortage of water	7	12	11	57	14	100 (258)
5	Loss/recovery of property	9	28	11	38	14	100 (260)
6	Limited access to clothing	4	17	11	54	14	100 (260)
7	Loss/recovery of income	8	20	7	52	13	100 (260)
8	Congestion	9	21	5	61	04	100 (260)
9	Insecurity	23	23	7	42	05	100 (257)
10	Loss of dignity/self-esteem	12	18	5	51	14	100 (257)
11	Family cohesion and integrity	10	17	6	53	17	100 (257)
12	Lack/poor sanitation	16	19	6	51	9	100 (260)
13	Sickness/lack of medical services	27	30	6	37	06	100 (257)
14	Accessibility of education facilities	11	19	6	47	18	100 (60)

Household occupation and resilience

We examined recovery on the occupation of the households; using the type of occupation held by 2018. The key change was the transformation from casual labor (45%) in 2008–09 to farming (32%) which became the main occupation supporting 32% of the households. The resulting transformation enhanced the participation of the displaced population in both subsistent and commercial farming from 16% in 2008–2009 to 32% (which represented an increase of 16%). The results are presented in Table 3.6 below:

Table 3.6: Post-displacement (present) occupations of the household heads

	Occupation by 2018	Frequency	Percent
1	Farming	83	32
2	SME trading	72	28
3	Technical occupations	63	24
4	Casual laborers	42	16
	Total	**257**	**100%**

Household income and resilience

We examined recovery on household income using monthly income by 2018. It was noted that although they still were not able to meet their needs, there had been some recovery in the household income. A household that accessed less than 5,000 KES per month had reduced from 61% to 25%, an improvement of 36%. Similarly, a household that accessed less than 10,000 KES per month had increased from 19% to 48%; again, an improvement of 29% as shown in Table 3.7:

Table 3.7: Post displacement monthly household income, 2018

Household Income (KES)	Frequency	Percent
500–5,000	65	25
5,000–10,000	124	48
10,001–20,000	38	15
20,001–35,000	20	08
Over 35,000	13	05
Total	**260**	**100**

Post-displacement household expenditure was examined to determine the way they met their needs and it was found that household expenditure ranged from KES 2,000 (USD 20) to 35,000 (USD 350) per month. By 2018, most of the displaced households (47%) reported having spent over KES 5,000 (USD 1.7) as shown in Table 3.8 below:

Table 3.8: Post displacement monthly household expenditure

Household Income (KES)	Frequency	Percent
2,000–5,000	87	33.46
5,001–10,000	121	46.54
10,001–20,000	33	12.69
20,001–35,000	12	4.61
Over 35,000	7	2.70
Total	**260**	**100**

Sources of immediate assistance

We identified key agencies that provided emergency responses and attended to some of the needs. In response, agencies were ranked as follows: aid agencies (40%), government agencies (27%), local religious agencies (11%), relatives and friends (12%), and local networks including credit and begging (08%) as shown in Table 3.9 below:

Table 3.9: Sources of immediate assistance at the camp.

Key Challenges	Frequency	Percent
Aid Agencies	105	40
Government Agencies	70	27
Local Religious Agencies	33	11
Relatives and friends	30	12
Local Networks	22	08
Total	**260**	**100**

Discussion

This study was determined to establish the nature and rate of resilience (recovery) among the displaced population in Nakuru County Kenya as a result of the post-election violence of 2007/2008 in Kenya. Widespread disenchantment, illusions, losses, and deprivations during the 1st one year of displacements were reported. Every household had lost property, money, work or trade, and self-esteem. Also, households experienced diseases and an increase in mortality rates. A key informant reported that within a few days of displacement, they realized that they were incapacitated and unable to support themselves. The participants at the FGD informed us further that their houses were reduced to tents.

In Afghanistan, it was reported that the proportion of households that owned their home fell drastically, from 70% before displacement to 25.6 percent (regardless of the period of displacement) (IDMC *et al*., 2012). Other documentation indicates that internally displaced persons arrive at refugee camps with minimal resources, generally

without the financial and social networks to live anywhere other than in tents and small insubstantial mud homes (IDMC *et al*., 2012). Besides tents and sub-standard shelters, added vulnerabilities include lack of privacy, limited water, sanitation, ventilation, etc. We were informed also that food insecurity continued for over three (3) years because displaced households had no access to fields to cultivate.

Although there were relief foods from Aid Agencies, most of the households did not receive adequate rations to support their families. Poor nutrition and severely limited access to medication led to an increase in diseases at the Camp particularly those of the children under five (5) years. These ratings were substantially similar to the reports in the previous studies including monitoring of the displaced persons in Kenya (Getanda *et al*., 2015; Irish Aid, 2017; Kamungi, 2013).

Other categories of aspects that were rated also as not available (accessible) included the shortage of water (52%), lack of sanitation (51%), and security (47%). Some participants from the FGD reported that from the Nakuru Agricultural Show Grounds to the Nakuru Pipeline Displaced Camp, water, sanitation, and security were part of the key challenges. Water was supplied by the Government for two (2) years, from 2008 to 2011 after that, the Camp had to make alternative provisions to purchase a driven supply of water. Although some common toilets were established, based on a given number of houses (tents), sanitation remained a challenge. A key informant informed us that "*When we arrived at the Nakuru Displaced Pipeline Camp most of us were tired, sick and traumatized, and struggled to access food every day".* He added, "*fear and helplessness were common among us*". Another key informant added, *"we all had feelings of pain because we had lost everything—small pieces of land, savings, jobs, and families scattered in all directions everything was therefore new for us, the Camp, the people, order, and the security".*

The rating of insecurity as a key challenge stood at 78%. It is instructive to note that at the establishment of the camp, a police station was also established. However, the participants of FGD emphasized that insecurity was a pervasive challenge to most households, particularly women, children, and girls. They reported that at the initial stages of the camp, ladies were exposed to sexual manipulation and abuse at the hands of the native population who fostered transactional relationships in exchange for food or temporary employment. Another informant added that "*people were targets of all kinds of intimidations and harassments*". Previous monitoring reports had made similar observations. Irish Aid (2017) summarized that at the start of the conflict and, displacement and initial settlement, the female gender is marked for sexual and gender-based violence.

Family cohesion and integrity were also rated as severe challenges because of the challenges related to violence against women (VAM), prostitution, forced or early marriages, and drugs. A key informant reported that every household had one issue or another related to VAM, prostitution, forced or early marriages, and drugs. The participants

from the FGD agreed that every household had a challenge related to VAM, prostitution, forced or early marriages, and drugs. It was estimated that over 35% of girls between 15 and 17 years were forced to early marriage and/or had children, accompanied by the problem of the upkeep. Reports from Afghanistan indicated that over 37% of the households had at least a girl who was under the age of 16 getting married during displacement. An additional 27% of female children were forced to marry against their will (IDMC *et al*., 2012).

These results were consistent with the previous studies (Samuel Hall, 2016, Getanda *et al*., 2015; Majidi & Hennion, 2014; Boano *et al*., 2008). The rating of these aspects reflected the contention that displacement dramatically disrupts the livelihoods of the households (or displaced persons), and severe reduction in availability (or accessibility) to essentials such as food, clean water, shelter, proper clothing, health care, and sanitation.

The experience of recovery three (3) years after displacement (adversity, disruptions, or discontinuity) on key aspects showed interesting results. Areas in which they reflected a reasonable rate of recovery included spiritual growth (53.6%), self-employment (42%), trade (41.6%), and education for children (38.6%). access to religious services, and access to basic needs (43.5%) reflected reasonable recovery during the three (3) years of displacement. Access to religious services was generally 52.7% because of services that were provided by religious agencies within and outside the camp. Access to basic needs stood at 43.5% because of improved housing at the Nakuru Pipeline Displacement Camp and the production of food at adjacent parcels of land. It also included improved water and sanitation at the Nakuru Pipeline Displacement Camp.

Conversely, the other four (4) indicators namely access to livelihoods, access to welfare support, access to opportunities to improve well-being, and adjustment to living at the camp reflected low or negligible recovery. More specifically, access to livelihood resources (i.e., farm produce, trade, employment, and/or income) reflected a slow response rate (31.1%) and therefore appeared to have been complex. According to the FGD sessions, many of the households were not and have not been able to secure adequate access to livelihood to the present.

Although they still had access to humanitarian support, 52.7% reported limited access to welfare. Focused group discussions indicated that humanitarian support was not adequate and was not consistent; i.e. three to four months would pass before the next round of support. Similarly, even a higher percentage (58%) reported limited opportunities for improving their well-being. Further, a similar percentage (58%) reported limited adjustment to living at the camp. Except for the loss of property, loss of employment, insecurity, and medical services, all the other indicators were over 50% of the availability (accessibility) and therefore reflected considerable recovery over the initial period of one year (12 months) of displacement. More specifically, indicators with

considerable recovery included housing (72%), access to food (63%), access to water (57%), clothing (54%), sanitation, congestion, and self-esteem (51%).

Although there were still some desperate segments, by 2018 availability and access to food had improved by 75%. Indeed, the proportion of displaced that had severe difficulties accessing food reduced from 85% at the beginning of displacement (2008/2009) to 73% after 12 months and finally to 37%. During the first three (3) years of displacement, they relied largely on food aid and begging to access food.

Various reports emphasized the continued challenge of food among the displaced; particularly desperate efforts to find regular and adequate employment to support food requirements. By 2018, as an advantage to this segment of the displaced population, over 58% of the households generated their food and livelihoods from one of the three fields: (1) the Nakuru Pipeline Displaced Complex; (2) Njoro Re-settlement Farm; and (3) Subukia Re-settlement Farm where they cultivate maize, beans, and other horticultural produce. However, by 2018, the time of the study, 25% still relied on food aid and begging to access food; an additional 41% of the displaced households survived on less than three meals a day, and seemingly adapted to chronic food deficiency. About 43% cited cost and lack of a consistent supply of food as a major hindrance to them getting food.

By 2018, housing had been transformed from tents to earth-based floors of semi-permanent structures. Rooms in these structures ranged from two to three rooms; and still, some households cooked outside. These structures were spread from the Nakuru Displaced Pipeline to Njoro and Subukia. The participants from the FGD reported that they have advised the household to carry out stepwise improvement of the houses as a way to mitigate the financial burden. Further, there was a water improvement (57%) but which was relied on purchases from the neighboring estates. The provision of water for the households in Nakuru Displaced Pipeline, Njoro, and Subukia was understood as ad-hoc, awaiting a durable solution, and, therefore, households with limited income will continue with the challenges of water.

There was also a modest improvement in family cohesion and integrity (53%). Households continued to witness challenges related to violence against women (VAM), prostitution, forced or early marriages, and drugs. Challenges have shifted to relatively poor households that were not able to meet a wide range of requirements.

By 2018 congestion had improved with a rating of 65%. Allocations of additional parcels of land in Njoro and Subukia were instrumental in the reduction of the congestion. Each of the new parcels took at least 1/3 of the 810 households; thereby reducing the congestion at the Nakuru Displaced Pipeline. Similarly, dignity/self-esteem improved with a rating of 65% again driven largely by the two additional parcels of lands in Njoro and Subukia.

Aspects that have not been promising include employment (45%), insecurity (47%), and medical services (43%). Of these aspects, employment was the most surprising. From the onset, the government and the Aid agencies should have focused on competencies necessary for employment and integration. Members of the focused group discussion had reported that security was still a challenge particularly for women and girls.

Accordingly, the change in the order of the occupation and emergence of farming as the principal occupation was attributed to three fundamental developments: (a) purchase of the land and cultivation at the Nakuru Displaced Pipeline Complex; (b) allocation of farm and subsequent cultivation at Njoro area; and (c) allocation of farm and subsequent cultivation at the Subukia area. The three farms are held in the form of shares that enable each of the displaced households to have a portion for cultivation. It is instructive to note that the two farms, one in Njoro and the one in Subukia are partly owned by the displaced households because there are still disputes with the previous farmworkers who are also claiming some stakes in the two farms. Notwithstanding the dispute, most of the displaced households were planting maize in the three (3) parcels of land and some of them had even established enterprises that included shops for various hardware and other items.

Also, some of the women around the Nakuru Pipeline Displaced Complex engaged in income-generating activities that included trade in second-hand clothing (mitumba), factory work, selling vegetables, making illicit liquors, tailoring, and prostitution are all options. Some were even allowed to visit their fields while working from rented space. In comparison, whereas 67% were employed before displacement in Afghanistan, 57% were reported to be engaged in part-time skilled, underpaid, and seasonal-bound jobs (Samuel Hall, 2013). Others were engaged in self-employed activities that ranged from shopkeeping to street vending.

Recovery on household income using monthly income by 2018 showed that most of the households had shifted to the category of earning between 5,000 and 10,000 KES per month (which was in the range of more than USD 1.6 per day). With an average household size of between 3 and 5 members, most of the internally displaced still lived below the poverty line of less than 5,000 KES per month (or 1.80 EUR, 2.00 USD per day. As in the previous reports, displaced households spent their income on meeting immediate needs, with 61% on food, 14% on energy, 9% on clothing, and medical treatment. Expenditure on these goods was their primary priority, accounting for nearly 93% of their total resources. 67% of the households used credits (loans) with an average monthly loan of KES 3,700 which was 74% over and above their average income.

57% of household heads belonged to some self-help groups for purposes of supporting livelihood and participated regularly to support cultivation, commercial, and saving ventures. The key aspect of the Nakuru Displaced pipeline Complex is their Njoro-Subukia rural-based farming, where the operations required joint efforts and collaboration.

Key agencies that provided emergency responses and attended to some of the needs of the displaced households did not provide measures to ensure sustainability such as re-training members of the households to adapt to new careers. Other examples existed where Greater economic and employment opportunities from the Africa Trust Fund (ATF) have supported displaced households in the Horn of Africa region to adapt to sustainable careers and various SME options. There were few chances for capacity-building or vocational training openings to enable displaced households to build new occupations. This could have been particularly important for rural IDPs who had to find work in an urban setting where many displaced families could not earn enough to cover their daily expenses for food, water, transportation, gasoline, and essential non-food goods like toilet paper, sanitary napkins, soap, detergent, and toothpaste.

Assessment of any commercial support services towards the establishment of a vocational or business venture was done and about 68% indicated NO; and 32% reported that they were aware but had not accessed the services. From the FGD, we established that they were aware of the NCCK micro-finance and credit program (SMEP) which targeted Christians in NCCK. Besides, Females in Pain conducted training workshops for displaced women to enable them to develop ideas and strategies for starting and sustaining income-generating activities. However, the repayment terms were based on the economic sustainability rate which was relatively expensive for most of the households particularly those headed by extremely low-income persons

Conclusions

Although we identified key dimensions of recovery and by extension resilience, it will be important to refine the scope of those dimensions to form part of the pre- and post-displacement interventions. Given the occurrence of processes that induce disasters and displacement, social development efforts should be directed to the reduction of vulnerabilities, including socio-ecological vulnerabilities. Such measures will ensure that when disasters and displacements occur, it will be possible for the people, and citizens, to recover, adapt to new environments, and continue with their livelihoods. Reduction of severity in magnitude and duration will need to be an integral part of the social development planning.

References

1. Boano, C., Zetter, R., & Morris, T. (2008). *Environmentally displaced people: Understanding the linkages between environmental change, livelihoods and forced migration*. Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford.
2. Department for International Development (DFID). (2011, November 1st). *Defining disaster resilience: A DFID approach paper*. DFID.
3. European Union (2017). *The new EU indicator of material and social deprivation*. EU.

4. Exeter, J. D., Zhao, J., Crengle, S., Lee, A., & Browne, M. (2017). The New Zealand Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD): A new suite of indicators for social and health research in Aotearoa, New Zealand. *PLoS One, 12*(8), e0181260. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0181260.
5. Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses. *Global Environmental Change*, *16*(3), 253–267.
6. Getanda, E. M., Papadopoulos, C., & Evans, H. (2015). The mental health, quality of life and life satisfaction of internally displaced persons living in Nakuru County, Kenya. *BMC Public Health*, *15*(1), 1–9.
7. IDMC, Norwegian Refugee Council, & Samuel Hall. (2012). Challenges of IDP Protection Research study on the protection of internally displaced persons in Afghanistan. *Reliefweb*. Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/report/afghanistan/challenges-idp-protection-research-study-protection-internally-displaced-persons.
8. Irish Aid. (2017). *Conflict and displacement: Voices of displacement and return in Central African Republic's neglected crisis*. Irish Aid.
9. Kamungi, P. (2013). *Municipalities and IDPs Outside of Camps: The case of Kenya's 'integrated' displaced persons*. BROOKINGS.
10. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607–610.
11. Majidi, N., & Hennion, C. (2014). Resilience in displacement? Building the potential of Afghan displaced women. *Journal of Internal Displacement, 4*(1), 78–91.
12. OCHA. (2017). Breaking the impasse: Reducing protracted internal displacement as a collective outcome. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/publications/report/world/breaking-impasse-reducing-protracted-internal-displacement-collective-outcome-enruuk.
13. Samuel Hall. (2016). *Review of durable solutions initiatives in East and Horn of Africa: Good practices, challenges and opportunities in the search of durable solutions*. Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat.
14. Samuel Hall. (2013). *Cash programme review for IDPs in the Kabul informal settlements*. Danish Refugee Council.
15. UN. (1951). *UN convention relating to the status of refugees*. UN.
16. UNHCR. (2009). *Conclusion on protracted refugee situations. No. 109 (LXI)*. UNHCR.
17. UNHCR. (2015). Global trends: Forced displacement in 2015. Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/576408cd7/unhcr-global-trends-2015.html.
18. UNHCR. (2016) Global trends: Forced displacement in 2016. Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/5943e8a34/global-trends-forced-displacement-2016.html.
19. UNHCR. (2018). Global trends: Forced displacement in 2017. Retrieved from https://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/5d08d7ee7/unhcr-global-trends-2018.html.
20. UNHCR-IOM-UNOPS-MoDM-KRG. (2007). *Socio-economic conditions of Internally Displaced Persons and their intentions*. UNHCR.

21. UNISDR. (2012). *Making cities resilient, world disaster reduction campaign*. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR).
22. Wisner, B., & Fordham, M. (2014). Vulnerability and capacity. In B. Freedman (Ed.), *Global environmental change*. *Handbook of global environmental pollution* (pp. 857–863). Springer.